

MINUTES

FOR THE REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
FOR TUESDAY, July 11, 2001
6:00 P.M. - 8:00 P.M.
MID-CITY COMMUNITY POLICE STATION
4310 LANDIS STREET
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

ITEM-1: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Ralph called the meeting to order at 6:14 p.m..

ITEM-2: ROLL CALL

Deputy City Attorney Lisa Forster 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 A027-050.)

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

- (C) Chairman Ralph R. Pesqueira-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
Staajabu Heshimu, Operations Director
Joey Perry, Senior Planner

ITEM-3: PUBLIC HEARING

Welcome and Introductions by Chairman Ralph Pesqueira:

The Chairman introduced the Commissioners and staff members introduced themselves. Mr. Pesqueira also introduced two Commission alternates, Maxine Sherard and Elizabeth Stump.

Deputy City Attorney Lisa Foster:

Ms. Foster explained factors to be considered when drawing district boundaries and the final map. Ms Foster also explained that the Consultant Bruce Cain is doing a study to determine if the preliminary maps violates the Voting Rights Act. If the consultant finds that there is a Voting Rights Act violation the Commission may have to take that into consideration in drawing the boundaries. The alternative map essentially unifies all of the parts of City Heights that are currently in three districts into a single district in District 3 and that is the premise behind that map. It is not the preliminary map at this time, but it was drawn in the event that the Commission does come back and are told by the consultant that by law they have to do that. The Commission had to look at how they would do that. It is something that the Commission wanted to share with the public so everything is open as far as the process, but right now the preliminary map has City Heights in two districts.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A140-314.)

The Preliminary Redistricting Plan as adopted on June 29, 2001, was explained by Senior Planner Joey Perry:

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A324-442.)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

SPEAKER 1: Council Member Toni Atkins

Thank you Chairman Pesqueira and Commissioners. I took the liberty of writing my remarks down so I wouldn't go on and on and I appreciate your giving me the opportunity to speak. Once again I want to welcome you to Council District 3 and thank you for your dedication and efforts to this very important matter. I appreciate your hard work in what has been a difficult task. When I stood before you at the beginning of this process back in Normal heights, I thought that District 3, given the census numbers, would see no compelling reason to make major changes to the district's boundary. This appears to be the case with the preliminary map that has been submitted. I would like to commend you for that map and your work. It's clear when drawing these lines you listened to the testimony and heard the wishes and respected the opinions of the residents of the communities and neighborhoods of District 3. You've drawn a map that maintains the integrity and diversity as well as the historic and cultural link that is the thread of District 3. You have united the communities of Hillcrest, University Heights and Talmadge and preserved the connectivity of the older communities, urban communities along Adams Avenue such as North Park, Normal Heights and Kensington. You recognized the political clout that City Heights enjoys by having more than one voice on the City Council and have kept the boundaries that the community clearly stated that they wanted. You've maintained the ethnic and cultural diversity that is celebrated by this minority majority district and you have recognized the GLBT Community's right to have a voice in local government. While the federal government does not believe that the GLBT Community deserves to be recognized, you have honored and respected the City's Human Dignity Ordinance and the norms and values upon which the City of San Diego operates. You are to be commended for your bold action. District 3 may be the most ethnically, economically, socially varied district in the City and it is this melting pot of diversity that is its strength, that is our strength. District 3 has distinctively spoken with one progressive voice. Here are some examples if we look at three different communities in District 3. Hillcrest, census tract no. 4, Normal Heights Census Tract 18, and City Heights Census Tract 25.01. If you look at those three, these areas on the surface may appear to be quite dissimilar. However they tend to speak collectively on issues of concern and importance. For example these communities in the 2000 presidential election, 70% of the vote was cast for Al Gore and in the Mayor's race over 60% was cast for Ron Roberts in these three areas. In the highly racially charged Proposition 187, voters in these three geographical census tracts each voted against its approval by over 60%. Interestingly though to note, in City Heights in Census Tract 27.10 only 39% of the voters voted against this measure so you can see that some of the assumptions made early

