Latino Voters and the November 2025 Special Election: Redistricting and Representation

Dr. Raquel Centeno (Caltech Linde Center for Science, Society, and Policy)[1]

Dr. Jarred Cuellar (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona)[2]

Executive summary: This nonpartisan and educational report analyzes the impact of the proposed Proposition 50 map on Latino representation across California, with a focus on how the proposed map would alter Latino-majority and Latino-influence congressional districts if it is adopted by voters. Our analysis finds that the proposed map will likely not negatively impact Latino voting power. The proposed map instead diffuses and enhances that power across more districts, and in many ways reflects the changing demographics of communities within the state. While the current map increased Latino voting power over the previous map, we also find that the proposed Proposition 50 map will further increase Latino voting power over the current Commission map. The proposed map will likely *increase* Latino voting power, given its creation of two new Latino community influence districts and the expansion of the Latino electorate in other districts.

Key findings of this report:

• The current map has 16 Latino-majority districts, and the proposed Proposition 50 map maintains 16 Latino-majority districts. From our review of the maps, both the current map passed by the Commission and the Proposition 50 map being presented to voters enhance Latino voting strength and Latino communities of interest over their predecessor maps.

• The current map has 14 Latino-majority districts that frequently elect candidates preferred by Latino voters, and the proposed map is likely to improve Latino representation by creating 16 Latino-majority districts that frequently elect Latino voters' preferred candidates.

• The current map has 6 Latino-influence districts, and the Proposition 50 map will increase the number of Latino-influence districts to 8.

• The proposed Proposition 50 map will likely increase Latino descriptive representation—the election of Latino representatives—via the creation of a new Latino-majority District 41 in southeastern Los Angeles County, as well as the likely reelection of the Latino representative in

---

neighboring District 42. New Latino-influence districts in the proposed map may also provide new opportunities for Latino candidate emergence.

• Latino voters are the largest minority group in California and are increasingly flexing voting power. Both the current map passed by the Commission and the Proposition 50 map reflect this Latino voting power in the state, though differential turnout between Latino voters and non-Latino voters in California plays a critical role in who gets elected and who is represented.

I. Introduction & Context

Purpose of the Report

This nonpartisan and educational report examines the potential effects of California's Proposition 50 on Latino voters, who constitute nearly forty percent of the state's population and 32% of the citizen voting-age population, and play a central role in shaping the state's political future. Although redistricting has implications for all Californians, the Latino electorate merits focused analysis because of its size, regional distribution, and internal diversity. Latino communities are not a uniform constituency; they differ significantly across urban, suburban, and rural regions in terms of socioeconomic status, citizenship rates, linguistic backgrounds, and political participation. These variations influence both how district boundaries translate into political representation and how redistricting changes may amplify or diminish Latino influence in congressional elections.

By isolating the specific effects of Proposition 50 on Latino voters, this report aims to identify where the proposed temporary redistricting process may alter opportunities for representation. Specifically, we examine and compare the current congressional map and the new map that would be put in place temporarily if Prop 50 passes. Understanding these differences is essential to determining whether Proposition 50 strengthens or weakens pathways to equitable representation for California's Latino population.

Background on Proposition 50 and Redistricting

Proposition 50, officially titled the *Election Rigging Response Act*, proposes a temporary transfer of congressional redistricting authority in California from the California Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission to the state Legislature for the 2026, 2028, and 2030 election cycles. The measure would allow voters to put into place a new congressional map put on the ballot by the Legislature that complies with federal requirements such as equal population and contiguity. After the 2030 Census, redistricting authority would revert to the Citizens Redistricting Commission under the standard decennial process.

California's independent redistricting framework was established through voter initiatives in 2008 and 2010 to reduce partisan influence and enhance public accountability. The Citizens

Redistricting Commission has since been regarded as a model for transparent and nonpartisan mapmaking. Proposition 50 would temporarily alter this structure, introducing new maps that voters will consider in 2025. Understanding this institutional shift provides essential context for evaluating its potential implications for Latino political representation and the broader distribution of congressional influence across the state.

