

MINUTES

**FOR THE REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
OF CITY OF SAN DIEGO
FOR TUESDAY, JULY 10, 2001
6:00 P.M. - 8:00 P.M.
(DISTRICT 2)
CENTRAL LIBRARY AUDITORIUM
820 E STREET
SAN DIEGO, CA**

ITEM-1: CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Redistricting Commission was called to order by Vice Chairman Saito at 6:07 p.m. Vice Chairman Saito informed the public of the procedures for those people interested in giving testimony. The Commissioners and staff proceeded to give a short introduction about themselves. The meeting was adjourned by Vice Chairman Saito at 7:26.

ITEM-2: ROLL CALL

Operations Director Staajabu Heshimu called the roll:

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

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION: (Tape location: A004-008.)

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

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

Also present:

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

ITEM-3: PUBLIC HEARING

The Redistricting Criteria

Ms. Foster explained that the Commission has seriously taken into consideration the feedback received in the public hearings. One of the things that Ms. Foster wanted to point out was some of the legal criteria that the Commission had to follow in making their decisions. She informed the audience that hopefully this would help explain why some of the boundary changes occurred in the way shown on the preliminary map. Ms. Foster stated this was the first time San Diego was having a Commission make all the necessary decisions regarding redistricting. Ms. Foster shared with the audience that in 1992 the citizens of San Diego voted to change the City Charter. This resulted in placing an independent Commission in charge of redistricting to take some of the politics out of the process.

Ms. Foster went on to explain the legal factors in order of importance. She stated that number one on the list is the equalization of the population between districts. The most important reason

to do that is because the constitutional concept of one-person-one-vote. When a person votes for their councilperson, their vote is worth the same as someone else's vote in another district. They will be getting the same amount of representation for their vote as someone in a different district.

Ms. Foster informed that the second criteria is the Voting Rights Act. In the process of equalizing the districts, the process should not make changes that are harmful to racial, ethnic, and language groups in their ability to elect candidates of choice. Certain groups qualify for protection under this act when they meet a three part test. The group has to be large enough to potentially be a majority in a district. The group has to be politically cohesive meaning they tend to vote the same. The group prefers candidates that are defeated by the white population in that particular area.

Ms. Foster explained that the Commission is working with a well-known redistricting consultant. He is currently doing a Voting Rights Act analysis on voting patterns in the City Heights area. Ms. Foster commented that the Commission does have an alternate map in the make. The Commission does want to have a backup plan in the event that the analysis does show a Voting Rights Act issue.

Ms. Foster shared that the third concept was that race cannot be considered too much. In some cases the people are not geographically close together and the district shape turns out to be very irregular.

Finally, the districts have to be eight in number. This criteria appears in the City Charter and can't be changed unless the people vote to change the number. The districts need to be made up of contiguous territory. They need to be geographically compact as possible. They need to use natural boundaries to the extent possible. They need to preserve identifiable communities of interest. The Commission is to use whole census units and should not draw lines for the purpose of creating an advantage for elected officials.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: A009-134.)

**The Preliminary Redistricting Plan
(as adopted June 29, 2001)**

Ms. Perry briefed the public on the Preliminary Redistricting Plan and changes that effected the various districts.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: A135-180.)

Ms. Heshimu outlined the dates and final process that the Commission will be concluding within the next few weeks.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A181-234.)

SPEAKER 1: Cesar Portillo

I live in District 3. I am a first-time homeowner. I chose specifically District 3 because it allows me to represent my specific interest, and my goals in life are better represented in District 3. Certainly, they are represented in a way which your preliminary map draws. I feel that the preliminary map really supports me as an individual, supports me as a Latino, and I am able to better express my political ideology through District 3. I have attended several of the public hearings. I have attended several of the meetings that you have had, certainly, not as many as other people in the audience. I am really impressed with the amount of energy and time you have put into this. So I have to thank you for the hard work you have put into this. I realize that even though Marichu had said that you got paid a lot, I know that you did not get a cent for this but probably just a lot of grief from everyone. Just to reinforce though that your preliminary map is one that I support, and it supports me as an individual, supports me as a Latino in the community, and I feel that I can better express myself politically through that particular map. Thank you very much.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A235-253.)