on in discussions at these hearings does not exactly always hold true. As you can see District 3 did not vote for the winner in any of these races. However, they did speak convincingly and solidly together for their beliefs. While I believe your preliminary map is both good and fair, I do have concerns with the alternate map which I am aware of. My first concern is the process. If for some reason you decide to adopt the alternative map, there will be limited, if any, public reaction to this map. Additionally the alternate map does not accurately reflect the testimony that has been collected from residents during this redistricting process. The residents of City heights have stated that having representation from several Council Districts strengthens their voice. They have stated that their ability to have their issues addressed would be severely diminished if they are lumped into one district by trying to unify an area. You're also — with the alternative map again — you would be disenfranchising the residents of Normal Heights, Kensington and Talmadge who have noted that they believe their older communities have a natural historic and cultural tie to the other neighborhoods in District 3. The progressive voice of these residents will be lost if they are shoved into another district. For example, in the recent State race for the 39th District, over 70% of the vote was cast for Senator Dee Dee Alpert in Hillcrest and Normal Heights compared to the 44% she received in the community of Navajo in District 7 and 51% in Point Loma in District 2, which if you moved off parts of — okay. Finally, if you approve the alternate map you will effectively destroy the Gay and Lesbian voice in San Diego. True, you have united Hillcrest and University Heights, but you have also removed Bankers Hill, Park West, Normal Heights, Kensington, and Talmadge with the alternate map, thereby diluting the GLBT vote in three districts rather than the two that currently exist. I ask why we must tear down one minority group's progress to try to affect another's when traditionally these groups are on the same side of many issues. In closing I want to leave you with the understanding that the preliminary map clearly reflects the community of villages we are striving for in San Diego. The diversity of a district is our strength and it is celebrated in one progressive voice. I urge you to respect the sense of neighborhood pride and accept the preliminary map as your final map. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location A055-127.)

SPEAKER 2: Al Stasukevich

I have been before you before. First of all I agree with what our City Council person has stated, but there are a few things I do disagree with. On June 27th as a direct result of your outreach, District 3 residents came before you totally united from Hillcrest to Ridgeview, residents from the length and breath of District 3 representing the numerous communities of interest and they all raised the same cry, leave us the way we are; it works. Since then,

your actions gave me cause for alarm and dismay. First, we had our time cut the last time we came before you because we had to allow all of the politicians to have thirty or forty-five minutes, now tonight we have two minutes again. Secondly, it appears that our testimony was not significant enough for your consideration. Your statements have been contradictory and confusing. While saying you heard us, you changed our representation from three districts to two in order unite Oak Park and this drastically affects cross roads. You said that neighborhoods should take turns being split. We requested to remain split to make your job easier. While saying population was the first consideration, you changed us from a nearly perfect district of plus 300 to a district of over plus 3,000. And with the alternate map over 6,000. What you have said is that communities that have been broken up have survived, but at what cost? Changing City heights will negate 15 years of unbelievably productive work. You are sitting on the cornerstone of the first village of the strategic framework. Allow us to build upon it and continue on to other City Heights villages.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location A600-656.)

SPEAKER 3: Cesar Portillo

I have attended several of your meetings and do not envy your prestigious positions. I live in the University Heights neighborhood, District 3. I understand questions have been raised concerning the diversity of the citizens in District 3 and more specifically whether people of color hold any leadership positions in the LGBT community. I have served two years as co-chair of the San Diego Lesbian and Gay Pride, probably the largest event in the City; it attracts over 120,000 people. While we are at that point I would like to extend an invitation to the Commissioners to attend the events at the Pride Festival. You will have an opportunity to see the diversity in our community. I have also served two terms as the president of the South Bay Hispanic Unit for the American Society. I bring up my activities to answer the question of whether people of color in District 3 hold any leadership positions in the LGBT community and the answer is yes. Now, to move on to the issue at hand, redistricting. I am very happy to say that when I purchased by home, I did so knowing the community. I knew the general voting trends of the community. I knew how supportive the community was and continues to be toward issues of diversity. As an openly gay Latino, I made a decision to live in District 3 because it afforded me the best political representation. I do not know how many other people of color, and more specifically Latinos, will speak tonight. But I can tell you that I am not alone in the Latino community when I express my support for the preliminary map.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B037-065.)

