MINUTES

FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
YEAR 2000 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
FOR JULY 6, 2001
1:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM
202 C STREET 12TH FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

Chairman Pesqueira called the meeting to order at 1:14 p.m. Chairman Pesqueira recessed the meeting for a short break at 3:10 p.m. Chairman Pesqueira reconvened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. with Commissioner Magana not present. Chairman Pesqueira adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

ITEM-1: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Pesqueira called the meeting to order at 1:14 p.m.

ITEM-2: ROLL CALL

Operations Director Staajabu Heshimu called the roll:

(C) Chairman Ralph R. Pesqueira-present
(VC) Vice Chairman Leland T. Saito-present
(M) Mateo R. Camarillo-not present
(M) Charles W. Johnson-present
(M) Marichu G. Magaña-not present
(M) Shirley ODell-present
(M) Juan Antonio Ulloa-not present

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A005-015.)

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

(C) Chairman Ralph R. Pesqueira-present

(VC) Vice Chairman Leland T. Saito-present

(M) Mateo R. Camarillo-present

(M) Charles W. Johnson-present

(M) Marichu G. Magaña-not present

(M) Shirley ODell-present

(M) Juan Antonio Ulloa-present

ALSO PRESENT:

Deputy City Attorney Lisa Foster
Staajabu Heshimu, Operations Director
Joey Perry, Senior Planner

Chairman Pesqueira announced that the Commission has adopted a preliminary map but is waiting until the justification is finished so as to submit a complete package. The preliminary map is on the board for those who have not seen it.

Chairman Pesqueira announced that this meeting is different from all the other meetings as far as the timing is concerned. Chairman Pesqueira asked Deputy City Attorney Foster to comment.

Deputy City Attorney Foster advised that it is a legal meeting as far as the noticing requirement having been complied with and the meeting has been noticed appropriately under the Brown Act.

Chairman Pesqueira stated that there was an error in the paper regarding the City Heights area and asked Deputy City Attorney Foster to comment.

Deputy City Attorney Foster stated that there was an article in the paper describing the primary changes that were made in the preliminary map at the last meeting. There was one item that needed to be corrected from that article which related to the City Heights area. According to the paper the preliminary plan did not make any changes to City Heights and that is incorrect. There was a minor change to City Heights in the preliminary plan. Although it was not completely unified into one district, there was an area called Ridgeview taken from District 4 and put into District 7 which is a part of the

City Heights community. This changed City Heights from being in three districts to two districts. That move was made because the Commission needed more population in District 7, and the Commission determined that move would assist with equalizing the population in the districts.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A015-038.)

ITEM-3: NON-AGENDA COMMENT

This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the Redistricting Commission on items of interest within the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Comments are limited to no more than two minutes per speaker. Submit requests to speak to the Commission's Operations Director prior to 1:00 p.m. pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act. No discussion or action, other than a referral shall be taken by the Redistricting Commission on any issue brought forth under "Non-Agenda Comment."

Jim Varnadore:

Depriving City Heights of one third of their political power is not a minor correction. City Heights does not care as do many who speak to you what color, gender, sexual orientation, etc. the council members are. We are trying to develop a community for every person that lives there. Our economic engine is four green lights on that board above the City Council. It is difficult to say that it is easier for the community to get from 3 to 5 than from 1 to 5. Very little of the public testimony has appeared on the maps. I think you have the duty to pay attention to what we say. What we say is we do need three votes to continue another decade of advancement in City Heights and we cannot do that by being represented by a single council member and having to fight to get the other four. That is what City Heights needs and we don't care what the demographics are.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A043-084.)

Michael Sprague:

I wanted to take the opportunity to make comments on last week's session. My concern regarding the Brown Act was that people should not have to spend half a day trying to find out when the meeting is going to be. I think that public testimony should be consistent and

consistent for all people who speak in front of the podium regardless of their titles. When members of the public have to wait two and a half hours when other people can travel up a couple of flights (of stairs) any time they could've been bounced back and forth and I did not think that was appropriate. A great deal of clarity was given when Commissioners talked about the Coastal Commission and how having representation on the Costal Commission was important and having as many council districts in the Coastal Commission was important but ignored the same argument regarding City Heights. There was disregard for the GLBT community in Hillcrest. Ridgeview has had very little attention. It is not contiguous and the change is not appropriate.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A096-127.)

ITEM 4: DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Staff will report on the filing of the Preliminary Redistricting Plan with the City Clerk's Office and present the draft agenda for the upcoming Public Hearings.

