

MINUTES

FOR THE REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
FOR TUESDAY, July 17, 2001
6:00 P.M. - 8:00 P.M.
FAITH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
5075 CAMPANILE DRIVE
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

ITEM-1: CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman Saito called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.

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-present
- (M) Marichu G. Magaña-present
- (M) Shirley ODell-present
- (M) Juan Antonio Ulloa-present

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location A001-011.)

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

- (C) Chairman Ralph R. Pesqueira- not present
- (VC) Vice Chairman Leland T. Saito-present
- (M) Mateo R. Camarillo-present
- (M) Charles W. Johnson-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 Vice Chairman Leland Saito:

The Commissioners and staff members Staa Heshimu and Joey Perry introduced themselves. Ms Heshimu introduced the consultants and other City staff present.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A011-048)

Deputy City Attorney Lisa Foster:

Ms. Foster explained factors to be considered when drawing district boundaries.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A049-194.)

The Redistricting Task by Director Staajabu Heshimu:

Ms. Heshimu explained the time line and where the Commission is in the redistricting process.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A415-447.)

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

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A202-411.)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

SPEAKER 1: Judy McCarty:

I am the former council member for this district so you can imagine I have very strong feelings of protection for the Seventh District. I went through this the last time. Guess what? They tried to move the Navajo boundary east on us. The river is the boundary of the Navajo Community Plan. It has been since it was written in the '60's and the Mission Valley Council office, or however they -- they like to keep all the businesses together. We're proud that Home Depot is in the Seventh District and we don't want to lose that. We want the boundary at the river to stay the same. I think the Navajo Community is probably unanimous that we want to keep our community plan together. I don't know what the population is between the river and Fairmount, but I'll bet it's not many. Why are you changing it except to put more businesses in District 6 and take them out of Seven when we have so little now and that is not right. Now we're going to do the same thing on the other side of District 7. Why on earth — I shouldn't speak this way. Look at what you're doing to District 7. You're doing the same thing to us that you do between Two and Eight. Well, it make sense between Two and Eight; there's no land in between, but there is land there. Why are you taking away the part that is contiguous to Seven and then giving us a part — I don't even know where that street is but you have to go down. You know what I think? I think it's the College Grove Shopping Center. What is the population of College Grove? The same as it is between the river and Fairmount Avenue. Zero. One man one vote, no vote dilution of racial groups, Charter principals, that has nothing to do with it. What this has to do with is politics and with tax increment. We worked our tails off in District 7 to get that shopping center built. It took three tries and we finally got it done. We are planning to use the tax increment from that to fix the rest of the blight in District 7 along University Avenue. There is money for parks at the State. I know because I helped work on that before I left office. It is not right to take that shopping center away from the people of District 7 who worked so hard to make that happen. It doesn't solve any of your problems and it looks pretty gerrymandered if you ask me.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location A464-508.)

SPEAKER 2: Charles Lewis:

Resident of the Fourth District and Chief of Staff to Council Member Stevens. I am here to speak in opposition to the June 29th map as it is presented basically because I support the July 6th Alternative Map as it relates to the Webster Community. For the last ten years, I've had the honor of being on Council Member Steven's staff and for about six of those years I served as the council representative for the Webster Community. I can stand here and tell you that the Webster Community is very much different from the City Heights Community. The Webster Community when you're talking about natural boundaries you can look at the natural boundary of the canyon, also I believe, the ethnicity of the residents of Webster, a large African American population as well as, you talked about the community planning groups, Webster is in the Eastern Area Planning Group closer to the line of Oak Park than it is within the City Heights Planning Area. I hope you take this into consideration. I was speaking today regarding Census Tract 31 with a resident of the district and he mentioned that maybe you want to look at census tracts going north. He mentioned 192001 or 192002 which I'm still not sure exactly where they are. That's more in line with District 7 and also has about the same about of population we're trying to get those numbers so I hope that you can take that into consideration and keep the Webster Community in the Fourth Council District because of the hard work we have done in that community and like I said the natural boundaries, the ethnicity, and the planning groups. We worked really hard in that area. The community is working with the different interests out in the canyon, with the little leagues and so forth so please do that. Like my council member told me, please use common sense because common sense is not so common any more.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A520-557.)