SPEAKER 4: Michael Sprague

This the police map that we have and as you see it has the Adams service area which contains a number of neighborhoods which you have divided into two council districts and has 40,000. The services areas of east and west City Heights, each of them has 40,000. You have divided them into one council district. Below that you see the Rolando service area, which is a number of neighborhoods and you have divided that into 2 and 3 districts. You have consistently used police maps for Mid-City that have never had one second of community input, have never been our maps, and the City promised us would never be used as neighborhood maps. There is no neighborhood in City Heights called City Heights. It is made up of 16 neighborhoods with a regional population of 80,000 people. There is no reason for it to be segregated into one neighborhood, which is what you are doing. This process has been unbelievably critical. I have little justification for any of the things that you have done and I don't think you're going to see this challenge in the courts. I think you are going to see a challenged by the Grand Jury because the inconsistency on this Board has been phenomenal, and the incredible stereotyping has lead to conduct that is incredibly unbecoming. If you want to reach Hispanics, as you say you do, you might do the courtesy of providing information in Spanish, minutes in Spanish, agendas in Spanish. All of these things you say you're doing to enfranchise people you're not doing yourself. Your behavior has been absolutely disgraceful and I think half of the people on this Commission should leave.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B068-092.)

SPEAKER 5: Alex Sachs

I want to speak to you today as a general community member and resident of District 3. I want to commend the Commission for the preliminary plan you have done. I also want to say that I strongly oppose the alternate plan. When I moved to San Diego, I knew what community I wanted to live in and it was any one of the Mid-City Communities that comprise District 3. The preliminary plan does not satisfy everyone, but it does do the best job of retaining the communities of interest that make up District 3. My position favoring this plan may not reflect the views of all of University Heights residents. We do enjoy the representation that we currently receive from two council members. We receive greater attention and probably receive more funds for community activities. University Heights and City Heights are very different communities. University Heights, both the commercial area and residential community, have been undergoing a major resurgence since the early 1980's. City Heights on the other hand is a poor community that has only now begun to grow in economic strength with the support of three council members. City

Heights is a vast community made up of 16 neighborhoods and comprising more than half of a council district in and of itself, while University Heights is one smaller community as a part of District 3. City Heights needs and deserves the continued representation of three council members. Let me try to summarize my opposition to the alternate plan. In addition to dividing the LGBT community in Normal Heights, Kensington, and Talmadge, you also assure that the communities will be an isolated enclave of District 7. The similarities between Normal Heights, North Park, Kensington and Talmadge are vast. The similarities between those communities and the communities of District 7, especially the suburban communities north of I-8 are minuscule.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B097-126.)

SPEAKER 6: Brenda Lesane

I am a very involved parent and at no time did you think about education, specifically schools. The school district has a Prop. MM school bond. Those schools that are going to be built are all south of I-8, but they're in areas that you are planning to split up. I don't think that families have to send their elementary kid to a school in District 3, have to send a middle school kid to District 7, and a high school kid to District 2. I'm here for questions. Were school district boundaries considered at all in this redevelopment? If not, I know it is not high priority, but these are the youth that will later on buy homes, vote and help your map. If you will go back to the City Council and suggest that they afford affordable housing in your District 2 and District 3 and District 6, you can get rid of half of City Heights. They are here because they can afford to live here and the schools are here. I think you need to consider that. I live in East San Diego. Someone named it City Heights because of crime. I'm not in a crime capital. I live in East San Diego and that's what I call it and I've lived here for over 50 years.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B128-153.)

SPEAKER 7: Susan Ringo

I've heard you mention that you have been successful in uniting communities. I believe this is one community that has not asked to be reunited. We do very well independently and with three districts. We have worked very hard over the past ten years to recover from 30 years of neglect by the City. As a result we have three council people we can rely on to help us get things done in redevelopment and bringing our community back up to the level the rest of this great city. By watching what has happened over the last couple

of weeks, I watched us go from three council people that can help us get things done back to the possibility of one and now you are saying that your preliminary map has us in two districts which makes it much more difficult for us to get the funding that we need to get things done in our community. We are not people that sit back and wait for someone else to get it done for us. We're willing to do the work, but we need you to understand that we need three districts to get the work done.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B160-174.)

SPEAKER 8: Patty Vaccariello

I live right here in City Heights. This building that we are meeting in is symbolic. It is one example of what the community is saying that sharing council members works for us, that distributing this diverse community among council districts has provided better representation on the Council and served to focus attention and services where they are needed most. By now you know this is partnership between council districts that made this building possible and you have heard the other success stories. Since the existing boundaries do work well, it is a concern when the map changes in a way that causes our community to lose a representative on the Council. That is not a minor matter. One of the tools we use to make our community work is being taken from us. A lot of effort has gone into building those relationships between districts and the community they have in common. A lot of hard work and dedication has gone into rebuilding City Heights. Accordingly the consultant had mentioned that moving the District 4 portion of City Heights was not required under the Voting Rights Act and if that were to happen another justification would have to be used. When making changes to this map, I've noticed some inconsistencies. The same move that is made for economic reasons at one meeting is then justified by reasons of population or some other reason at the next. Being more consistent in the reasoning or justification would be helpful and less confusing to us.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B183-203.)