Ms. Heshimu informed the Commission that staff had not filed the plan with the City Clerk because when we left last Friday evening we hoped we would have the statement ready by late today but there were only three working days between then and now. I think you will know we have been busy working on the public hearings because they start on Monday. Staff definitely intends to have the preliminary map filed on Monday. The draft is ready, but transcript and audio tapes will need to be reviewed before putting the final statement together. Staff has been working on the public hearings and you will find in your packets eight agenda and each is attached with a map from downtown to the site. We did site checks this past week and will send an e-mail with information on sites that may present a challenge as far as the parking is concerned. The meeting in District 6 will be video taped. The preliminary map is on the website and the office has been very busy with calls and e-mails.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A096-127.)

ITEM 5. DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION OF AN ALTERNATIVE REDISTRICTING PLAN

Commission members will continue the map development process by drawing an alternate map based on unification of the community of City Heights. Staff will assist the Commission using the Maptitude Redistricting software. Maptitude will also be used to analyze the effects of the proposed boundary changes on protected groups and communities of interest pending a more detailed analysis and report from the Commission's consultant.

Chairman Pesqueira requested that the Deputy City Attorney comment on exactly what the priorities are as the Commission draws a map. It is important to periodically publically declare the priorities the Commission must follow.

Deputy City Attorney Foster outlined the priorities of the Redistricting Commission in drawing a redistricting plan.

Commissioner Camarillo: A previous speaker on the agenda spoke about being kept waiting. Are people not taken in order?

Chairman Pesqueira: What he is referring to — a few meetings back it seemed as though the City Council woke up to what we were doing and they all decided, with the exception of one, to come in and talk to us. I had to make a decision as the Chair and that decision was that , yes, this is not a political body but it was important for us to hear from the representatives from the various districts and so we did give them more time. That might have been a decision that was ill thought out, but it has been about the only real time that we have had council people come before us and discuss with us and give us insights into their district's feelings because they are much closer to their districts than we are. We did give them a significant amount of time and it is true that time went on perhaps a little longer than we wanted. Yes, it is true that I did go back to the clock and put the rest of the speakers on the clock. It was a choice I had and I did that for the reason of allowing our elected representatives an opportunity to come and speak to us.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A222-319.)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Maxine Sherard:

I am aware of many of the concerns you have dealt with and many you will have to deal

with. I am here to ask you, because you're going to be pulled apart in the final moments, to take an inventory and take a look at some of the barriers you have. I don't know if you've done that. I think there should be a complete assessment, putting all the cards on the table so you know what they are, so that you can take away these things that would keep you from making the best decisions in the interest of the City of San Diego. I can mention a few. Some of them would concern having an unbalanced representation at your meetings. They have been one sided. You know there are people you have not heard from who ought to be represented here and so I encourage you to be their voice. You know who they are. You know your job, and you know that you are going to have to be the voice for those persons who are out there who might even be disenfranchised. Another one would be for those who spoke in self interest. I think that you are smart enough to know who those are too. Also one of the greatest factors would be that there is district representation of Three here. Someone is going to be pointing the finger at you in terms of your own special interest. Why there wasn't representation for number three, there wasn't representation for number four. I encourage you to take an inventory of the barriers you face so you can put those things aside and make sure that the decisions you make are in the best interests of the citizens of San Diego. I encourage you to really think of the disenfranchised voters in District 3 and bring those voters together. You have done it in some of the other districts without being really encouraged. I'm going to nudge you to really think about bringing City Heights together in District 3.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A366-413.)

Patti Vaccariello:

Last week the residents of City Heights asked this Commission to listen to the residents of City Heights. We told you the existing boundary lines work for us and why. We talked about the benefits and relationships that had been formed as a result of being in three council districts and then we asked that the lines be left alone. That did not happen in the southern portion of our community and as a result City Heights lost a council member. The reason we lost a council member came down to one issue, the College Grove Shopping Center. Once the shopping center was moved, it created a ripple effect. I was dismayed to watch for nearly two hours as the boundaries were drawn and redrawn to accommodate this one move. Each time the percentages and deviations just kept getting worse. Miramar, Grantville, different boundaries in various parts of the city were moved back and forth until it was City Heights turn to try and

make this move work and poof just like that we lost an advocate on the council, despite what the community had told you, despite the work and time invested in putting this coalition between three council districts together. Most significantly, despite the fact your own consultant had stated that moving the portion of City Heights located in District 4 was not required under the Voting Rights Act, and if that move was made, it would be on a discretionary basis and a different justification would have to be used. We are having trouble grasping what the College Grove Shopping Center has to do with the Ridgeview neighborhood in City Heights and why our community should lose a council member because of it. Part of what tells you City Heights is a community is the diverse group of residents you have seen during this process speaking in front of you saying basically the same thing. The lines work for us. They are natural geographic boundaries that the community understands. Don't take away the tools we have been using to make our community work.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A417-452.)