SPEAKER 2: William Watking

I go by Bill. I was always called Bill because most bills come on the first of the month, I understand. Very briefly I want to thank you because you used the term gerrymandering. When it's been applied here, you speak of racial gerrymandering. I am curious. I understand that gerrymandering can be more than just racial gerrymandering. Perhaps you may want to address that, but I want to thank you very much because I have not been aware of the good work you all have done. I have not--perhaps if I read the paper as close as I should have. One quick question though on a portion that says "groups not meeting Gingles".

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A254-267.)

Ms. Foster clarified that the Gingles is the name of a significant court case that interprets the

Voting Rights Act. The three part test that determines whether a group deserves protection under the Voting Rights Act is called the Gingles test. That is simply the three part test that determines whether or not a group needs to be protected under the law.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A268-278.)

SPEAKER 3: Michael Simonsen

Here representing Council Member Frye as her chief of staff. When I originally came tonight, I was not going to speak. I was coming just to observe until I was handed the alternative plan. I noticed that half of Mission Bay had been included in the District 6 drawing. Unfortunately, I did not attend last Friday's redistricting meeting and did not know that, that had been drawn in. I did attend the previous when it was in, it was out, it was in, it was out. I think the concern at that time was cosmetic as well as are we changing any population, and it was really we're talking about maybe a thousand people. If you look at the District 2 numbers, verses District 6, really you would be swapping those thousand between each other because right now District 6 is less an additional thousand than District 2 is. I am here simply--you'll hear more from District 6 residents, myself, and the Council Member on Thursday night. You must have made some findings that were consistent with what you needed to make to draw that map for the alternative map. I would implore you to--when you go away after these hearings --before you finalize the preliminary map-- to include half of Mission Bay Park. You've heard from the Council Member about the watershed and the communities of interest. I just want to touch upon something very quickly. Bay Park and Clairemont that's their front porch. When they come down the hill, Clairemont Drive runs right into the visitor's center. That is their park. That is their beach. This is Clairemont, Bay Park, Linda Vista. This is where they end up when they go down to the beach or when they go to the park. It's one of their community parks. They can walk to it, they can bike to it, they can skate to it. Once again, thank you for your time and your work. I would ask you that before you finalize the preliminary map to include half of Mission Bay in District 6.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A279-314.)

Ms. Magaña commented that she was not at Friday's meeting either when the alternative map was made. She did want to say that on the first map they did take a minimalist approach and that there were no changes made unless to equalize or reunite a community.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A315-320.)

Mr. Ulloa added that there were some common factors that reunited the bay with District 6.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A321-328.)

SPEAKER 4: Michael Zucchet

I am a resident of District 2. I am a resident of Pacific Beach, actually third-generation resident of Pacific Beach. I want to appreciate all of you for your time and efforts. Again, those of us who have no life and watch you on television have been entertained and are very appreciative of the time you've put in as well as staff. I would also like to compliment you on the job you've done and the consistency with which you've done it with respect to unifying communities not only geographically, but in every other way as well. As the Vice President of the Pacific Beach Town Council, former member of the P.B. Planning Group, we especially want to thank you for your unification of Pacific Beach into one district, into District 2. In addition, what I think is a sensible unification, based on the population you had to gain, of heading up the hill on the south eastern side of Mount Soledad. So I come tonight to say that. I appreciate that being the case in both the preliminary map and alternative map. Second, I wanted to speak about the Mission Bay issue. To be perfectly honest I thought it was weird when I first heard the idea of putting not the population but just the water of Mission Bay into District 6. I thought I don't know if that makes sense, but upon seeing that the plan was to split Mission Bay and the purpose being to have two council members have some direct interest in Mission Bay. It made a lot more sense. Mission Bay is not only a regional resource, but it is properly quoted as the largest aquatic park in the country and in the world. It is a big deal and I think it makes sense to have two council members to directly have their fingers in that resource. The reason that is true and it's true that we want to unify communities, I think it is different when we talk about unifying populations. Where as on the other hand we're arguing to split resources. You heard the arguments at the District 2 forum at the P. B. Library with respect to the coast. There was a thought of having one council district to encompass the entire coast from Del Mar to the border. That didn't make sense to a lot of us because we thought there is value in having multiple council members, at least two, touching the coast because as a resource it makes sense to have multiple council members with the direct interest in it. We would argue the same, or I would argue the same with respect to Mission Bay. This is in addition to the arguments that I've heard before especially from Council Member Frye with respect to the fact that the watersheds that feed into Mission Bay originate in District 6, and other substantive arguments. Last if I may, just to follow up on what Mr. Simonsen said with respect to the balancing, not to be picky, but District 6 right now is your draw on the low end. It's the most negative population district, and it's true that flipping the 900 and so residents of De Anza Park