How Redistricting Has Historically Shaped Latino Representation in California

Redistricting has played a decisive role in shaping Latino political representation in California. Major gains in Latino representation have occurred in response to redistricting, such as historic local changes made through *Garza v. County of Los Angeles* and other significant redraws. Across successive census cycles, boundary changes have expanded and constrained Latino electoral influence, affecting the creation and preservation of majority-Latino and Latino-opportunity districts under the Voting Rights Act—and preserving and enhancing Latino communities of interest. The establishment of the Citizens Redistricting Commission in 2010 marked a significant institutional shift toward greater transparency and reduced partisan manipulation, and commission-drawn maps have generally corresponded with increases in Latino-majority districts and officeholders.

Nevertheless, disparities persist between Latino population size and political representation, reflecting not only the enduring sensitivity of redistricting to Latino voting power but also broader structural factors such as turnout, citizenship, and candidate recruitment. As such, redistricting remains a central mechanism through which Latino inclusion and influence in California's democratic process continue to be negotiated.

II. Demographic Overview

Latino Population Trends in California

Latinos comprise roughly 40 percent of California's total population, making them the state's largest demographic group (NALEO 2024). Their political influence continues to expand within the *Citizen Voting-Age Population* (CVAP)—the segment of residents aged 18 and older who are U.S. citizens and therefore eligible to vote—which serves as a key metric in voting-rights and redistricting analyses (U.S. Census Bureau 2025). As of the most recent 2019–2023 CVAP tabulation, Latinos constitute approximately 32.4 percent of California's total CVAP, underscoring their growing weight within the state's eligible electorate (NALEO 2024 & Redistricting Data Hub 2025).

From 2012 to 2022, the Latino CVAP expanded from 6.4 million to 8.5 million—an increase of 32.5 percent that accounted for more than 90 percent of the state's overall growth in eligible voters during that period (NALEO 2024). This sustained expansion positions Latino voters as an

increasingly central constituency in California's political landscape and a focal point for assessing electoral equity under any proposed redistricting changes.

Spatially, Latino populations are most concentrated in Los Angeles County, which remains the single largest Latino population center in the United States. The Inland Empire (Riverside and San Bernardino Counties) is now majority Latino—about 52 percent of residents identify as Latino (OCPSC 2025)—and the Central Valley also hosts numerous majority-Latino counties. Significant concentrations extend across the Central Coast, San Diego, Imperial, and inner Bay Area regions as well (UCLA Latino Policy & Politics Institute 2021; U.S. Census 2020). At least 11 of California's 58 counties now have Latino majorities.

While the overall state population has stabilized, Latino growth within the electorate has continued due to natural increase, naturalization, and aging into voting eligibility. Recent *CVAP* data from the 2019–2023 American Community Survey confirm that Latinos are steadily increasing their share of California's eligible-voter base (U.S. Census 2025).

These demographic and geographic patterns are directly relevant to redistricting. Latino population concentration—particularly in the Inland Empire and the Central Valley—creates opportunities for drawing districts where Latino voters can flex electoral power and elect candidates of their choice. Conversely, uneven growth or dispersed settlement in suburban regions raises the risk that new district lines could divide cohesive Latino communities, diluting their collective influence. As Proposition 50 proposes temporary changes to congressional map-drawing authority, these evolving demographic realities underscore the importance of evaluating how any interim maps will reflect, or potentially distort, California's Latino electorate.

Political Participation in Congressional Elections

Latino engagement in California is increasingly consequential in congressional contests, though participation remains uneven and sensitive to electoral context. Registration among Latinos has grown, but gaps persist relative to their share of the citizen voting-age population. According to NALEO's 2024 portrait, Latino registered voters make up about 30% of California's total registered voters—while Latinos account for roughly 36% of the state's eligible electorate (i.e., citizen voting-age population). This disparity suggests that a nontrivial share of eligible Latinos have not yet registered, limiting their potential influence in all elections, including those for the U.S. House.