Kevin Davis:

I wanted to say that the LGBT Coalition is very pleased with the District 3 that has been drawn and I believe the map for the City overall reflects a good balance of the competing needs with the exception of the change to the number of votes on the council that City Heights has. That would be something that we would not support, but overall we believe that is a fair map. I did some analysis on the racial balance of the new District 3 that is drawn. If you take the non-Hispanic whites it is 41% of the new District 3. The non-whites make up 56% of the new District 3. If you look at the voting patterns of the old District 3, you come to some surprising conclusions. If you look at Prop. 187 that was passed in 1994 that would make it illegal for illegal aliens to receive public services, that proposition was more strongly rejected in Hillcrest than it was in City Heights. The other two racial propositions 209 and 227 were also — the balance was pretty much even throughout the district so you can't look at a white district or Latino district and make any conclusions. It was pretty much evenly supported or rejected as the case may be in those areas so I don't think there is any racial polarization that you can see from those three propositions. I would support the current District 3 and make the change in the current map just to City Heights to restore their vote on the council.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A491-527.)

Commissioner ODell: Chairman, as you know I wanted to change my vote from last week on something that we talked about and I need to do it early.

Chairman Pesqueira: I'm sorry Shirley, I didn't have the minutes and it slipped past my mind and I am going to give you an opportunity now to make that adjustment to the minutes so it can be recorded and the minutes can be changed before they are brought to us.

Commissioner ODell: Thank you very much. Some of you may remember at the last meeting I said, "When did we do that?" I must have been asleep. Everyone laughed about it, but that had to do with the change of Oak Park and I could not recall anybody ever talking about Oak Park or whether we had had testimony about it. It concerned me and I was wondering. We all have to be very aware of our neutrality and our decisions. I gave a yes vote on that but I erred on that. I want to change to abstained because I feel I didn't have enough information and it's extremely important to me. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Camarillo: I just want to re-enforce a comment so it is well understood. We have said it before, but I think it's important to repeat it. What we have adopted is a preliminary map. Preliminary means just that. It is subject to finalization which could or could not happen based on the 30-day input that we have throughout the districts. Just so people fully understand, it is a preliminary map.

Chuck Bahde:

> I reside north of Hillcrest in the medical complex. The area is designated as Census Tract 4, and I have always been in the 17 years I have lived there in District 2. I have worked as a real estate broker and property manager in the areas surrounding Balboa Park, City Heights, Kensington, Barrio Logan, and Mission Hills. I have worked with numerous gay and lesbian clients. What I have noticed is that while the gay and lesbian businesses and social service agencies are concentrated in Hillcrest, they are actually dispersed as are the residents throughout all the central city area. The gay community that helped revitalize the Hillcrest core continues to move to the surrounding areas spreading this vitality to other communities. All types of people live in Hillcrest. With this in mind I would like to make one suggestion. Tract 4 in the medical complex north of Washington should return to District 2. You will see on the maps I have outlined the area that should remain in District 3 which is in yellow. This action would add back somewhat less than the 3400 diverse residents of this tract and would take the deviation of District 2 to near zero as it would to District 3 if you would make a change I will propose at the end. You will note the map I have attached shows the subarea of the

medical complex as part of the uptown plan. Hillcrest is defined as south Washington. I'll move to Barrio Logan now. In your discussions you were working on Census Tract 51 down on the East Village and the northerly, westerly part of Barrio Logan. That census tract is 43% Latino near 70% non-white voting block. Going back to the original proposal of have just the area north of Imperial in District 2, District 8 will also move to the deviation of near zero, which is your primary goal. If you were to adopt the minor changes I have outlined, Council Districts 2, 3, and 8 would all have a population near zero, indeed a job well done. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B109-140.)

Joseph Moseray:

I work with the Alliance for African Assistance. Eighty percent of the African refugees reside in City Heights. Since the inception of this redistricting we have also been dialoging with these refugees. Most of them are saying we are happy the way City Heights is. City Heights is spread in three districts. They all think that gives them political leverage and power. They are also saying, please don't taking anything away from us. We still want to be in three districts. It is on the basis of this that we are making progress politically, socially, and economically. Leave us as we are. That's the message I bring to you today.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B145-168.)