which would be the only population that would go if you moved the eastern half of Mission Bay into District 6. It's true that it would essentially make District 2 the drag instead of District 6, but it would improve the situation by 300 hundred voters. It would be an improvement, it would be another argument, it would be another justification for moving that resource into District 6. Again, just want to thank you very much for all your efforts on this and for the unification of all the communities especially with District 2, East Village, Pacific Beach, and I appreciate your time.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A329-386.)

SPEAKER 5: Bruce Reznik

I am the Executive Director of San Diego Bay Keeper. I am coming from basically the same perspective as Mr. Simonsen and Mr. Zucchet. Bay Keeper as you may know is a clean water advocacy group. When I look at the definition of communities of interest I think watershed lines would make a very logical sense and was frankly a little concerned on the original drawing of land locking an area like District 6 when that clearly feeds into Mission Bay. I am also a little bit concerned about some of the development issues. Frankly, that's an issue we worry a great deal about in District 2. It seems, as drawn currently, District 2 is not one of the larger districts. It is home to a number of the development projects that are coming down the pipeline for San Diego in the near term including most of Mission Bay development, Sea World, hotel development, airport, downtown ballpark, NTC, and the list goes on and on. I worry if that can become a very developer friendly district, and what if some of those developments get lost and the attention is paid that needs to be. I'd be one of the people joining in and looking at more of a watershed approach getting some of Mission Bay, if not all of Mission Bay into District 6. I'm speaking on behalf of Bay Keeper and probably a number of clean water environmental advocates in San Diego.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A387-413.)

SPEAKER 6: Charles McKain

As we stated earlier our coalition supports your preliminary map to the extent it includes within District 3 the neighborhoods shown by overwhelming testimony and data to contain large concentration of GLBT people and their supportive neighbors. The preliminary map tells us that you have listened to the testimony presented and we

appreciate that. Under the preliminary map the 3rd District will remain a collection of ethnically and socially diverse but generally like-minded and cohesive voters. The preliminary map also correct splits that were made in earlier maps. Under the preliminary map the 3rd District will remain San Diego's most diverse district and a home to progressive voters. Once again, we thank you for listening to our coalition and recognizing GLBT people as an identified community of interest, and retaining the 3rd District as a place allowing us reasonable access to the table where public decisions are made that directly affect our lives.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A414-444.)

SPEAKER 7: Leslie Wade

I represent the East Village Association and I too wanted to thank you for unifying the East Village in the rest of Downtown. It's just a huge improvement for us and we're really looking forward to being considered as one district. I just had a question if there are a--it looks like the alternative map has the same boundary in that the East Village will also be included in District 2. Is that a correct assumption? It appears that way to my eye, but on these small maps it's difficult to tell. Is it possible that any other alternative maps could come forward at this point for the Commission's consideration or that we might see any dramatic changes to that particular boundary?

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A445-458.)

Ms. Perry reassured it is difficult to tell, but the East Village is included in District 2 on the map.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A459-460.)

Vice Chairman Saito informed that the preliminary plan that they now have will be discussed after the eight public hearings. They are going to be meeting again to discuss the existing plan, and changes could be made at that time based on the public testimony.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A461-469.)

Ms. Leslie Wade: Let me then just strongly state that we are very pleased with the map that is drawn here, and the inclusion of East Village with the rest of Downtown as a single community of interest.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A470-473.)

SPEAKER 8: Raquel Rogers

I work in the East Village and I'm glad to know that we are included now in District 2. I like the way your map looks. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A474-480.)