SPEAKER 9: Jessie Sergent

I have been a resident for over 30 years and I too want to let you know that I am a person of color and I belong to the City Heights Town Council, the City Heights Planning Committee, City Heights on Patrol and vice president of the Friends of the Library. I am very much involved in my community. My children all attended school here. I have lived all over this part of City Heights. Now, I own a home here and we could never have

done that without having three council members.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B205-218.)

SPEAKER 10: Jose Lopez

I am pleased with the preliminary plan, except we have a hanging chad that we need to fix. Oak Park is a place where you can move and put it on the bottom of District 7 and you will be fine and then you will leave us at the cross roads which is very important to us. I am very concerned about the alternative map. Without having all the data and if we have the data and it has to be done, it is going to be a crush, big time, for the reason that the Latino community has not the infrastructure to be able to really bring a candidate that is a Latino in District 3 to be able to interrelate with these issues or for us to be able to elect it. We are a young community. Most of us are either illegal aliens, too young to vote, or uneducated. Therefore, we need to get these issues done.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B219-235.)

SPEAKER 11: Clive Richard

I've been really happy to see what you have done with what you were given to work with except when I look at — well, I'll say — District 8 getting rid of the Filner finger, getting rid of that boot or whatever it was in District 6 and then I suddenly noticed after you had come up with all of that and united communities that had come to you and said unite us, you then looked at what a council member had said to you, "Gee wouldn't it be nice if this district had a nice shopping mall, a generator, economic generator and then suddenly all the neighbors around that shopping mall were put into a united community, having never said hey what about us. Apparently, they were content with what they had or else you would have heard from them very loudly as you have heard from other groups. I then noticed what you did with District 7, to balance that out was to take Webster out of District 4 and balance what you — when you took Oak Park out of District 7. That now creates a new boot. I think that historically that boot will be the footprint of District 5 into District 6. That will be the Filner finger. This will be the thing that people will look at in ten years and remember that it was done that way, but I think that putting it back the way it was is really what the communities have asked for. The communities have wished to be united should have been and taking turns being divided is an option. It shouldn't be a necessity.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B258-290.)

SPEAKER 12: Myrna Zambrano

I am representing Assembly Member Christine Kehoe who is in Sacramento today representing you. She writes: Dear Chairman Pesqueira and Commissioners, thank you for serving on the redistricting commission and your work to draw fair and legal boundaries for the City of San Diego's council districts. This is an important responsibility that I know you take seriously and have already dedicated many hours of valuable work. I have two concerns that compel me to testify this evening. First as the former City Council Member to represent District 3, I strongly oppose the alternate map that significantly alters the character, diversity and geographic boundaries of the district. Putting the community of City Heights in only one district will result in a great disservice to the residents, community groups, and leaders who have been able to accomplish so much for this area. They are a vocal and organized group of citizens that in the seven years that I represented them were able to be part of the largest redevelopment efforts since Horton Plaza was built downtown. We began by building a police substation which you are sitting in this evening, bringing in over 200 officers into City Heights. Together we lowered the crime rate and raised homeownership. This followed with a new public library, tennis courts, swimming center, joint use recreational fields, tot lots, a theater performance space, Head Start class rooms, and even an office for the City Heights Town Council. We also were part of bringing in a new continuing education center, and a shopping complex that is currently under construction. The initial funding for the City Heights police substation was shared by former Council Member Judy McCarty who represented District 7 at the time and me. Would this have happened if only one member of the council represented this district? I don't think so. Where City Heights is today, is not the accomplishment of a disenfranchised community struggling to be heard. In fact it is because of it's out spoken persistent and effective leaders and the elected officials who listen that we accomplished so much in so little time. City Heights continues to grow today to accommodate and serve its many residents because it is represented by members of the City Council and the Mayor. Second the make up of District 3 and the proposed map is what San Diego should be, an integrated city of income levels, ethnic backgrounds, religions, ages and sexual orientations. Respecting and recognizing the voice of the Lesbian and Gay Community took years of hard work and involvement. The alternate map that unifies City Heights will marginalize yet another community. In essence, you will water down the political voice of two communities instead of strengthening them as they have been during my two terms in office. I urge you to accept the preliminary map and reject the alternate map.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B292-330.)

