The November 2012 election generated increased focus on demographic change and its potential impact on political representation in California, as well as the nation. Much of this discussion has focused on how the expected growth in the non-white population might reshape the electorate and, thus, potentially change the state’s political landscape.

From 2000 to 2012, California’s demographic landscape changed significantly. The Latino and Asian populations drove the state’s growth, increasing 32% (3.5 million) and 34% (1.2 million), respectively, while the white, non-Latino population, decreased 5.5% (-.9 million). The total Black population remained steady (adding 20,000) but declined as a proportion of the state’s population as a result of faster growth among Latinos and Asians. By 2012, Latinos made-up over 38% of the population, Asians, at 12.8% and Blacks 5.8%.1 By 2013, Latinos were projected to comprise nearly 39% percent of the state’s population—for the first time, essentially reaching parity with whites with regard to their share of the state’s total population.2 With these population shifts came substantial changes in California’s voting electorate.

Future increases in the Latino and Asian populations will vary significantly in size and location across California, meaning that changes in the strength of Latino and Asian voter growth will be uneven across the state in the coming decades. Projecting the extent and location of this demographic impact in California can help inform political expectations involving the state’s future population shifts.

Utilizing the California Civic Engagement Project’s analysis of Current Population Survey data and actual voter data, this brief addresses the following questions.3

1. Who will be California’s future eligible voters?
2. How might the state’s future demographic trends reshape California’s vote?
3. How will changes in California’s regional population affect the political strength of underrepresented groups?

With population changes came dramatic shifts in the number of California’s voters. Utilizing Current Population Survey data, we identified that from 2000 to 2012 the number of Californians voting in elections increased 17%. While the number of non-Latino white voters declined by .4 million, Black, Asian and Latino voters all increased at rates outpacing increases in the citizen voting age population (CVAP) growth of these groups. Latinos nearly doubled their number of actual voters (by 1.5 million), Asian voters increased by two-thirds (.5 million) and Blacks experienced a 23% increase (.2 million).4
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Disparities in California Eligible Voter Turnout

Latinos and Asians are underrepresented in their share of California's vote because they both register and turn out to vote at rates much lower than the non-Latino white electorate. While eligible turnout rates have fluctuated since the 2000 general election (for comparable presidential and midterm elections), dramatic disparities in voter turnout by race and ethnicity have remained historically consistent in California through the 2012 election.

Among all eligible voters (defined here as citizens of voting age), California turnout was only 57.5% for the 2012 election (a decrease from 63.4% in 2008) – meaning over 40% of the state's eligible voters did not vote. Latino and Asian eligible voter turnout was essentially the same at only 48.5% and 48.6%, respectively. In contrast, non-Latino white eligible turnout was 64.3% - an almost 16 percentage point disparity in electoral participation compared to Latinos and Asians. Blacks also experienced lower eligible turnout than non-Latino Whites, although with a much smaller gap.5

Increases in the number of eligible voters contributed to a steady increase over the decade in the Latino and Asian share of the state's total votes cast (for comparable presidential and midterm elections). The white proportion of California's vote has declined 13.5 percentage points from 2000 to 2012.

But disparities in electoral participation still exist for people of color in California. Latinos’ and Asians’ share of the state vote is not representative compared to their share of the state's overall population, nor of their share of the state's eligible citizen voting population (CVAP). At 23.5%, the 2012 Latino share of California's general vote remains below their 26.4% share of the state's 2012 CVAP and far below the nearly 39% Latino share of the state's total population. At 10.3% of the vote, Asians are below their 12.3% of the state's 2012 CVAP and below their 13% share of the total population. In contrast, Blacks hold a larger share of the state's vote in comparison to their share of the CVAP and total populations.5

Dramatic disparities in turnout by race and ethnicity have remained historically consistent in California through the 2012 election.
Any assessment of what the future of California’s voting electorate might look like requires projecting changes both in the state’s total population (all ages and citizenship status) and the state’s citizen voting age population (CVAP). For California, there has been much speculation around what continued high Latino and Asian population growth might bring to the state’s citizen voting population. Examining the state’s projected population growth, we found that both these groups will make the fastest growing block of voters in the state over the next 30 years.\(^7\)

Just as the Latino and Asian population grew by impressive numbers over the last decade, they both are projected to continue their population growth by large percentages for the next three decades. While California’s total population growth is projected at 26% from 2012 to 2040, the Latino and Asian populations are projected to grow 48% and 32.5%, respectively. The Black population will increase only 8% and non-Latino whites, 2.5%. Latinos will drive the state’s population shifts, comprising 70% of its total growth.