SPEAKER 9: Don Mullen

I'm with the Pacific Beach Town Council. I'm also an 18-year surf shop, rental shop owner in the beach and bay area. I've spoken with you before in Pacific Beach and also downtown where I brought up the issue of Bay Park originally. When I was sitting at home again--another one of these people with no life--watching everything that you do. Again, I say thank you very much for your time and what you're doing for the city. The discussion came up about Mission Bay Park. I've always been concerned that, that area of District 6, the Bay Park, and Morena area really is a patch to Mission Bay. Although I spoke before about maybe including that into District 2, I think, the idea has come forward about including this into including that part of Mission Bay that half of that is a great idea. Especially from my perspective as a small business person that there is a lot of common interests that are represented there. And also from the fact now that District 2 has the ballpark redevelopment area. District 2 is starting to get some huge amount of resources and I think it will be wise to split up a little bit of that between two council districts, and once again I would agree with a lot of the comments that were made before me. Actually, if I had known that those were going to be made, I might not have come down. So having said that, I think it would be a wise decision to consider including that eastern portion of Mission Bay into District 6. Give the beach and bay area another council representative to deal with the sensitive issues that we have going on there. Thank you again for your work.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A481-513.)

SPEAKER 10: Al Strohleim

Several concerns, but first I do commend you for your preliminary alternate map which divides Mission Bay into more than just one group putting it back into District 6. I have a concern that goes back to May 22nd. I wrote to your Chairman to ask how he would maintain geographic diversity of your panel particularly since three of you are from one

district, and two each from two other districts. It is woefully biased in favor of some districts, however, objective you are. I think it's unfair, and I think it is rude not to have an answer to this letter which is why I'm here tonight. I don't think I have to come down here to ask for that, particularly since your Chair is not here. Now as to the meeting on June 29th, I was particularly offended at the lack of any procedural efforts to maintain objectivity among this group. Some of you cautioned the Chair to maintain his perspective on identifying populations and diversifying that throughout your eight districts. Lisa Foster, I have sent a letter of concern to the City Attorney regarding the public integrity unit because of what happened on June 29th. Four of you had voted and the Chair interrupted the vote to correct the vote that Ms. ODell had made. She voted yes and the Chair got a little concerned at that, and asked Shirley do you mean to vote yes. So Shirley changed her vote. Now, it doesn't matter what the vote was, but the Chair should not interrupt a vote in progress. It is just not done. Just play fair and let the chips fall where they may. If you didn't like that vote you reconsider it with a two-thirds effort, but don't stop the vote in progress. That was offensive and I suspected that from Shirley's reaction which was a little bit startled that she didn't expect to be corrected. If she wanted to vote for the devil it should have been maintained that way, and then to have the Chair refer to District 6 as looking pregnant, and then he actually said it didn't look well aesthetically. So you started manipulating the topography of a district that's absolutely irrelevant. One of you had the good sense along with your staff advisor to say we are suppose to be dealing in numbers only, and I commend you for remembering what your charter is, numbers only. Okay, I do--I'm delighted that you have a pregnant six as an alternate. At least Sea World goes over to somebody else and doesn't stay in District 2 which is overloaded with the big projects. That is it. Thank you very much. I would like an answer to the letter though.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: A514-574.)

Ms. Heshimu announced that there was no response to the letter and that was most likely her fault. She apologized. Ms. Heshimu explained that she did see it, she did copy it, send it to all of the Commissioners. She said she should have followed up on it, and contacted either the Deputy City Attorney or the Chair. She does remember the panel of retired judges appointed the Commissioners. They didn't appoint themselves. They have to try to be as objective and as non-biased as they can. The panel of retired judges who made the appointments got to define that operationally in their own ways. None of us here were responsible for the appointments.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: A575-605.)

Ms. Foster mentioned a little bit of the geographic diversity issue. There was an actual piece of litigation that happened over that issue. There was a lawsuit. A group sought an injunction to prevent the group from meeting on that basis. The court ruled against them and found that the

appointing authority had followed the Charter recommendation for geographic diversity based on geographically where their residences are. There was actually a Court challenge and the Court upheld the configuration of the Commission.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A606-619.)

Vice Chairman Saito mentioned the vote in question was in one of the 6-hour meetings. There were quite a number of votes, and it was a very long meeting. The issue was Mission Bay, and whether a portion of Mission Bay should or should not be moved into District 6.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: A620-B026.)