Theresa Quiroz:

I live in the Ridgeview neighborhood of City Heights. City Heights is not your average community. It's been written we have the most diverse population in the U.S. We can't fit into your nice molds of Whites, Hispanics, Blacks and Asians , nor should we be forced to. We have the whole spectrum. Hispanics who have recently become citizens to Hispanics with generations of citizenship behind them. We have African Americans and Africans both Black, but they have widely differing needs in our council members. We have Asians, all kinds of Asians. How can you expect that such a wide group's needs will all be the same. There is no one racial group that constitutes a community of interest here. In City Heights we have only one community of interest

and that is blight. The Supreme Court has made it simple, you can't take actions that would be retrogressive to the bench mark. That benchmark is how the lines are drawn now. Look what has happened in City Heights in the last ten years. I need you to explain to me how you honestly believe that putting City Heights into one district would benefit anyone. Because I see it simply as retrogression. You have been told by citizens how much we have accomplished with the lines drawn as they are now, but our history shows clearly what you're proposing to do to us. There is no guess work here, just look to the past when we had only one vote and see the slums and the overcrowding that were voted in by the council despite the vote of that one council member. We are not numbers on a page. Your actions will have real consequences. The past has proven that one vote doesn't give this unique community fair and effective representation as required by the City Charter. Less than three simply gives us a ghetto and we deserve more.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B171-196.)

Michael Dunn:

I live in the community of City Heights and I too am concerned about the discussion that has been going on. I feel that you disenfranchise people when you only give them one voice when they need five voices to get things done. When you bring together a community that has worked so hard to have three voices and three voices that work together, and you bring them to one voice, that's devastating. I would think of all the funding, the state funding, the federal funding, the city funding, that we would lose as a community that many organizations such as the City Heights CDC, business improvement districts, San Diego NHS, Chicano Federation, Price, all the funding they could have their hands on to be able to develop such a wonderful community would be lost because you would disenfranchise us into one community or one district. I am concerned about that. I am concerned about a lot of the things you have proposed within the redistricting and the way you have described the City Heights community. We are a wonderful community that is diverse. As Teresa said, you can't divide us by our voting population or by our ethnicities, you have to divide us by our area and we believe that the area it is currently divided in is the area that we would like to keep it divided.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B199-219.)

Commissioner Camarillo: Mr. Speaker, I'm not clear on your statements. Many of the things you itemized based on need — I was the chairman of the board for 15 years of the CVC, on the board of the Chicano Federation. I'm familiar with the revenue sharing, block grants, all that's based on need. That need does not go away by drawing a line here or there. I don't understand how the money goes away. Could you elaborate.

Speaker: I can tell you that because you're working with — if you put us in one community, you're only putting us in one pot of funding. If you put us in one council district, you're only putting us into one pot of funding. For example, you know that the CDBG funding is divided into eight areas because we have eight council districts. Seven gets a portion, Council 3 gets a portion, Council 4 gets a portion. Because of the way we are situated that means we can ask Council 3, Council 7 and Council 4 for funding for certain things within the community of City Heights. If you redistrict us to where you put us into one council district or even two, we lose a vast majority of funding because we're only allowed this one pot of funding to vie for and the community of District 3 has several areas of redevelopment such as North Park, Hillcrest, University Heights, Golden Hills. All of them are vying for the same pot of funding that District 3 is vying for within the community. Also you change the way the funding is distributed within the City of San Diego. In reality District 7 will lose quite a lot of funding from the federal, state, and city government.

Commissioner Camarillo: It is all based on need and I don't understand the misconception that continues to exist.

Deputy City Attorney Foster: There are really two ways to look at the CDBG. The funding is based on low and moderate income in the census tract so as the district lines change the allocation based on the low and moderate income doesn't change. It stays ; the amount of funding that goes to the district stays with those tracts. I think the issue that comes into play that maybe Mr. Dunn is referring to is that if you have three council districts, they can use whatever pot of CDBG money they get from whatever census tract they have in their district for any project. It doesn't have to be kept within the census tract that resulted in the district getting the funding. It all depends on how the council member allocates the money they receive, but it does stay with the moderate and low income tract.

Commissioner Johnson: I'm a little bit concerned too, Mr. Chair. It seems to me even with it being split like that, there are still no guarantees that the money is going to go to District 3. It seems that it is still going to be up to the will of the council member. It is not a written contract. Am I correct?

Chairman Pesqueira: I think the thinking there is when they have three council people that they can pull together and work with, it gives a greater opportunity for funds to be pooled to take care of the most needy project. I think the feeling is with the three council people working in unison they are going to be

able to 1) have better assurance of the project being taken care of, and 2) that there is a potential for greater funds to be used. If they are separated from a situation like that, they can only use the funds that are allotted to their particular tract.