We can see in the above chart, that parity between the Latino and non-Latino white populations is reached in about 2013. After this year, Latinos steadily outpace non-Latino whites to grow to 45% of the state’s total population in 2040, while the non-Latino white population steadily declines.

Also growing dramatically is California’s citizen voting age population (those citizen eligible to vote). Based on current projections, total CVAP will increase 35% over the same 30 years with Latino CVAP increasing 94% (5.8 million). Asian CVAP is projected to increase 43% (1.3 million), Black CVAP at 15% (.2 million) and non-Latino white at only 2% (.2 million).

In contrast to projected trends in the total population, the gap between the non-Latino white and Latino proportion of CVAP remains quite large in 2012. These two groups are projected to not reach close to parity until 2040. Additionally, we expect the Asian proportion of CVAP to increase slightly, and Blacks and non-Latino whites to decrease their proportions of the citizen voting age population. Latinos are projected to comprise 71% of the state’s total CVAP growth through 2040. The gap between the Latino proportion of the total population and the Latino proportion of the citizen voting age population is projected to narrow over the next three decades.

Note: These are straight line CVAP projections developed by the California Department of Finance for the UC Davis California Civic Engagement Project. These projections are based on assumptions that straight line birth rates, death rates, and immigration rates follow current trends under current laws. If immigration rates change beyond what is currently expected, these assumptions may over or understate population growth. Future adjustments to these projections will be made as new trends emerge.
2. How might the state’s future demographic trends reshape California’s vote?

Changing Political Representation: Projecting More Voters of Color

Since the November 2012 election, many analysts have attempted to assess how the vote might change in California given projected population changes. For the purposes of informing these discussions further, we engage in a qualified exercise calculating the projected change in the composition of California’s actual voters through the general election of 2040. For ease of discussion, we project the vote for the four numerically largest race and ethnic groups assuming two sets of eligible turnout rates constant through this period: the current 2012 eligible turnout rate for each group and the 2012 eligible turnout rate for non-Latino whites (the major racial group with the highest eligible turnout).8

Projecting the Vote: Utilizing 2012 Eligible Turnout Rates

Even though Blacks have a much higher 2012 eligible voter turnout rate than Latinos and Asians, they will still experience a decrease in their share of the vote largely due to increases in the sheer number of Latino and Asian voters in California.

When assuming current eligible turnout rates will remain constant, we see major changes in the state’s vote occurring with non-Latino whites and Latinos given projected shifts in their citizen voting age populations. If Latinos were to maintain their current eligible turnout rate of 48.5% (of course, in reality we would expect many fluctuations) through the 2040 general election, their percent of the state’s actual vote would rise considerably - to 33.2% in 2040. In contrast, assuming non-Latino whites maintain their 2012 turnout rates would decrease their share of California’s vote to 44.7%, over the same period. These projections show the increased influence Latinos will have on the state’s vote driven by their increases in the citizen voting age population.

Assuming their 2012 eligible turnout rate of 48.6% remains through 2040’s general election, Asians are projected to increase their share of the state’s vote only slightly. Even though California Blacks have a much higher 2012 eligible voter turnout rate than Latinos and Asians, they will still experience a decrease in their share of the vote largely due to increases in the sheer number of Latino and Asian voters in California.
Projecting the Vote: Eliminating Disparity in Eligible Voter Turnout Rates

What if the gap in eligible voter turnout rates were eliminated in California? To analyze this scenario, we project the vote in California over the next 30 years utilizing the 2012 non-Latino white eligible turnout rate for the four major race and ethnic groups in the state. If Latinos were able to achieve parity in their turnout rates with whites (a goal that has not yet been achieved in any statewide election), we project the Latino share of the vote would rise considerably. A 2012 eligible turnout rate for Latinos of 64.3% (the 2012 non-Latino white eligible turnout rate) would have translated to Latinos becoming 26.4% of the vote in 2012. If this turnout rate were held steady for Latinos through the 2040 general election, then Latinos would rise to 38% of the state’s total voters.

For Asians, achieving an eligible turnout rate the same as non-Latino whites would mean their share of California’s vote would increase only slightly. If eligible turnout reached parity for all groups, Blacks would experience an even greater decline in their share of the state’s vote, again, largely due to the greater increases in the number of Latino and Asian voters in California.