SPEAKER 13: J.W. Stump

Welcome to the house that City Heights' CDBG funds paid for. This was paid for because we have poor people here. It wasn't a contribution of the General Fund. It was because we had poor people here. I would like first to make comment on your filing of the preliminary district map. I think you should be adding at least a 15 and 16 and that should discuss why you decided to dilute and disunite City Heights and parts of District 4 by putting in what we are now calling in District 4, the "moose head." I think there should be some explanation on most of your points. It's preliminary. We're trying to help. There should be some explanation why every place else you unite and where you have the largest concentration of protected class members you keep them apart. The next thing I'd like to say is if Hillcrest and that area are trying to get united into a single council district, why isn't it good for City Heights. I think the alternate map has some positive aspects to it. Maybe it's not perfect. I suggest first that you look at block groups and you particularly look at block groups around Hoover High School. Also in this moose head there are two communities there and that valley forms something so I think you want to look at block groups and balancing in there. The final thing I want to say is when you look at City Heights, please go around and check it out and particularly, don't think of this just as Webster. It's Webster and Ridgeview and answer why is it a sin of omission that you're doing for not giving us reasons for uniting everybody else, but not uniting the goose and the gander.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B332-371.)

SPEAKER 14: Mshinda Nyofn

I want to support some of the statements that John Stump made in terms of — though the preliminary map does have some positives that I see coming from 3 to 2 in terms of City Heights, in terms of representation as a lot of people have testified to, I still do see a need to wait and adhere to the 1965 Voting Rights Act in terms of waiting for the results. I'm glad to see that will be forthcoming around July 22nd. I anxiously await those results. Though I understand that people are concerned about having three representatives in terms of getting things done economically, however, this is about voting and about elections. Where ever you live you only have one vote to vote for one person on that board. I understand the economic part. I want to support — in terms of taking your time and listening to the people, but also waiting until all the results are in, in terms of what the consultant is looking at.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B384-410.)

SPEAKER 15: Maxine Sherard

I am here to support the alternate plan. I want to say my intent is not to alienate any group, but I believe there is a higher purpose in this whole process and it stems from the U.S. Constitution, it stems from federal laws, and it also stems from a community and local imperative and that is to unite communities, to empower communities so that they can take part in government. I would like to see City Heights reunited. In the 1980 redistricting it was united. In 1990 it was separated into three parts. I am here to say I believe people have been disenfranchised as a result of it and the area has been neglected for years because of it. You don't need three councilmen; you need five because there are eight on the panel. Three votes won't get it. You need a majority of votes. This business of three, will not get the job done for you. Most people want to reunite. Why is it that you want to divide. Is it that the people here are so disenfranchised that you feel that you don't have the power to do what is needed in the community? I suggest that you do have that power. I am going to also say that City Heights has the potential of being one half of a district. It should be the center and core of a district in all of your planning. Why would one want to disenfranchise voters who have a common interest in their common communities. I say to the Commission, I don't have a vote, but I urge you, you must reunite those communities if you are in violation of the Voting Rights Act, but I think without the Voting Rights Act, you know the right thing to do.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B424-469.)

SPEAKER 16: Charles Sheppard

I have been living here over 30 years. I've been working here for 30 years in that little office on 42nd and University. I've seen City Heights go from upper middle class down to what we call poverty level. Now City Heights is on the way back because people like myself, Lopez, John Stump always fight for City Heights. We always fight for the little guy. I'm not a poor man. John Stump is not a poor man. I consider myself middle income. I love City Heights. People ask me why do you stay in City Heights? You don't have to stay over there. I say no I don't, but I love City Heights. This is where I grew up. It used to be called East San Diego when I was a kid. The last time I was here about two months ago we had a hearing about the new elementary school. About ten people showed up. Tonight, I think we have about 2 or 300 in here. These people are against this. We are against this. You guys can see how many people turned out tonight

and that will tell you that you are doing something wrong.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B470-510.)

SPEAKER 17: Francisco Yescas

I live in the community of Talmadge. I just wanted to let you know that I am very active in the Latino community. I encourage the Commission to stay with the preliminary plan. We have come too far. We have too many things in place. We received some funding from a county board of supervisor to put in more lights, to do some more landscaping. There are areas of Talmadge that have been totally neglected by the City of San Diego. There are no street lights on the east side of Talmadge and the way we have structured our community activism program, we have things to do. Talmadge has always been considered part of the metro-center city. If Talmadge were to be put in District 7 we would be associated with other communities that don't have the interests that City Heights, Kensington, Normal Heights, and University Heights have. There is that common thread that cultural, historical identity that runs through that community and I urge the commission to stick with the preliminary plan.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B511-548.)