SPEAKER 3: Pat Hammon

I very concerned and I am hurt that you are putting the College Grove Shopping Center into another district. Former Council Member Judy McCarty with our new Council Member Jim Madaffer and Gary Debrashaw who worked with Judy worked very hard to upgrade, to get the seed money, and to get the work done to get the comeback of the College Grove Shopping Center. Judy McCarty has her name on the main street off of College Avenue and to the Center, and it was named after her. This was due to all of the Seventh District's efforts of the blood,

sweat, and tears put into this center coming back together. I have lived in this area and I have worked in this community for 39 years. I have lived in San Diego 59 years. I have been on the College Area Community Council for 25 years so, therefore, I do work for the community. I was here when George Scott opened Walker's Department Store. I saw it when it went down, and I saw the Center go down, and now I have seen it come back because of all the efforts of the Seventh District. This has helped to revitalize the Seventh District community and it has approximately 700 jobs in our area. How unfair it is to the Seventh Council District to do all the upgrade and then you give it to some one else. I hope you have an open mind and are listening to how we feel and what is fair. Be fair. Give the College Grove Shopping Center back to the Seventh District the way it was in this area.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location A559-604.)

SPEAKER 4: Bill Nugent

The thing we're here tonight to talk about is the redistricting of Darnall. The Darnall community has been divided among council districts at least three times in my experience. I have lived in Darnall for nearly 52 years. The consequences of it has been of people that are not what I would call desirable people. Just pick on council districts that are separated. We've been chunked off one district repeatedly about three times. The experience we had one time before Judy McCarty took over was the position of having to reject and fight against a strip night club on Billman Avenue near College Avenue and a rock and roll jazz place to replace the bowling alley where Food 4 Less is at the present time. We have established good neighborship and established the College Grove. You've heard about that and I am not going to go over it again, but George Scott when he started that program the first shopping center in San Diego, he complimented us for the aid we gave him then. We worked with the Navy planning and developing of the Navy housing to avoid its being located on toxic waste. We are now in the process of establishing a park and the area is still tight and cohesive and we don't want to be moved out of the area of the Seventh District. We've been jumped around at least three times and each time the consequences are that we have to build up our knowledge and acceptability in the council district to which we are assigned and it takes time and our services and our street work and so on is deficient and it still is.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B028-B062.)

Question by Commissioner Magana: Excuse me, Bill, could you answer a quick question? You referred to Darnall as being divided. Are you saying Darnall includes the area west and east of the College Grove Shopping Center, of College Avenue right next to the College Grove Shopping Center? It used to be?

Answer: Inaudible, speaker not on microphone.

Question by Commissioner Magana: That's my question to a community that lives there, do you consider that part as part of Darnall?

Answer by Mr. Nugent: Originally, Rolando Park was part of Darnall because it was the only area that used the school. Even parts of Oak Park, which are now, used Darnall schools. We talked about Darnall as the area in which the school was originally — was the center. As a result of that, we have people going down Billman which is east of — yes, it's east of College. The consequences of that is that parts of Rolando Park is considered in the Darnall area.

SPEAKER 5: Richard Esqu

What made the area in which I live so nice is Judy McCarty. She did; she made it very, very nice there. Jim Madaffer is doing a good job also. I've talked to many people in our area and they want College Grove to stay in Seven and it's well worth it because as it's been mentioned there have been several people mention that College Grove was re-established by District 7 and it's been wonderful. I've talked to a lot of people in our area and they love the district as it is and we don't want it to change at all. We have very little crime compared to a lot of the other areas which I think is very nice because I'm on RSVP Patrol for over six years. I patrol all of these areas and we like it here and well I'd say we have some wonderful people in District 7.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B083-B112.)

SPEAKER 6: Philip McGoldrick

I am a member of the Webster Community Council. I have lived in the neighborhood for 59 years so I am really probably the oldest resident in the Fourth District. I am here to protest this piece of gerrymandering that has been fostered

on the Webster Community Council. The little hanging down part is us. I resent being chopped off and stuck in another district with which I have absolutely no acquaintances or anything else. The problem I see here is that Webster has been in the Fourth District when Harley Knox was Mayor of the City and we looked toward the Fourth District. Now all of a sudden people from outside of the community move us around like we're some kind of little jigsaw puzzle. We are part of a community and that's the Fourth District. I'm not going to quibble about the Darnall area or the Shopping Center because they have their interests there very strongly. I do not want to see the Webster Community Council moved into the Seventh District; that's Miramar somewhere isn't it?