Additionally, bringing Latinos and Asians to the same eligible turnout rate as non-Latino whites makes their share of the vote equal to their share of the eligible citizen voting age population—meaning that California would finally have a voting electorate representative of its citizens. However, Latinos and Asians would still be underrepresented in the electorate compared to their total populations due to their lower citizenship levels. Please see the CCEP website for detailed data tables.

Midterm Turnout: Greater Disparity

It is important to note that eligible turnout rates are consistently lower (for all groups) in mid-term elections. However, disparities in turnout by race, ethnicity and age are even greater—meaning the turnout gap between historically underrepresented groups and whites/older voters is wider in mid-term elections. Projections for mid-term elections through 2038 (using 2010 group turnout rates) show a smaller gain for Latinos and Asians in their share of the state’s vote—an increase to 28.3% and 9.6%, respectively in 2038. Conversely, non-Latino whites will lose less of their vote share—reduced to 47.1% in 2038, compared to a 44.7% share of the vote in the presidential election year of 2040.

Note: This exercise utilized straight line CVAP projections that consider proportional differences in the youth and citizen population for each race/ethnic group examined. We also know that youth are less likely to participate than older citizens. However, levels of education and family income among Latinos are expected to increase and these two demographic factors are primary predictors of political participation (in general and Latino turnout). In order to more accurately project the detailed vote among eligible Latinos in California, future projections will be made considering detailed turnout rates by age, education and income, as well as increases in the levels of education and income among Latinos. Future voter projections should also consider the percentage naturalized vs. percentage native-born among Latino CVAP and their variation in eligible voter turnout rates.
On a national scale, population changes will bring shifts in the make-up of both eligible voters and actual voters. Our analysis of Pew Research Center U.S. population projections found that between 2012 and 2030, the U.S. citizen voting-age population is projected to increase 19%. However, in contrast to California, national population changes will not be driven as significantly by Latinos. While non-Latino white CVAP will decline 5.8%, Latino CVAP is projected to increase 67%, Asian CVAP will increase 78% and Black CVAP will grow nearly 30%. Latinos will drive only 39% of the nation’s total CVAP growth (16 million), compared to 22% for Asians (9 million) and 17% for Blacks (9 million). By 2030, non-Latino whites will be 63.7% of the nation’s CVAP, Latinos at 15.6%, Asians at 6.3% and Blacks at 13.7%.

Assuming that each major race and ethnic group keeps constant their 2012 eligible turnout rates through the 2032 general election, we see a sizable decrease in the non-Latino white share of the U.S. vote. By 2032, non-Latino whites are projected to comprise 67.2% of the U.S. vote, down from 73.7% in 2012. If Latinos keep their current U.S. eligible turnout rate of 48% steady (in reality we would expect many fluctuations) through 2032, their percent of the state’s vote would rise to 12.4%, up from 8.4% in 2012. We also project that Asians would move to 4.9% of the nation’s vote in 2032. In contrast to California, U.S. Blacks would increase their share of the vote to 14.9% by 2032.

**What if disparity in voter turnout were eliminated in the U.S.?**

We also project the vote in the U.S. until 2032 utilizing the 2012 U.S. non-Latino white eligible turnout rate for the nation’s four largest race and ethnic groups. If Latinos were able to achieve parity in their turnout rates with whites, we project that the Latino share of the U.S. electorate would rise considerably. A 2012 eligible turnout rate for Latinos of 64.1% (the 2012 U.S. non-Latino white eligible turnout rate) would have translated to Latinos achieving 11.2% of the vote in 2012. If this rate were held steady for Latinos through the 2032 general election, then Latinos would rise to 15.6% of the nation’s total voters.

For Asians, an eligible turnout rate the same as non-Latino whites would mean their share of U.S. vote would increase to 6.3% in 2032. Blacks would experience an increase of about the same size as when projecting the vote through 2032. Note: The U.S. Black eligible turnout rate is higher than the non-Latino white turnout rate. Consequently, we utilized this rate for both sets of U.S. voter projections when calculating the Black vote. U.S. Blacks actually increase their share of U.S. vote over the next 30 years. Nationally, Blacks can expect a different political story over the next few decades than in California. It should be noted that the U.S. Black eligible turnout rate was historically high in 2012 (unlike in California). Voter projections based on this rate may not hold in future presidential elections.
The California Youth Vote: Declining Eligible Voters Will Bring Challenges