SPEAKER 18: Morris Dye

I basically did agree with most everything that Toni Atkins said. I think you should stick with the preliminary plan. I wouldn't like to see Normal Heights and Kensington taken out of District 3 and put into District 7. We have too many issues that we worked long and hard together on and much more work to go in those neighborhoods I mentioned as well as the I-15, El Cajon Boulevard intersection, the Transit Center and those kind of projects that are there to have that taken out and put in a different district would be a disservice to us. I am most concerned about the process. I know you have to obey the law. What I am concerned about is that it seems that at the eleventh hour we're going to do a study and we're going to get the data late and we don't even know what that data is going to say and then at the eleventh hour, you are going to have to change and go to a new map that we haven't had a chance to look at. I don't think that process is a good one. I think you should abandon that if it's going to take longer to do this. Go through this same process you did to get to the preliminary map with the alternative. You're going to have to go through the same forms again, if that is possible. I don't like the process. I think we are being slammed at the end. It sounds like you're being slammed by the law,

but I don't think the process has to be that way. I would encourage you to stay with the preliminary map. Take a very detailed look as we would like to take a detailed look at the data that comes out of that study so that we are all on board with, if we can be, about the alternative map. Right now, we are not. That is what I am most concerned about is the process. I would like to be well informed so that I can inform my board and other people in the community about what that process is going to be so I know well ahead of time to make an informed decision about whether I like that alternative map or not.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B549-591.)

Staa Heshimu: Sometimes I like to make a public announcement about what happens next and I thought this was a good opportunity to let you know if you don't or remind you if you do that after the public hearings are over, the last one is in District 4 on July 19, the Commission will be meeting again in regular session at least once a week and I would predict either three or four meetings. All of those meetings will be open to the public and I expect we will receive the analysis and report from the consultant at that first meeting on July 25th. All three or four of those meetings are expected to be broadcast on cable T.V. We have prepared for a very open process even after the hearings are concluded.

Chairman Pesqueira: If we are forced to abandon the preliminary map, we will go pretty close to a full-time schedule which means we will be meeting more frequently than one night a week so we can give as much opportunity to as many people as can to come down to 202 C Street. That is going to be extremely important that you do come down there. Right now we have no plans to come back into the districts. By law we were only required to meet in four districts before we had the preliminary map and only three after. This Commission said we were going to meet in all eight districts. We wanted to give every opportunity for every person who had an interest to come to these meetings. If we must move into another map because of what we hear, we are going to have to go to, if not two, maybe three meetings a week until we get an alternative map up there. It will all be notified. You can see it on our website. There will be plenty of public announcement of it. I would invite you to be there, work with us, and help us draw those maps.

SPEAKER 19: Mary Schilling

I live in Talmadge. I strongly support the preliminary map and hope there is not a need to go to the alternate. If there is, I agree with the previous speaker that we need to have more opportunity to speak and reconsider it.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C022-028.)

SPEAKER 20: Craig Roberts

I am here to respond to earlier comments by some of the speakers regarding the need for City Heights to be in one council district. I have walked several neighborhoods in City Heights on behalf of District 3 City Council candidates so I feel like I know it pretty well. I think the Commission needs to listen to the majority of the City Heights residents that time and again have told you about the need to have their diverse vote split among three council members. Earlier speakers said you need five and three doesn't get you there. Well three gets you a lot closer to five than one does. Also, one of the two speakers maintaining that City Heights needs to be in one neighborhood does not even live in City Heights and doesn't even know the neighborhood like most of us here do. Most of the speakers who are going to speak in favor of keeping City Heights split among three council districts know where of they speak. My only gripe with the preliminary map is the Webster neighborhood being put in District 7. I think that is ridiculous to trade that for the College Grove Shopping Center. The neighborhood did not ask for that and there is no reason why they can't stay in District 7 and why Webster can't stay in District 4 and therefore, City Heights can keep itself in three council districts. I am kind of emotional about this because I feel the LGBT community has been sandbagged. If your goal was really to create a third district unifying City Heights addressing the Voting Rights Act and no one is even sure if there is any problem with that then what you would do is take part of what you have as District 8, what you have as District 4 put all of City Heights next to that and leave the LGBT community where it is in District 3. I am angry that you are trying to cannibalize a unified LGBT community for this purported need to unify City Heights in one council district. If your goal is to unify all of City Heights into one council district and make that council district a largely ethnic minority council district, then what you can easily do is take the northwestern corner of what you have as District 8, the northeastern corner of what you have as District 4 and there will be enough people there to make a third council district without affecting the LGBT community's unified voting voice.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C032-097.)