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B128-B132.)

SPEAKER 7: Patty Vaccarillo

We're still 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. We've been told this process is about re-balancing population and one person one vote so the emphasis placed on moving a shopping center that has no population over the voice of actual voters is of great concern. The chain of events that took place to accommodate this move boggles the mind. At first it was openly cited as an economic move, until your legal advisor pointed out that reasoning by itself was shaky legal ground. That's when it became clear a priority of this Commission was to make this move fit. As you tried again, this time picking up some people and moving them too. A variety of justifications were cited including the idea that a street could be a more natural boundary than the vast open space that is the park and landfill that there was some how a need to fix the current and natural boundary, and that there was a need to reunite a community we hadn't heard ask to be reunited again using police beat maps as community maps so that the real community boundaries are unclear. This caused a ripple effect throughout the city in order to try and balance the numbers. That's the story of how my community lost a council member to accommodate for what began as a zero population issue and ended up as the boot at the bottom of District 7. Does that look compact to you? The explanation given, Number 14, adjusting for population, just doesn't do it justice. The Assistant City Attorney questioned whether it was really practical to try and reunite a community such as City Heights that had made it's wishes clear. I'd ask the question, is there anything in what I've said that meets the definition of

practical?

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B138-164.)

SPEAKER 8: Doug Case

I speak tonight first on behalf of the College Area Community Council. Our president was unable to be here tonight and I would like to read to you a letter that was sent to be entered into the record. The College Area Community Meeting held on the evening of July 11 included a discussion of the Redistricting Commission's preliminary map; a motion was unanimously passed to send the Commission this letter. The CACC strong feels that the College Grove Shopping Center should stay in District 7 and that the current boundary between District 7 and District 4 should remain where it is currently located. The CACC supports the Darnall Community Council and the residents of Oak Park and Webster who wish to keep the boundary where it is. Moving the Fourth District line north to College Avenue and Streamline Drive decreases District 7 representation. Therefore, the Commission has to increase District 7 representation by creating a slim finger southward. Is it not the goal of redistricting to eliminate fingers? The newly created finger includes the neighborhoods of Webster as a result Webster is removed from their community of interest and faces potential dilution of the rights of the protected ethnic groups for fair representation in District 4. The CACC asks, "Why fix a wheel that is not broken?" Moving the boundary back to the original boundary between Districts 4 and 7 allowing Webster to remain in District 4 meets the Commission's charge by priority to 1) distribute population between districts, 2) meet the needs of protected communities, 3) support communities of interest, and 4) have geographically compact areas. Speaking on behalf of myself, it's all quite clear as the previous speaker said, that the true intent of this Commission was to accommodate the request of Council Member Stevens to move College Grove Shopping Center into District 4 for economic reasons. After it was explained by your legal counsel that under the Charter you could not do that, this Commission manufactured a screen that tried to put Oak Park together as the rationale although nobody in Oak Park asked you to do that. It is quite apparent what your true motivations were. I'm also quite concerned about the intent of this Commission with regards to City Heights. It's astounding to me that you have chosen to ignore the overwhelming majority of the residents of City Heights and to push your personal agendas to create an alternative map. That paternalistic attitude is simply not acceptable. I would suggest to you that if

you decide to adopt the alternate map based upon what your consultant tells you, you have an obligation to go back to the community and allow the community to respond to that. I think in order to comply with the spirit of the initiative passed by the voters of the City of San Diego that you have an obligation to act in good faith, and if you chose to throw out the preliminary map and adopt the new preliminary map, you owe an obligation to have a new set of public hearings so the community has an opportunity to express their opinion on that.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B183-197.)

SPEAKER 9: Barbara Hutchinson

I take very seriously the appearance of idiocy here. I don't understand this boot. It doesn't make sense to me. I look at the map you have for the 29th and the one you have one for the 6th. Neither one of those makes sense as far as District 7 is concerned. I'm one of the board members for the Eastern Area Community Planning Advisory Group. I am not speaking for them. I am Chairman of the Alamo Area Homeowners Group which is Alamo Drive. I'm on the board for the Kroc Center. We are very concerned, and I speak for my immediate community, when you start moving things around and you tell me that it is for policing. I thought it had to do with voter representation. We rarely see a policeman. We really don't need one very often, but I thought this was all about voters. That's what I thought it was about. We pretty well had it compacted already in District 7. Please just leave it like it is.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B199-216.)