John W. Stump:

I reside in Census Tract 2502. Earlier I distributed to you some transit maps. The reason I distributed those is that it is very important to know in a poor area, in a high bus ridership area like City Heights that the transit routes, the major streets are very important and in fact — the number 13 bus, which is our second highest bus goes right through Ridgeview. Keep that in mind that bus routes are kind of important in our area. I passed out a table for you. What it shows is where there are concentrations of protected class members and I've tried to balance the colors for you. Please look very carefully at the dark areas because you'll see that they are majority protected class areas. I wanted to say the Voting Rights Act is not the "just as good Voting Rights Act," or the "separate but equal Voting Rights Act," or "in the alternative better access Voting Rights Act," or don't make me uncomfortable Voting Rights Act." Please keep in mind that you are going to have to do some uncomfortable things if you're going to assist protected class members. If I can make a suggestion on the CDBG monies, I suggest on the narrative on the back, the second page, one of the analysis you might want to do is look at the source of CDBG money, the census tract it's coming from, and where it is being spent. I have been a grant writer and a person who obtains CDBG money since there was CDBG money. My impression is that CDBG has been spent more away from the census tracts it was generated from than in them.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B359-399.)

The Commission asked Mr. Stump questions regarding the maps he drew.

Charles McKain:

I want to say we support your preliminary map to the extent it maintains in District 3 the neighborhoods identified as containing high concentration of GLBT people and supportive neighbors. We thank you for that. We also recognize and support the legal requirement that the map as a whole must comply with the Voting Rights Act. However, we believe that if your consultant finds that the census data shows that the

Voting Rights Act requires that the various ethnic groups in City Heights be unified into one district, we think that such unification can be achieved without slashing the present District 3 into three pieces as suggested by the proposals first submitted by Mr. Ulloa and then supplemented by the proposal of Mr. Camarillo. Those proposals would divide the demonstrated GLBT communities of interest in the current district by removing Kensington, Talmadge, and by making Park Boulevard the western boundary of District 3, the precise means of destroying the current District 3 that we consistently opposed since the beginning of this process. In response to our repeated concerns and to the testimony of District 3 residents, we have also consistently been assured by various commissioners that Park Boulevard would not be the new district's western boundary. That is until the last couple of meetings where this proposal we find unacceptable suddenly surfaced. Last Friday, I submitted into the record a sample map and data suggesting various possibilities for complying with the Voting Rights Act that would not entail destruction of the unification of the GLBT communities in District 3. We don't necessarily support all the details of the map, but we see it as a starting point for an alternative approach to satisfying the Voting Rights concerns that your consultant may identify. That map suggests the possibility of creating two Latino majority districts. When you consider Voting Rights matters, please bear in mind that the term GLBT or gay is not the equivalent of white. The terms Latino and gay are not mutually exclusive, neither are the terms African American and gay or Asians and gay. No where is the truth of such diversity more obvious than in the current District 3 and in your preliminary map's District 3.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B468-516.)

Levin Sy:

I am coming to you today from the Asian American Pacific Islander Community. I know that there has been a great amount of interest regarding the minimal comment that has been coming from this community. We are about 14.5%, according to the DOJ numbers, of the City's population. I know that myself and one other person have been the only people that have come and spoken before you. I think it was about eight weeks ago that I spoke before you and I think I am coming bact today to reiterate some of the points that I brought forth at that meeting and to help guide you along with your current map. I have yet to draw a proposed map, but I will turn that in on July 20th. What I wanted to do today was to discuss the City's API voting age population. These are folks that are going to be eligible based on their age to be registered to vote.