When it comes to turnout in congressional and midterm cycles, Latino participation tends to fluctuate with electoral competitiveness. Historical data from the California Voter Turnout Project show that, in general elections, Latino voters are under-mobilized in off-year cycles compared to presidential years. Given that congressional elections typically occur in these lower-turnout contexts, the consistency of Latino engagement is especially critical to representation and

policy responsiveness. Further, while Latino voters often prefer Democrats in California, cohesion levels can vary within the diverse Latino voter populace.[3]

Examples of Districts in Current Map Where Latino Participation Was Key in 2022 and 2024

In several recent House races, Latino turnout—and the success or underperformance of Latino-preferred candidates—was pivotal:

- **CA-13 (Central Valley)**: A majority-Latino district (50.2% Latino CVAP) where Democrat Adam Gray defeated Republican John Duarte by just 187 votes in 2024, following Duarte's 564-vote win in 2022. Latino voters supported Gray both cycles, and minor shifts in turnout likely determined the outcome.[4] While the Latino-preferred candidate won narrowly in 2024, the opposite occurred in 2022.
- **CA-22 (Kings, Tulare, and Kern Counties)**: A 59% Latino CVAP district where Rep. David Valadao (R), who is of Portuguese descent, has not been the Latino-preferred candidate. Most Latino voters supported Democrat Rudy Salas, yet Valadao's victories in 2022 and 2024 were sustained by lower Latino turnout and stronger participation among non-Latino voters. This pattern highlights how turnout gaps—rather than a simple focus purely on the Latino CVAP—can dilute Latino electoral power.
- **CA-27 (Northern Los Angeles County)**: Roughly 33% Latino CVAP, this district defeated the incumbent in 2024 after several close contests, reflecting the influence and mobilization among younger and suburban Latino voters in a competitive district.
- **CA-41 (Inland Empire)**: At 29.7% Latino CVAP, this district remained competitive across 2022 and 2024, with margins narrow enough that Latino turnout increases could materially affect future results if this district is not changed. This district did not elect candidates in 2022 and 2024 preferred by Latino voters, but was electorally competitive.

In sum, Latino political participation in congressional elections reflects a dynamic interplay of voter registration levels, turnout volatility, Latino voter cohesion, and generational renewal. Because U.S. House outcomes in California can hinge on narrow margins, mobilizing Latino voters—especially in competitive and Latino-majority districts—can directly shape representation. Proposition 50's temporary redistricting framework must therefore be assessed not only in terms of population balance, but also in how new district boundaries either strengthen or weaken the ability of Latino-preferred candidates to translate community support into electoral success.

---

[3] Jarred R. Cuellar. 2025. "*Fe y Politicas*: Latino Evangelical Vote Choice in the 2020 Presidential Election." *Religions* 16(6):708. Also see Matt Barreto. 2010. *Ethnic Cues: The Role of Shared Ethnicity in Latino Political Participation.*

[4] These data on voting preferences are taken from analysis of individual-level survey data and additional analysis of homogenous precincts. For survey data, please see the California Elections and Policy Poll of 2024 California congressional districts. In California, survey data shows that a majority of Latino voters prefer Democratic candidates of choice.

III. Latino Representation in Current vs. Proposed Maps

Current Map: 16 Latino-majority Districts and 6 Latino-influence Districts

The maps created by the California Citizens Redistricting Commission during the 2020 redistricting cycle resulted in a noteworthy 16 Latino-majority districts and 6 Latino-influence districts. *Latino-majority districts* are districts in which Latinos make up a majority of the citizen voting age population, meaning campaigns in these districts are incentivized to campaign for and mobilize Latino voters. We define *Latino-influence districts* as those in which Latinos are a significantly sized minority, meaning they are at or above 30.0% of the district's CVAP but below 50.0% Latino CVAP. In these districts, Latinos are a large enough portion of the voting population to play an influential role in election outcomes.

The current map was drawn to comply with the Voting Rights Act, ensuring that Latino voters have fair opportunities to elect candidates of their choice in districts where they form a sufficiently large and cohesive community.[5] Many of these districts are concentrated in the Central Valley and interior communities including San Bernardino, Riverside, and Imperial Counties. Table 1 lists all Latino-majority districts under the current map, and Table 2 lists the Latino-influence districts in the current map. The districts are listed in order of highest to lowest Latino CVAP.