Examine population change in California by age uncovers a very different story than projecting growth by race and ethnicity. Not only is the youth proportion (defined here as age 18-24) of the state’s citizen voting age population projected to decline steadily over the next 20 years, this decline will occur for the youth of each major race and ethnic group. Not until after 2032 is the youth proportion of the general citizen voting age population projected to slightly increase. California’s eligible voter population will be steadily aging.10

The California Latino citizen voting age population (as well as its total population) will also be getting significantly older. California Latinos are projected to experience the largest decline in their youth proportion of any of the state’s major race and ethnic groups – from 23.1% in 2012 to 15.8% in 2040. Asian youth are projected to decline 2.3 percentage points, Black youth to decline 4.3 percentage points and non-Latino white youth should remain flat compared with their 2012 proportion (after a small decline for two decades). Essentially, California’s youth population has already come of age and “peaked” from record fertility rates two decades ago. While the total number of youth Latino CVAP will increase, older Latino age-groups will be expanding more greatly. Expectations of a growing influence for the young within the Latino population may be challenged by these projected trends. Please see the CCEP website for detailed data tables.

Note: From 2012 through 2040, the difference between the youth proportion of the state’s CVAP and the youth proportion of its total population will remain essentially steady – a difference between the two of a .5 percentage point in 2012 to a .8 percentage point in 2040.

Declines in the eligible voter share for youth will bring changes in the future make-up of the youth vote in California. Assuming constant the 2012 youth eligible turnout rate (41.6%) through the 2040 general election, we will see a sizable decrease in the youth share of California’s vote – from 10.7% in 2012 to 8.9% in 2040. In contrast, 65-74 year-olds (the age group with the highest voter turnout) are projected to increase their share of the state’s vote to 14.7% when keeping their 2012 turnout rate (68.3%) constant. Until about 2032, these two age groups are quite literally moving in the opposite directions with regard to vote share. From 2012 until just after 2020, youth are projected to continue to hold a larger share of the population (although declining). Youth are projected to continue to be underrepresented in the state’s vote share due to their much lower eligible voter turnout rates versus older age groups.
**Projecting Parity in Age Turnout**

If we assumed that young citizens voted at the same rates as older citizens, we would see a very different picture. We project the youth share of the state’s vote would be considerably higher and hold a larger share of California’s actual voters than the 65-74 year-old age group (utilizing their 2012 turnout rate - 68.3%). Based on their higher CVAP proportions, youth voters would outnumber older voters. We project that only after the 2020 general election, would youth become a smaller share of California’s actual vote as they become a smaller share of its eligible voter population (versus the 65-74 age group).

---

**3. How will changes in California’s regional population affect the political strength of underrepresented groups?**

**Projecting the Latino Population: The Rise of the San Joaquin Valley**

Growth in the citizen voting age population will vary greatly in size and timeline across California over the next 30 years. Projecting the magnitude and location of these future eligible voters can help inform expectations involving changes in the political landscape of the state.

Looking across California’s regions, the San Joaquin Valley and Los Angeles region are projected to drive much of the state’s growth in the Latino citizen voting age population through 2040. While the LA region is projected to increase its Latino CVAP by 2.7 million, it is the San Joaquin Valley that will experience the largest percentage increase in the Latino population (159%) among all of California’s regions – bringing the Latino percent of the San Joaquin Valley’s CVAP to 49.1%. Of the projected additional 2 million new citizen voting age residents in the San Joaquin Valley, Latinos will comprise 1.3 million of them – meaning that 65% of new eligible voters in the San Joaquin Valley are projected to be Latino.

---

*Of the projected additional 2 million new citizen voting age residents in the San Joaquin Valley, Latinos will comprise 1.3 million of them – meaning that 65% of new eligible voters in the San Joaquin Valley are projected to be Latino.*
At a regional level, large increases in eligible voters are projected to translate into a significant rise in Latino electoral participation by 2040. Of all of California’s regions, the San Joaquin Valley is projected to experience the largest percentage increase in the number of Latino actual voters – 159% from 2012 to 2040. Close behind is the North State area with a 153% increase in Latino voters and the Sacramento region at 125%.

Assuming that 2012 regional Latino eligible turnout rates remain constant (38.1%), we project the Latino share of the vote in the San Joaquin Valley will increase to 39% - 500,000 new Latino voters.