SPEAKER 10: Anthony Navou

I'm from the College Area. There are many points I could bring out, but it would be repeating what you've already been told. I think there is another factor that should be considered and that is sovereign immunity. In District 7, we have a State sovereign immunity with San Diego State. We have, in addition, the area being expanded in the north and sacrificing some area in the south to get into a federal sovereignty of immunity. That's not an equal exchange. What you are doing is you are stripping down the 7th by doing the approach that you have. I'm all

for having the College Area, the College Grove Shopping Area in District 7. We fought to get Judy McCarty Way in there to show where credit is due, and you're taking all the credit away so I'll just leave it there.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B217-260.)

SPEAKER 11 Alex Sachs:

I live in the University Heights community in District 3. I appreciate the opportunity to address the Commission to follow up the testimony I provided last week in the District 3 hearing. I would like to again commend the Commission for the preliminary map which does the best job of retaining the communities of interest that make up district 3. I would suggest however and I think I join most of my neighbors here from district 7 that the Commission should tweak the preliminary map to return what has been called the hanging chad, the boot, or the finger of Webster from District 7 to District 4. Please also give back to Council Member Madaffer and former Council Member McCarty in District 7 the College Grove Shopping Center. In the interest of brevity I'll not submit a longer statement for the record but I do want to speak my strong opposition to the alternative plan. The alternative proposal as it relates to the District 3 Community, tears communities of interest asunder in addition to dividing a significant population of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender voters in Normal Heights, Kensington and Talmadge from the rest of the community. You assure that these communities will become a more isolated, liberal and more Democratic enclave for District 7. Your adoption of the alternate plan would show disrespect for our Mid-City Communities and would fly in the face of advice you're receiving from City Heights, from Kensington and Talmadge and from Normal Heights. Secondly, I also oppose the alternate plan because I do not believe that the division of City Heights constitutes a violation of the Voting Rights Act. As such, the alternate plan should not be considered. Using the Assistant City Attorney's memo on the voting rights criteria, I think that clearly there will not be a case that racial polarized voting exists in District 3 and City Heights. You will find a common thread of voting between minority voters and the progressive non-Hispanic white population of District 3. In District 3 you will find cohesiveness of voting across ethnic and racial lines, but not any particularly strong cohesiveness within a racial or ethnic group. Probably the strongest political cohesiveness will be among the LGBT Community voting for openly

lesbian officials and against Proposition 22. Again our straight neighbors usually vote with us and not against us. District 3 is very ethnically diverse and that is one of its strengths, even under the alternate plan. However no one ethnic group or racial group meets the voting rights criteria of 50% or close to 50% with an ability elect candidates of the same ethnic background under the alternate plan the LBGT voting rights coalition estimates that the voting age population of the proposed District 3 will be 33.21% Latino, 10.95% African American, and 10.49% Asian and Pacific Islander. The white non-Hispanic population is estimated at 41.19%. In other words in order to win in District 3, a candidate of any ethnic or racial group must assemble a strong coalition among the varied constituencies in the district. When you consider the entire population of District 3 including the under 18 population the district is 39.72% Latino. Regardless, a strong Latino candidate or a candidate of any race can win in either the proposed or alternate District 3 as long as that candidate is able to appeal to a strong multi-ethnic coalition. I appreciate the hard work that the Commissioners have done and the efforts to remain within the letter and the spirit of the law. Thank you again for the opportunity to put my thoughts on the the alternate plan and my comments on the applicability of the Voting Rights Act on the record.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B262-B312.)

SPEAKER 12: Michael Sprague

I watched with interest the Commission's hearings in District 6. As I watched them I was trying to understand how it is exactly the same rules can be used to make exactly the opposite decisions in different parts of the city. I was trying to decide how one set of rules could apply differently in Mission Bay, Grantville, Fairmount Park, Ridgeview, Webster, Oak Park, Darnall, East Village, Hospital District and Talmadge because you have used whatever rule you've wanted to without consistency, that I've been able to find, and I still cannot understand how environmentalists who live in District 6 seem to be a protected class, but environmentalists who live in District 2 are not. I can't understand why river drainage areas are of such great importance to Mission Bay but not in San Diego Bay. No department of the City of San Diego including the Police Department calls beat maps community maps. They have never been referred to as such. They are referred to as what they are, beat maps and they were divided into service areas. Rolando police beat was divided into Rolando, Rolando Park, College Park, Darnell, Oak Park, Webster, part of Ridgeview, and part of Fairmount Park. The Adams police beat is divided into Normal Heights,