Table 1: Latino-Majority Congressional Districts Under Current Map

District	Representative	% Latino CVAP in Commission map
22	Valadao	59.4%
35	Torres	57.4%
34	Gomez	56.1%
38	Sánchez	55.6%
31	Cisneros	54.7%
29	Rivas	54.2%
21	Costa	53.3%
25	Ruiz	52.5%
33	Aguilar	52.5%
42	Garcia	52.4%
39	Takano	51.2%
52	Vargas	51.1%

---

[5] Christian R. Grose and Lucien LaScala. 2023 "The Supreme Court Supports Voting Rights - with massive implications for congressional redistricting." *3Streams Blog/Medium.*

44	Barragán	51.0%
18	Lofgren	50.5%
46	Correa	50.5%
13	Gray	50.2%

Source: https://wedrawthelines.ca.gov/final-maps/. Percentages rounded to nearest tenth, based on 2020 Census for each district as reported by the Citizens Redistricting Commission.

Table 2: Latino Community Influence Districts Under Current Map

District	Representative	% Latino CVAP in Commission map
43	Waters	44.0%
37	Kamlager-Dove	38.7%
27	Whitesides	33.3%
23	Obernolte	32.8%
26	Brownley	31.6%
9	Harder	31.0%

Source: https://wedrawthelines.ca.gov/final-maps/. Percentages rounded to nearest tenth, based on 2020 Census for each district as reported by the CA Citizens Redistricting Commission.

With Latino-majority districts totaling approximately 30% of California's 52 congressional districts, it is clear why Latinos are an important group within the electorate. When including the six Latino-influence districts in the current map, Latinos are a sizable portion of the electorate in over 40% of the state's districts. Latino-majority districts are spread throughout the state, generally found in places with historically large concentrations of Latinos. Of the five districts with the highest Latino CVAP, one is in the Central Valley (CD 22); three are in the greater Los Angeles region (CDs 31, 34, and 38); and one is in the Inland Empire (CD 35). Most of these districts are concentrated in the Central Valley or further south.

However, just because Latinos are the majority (or even a large minority) of a district does not mean it is a guarantee that a Latino candidate of choice will be elected. Racial turnout gaps and fluctuations in electoral competitiveness sometimes result in lower than expected levels of support for Latino candidates of choice, even within Latino-majority districts. For example, in the rural and agricultural communities of CD 22, lower Latino turnout in part led to the Latino candidate of choice losing the 2024 election. Increases in the size of the Latino electorate even in already Latino-majority districts in the proposed map could result in meaningful differences in election outcomes. These changes could be especially palpable in districts like CD 22 where the Latino electorate tends to be lower in socioeconomic status and younger, making mobilizing lower-propensity voters especially challenging. Similarly in the current Commission-drawn CD 13, the Latino candidate of choice has not always won in this district.

Taking into account how frequently Latino candidates of choice are elected in these districts, the current map has 14 districts that are effectively providing an opportunity to elect Latino voters' preferred candidates in every election since the map was put into place. However, two of the 16

Latino CVAP-majority districts in the current map passed by the commission—CD 13 and CD 22—are not effectively providing Latino voters' preferred candidates the opportunity to win. In 2022, the Latino-preferred candidate lost in both CD 13 and CD 22; and in 2024, Latino voters' preferred candidate lost in CD 22.[6]

Proposed Map: 16 Latino-majority Districts and 8 Latino-influence Districts

The new map maintains the same number of Latino-majority districts as the current map, and it increases the number of districts that will provide effective opportunities for Latino voters to elect candidates of choice. Even with changes to district boundaries, the proposed Proposition 50 map will result in 16 Latino-majority congressional districts. Table 4 shows the percentage of the Latino CVAP in each of the majority-Latino districts in the proposed map. In general, most of the Latino-majority districts under the current map remain a Latino-majority district in the proposed map. The Prop 50 map maintains the same number of Latino-majority districts as the current map.