As you know this isn't a citizens of voting age population which is bigger difference, but since that data is not yet available, I wanted to take a look at this. As it currently stands, the 1991 City Council boundaries divide a huge proportion of our community north of the City in Mira Mesa and Rancho Penasquitos. I know that most of these discussions today from last week's six and a half hour marathon focused on City Heights and I wanted to talk a little bit about a community north of the 56 freeway and to talk about a community that is bounded by many things other than race and so I wanted to talk about the criteria by which I will evaluate these communities. This is the fifth district. As you know Mira Mesa is split up from Rancho Penasquitos which is currently in the first district and the fifth currently has Rancho Bernardo, Sabre Springs, Carmel Mountain Ranch, and Scripps Ranch. We feel that on many variables other than race these communities should actually be combined. These are the criteria I have been looking at to combine them: First Geographic criteria. Neighborhood planning boundaries are very specific in this northern part of the City . As you all remember at the Scripps Ranch Library , neighborhoods from the Diamond Gateway communities of I-15 corridor, those are the chambers of commerce that have formed together to form the diamond gateway. They are Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Sabre Springs, Rancho Penasquitos, Mira Mesa, and Scripps Ranch all told you that they wanted to be in one community. Their communities did not want to be divided up. Further, they told you they wanted to be in one district, District 5. Unfortunately, we will violate the one-person, one-vote if that happens. It is impossible to have all these communities in one district. What I did was I looked at the testimony that they provided at the District 1 hearings and what I've gleaned from that is that there are two communities of interest. One that is based on the I-5 corridor and one based on the I-15 corridor. The city council member and representatives from District 1 told you themselves they do not believe Rancho Penasquitos belongs in their area. The felt that Rancho Penasquitos was more impacted by the I-15 corridor traffic while their communities were impacted by I-5 traffic. On issues related to growth, I believe that Scripps Ranch and Rancho Bernardo and Carmel Mountain Ranch and Sabre Springs have more in common than they do with Rancho Penasquitos and Mira Mesa. For example, if you look at the growth battles that have happened in Rancho Bernardo and Scripps Ranch, those are totally different than the growth battles that are happening in Rancho Penasquitos and Mira Mesa. Part of that is because of the neighborhoods. Rancho Penasquitos and Mira Mesa were developed in the '70s and '80s where as the communities to the east on the 15 were developed in the '80s and '90s. New development that is happening now make those communities more in common with respect to their desire to control growth and fight it. Another issue is related to voting behavior. I think Kevin spoke a little bit about City Heights and the 187 and 209 vote.

Well, under the analysis I have done preliminarily, 187 no vote and the 209 no vote the Mira Mesa and Penasquitos communities were more in common than they had in the communities to the east. Related to the socio-economic status, I think with the assessor data that data base provides for us, based on the value of homes, clearly Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Sabre Springs, and Scripps Ranch is higher valued homes. They also have less renters in the area. That also means they have higher income individuals in their community. One other area that I wanted to look at was related to how these communities of interest arguments that are not racially based now come back to help us in forming our debate for why we need to develop a district that includes all our communities. Our communities in this area are bounded by those same concerns. Mira Mesa and Scripps Ranch have high API concentrations. They are older homes, they have more renters, they vote similarly than these communities on the east. I hope we develop a plan today that incorporates that. I know that a lot of comment has been made to City Heights, but we also would hope that you can develop a district that incorporates these two communities into one solid district. To give you some further feedback, I think a coastal zone district that goes down on this way would probably be preferable for City Council District 1 and that would allow you to combine Rancho Penasquitos with Mira Mesa. Another issue that was very interesting based on the testimony that was provided last week was this issue of retrogression and also related to racially polarized voting. I know that a lot of the data that Bruce would probably want is not available digitally. The City Clerk has yet to put that in a format that we can map. What I would like is to have you point to a 1992 race. Villa Mills a Filipino woman from Scripps Ranch ran for city council. She eventually lost to Barbara Warden. Right now our representative in District 5 is Brian Maienschein who is in Rancho Bernardo. Mira Mesa has been represented for three city council cycles by people from Rancho Bernardo. We feel though these communities all share similar comments based on I-15 traffic for example. Given the fact you have to divide them, a dividing line would be the 15 freeway. Having Mira Mesa with Rancho Penasquitos would make the most sense. An argument that was made by City Heights residents could also be made up in the northern area. Scripps Rancho people as a matter of tradition are closely aligned with Mira Mesa. They would feel like why do we need to split it. Well if you want to advance the goals of a diamond gateway community, for example, fixing the 56 route or combining that and having it go all the way through, if you want to advance traffic, if you want to add lanes, wouldn't it help to have two city council members that represent the diamond gateway communities? With respect to communities of interest based on shared concerns, these communities also have common community newspapers, the Rancho Bernardo Sun in 1998 became the Diamond Gateway Report. They also have another paper just for the chamber of

commerce. These communities all share something in common, but given the fact you have to split them up, I think it makes more sense to have Mira Mesa with Rancho Penasquitos than it would to split it up and have it with the District 1 communities of La Jolla. La Jolla communities and the other coastal communities are totally distinct and different socio-economically, politically, socially from those in Ranch Penasquitos. The Public Policy Institute of California report recently revealed 1994 research that was done on majority, minority districts in California. This researcher looked at Latino and African American political participation throughout the state of California and they showed that drawing majority, minority districts increased the rate of participation of Latinos and African Americans. It did not detract from the participation of white residents in the area. I give this research back to you because I feel that in your quest to draw majority, minority districts in San Diego, respect the Voting Rights Act, having an Asian district where we represent 14.5% of the city's population, where we are geographically compact, where we are cohesive - we are not yet politically empowered fully - where we are participating fully at all levels, but we believe drawing a district that includes our community's interest in one district would allow that type of participation to happen. I think that is why we are all involved in redistricting. We care about our communities and community lines, freeway lines, and these other lines have been created by people, but these lines are important enough that we organize ourselves politically around it. We believe that drawing that to include Mira Mesa and Penasquitos in one area would increase the amount of participation that you have not only from the Asian Americans that are in that district, but also for the Latino community that is moving up in the community.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B526-C048.)