If the eligible turnout rate in the San Joaquin Valley reached parity with the non-Latino turnout rate (57.1%) the Latino share of the vote would increase to 49% - 900,000 new Latino voters. Four counties in the San Joaquin Valley would see 50% or larger Latino share of the vote (Kern-51%, Merced-53%, Fresno-54% and Tulare-60%). This is dramatic change for a region that many have considered to be underrepresented in terms of Latino elected officials and policy participation. Please see the CCEP website for detailed data tables by region.

Note: For regional vote projections, we utilized actual voter records provided by the Statewide Database. Current Population Survey data is not consistently available at regional level in California. Actual voter data produces a more conservative calculation of eligible voter turnout rates. Due to methodological differences, the regional analysis should not be directly compared with statewide projections of California’s vote on pages 4 and 5 of this brief. See note section for more discussion.

The Asian Vote: Strength of the San Francisco Bay Area

Growth in the Asian citizen voting age population will also vary greatly in size and timeline across California’s geography over the next 30 years. Looking across California’s regions, we found different growth patterns for the Asian citizen voting age population; the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles region are projected to drive much of their growth in the state through 2040.

The LA region is projected to lead the state with new Asian CVAP: .4 million of all its new eligible voters. However, the Asian proportion of CVAP in the LA region stays about the same through 2040.

The San Francisco Bay Area will experience the largest percentage point increase in the Asian share of CVAP from 2012 to 2040 – bringing their percent of the San Francisco Bay Area’s CVAP to 23.4%. Of the projected additional 1 million new citizen voting age residents in the Bay Area, Asians will comprise 380,000 of them – meaning that 38% of new eligible voters in the San Francisco Bay Area are projected to be Asian.
Of California’s regions, the North State area and San Joaquin Valley are projected to experience rapid increases in the number of Asian actual voters over the next 30 years. The North State area will have the largest percentage increase in the number of Asian voters (172%) from 2012 to 2040. Close behind is the San Joaquin Valley with a 128% increase in Asian voters. It is the San Francisco Bay Area that is projected to produce the highest increase in the total number of Asian voters. Assuming 2012 regional Asian eligible turnout rates remain constant (35.8%), we project the Asian share of the vote in the San Francisco Bay Area will increase from 12.2% in 2012 to 14.1% in 2040 - 130,000 new Asian voters. If the eligible turnout rate in the San Francisco Bay Area reached parity with the non-Asian turnout rate (66.6%) the Asian share of the vote would increase to 23.4% - 560,000 new Latino voters. Four counties in the Bay Area would see a 20% or larger Asian share of the vote (San Mateo-27%, Alameda-27%, San Francisco-32% and Santa Clara-35%). Achieving parity in Bay Area eligible voter turnout rates produces a strong boost to the number of Asian voters due to the Bay Area’s high disparity in 2012 eligible turnout rates (and historically in the region, as well). The SF Bay Area has the largest percentage point difference between Asian eligible turnout and non-Asian eligible turnout rates among all regions in California.

California’s Eligible Non-Voters

By 2040, California is projected to have 31.7 million eligible voters (registered and non-registered to vote). If 2012 group eligible turnout rates remain constant, California will have an eligible non-voting population of 14.1 million. Due to disparities in eligible turnout rates, Latinos and Asians will be disproportionately represented in this number - 44% will be Latino and 15% will be Asian. Just as both of these groups will be increasing their share of the state’s vote, over the next 30 years, they will also be increasing their share of the state’s eligible non-voters. Only if disparities in turnout rates were eliminated, would Latino and Asians (along with other every race and ethnic group) hold a proportion of eligible non-voters that is commensurate with their proportion of all those eligible to vote.
California’s eligible electorate will dramatically change over the next 30 years. If projections hold, it will gain 8.3 million new eligible voters – 8 million of which will be people of color (non-white). By sheer population change, the state will shift from an electorate historically (and still currently) proportionately dominated by non-Latino whites. Already by the 2016 elections, California is projected to have a majority-minority electorate. For the first time, non-Latino whites will fall below 50% of the state’s eligible voters. By 2040, Latinos and Asians combined are projected to be just over 50% of California’s actual voters (assuming parity with non-Latino and non-Asian turnout rates) – and over 60% of the vote in many counties within the state.

However, an increased share of the state’s vote does not automatically mean a representative democracy for California. If disparities in eligible voter turnout rates remain, then Latinos and Asians in the state are projected to continue to hold a share of the vote that is not commensurate with their proportion of the eligible citizen voting age population. If new eligible non-white voters are not transitioned into actual voters at a rate that is at least on pace with their increasing proportions of the electorate then the state’s voting population could become even less representative.