In fact, a number of Latino-majority districts in the proposed Proposition 50 map change very little relative to the current map. For instance, the Latino-majority District 18 and the Latino-majority District 34 had only minimal changes over the current map. District 18 was created by the Commission in 2020 to provide an additional Latino-opportunity district representing Salinas Valley communities of interest. This district faces minimal changes in the proposed Proposition 50 map and thus maintains Latino voting strength in this region. District 34 is a historically Latino district that has existed over many redistricting cycles and includes eastern sections of the city of Los Angeles, and this district is maintained with significant Latino voting strength.

There is one new Latino-majority district created in the Proposition 50 map that was a non-Hispanic white-majority district in the current map (CD 41, bolded in Table 4). This white-majority CD 41 is represented by Ken Calvert in the current map. The proposed map shifts CD 41 to the west to create a new Latino-majority district centered in the Gateway cities area of southeastern Los Angeles County. This shift of CD 41 into a new Latino-majority district caused one district (CD 42) to have a meaningful decrease in Latino CVAP. It appears that this change occurred because CD 42 was altered to create CD 41 around the Gateway cities community of interest area and to increase the Latino CVAP of CD 41. Public testimony during the 2020 Commission process frequently identified the northern Gateway cities as a community of interest and the city of Long Beach as a separate community of interest, and this significant level of testimony may have factored into the newly proposed CD 41 in the Proposition 50 map.

---

[6] We examined individual-level survey data in these districts, as well as conducted an analysis of homogenous precincts to draw these empirical conclusions. For instance, surveys we have conducted of congressional districts showed that the Latino-preferred candidates lost in both CD 13 and CD 22 in 2022, and in CD 22 in 2024. Thus, while these districts are majority-Latino CVAP, the districts are not effectively electing the candidates that a majority of Latino voters voted for.

Where CD 41 is not a Latino-influence district in the current map, in the proposed map it has the third highest Latino CVAP proportion in the state. The current map's CD 42 is Latino-majority, and in the new map it is centered in Long Beach and coastal Orange County. The proposed CD 42 is a racially and ethnically diverse district with slightly less than half of the district's CVAP being voters of color. CD 42 will likely continue to elect the Latino representative who currently represents Long Beach in the current map if Proposition 50 passes and if voters of color vote in coalition for this Latino representative, even though it is no longer Latino-CVAP majority.

Table 4: Majority Latino Congressional Districts in Prop 50 Proposed Map

District	Representative	% Latino CVAP	Change from 2020 Commission Map
22	Valadao	65.4%	+6.0%
44	Barragán	62.3%	+11.3%
41	Calvert	55.0%	+25.3%
34	Gomez	54.9%	-1.2%
33	Aguilar	54.5%	+2.0%
21	Costa	54.4%	+1.1%
39	Takano	54.3%	+3.1
13	Gray	53.8%	+3.6%
29	Rivas	53.6%	-0.6%
35	Torres	53.1%	-4.3%
18	Lofgren	53.0%	+2.5%
46	Correa	52.7%	+2.2%
38	Sánchez	52.6%	-3.0%
31	Cisneros	52.2%	-2.5%
25	Ruiz	52.1%	-0.4%
52	Vargas	51.8%	+0.7%

Source: https://aelc.assembly.ca.gov/proposed-congressional-map. Percentages rounded to nearest tenth, based on 2020 Census for each district as reported by the CA State Assembly.

While the number of Latino-majority districts remains the same, the proposed map does shift the share of Latino voting power across districts. There is an increase in the Latino CVAP of ten districts, and in eight of those districts, the Latino CVAP would be at least two percentage points higher than in the current map. Such a change is noteworthy because even a two percentage point increase in Latino CVAP can make a meaningful difference for Latino candidates of choice, and two districts see even greater jumps in their Latino CVAP. If Proposition 50 is passed, CD 22 in the Central Valley would have a 6 percentage point higher Latino CVAP and CD 41 in southern California would have a 25 percentage point higher Latino CVAP than in the current map.