SPEAKER 21: Fred Lindahl

I reside in Talmadge Park. I am a member of the Kensington Talmadge Planning Committee and I have come to speak on their behalf. The committee is holding their meeting at this moment and have sent me to represent their views. The Kensington Talmadge Planning Committee strongly supports the proposed Plan 1 which retains the Kensington Talmadge communities in District 3 and maintains the City Heights

community in separate districts. The reasons for these positions are as follows: Kensington Talmadge has more in common with our neighbors south of the I-8 than the areas north of the I-8. Since the communities south of the I-8 are all older and have similar problems concerning density, need for redevelopment, age of utilities and impact of the new I-15 freeway. Two, the City Council Member from District 3 and her staff are well aware of the issues of our communities including the issues that led to the formation of the Talmadge maintenance assessment district. To familiarize a new council member and staff with these issues would be time consuming and inefficient. Three, the City Heights community is moving ahead with very necessary redevelopment efforts with the support of the three council members who currently represent the area. The planning along the I-15 and the Fairmount avenue is being properly coordinated between City Heights, Kensington, Talmadge through the District 3 council member and staff. This process is working. The Kensington Talmadge Planning Committee feels that the alternate plan 2 which would relocate our two communities into District 7 while placing most of City Heights in District 3 would be disruptive and can jeopardize the progress that is being made in redeveloping the communities south of I-8. We urge you to approve plan 1.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C103-133.)

SPEAKER 22: Ellis Rose

I am here tonight to say that I do like the preliminary map for what it does for District 3 and I strongly oppose the alternative map. I initially want to speak about the reasons I support the preliminary map, but as somebody who has attended these meetings and watched the process, I was disturbed that Monday night when a request was made to reunite Rancho Penasquitos and Mira Mesa they were told that the Commission spent a whole two and a half hours on this. You have spent weeks and weeks on the issue of City Heights. When the City Attorney pointed out to you that she would feel uncomfortable representing the alternative map because at this time there is no evidence that there are voting rights violations, you finally decided to send it to the consultant and ask the consultant to look for violations. The consultant didn't know what to look for. He ended up coming to people like Kevin Davis and myself and asking us for possible races in terms of issues or candidates to look at. There has been no evidence presented that there have been violations. Why you hang on to this, I don't know especially after you hear testimony from people of various ethnicities and races, I don't get it. Besides that, I do want to talk about what this process has done for me in terms of deepening my love for the current District 3 neighborhoods, especially for what City Heights and the activists have taught me. I have known them for a few years now having worked in a campaign,

but what I have learned in the last few months has really made me appreciate their situation. The switch of the Webster area that includes the City Heights neighborhood of Ridgeview from District 4 to District 7 in exchange for a shopping center packs the various CityHeights neighborhoods into fewer districts reducing the effective political participation they currently have. It also contradicts the goal of compactness which you have been striving for because it takes this dangling shape here at the bottom of 7.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C142-173.)

SPEAKER 23: Charles McKan

Our coalition supports the preliminary map to the extent it includes in District 3 the neighborhoods identified by overwhelming testimony and data as containing large concentration of GLBT people and their supportive neighbors. However, we find unacceptable the portions of the alternative map that would divide such identified community of interests by moving Normal Heights, Kensington, and Talmadge from District 3 to District 7. We thus oppose that option of the alternative map if your consultant finds no factual basis for the theory that the Voting Rights Act somehow requires unification of various portions of City Heights in the fewer than the current number of three districts. We also disagree with the statement made by Maxine Sherard that the alternative map should be adopted even if not required. By doing so, you would have to ignore the overwhelming testimony of District 3 residents in favor of retaining District 3 as it is with at most only a few minor adjustments. You would also have to ignore the overwhelming testimony of City Heights residents. By following her suggestions you could expose your map to constitutional and statutory challenges based upon Supreme Court Redistricting Jurisprudence, the Voting Rights Act, the City Charter or other theories. Moreover, if your consultant should find that the Voting rights Act requires the unification of City Heights into one district we would also oppose adoption of the alternate map. On June 29, I placed in the record a sample map that suggests City Heights could be unified as part of creating two districts with more than 55% Latino population and about 70% minority/majorities. This could be done without carving into two or three pieces the portions of District 3 identified as containing the LGBT community of interest. If your intent of the alternative map is to empower protected groups particularly Latinos, that sample map would appear to offer better possibilities to do so. However the record appears to indicate that in creating your alternate map you simply ignored those available feasible possibilities that would be less destructive to the current cohesion of the LBG T community of interest of District 3. We are left to wonder why.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C182-219.)