Kensington, Talmadge and the College area. City Heights West is divided into Corridor, Church Point, Castle, Azalea Park, Hollywood Park and Swan Canyon. City Heights East is divided into Chollas Creek, Fox Canyon, and Islanaire. None of the police beat maps that I have seen accurately reflect what those neighborhoods, the City Council, the Planning Department, and every department of the City of San Diego call neighborhood maps which this Commission has decided not to use. I still can't understand that. It is difficult to understand when decisions are made based on political issues and on economic issues. I think we have seen a great deal of interest regarding Sea World as an economic or as a watershed. I think we've seen that East Village is appropriately divided along a planning group line, but Grantville for some reason — that can't happen even though there is no population. We've seen protrusions where there is no populations. Around De Anza Cove which evidently isn't part of Mission Bay because the residents of Mission Bay were never mentioned in the discussions. An area that is completely commercial deserved more time and attention than Webster and Ridgeview. There is nothing about Webster that I know of that would want them to be united into District 7 or District 3 because there is a huge canyon in between. That is the natural boundary. It is a boundary that has existed as long as I have lived and I have never known that Ridgeview was part of Webster. I have seen so many definitions of Oak Park in the last few weeks, but every time I look at what the Oak Park Neighborhood Association calls Oak Park it certainly is different than the police beat, but it's also different than what the Planning Commission uses — Planning Department uses as well. I know that your jobs are difficult, but when I look at the alternative map what I see is a map drawn based on a poverty mentality of "let's throw as much CDBG into one pocket as possible so that people can get their hands on the money." I don't see any voting rights irregularity because there hasn't been one. You're searching one when it's not there. There's suppose to be one that you try to correct by looking at population. You don't use the Voting Rights Act to invent one that doesn't exist.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B315-B376.)

Comment by Shirley O'Dell: I am very interested in what I am hearing tonight. I happen to be somebody that was questioning about who it was that came before us and spoke from Oak Park that wanted to be moved. I said, I must have been asleep when that happened and that made somebody laugh. It has bothered me ever since it happened. You're making me feel a lot better because apparently I wasn't asleep; it just didn't happen, or maybe it was in a way I didn't recognize it. I want to tell you something about the decisions we have made. We certainly have made some mistakes. I can't imagine us not making them. This has never been done before in

this manner and we have never done this before so we are not infallible, not ubiquitous either, but we are dedicated, each one of us with our errors we can correct, and we will correct them if we can have the proof to correct whatever it is that needs to be done according to law. You're being very helpful and I appreciate it.

SPEAKER 13: Jolaine Harris

I called Staa because I couldn't find in the minutes of the first meeting I came to where it said that Oak Park wanted to remain the same with all boundaries the same and having two Council people in our area. The president of the Oak Park group that sent me to the meetings called me on Sunday and said, "What have you done?" They put Oak Park together, you've taken Webster out, why did you do that? I said, "Go to the minutes on the Internet and you're going to see I never said that." When I go there, it's not on there, but I have always said we wanted to stay in the two with Madaffer keeping what he had and Oak Park having -- the way it is. We're in the eastern area planning group. We're in the Mid-City Plan and we're with the -- we have neighborhood watch all over the place. We help all the Council people put the money in and we built the police department that is over there on Fairmount, together as a team so that it could take care of all of our areas. I just came tonight to finally get it in the minutes so that they can find out that all the time -- and I know remember last time Ralph said, "Yes, Jolaine we heard you." that that's what you wanted to do and we're not saying what to do with College Grove, but we want to keep -- and Madaffer goes in through half of Streamview and up through Hastey and on up through Redwood. That's his area, up to College Grove. We would really, please, like you to leave Webster with us because we work hand-in-glove with them. 54th Street -- well Euclid comes straight down like this and this side is Webster. This side is Oak Park. Even when we turn the corner and go east, this side is Oak park and that side is Webster. We just work really, like you said, we're really close neighborhoods and when they had to put Webster into the 4th District, we chose in our community to go with them because we have always been together. I just wanted to clear the record. I'm not trying to say anything new. I just want to make sure it gets in the minutes, what I said this time. I know how hard you've been working because I've been at all the meetings. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location B422-B469.)