Not all districts in the proposed map would increase the size of their Latino electorate. The Latino CVAP would decrease in six Latino-majority districts. However, these decreases would generally be small, hovering around one percentage point or less. Of the Latino-majority districts

in the Proposition 50 map, CD 35 and CD 38 are the two districts that would see the largest decreases in their Latino electorate, with about a 4%-point drop to 53.1% and a 3.0%-point drop to 52.6%, respectively. However, given that these districts still have high enough Latino CVAPs to not even fall to the bottom of the list in Table 4, there is reason to believe the proposed map would not significantly dilute the Latino voting power in these districts.

To summarize, the Latino CVAP increased in a number of proposed districts where Latino voters have not had meaningful voting strength, and the percentage point increases are relatively significant. In districts where Latino CVAP declined, most of these declines are relatively small and in districts where Latino voters' preferred candidates are winning in the current Commission map and will likely continue winning in the Proposition 50 map. Only in CD 42 was there a significant decrease in Latino CVAP in the proposed map, though it was offset by the significant increase in Latino CVAP in CD 41.

Table 5: Latino Community Influence Congressional Districts in Prop 50 Proposed Map

District	Representative	% Latino CVAP	Change from 2020 Commission Map
43	Waters	46.5%	+2.5%
37	Kamlager-Dove	39.8%	+1.1%
27	Whitesides	39.5%	+6.2%
23	Obernolte	37.0%	+4.2%
26	Brownley	33.9%	+2.3%
48	Issa	32.0%	+10.6%
20	Fong	31.8%	+6.4%
9	Harder	31.0%	+0.0%

Source: https://aelc.assembly.ca.gov/proposed-congressional-map. Percentages rounded to nearest tenth, based on 2020 Census for each district as reported by the CA State Assembly.

Table 5 shows the congressional districts that are not Latino CVAP majority but would meet the over 30% Latino CVAP threshold to be considered a Latino community influence district. **While the current map includes a noteworthy six Latino-influence districts, the proposed map would increase the number of Latino-influence districts to eight.** None of these districts would face decreases in their Latino CVAP under the new map boundaries. Many would see significant increases in the Latino portions of their electorate, strengthening the relative power of the Latino vote in those communities. The one district with little change in Latino CVAP under the new map would be CD 9, in which Latinos would remain the same 31% of the CVAP as the current map.

Of particular noteworthiness are the two new Latino influence districts, CD 20 and CD 48 (bolded in Table 5). Neither district has a sufficiently large enough Latino CVAP under the current map to be classified as a Latino influence district (25.4% and 21.4% respectively). With the proposed map, however, CD 20 would have a Latino CVAP of nearly 32% and CD 48 would also have a Latino CVAP of 32%. These are significant shifts in districts that under the current

map have much larger non-Hispanic white majorities. While the current map has a notable number of Latino-influence districts, the proposed map creates a heightened Latino electoral advantage through the creation of two new Latino-influence districts and generally larger Latino CVAPs than in pre-existing influence districts in the current map.

In addition, at least two of these proposed Latino-influence districts have majority-minority CVAPs, providing additional opportunities for Latino voters to flex strength if voting cohesively and in concert with other minority groups. Voters of color are more than 60% of the CVAP in Proposition 50's CD 9, while voters of color were about 55% of the district's CVAP in the Commission map. Latino voters may be able to elect preferred candidates if there is a multiracial coalition in this district. In both the current and proposed maps, District 27 has a majority-minority CVAP. Latino voters are the largest minority group in District 27 in the Proposition 50 map, and this district could provide electoral strength to Latino voters who vote in coalition with other voters of color or with crossover white voters.

To summarize, the Proposition 50 map increases the number of Latino-influence districts, defined as districts with Latino CVAP of 30% to 50%, relative to the current map. Both the current map and the proposed map provide meaningful influence for Latino voters in influence districts (6 influence districts in the current map and 8 influence districts in the proposed map).