Commissioner Camarillo: Did you do an analysis on this city and the voting age numbers to see if the district you drew, that population has the potential to elect a representative of their choice?

Mr. Sy: The district boundaries are the current boundaries. What I wanted to show is that those boundaries split our communities. In 1991 Tom Bear and Valerie Stallings were in favor of trying to draw an Asian American district; that's why they included that funny district down to Linda Vista because they knew those census tracts down there had enough of an Asian American Community. What I wanted to show here is, yes, our community based on 2000 numbers are in fact big enough. If you look at those numbers, those dark green numbers are 45% and over Asian Pacific American and yes, they are voting age population. Filipino Americans, Vietnamese Americans, and other Asian Americans have the highest rates of naturalization in this country. Research has shown that.

Commissioner Saito: Mr. Sy, you listed other criteria other than race that created a community of interest.

Mr. Sy: Let me allude to that a little bit more. We are not drawing this just to create an Asian district; what I am saying is that you have to listen to the citizens in the north part of the city. Council District 1 and 5 were very clear in saying that Rancho Penasquitos is part of the I-15 corridor. The proposed boundaries that you have drawn and hopefully that you will amend today keeps that out of the districts. Though those communities would rather be in one district, numerically that is impossible. The next best thing is to make sure that they are communities that they have identified and once again to articulate from the north to the south, Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Sabre Springs, Rancho Penasquitos, Mira Mesa, Scripps Ranch. They view that to be one community, one distinct community of interest that has many things in common. I feel by drawing in a Rancho Penasquitos with Mira Mesa not only do you advance the Voting Rights hopes of an Asian American community, you also further the community of interest that has been articulated to you. I think the Scripps Ranch Library meeting had the most participants that you have had to date. They were very clear. They wanted their communities to be intact and though we can't keep them in one area, having these two districts drawn so they can have two Diamond Gateway Districts would make sense.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C050-340.)

Ms. Heshimu: Mr. Commissioner, I did find the part of the minutes that you asked about regarding Ms. ODell's vote and you said " the suggestion we have now is taking this particular part of the northeastern side of Oak Park as defined by a police beat and putting it into four with the rest of Oak Park." The vote on that was 5 to 1 with Dr. Magana voting no and the Chair not voting at all.

Chairman Pesqueira announced that Public Comment is now closed.

Chairman Pesqueira called Alternate Commissioner Maxine Sherard up to share the map she had drawn. Ms. Sherard stated that she did have a map she had drawn but was not pleased with. Ms. Sherard expressed her desire to reunite City Heights.

Chairman Pesqueira invited Ms. Sherard to go to the Redistricting office and work with the software to create a map.

Mr. Ulloa suggested that the Commission began the work on drawing maps by working on each commissioner's map.

Commissioner Camarillo presented the map he drew and the Commission discussed the map.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location D001-280.)

Commissioner Ulloa stated that his map looks similar to Mr. Camarillo's map. He stated that his objectives were population, Voting Rights issue in City Heights, and reuniting communities.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location D285-485.)

The Commissioners agreed to work with Mr. Ulloa's map.

Mr. Saito requested that the Commission consider the unification of Rancho Penasquitos and Mira Mesa.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location D485-E145.)

Chris from Council District 1 clarified Council Member Peter's testimony regarding Rancho Penasquitos and that Mr. Peters stated that he was satisfied with District 1 as it was and did not want the impression that he wanted to lose Rancho Penasquitos.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location E150-175.)

The Commission continued to work with the map that has been drawn and named it 7/6A.

The Commission worked on the unification of Rancho Penasquitos, Mira Mesa, Sorrento Valley, along with Miramar and the Naval station. The Commissioners agreed that the numbers did not work and Mr. Saito agreed to visit Ms. Perry's office and work on this issue.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location E179-480.)

The Commission agreed to go back to the previous maps and the Commission discussed and compared Mr. Camarillo's and Mr. Ulloa's maps.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location E484-F075.)