SPEAKER 24: Karen Bucey

I live in Azelea Park which is Census Tract 25.02. I am here to urge you to adopt the proposed plan you have now. The alternative goes so far away from all the work we have done. It has been a grass roots effort. As a community we are unique we are in 3, 7, and 4 and we spent a lot of time building that coalition together with CDBG funds, with helping other communities and paint-outs and everything else. I feel as if it is so important that the boundaries that we have now that are really important to us stay. It is important that we have three districts. It may not seem like it on your map. It is a very relevant issue to us. It is so important. It is just not numbers on the map. It is the place that we live. It's a community we love and we live here on purpose and this is really important.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C220-235.)

SPEAKER 25: Nuri Ozgunouz

I live in Kensington. I have lived there 27 years. Christen Kehoe started improvements in our community and now Toni is following in those footsteps. This took a lot of energy in our community to get these things done. As an older community Kensington shares the similar interest in projects with all the older communities and District 3. Toni understands our needs and therefore, I oppose the alternative map.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C237-249.)

SPEAKER 26: Ramon Espinal

I have lived in my community for 20 years. In my heart, I agree with the feelings expressed by Mr. Stump and Maxine but, from a pragmatic point of view, the process of representation that we have has been working well for us up to now. For me it is not a question of whether the Latino community is too young or some of us are undocumented. The question is that yes more attention needs to be paid to our community. Having three council persons advocating for City Heights is a winning proposition. Therefore, I

believe that we should keep the representation we presently have. Of course there are areas of concern, specifically the equity question, the representation question. The reason I am a defender of not tinkering with the present set up, I believe it is important that the preliminary plan, which is a good beginning also looks at the question of perhaps including different precincts that have not been looked at. I'm talking about precincts like 1721, 2301, 2707, 2709. I think we need to add more coffee rather than more cream.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C250-277.)

SPEAKER 27: Andrea Villa

I am a new homeowner in Kensington. The current district map as proposed accurately reflects the social and political culture of those combined neighborhoods. It also provides me and my neighbors a forum with which to speak with one voice on very important political and social issues. If the alternative map which cuts Kensington and Talmadge away from District 3 becomes our new map, I and my neighbors become silenced. Aligned with another district with a history of social and political culture that is different from District 3 the older neon light neighborhoods of Kensington and Talmadge will be cut adrift impotent of any real impact of our political and social future; you silence the active LGBT community in this city. I urge you to adopt the currently proposed map. I understand that you do have some questions as do I about the validity of the application of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to this situation. I think after your consultant takes a look at the record of voting by organized communities in District 3 you will find we vote together on issues of cultural importance, of social importance, of political importance.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C279-313.)

ITEM 4: ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Pesqueira explained how the possible voting rights act violation was brought to the attention of the commission and when it was turned over to the Consultant to review and examine whether there is a voting rights violation.

Commissioner Saito thanked everyone for their attendance and explained that what makes the commissioners job so difficult is there are segments of the population that do not attend these public hearings and we don't know by looking at the people that speak what their income level is. Because the part that doesn't have a voice in this process and haven't spoken is why we are

doing the voting rights analysis.

Commissioner Magana commented on the Commission's process and asked that the public be patient and give the Commissioners the opportunity to think. At times the Commission may seem inconsistent, but we take into consideration everything the public has to say. She said she does not have Charles' (McKain) map.

Staa Heshimu advised Commissioner Magana to look at the handouts for meeting of June 27th.

Commissioner Odell asked the public to know that each Commissioner has your best interests at heart. The issues are discussed amongst the Commissioners; we are glad to hear what the public has to say and want to do the very best job we can.

Comment by Pesqueira reminded that is the numbers the Commission must keep in mind all the time. He said he felt very hurt that some people have spoken about the Commission as if we are all here to create some monster. Our whole idea is to satisfy the public and stay within the law and the charter.

Chairman Ralph Pesqueira adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location: C314-489.)

Ralph Pesqueira, Chairman
2000 Redistricting Commission

Esther Ramos
Legislative Recorder