IV. Key Districts of Interests for Latinos

The table below summarizes several of the largest net gains and net losses in Latino CVAP in the Proposition 50 map relative to the current map. As can be seen, several districts in southern California (CA-41, CA-44, CA-48) and the Central Valley (CA-20, CA-22) have gains in Latino CVAP in the proposed Proposition 50 map. Several other districts, all in southern California (CA-29, CA-31, CA-35, CA-38, CA-42), have reductions in Latino CVAP in the proposed Proposition 50 map relative to the current map.

Table 6: Proposed Districts with Largest Net Gains and Losses in Latino Eligible Voters

District	Representative	Net Change Latino CVAP (in Percentage Points)
41	Calvert	+25.3
44	Barragán	+11.3
48	Issa	+10.6
20	Fong	+6.4
22	Valadao	+6.0
42	Garcia	-27.8
35	Torres	-4.3
31	Cisneros	-2.5
38	Sánchez	-3.0

| 29 | Rivas | -0.6 |

V. Regional Breakdown of Latino Representation Shifts in the Proposed Map

Los Angeles County / San Gabriel Valley

Latino-majority representation in Los Angeles County remains robust under the proposed map but becomes more geographically balanced. The greater Los Angeles region trades one concentrated Latino-majority district for broader, multi-district Latino influence. This change will likely promote continued competitiveness and representation for Latino voters in the region.

- **CA-35 (Norma Torres, D)** and **CA-38 (Linda Sánchez, D)** record small declines (−4.3 percentage points in CA-35, and −3 percentage points in CA-38) but remain safely majority-Latino.
- **CA-42 (Robert Garcia, D)** shows the largest Latino CVAP decline statewide, falling from 52 % → 25 % (about a −27 percentage point change). Southeast L.A. County's Latino population is redistributed into nearby districts—especially CA-41 and CA-44—broadening, rather than eliminating, Latino voting power, while CA-42 continues to have Long Beach as its anchor population and making the former mayor of Long Beach, Garcia, likely to win in the new district.
- **CA-44 (Nanette Barragán, D)** gains +11 percentage points, rising to 62% Latino CVAP. This change consolidates South L.A. County and Harbor communities into a stronger Latino majority seat.

Central Valley (Fresno, Kern, Stanislaus, Tulare)

The Central Valley continues to be a cornerstone of Latino political power. Overall, the map deepens Latino representation in agriculture-based counties while extending influence into previously lower-representation areas.

- **CA-13 (Adam Gray, D)** increases from 50.2 % Latino CVAP to about 54% Latino CVAP (approximately a +4 percentage point increase), allowing greater opportunity for Latino voters to choose the winning candidate.
- **CA-20 (Vince Fong, R)** increases from 25.4 % Latino CVAP → 31.8 % Latino CVAP (+6.4 percentage point increase), becoming a new Latino–influence seat.

- **CA-21 (Jim Costa, D)** in the Fresno area has a slight increase in Latino CVAP between the current map and the proposed map, and is a district in which Latino voters' preferred candidates are likely to win in either the current map or the proposed map.
- **CA-22 (David Valadao, R)** climbs from 59.4 % Latino CVAP → 65.4 % Latino CVAP (+6 percentage point change), strengthening its ability for Latino voters to affect the outcome of the election.

Inland Empire (Riverside, San Bernardino, Ontario, Corona)

The Inland Empire emerges as California's new hub of Latino electoral growth. Latino voters are consolidated across Riverside County and the broader area, shifting the region's political center of gravity toward Latino-majority representation.

- **CA-25**, **CA-33**, **CA-35**, **CA-39** are all majority-Latino districts in the Inland Empire region in the current map and in the Proposition 50 map.
- **CA-41 (Ken Calvert, R)** posts the largest statewide gain in the Proposition 50 map— **+25.3 percentage points**, from 29.7% to 55.0% Latino CVAP—transforming into a new majority-Latino district (and moving the district to L.A. County in the Proposition 50 map).