Ms. ODell believes her vote was recorded accurately. She stated she has a pretty strict idea about how she votes. She realizes sometimes in a group like this the actions and the dynamics of it might come across differently. She did not feel that the Chairman had interrupted her. She had felt that way about this because of the argument for the pollution and so forth. The watershed is something that she would like to be able to consider, but this isn't one of their criteria. She realizes that they have the equalization of population and keeping together various communities of interest. "I wanted to maintain that in my own judgment so I voted the way I wanted to. We know that we can't please everybody in each and every one of our decisions."

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: B027-040.)

Ms. Magaña stated the terms that were referenced to the map looking pretty. She based those terms on cases that Lisa has brought to their attention in that the Courts looked at maps and based whether or not it was pretty or looked good. "I used that term based on previous law cases."

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: B041-046.)

SPEAKER 11: Kevin Faulconer

I am a resident of District 2 in the Point Loma area, also Vice Chairman of the Mission Bay Committee, and also member of the Downtown San Diego Partnership, and I'll keep my remarks to District 2. I'm not quite sure if I'm capable to compliment on how pretty the map looks. I do want to tell you that I think you all have done a fantastic job. I'm very supportive of the map and the way it is now for a couple key reasons. I testified before you as I think you probably remember a couple weeks ago and urged you to keep Mission Bay in District 2 which you have done. Very important particularly for the

communities of Mission Beach and Pacific Beach is absolutely critical and essential that they maintain and are tied to the bay. I think you've absolutely made the right decision there, and I commend you for it. I also want to comment about Pacific Beach. Many members of the Pacific Beach communities for years now have wanted to be under one council district. I think the steps you've taken by this map get us to where we need to be and that is absolutely a positive for the Pacific Beach Community. Lastly, I want to talk a little bit about East Village. Downtown, as you all know, we are continuing to be in the midst of really a renaissance. We are determining the future of our city and our downtown in a number of ways. Not only from infrastructure, but all the projects that are happening here, but also for how are we going to look like as people. What are we going to do about housing options, how are we going to make transportation work downtown. I think it is absolutely critical that we do what you have done which is include the East Village into Downtown because so many of the issues there are nexus with the downtown that we have to make sure are working. Particularly the issue of affordable housing. In my mind it is absolutely critical for the success of our downtown. It is going to be very helpful to have East Village as part of that. I want to thank you again for your map. I am strongly supportive of the map that you've come out with, and appreciate all the time, the hours, the hard work that you put into this, and I think it shows.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: B047-071.)

SPEAKER 12: Paul Ross

I'm in District 2. I've lived in the beach community since 1972. I bought a home here in 1987. It's ten miles from there to here, and one of my two comments is I think that's far. I feel that my interests in Pacific Beach that far away are diluted by all of the other things that are in District 2. It's Mission Bay, Sports Arena, NTC, the airport, downtown, ball park, all of the Navy facilities, Convention Center, and I feel my infrastructure needs are not met as well as they could be. That's something you probably have a limited ability to do. The main reason I'm up here is to support the alternative preliminary plan that you've come up with. Because I also feel as a surfer and a user of Mission Bay that it's important that Bay Park and Mission Bay be connected in the way this has been redrawn. As a City Planner, that's my trade, I've had training in the fact that freeways divide communities, They don't define them. That evolves over time, and it's inaccurate to assume that a boundary, legitimate boundary, truly of a community is a freeway. It's not true it just evolves that way later and it's convenient. District 6 was drawn freeway to freeway to freeway. I don't think in the case of Bay Park and Mission Bay that that's an accurate representation of the interests of the community. I would encourage you to look closely and deliberate on the alternative plan.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: B072-113.)

SPEAKER 13: Maxine Sherard

I want to commend the Commissioners for their good work, their hard work. I have shadowed them and I know just how involved they've been and they really want to do the right thing, and also the staff. Most of the people today testified how happy they were to see communities reuniting. I find that same thing to be true with the county people are really happy to be reuniting. I am here tonight to encourage you to think about City Heights. Reuniting City Heights again. In the 80's it was united, in the 90's it was split between four districts. That community is one of the most blighted communities in the City of San Diego. The most low-income of all of the districts, and perhaps one of the lowest turnout of voters in the City of San Diego. I believe that this Commission has a responsibility to help that community by reuniting them and giving them a political core. They can be involved in government the way that we'd like to see happen. I looked at the preliminary map, and I also see that there is a little funny foot coming down from District 7 that once was a part of District 4. You talked about maps being pretty. I think that there's little that can be done there to make the map look a little bit better. Either by reuniting that district, which is Webster into 4, or finding a way because I think that you might have an issue there in terms of dilution of the voting interests of the people. If you don't find that you can do it under the Voting Right Act, which is what you must do if that is the case, you should do it because there's so many commending reasons, you need to take a very serious look at the City Heights area and place it together. That group has more than 70,000 people. That's half of what you need for the optimum size of a district. So you need to think about making it the center of a district. Please combine it and use the alternate map. I believe that one is the one that would work for those people who need your help.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: B114-152.)