**Mobilizing California’s Eligible Non-Voters**

As the landscape of the state’s electorate shifts, it is likely that its political landscape will change as well. A larger political voice for historically underrepresented groups matters. Recent national level research supports the conclusion that those who vote in the current electorate often do not represent the views of those who don’t vote, particularly on issues related to economic policy. Current voters tend to be more conservative on issues of resource distribution than non-voters. As the make-up of California’s voting electorate changes over time, the interests and needs of its new members may push the state’s political structure to adjust its issue priorities.

Understanding the characteristics of California’s eligible non-voters will be key to mobilization and reform efforts aimed at increasing participation in California’s electoral system. In particular, targeting young, lower income and lower educated voters of color (historically less likely to vote) and bringing their perspective into the electoral system has the potential to have even greater impact on policy change.

**Demographic Hot Spots**

Identifying hot spots of eligible non-voters brings strategic opportunities for increasing the voice and interests of underrepresented communities within the polical process. This research will be critical for the Black and youth vote in California, as declining population proportions will challenge efforts to raise the voice of these groups in the state’s political process. As California’s population ages, policies and programming focused on youth could be impacted. In upcoming briefs, the CCEP will expand its analysis of California’s changing electorate, highlighting geographic areas of critical voter mass, by age and race and ethnicity. Achieving a fully participating electorate is critical to ensuring a fully representative and responsive democratic system for California.

**NEXT BRIEF:**

*Examining California’s Eligible Non-Voters: Geographic Opportunities for Expanding the State’s Voting Population*
The California Civic Engagement Project
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1 United States Census Bureau 2000 Decennial Census and American Community Survey, 2007-2011 5 year estimates. The term Latino is utilized interchangeably for Hispanic in this brief. The term Black is utilized in this brief to include individuals who have reported their race as Black or Africa-American based on available U.S. Census classifications.

2 California Department of Finance P-3: State and County Total Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity and Detailed Age, 2010-2060.


7 Analysis based on California Department of Finance P-3: State and County Total Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity and Detailed Age, 2010-2060. CVAP analysis based on straight line citizen voting age populations (CVAP) projections developed by the California Department of Finance for the California Civic Engagement Project. If immigration rates change beyond what is currently expected, these assumptions may over or understate population growth. If there are any significant changes in immigration, birth, or death rates, projections will need to be adjusted accordingly. For more information on the CVAP projections, see the CCEP website: http://regionalchange.ucdavis.edu/projects/california-civic-engagement-project-ccep. For more information on the base population projections please consult: http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/projections/P-1/documents/Projections_Methodology_2013.pdf.

8 CCEP voter projections utilized straight line CVAP projections developed by the California Department of Finance for the California Civic Engagement Project (CCEP). Baseline eligible voter turnout rates were generated by CCEP analysis of Current Population Survey, 2012 November Supplement on Voting and Registration: California data.


10 CCEP youth voter projections utilized straight line CVAP projections developed by the California Department of Finance for the California Civic Engagement Project (CCEP). Baseline eligible voter turnout rates were generated by CCEP analysis of Current Population Survey, 2012 November Supplement on Voting and Registration: California data.

11 2012-2040 regional voter projections utilize 2012 voter data acquired from the Statewide Database and aggregated to the county and regional levels. These data are the state's actual registration and voter records and not representative samples. Data for the following counties were unavailable and excluded from 2012 turnout estimates: Calaveras, Glenn, San Benito and Yuba. Latinos and Asians are distinguished in the data from the general population by the use of surname lists which identify registrants with commonly occurring Spanish and Asian surnames. The Passel-Word Spanish surname list, published by the US Census Bureau, was utilized to identify Latinos. Surname matching is not reliable for white, non-Hispanic, and African-American populations, and thus, voter data is not available for these groups. For more information on methodology and limitations, please see: http://swdb.berkeley.edu/d10/Creating%20CA%20Redistricting%20Database.pdf. Regions defined to include the following counties. Sacramento Region: Sacramento, El Dorado, Placer, Sutter, Yolo, Yuba; San Francisco Region: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin; Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma; LA Region: Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura; San Joaquin Valley: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings, Kern, Tulare; North State: Butte, Del Norte, Lassen, Modoc, Siskiyou, Humboldt, Shasta; Central Coast: Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara; San Diego: San Diego.

12 Please see: Leighley and Nagler. 2013. Who Votes Now? Demographics, Issues, Inequality, and Turnout in the United States
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