Orange County / San Diego

Latino representation grows markedly in northern Orange County and remains strong along the border. Overall, Orange County's Latino communities, once split among multiple suburban districts prior to this decade now form a more cohesive district in CA-46 in both the current and the proposed map, while San Diego's Latino influence increases in the proposed map in CA-48.

- **CA-46 (Lou Correa, D)** and **CA-52 (Juan Vargas, D)** remain securely majority-Latino in both the current and the proposed maps. In the proposed maps, these two districts are both at or near 53% Latino CVAP, and in the current map both are Latino CVAP majority. CA-46 is centered in Santa Ana and inland Orange County and CA-52 is centered in San Diego and suburban San Diego County communities near the Mexico border.
- **CA-48 (Darrell Issa, R)** rises from 21.4 % → 32.0 % (+10.6 percentage points) in the Proposition 50 map, creating a new Latino-influence district centered on the transportation corridor connecting San Diego County to Temecula and Palm Springs in Riverside County.

Bay Area & Northern California

Latino representation remains smaller in number but steady in influence. Overall, the Bay Area sees continuity rather than major change, maintaining current levels of Latino political presence within multi-ethnic urban districts.

- **CA-18 (Zoe Lofgren, D)** gains modestly (+2.5 percentage points → 53.0 % Latino CVAP) and remains majority-Latino. This was a new Salinas Valley-based Latino CVAP-majority district created by the Commission in 2020, and it continues with greater Latino CVAP strength in the proposed Proposition 50 map.
- Other Bay Area districts (e.g., CA-12) maintain coalition and crossover-based representation where Latino, Asian-American, and Black voters have the potential to collectively shape outcomes in both the current map and in the proposed map.

Statewide Takeaway

Adopting the proposed Proposition 50 map would largely redistribute—not diminish—Latino voting strength. Latino influence would expand across fast-growing inland and suburban regions while preserving or enhancing long-standing majority-Latino representation in Los Angeles and the Central Valley.

Rather than concentrating Latino voters into a limited number of extremely safe seats, the proposed map broadens their reach into more districts, creating more opportunity for Latino communities to have a decisive and influential voice in a greater share of California's 52 congressional races. This geographic rebalancing reflects the state's ongoing demographic evolution—where Latino population growth in suburban and inland corridors now reshapes the political landscape—making equitable representation increasingly dependent on sustained engagement and turnout among Latino voters statewide.

VI. Conclusion

Having examined the data under the current map and the proposed Proposition 50 map, we find that there is no change in the number of Latino-majority CVAP districts across both maps. Each map has 16 Latino-majority districts, meaning there is significant opportunity for Latino representation. We also conclude that—when considering Latino voting patterns in each district—Proposition 50's map increases the number of districts wherein Latino voters are likely to end up on the winning side, electing preferred candidates. In the current map, 14 Latino-majority districts regularly observe candidates preferred by Latino voters winning. In the Proposition 50 map, our data analysis suggests this will likely increase to 16 Latino-majority districts where Latino voters are able to regularly elect their preferred candidates. Because of changes to CD 13 and CD 22, in particular, Proposition 50's map enhances the opportunity for Latino voters' preferred candidates to win, without significantly altering Latino voters' decisive role in the other 14 Latino-majority districts. However, while our analysis suggests that Proposition 50's map is more likely to allow for Latino voters' preferred candidates to win in all 16 Latino-majority districts, we conclude that both the current Commission map and the proposed Proposition 50 map provide significant opportunities for Latino voters.

In terms of Latino-influence districts, the proposed map includes more influence districts than the current map. This increase of two districts could provide opportunities for greater Latino representation. Our analysis also suggests that the number of Latino descriptive representatives will likely increase in 2026 if the Proposition 50 map passes, but this does not diminish the fact that Latino descriptive representation was significantly improved by the current map over its predecessor map.

We present this nonpartisan and educational analysis in order to understand how the current and proposed maps would affect Latino voters in California. We also want to emphasize that more research is needed on the effects of redistricting maps on Latino voters and Latino representation. Attempts to increase Latino representation in California have historically occurred via the courts and redistricting. Voters now face a choice at the ballot box that will have implications for the future of Latino representation in California.