Ms. Magaña stated on the preliminary map City Heights was reunited somewhat. Instead of being in 3 districts it is now in 2. She questioned the suggestion of seeing all of City Heights in District 3.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: B153-161.)

Maxine Sherard: I don't think that you can recombine it in any other district other than District 3.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: B162-163.)

SPEAKER 14: Peter Bryan

I'm here really to convey Council Member Wear's position. I guess also mine as a resident of District 2. I live just down the street here in East Village. We both have the same thoughts on this issue. I'm really here to convey Council Member Wear's position. I know he would first want to give to you his appreciation for your serving on this panel and taking time out of your personal lives to do this, and also to commend you on a job well done. He's pleased with the map. It is consistent and it keeps with the natural boundaries which I think is one of your charges in this process. The many issues revolving around Mission Bay really need to be addressed in a comprehensive fashion. Particularly as it relates to water quality. I think that really--while that's not your mission here--that is how we look at it. Keeping Mission Bay in one district allows us to do that. You've done that quite well. Most importantly the eastern area of Mission Bay Park are communities of interest to District 2. They really have no resemblance to the Clairemont Community or some of the things upstream. There's a sense that this is--those communities along the eastern edge are more in tune with the rest of District 2. Therefore, we support the preliminary map as it has been presented today.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: B164-190.)

SPEAKER 15: Kevin Davis

I live in the Hillcrest neighborhood of San Diego. With all due respect to Ms. Sherard, I disagree with her conclusions. I live in Hillcrest and I have testified that I think you should reunite Hillcrest, people from Talmadge have spoken the same way, and the same for Pacific Beach. The people in City Heights have unanimously said leave us alone. We like being in three districts. That's our political strategy. I think it's a little insulting to say you don't know what's best for yourself. We know what's best for you. I just would like to respect the wishes of the City Heights people, and they wish to remain in three districts so they have three voices on the Council. That is their right to believe that's their best strategy. As for the fact, if we were to unify City Heights that District 3 would be the only district that this could be accomplished, I would disagree with that as well. If the unification would be achieved it could just as easily be put in District 7 or District 4. I don't see why District 3 is any better suited to be the place where it would be unified. Again, I disagree that City Heights needs to be unified at all. The people in that planning area should not be united against their will. I speak in support of the preliminary map as it has been drawn. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: B191-239.)

SPEAKER 16: Mary Wendorf

I'm a member of the University Heights Neighborhood Association. I had spoke to the group at the last meeting when it was in North Park. My personal view--I thought uniting was a good idea, but when I went back to our group everybody in the University Heights Neighborhood Association really felt they liked having the dual representation. They felt that they couldn't accomplish the revitalization that happened in University Heights without having the funding and representation from two districts. I'm just here to voice that opinion of our Neighborhood Association. I had a question on the alternative plan what was taken out of District 3 and put into District 7.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: B240-258.)

Ms. Perry noted that Talmadge and Kensington and Normal Heights on the east end of District 3 are moved in the alternative plan. The alternative plan shows District 7 extending all the way over to I-805.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: B259-279.)

Ms. Heshimu reminded the Commission of their packets and the letter dated July 4th from the Executive Director of the University Heights Community Development Corporation which speaks to the very same issue. In there it states that the University Heights Community Development Corporation and University Heights Community Association are voting against being united in District 3.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: B280-332.)

ITEM-4: ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chairman Leland Saito adjourned the meeting at 7:26 p.m.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: B333-339.)

Leland Saito, Vice Chairman
2000 Redistricting Commission

Gilbert Sanchez
(OCA)Legislative Recorder I