Chairman Pesqueira asked if the consultants comes back and say that there is a Voting Rights violation by leaving City Heights in three districts and we must move them into one district, and we do move them into the one district and we come up with the map that you see there, we've seen two maps, one with the Kensington Talmadge area outside of District 3 and with the Hillcrest area in tact; and we've seen another area with the opposite. The Hillcrest area is out in District 2 but the Talmadge Kensington is in 3. Which would you rather keep in 3, the Talmadge Kensington area or the Hillcrest area?

Commissioner Ulloa: My sense of it following the testimony is that Hillcrest and University Heights should be reunited. There was testimony also that Talmadge and Kensington should be united, but it was secondary to University Heights and Hillcrest.

Commissioner Camarillo agreed.

Chairman Pesqueira stated that the opinion and desire of the Commission would be to leave the Hillcrest, University Heights areas in tact and in District 3 rather than the Normal Heights, Kensington, Talmadge, and College Area which would be in District 7.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location F080-299.)

Deputy City Attorney Foster commented that at the last meeting the Commission took votes regarding Mission Bay and she noticed that the Mission Bay configuration on the map the Commission is discussing now is contrary to the votes taken at the last meeting.

Chairman Pesqueira questioned whether this was the map that the Mission Bay issue was voted on?

Commissioner Ulloa responded that this would be the map that he had revised to make the numbers work including giving part of the Bay to District 6 because he thinks it is important for more than one district to have a voice over the Bay area.

Chairman Pesqueira: On the Preliminary Map we took out Mission Bay as I recall. On this Alternative Map Lisa noticed that we had Mission Bay in here and when we voted on the Preliminary Map, we voted to take it out. I am going to assume that we want to keep it out.

Commissioner Ulloa: I would like to ask people what they think and since this is a second map, not the first map, maybe they're more comfortable having Mission Bay in the second map since the Preliminary Map already addresses their initial concern. This map addresses other concerns other than those articulated at the first meeting. This map addresses the Voting Rights Act which we are assuming is an issue, and this map for me also addresses the communities of interest in District 6.

Chairman Pesqueira: Based upon Mr. Ulloa's concern, I will ask Ms. Heshimu to call the roll and yes is that we leave it as you see it and no is we put it back into District 2.

MOTION BY ULLOA TO LEAVE MISSION BAY IN DISTRICT 6. Second by Pesqueira. Yeas-Ulloa, Johnson, Saito, Camarillo, Pesqueira; Nay-ODell; Not Present-Magana.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location F300-399.)

Ms. Heshimu asked how the Commission was going to present this map to the public.

Chairman Pesqueira: We have a Preliminary Map. We are drawing this map in case we have to move all of City Heights into District 3. Then we are looking at other areas as part of this Alternative Map.

Ms. Heshimu: Are you telling people at the public hearing that you are either going to use this map or the other.

Commissioner Ulloa: When we go out into the community with a Preliminary Map, that is the map we are asking for input on. We will say if the consultants come back and inform us that the Voting Rights Act is an issue in City Heights, this would be a secondary map that we would look at. However, if through public testimony the Commission is convinced that putting this portion of the Bay in District 6 in the Preliminary Map maybe something they would want to do, I would think that there may be some change in the Preliminary Map between now and the end of the public hearing sessions.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location F400-447.)

Chairman Pesqueira suggested discussing and reviewing the four alternative maps provided by the consultant.

MOTION BY ULLOA TO ACCEPT MAP 7/6 WOULD REPRESENT THIS COMMISSION'S OPINION OF AN ALTERNATIVE MAP WITH THE CONDITION THAT IT BE ANALYZED BY THE CONSULTANTS FOR ANY VIOLATIONS OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT IN THE KENSINGTON TALMADGE AREA. Second by Pesqueira. Yeas-Camarillo, ODell, Johnson, Saito, Pesqueira; Not Present-Magana.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location F450-504.)

Chairman Pesqueira: The Alternate Map will only apply if there is a Voting Rights violation on the Preliminary Map.

Commissioner Ulloa suggested that the Commission remain open to changes on the Preliminary Map as suggested by the public at the public hearings.

A discussion was had by staff and the Commission regarding the disclosures associated with the Alternate Map.

Motion by Ulloa that the Commission has one Preliminary Map that will be the primary focus, but disclose the Alternate Map and receive discussion on it. No second. No vote taken.

The Commission discussed the schedule for the public meetings.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location F505-G563.)

ITEM 6: ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Pesqueira adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

MOTION BY JOHNSON TO ADJOURN. Second by Ulloa. Passed by common consent.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: G564-581.)

Ralph Pesqueira, Chairman
2000 Redistricting Commission

Esther Ramos
Legislative Recorder