SPEAKER 14: Jody Talbott

I come here representing Rolando Community Council our president is on vacation and asked me to come. We do not support the redistricting of District 7. We are totally opposed to moving College Grove area out. For many years I worked on the Planning Committee and we listened to speeches about redeveloping both College Grove one side and the Kroc Center on the other side with the idea in the future looking for the redevelopment of University Avenue. We worked very hard to -- Judy McCarty has worked very hard to develop both of those projects and they're almost to fruition now and now we're looking to redevelop University Avenue and now we're being told we're going to lose one whole arm of the Keeper Program and the studies that we've listen to for many years and we just don't want to see that happening, so on behalf of the Rolando Community Council I wish to go on record as opposing the redistricting.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B470-B491.)

SPEAKER 15: Kathleen McCloud

I live in Encanto. I am a member of the Encanto Neighborhood Planning Committee, the Euclid Market Action Team, the Coalition of Neighborhood Councils. I am a native San Diegan. I've lived in the 4th District for at least 20 years. I'm here to urge you to adopt the plan with Webster included in the 4th District, the one dated July 6th. This plan rectifies the Voting Rights Act conflicts inherent in the initial proposed plan of June 29th. I urge this for the following four reasons. The African American community is among the smallest of our communities of color and the reason the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was adopted in the first place. On a policy level we must be vigilant not to engage in tyranny of majority tactics to weaken this community's standing as what occurred in the election of Florida last November. There are 35 census tracts in the 4th District now. Of these 10 or 28.5 % have an African American percentile of 30% or greater. More than one in three residences which is 36% of Webster are African American. To remove this census tract of some 5,900 residents from the 4th District adds less than 4% in population to the 7th District, but removes 10% of the predominant African American districts from the 4th District. Number 3, a goal of redistricting is to refer to topography, geography, and continuity of territory when creating districts. Webster is an extension of the Catchman Area that is being planned by the Euclid Market Action Team. The logical boundary for this area of influence is the natural topography of the canyon beyond Webster, not the man-

made intersection of 94 and Euclid. Number 4, finally as a tax payer, I am concerned about the cost of potential litigation should the plan of June 29th be adopted which treats Webster as an isolated appendage in the 7th district. This can be avoided by returning Webster to the 4th District where it has been historically.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B492-B539.)

SPEAKER 16: Ron Lacey

I am here, I work for Deputy Mayor George Stevens and I want to say that I work at this point on his staff as a Council Member Representative and I actually cover the Webster area as part of my assignment. I am here tonight to speak for the Webster Community to say that I'm in support of the map that is dated July 6th, the alternative because that map allows that hanging chad to disappear and bring Webster once again back into the fold of the community that it has shared for the past ten years, a cohesive vote and when I look at what the City Clerk put out here in terms of filing a preliminary redistricting plan, I note one of the first points made is to avoid diluting the voting strength of protected classes as set forth in the 1965 Voting Rights Act as it has been stated before that community is predominately African American and they vote cohesively. Again, we have an African American Council Member they can look forward to. I do know for a fact that after ten years of calling on that office to get different things done and having been there for eight months now to do some of those things for that community that community would be at a loss to be moved at this point in time or any point in time now that they have become part of that bigger 4th Council District and have made strides to be a real family. The next thing that I would like to talk about that I see is really a problem with all of this is I look at contiguous territories to form districts. Well, there are natural streets that run through there and as was said earlier there is a canyon that separates Webster as part of the 4th Council District and it's just a natural boundary that would be just — it's outrageous to see somebody draw a hanging chad at this point when all we know about hanging chads that they are no good and they create a bunch of confusion, so let's not do that. As I've often heard the Deputy Mayor say, let's just do the right thing and keep Webster within the 4th Council District. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B540-B581.)

SPEAKER 17: Roz King

I have lived in San Diego for 30 years plus. I now reside in beautiful north Encanto. I am also a property owner in the Webster area as well as a member of a home owners association in that area and I do not wish to be redundant other than to say that we support Webster staying with the 4th District. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B582-B596.)

SPEAKER 18: Fred John Lindahl

I am a resident of Talmadge Park in District 3. I'm actually reading a statement for Teresa Quiroz and she is in District 4. She and I concur with her statement and therefore I said that I would read it for her. She needed to leave early. Teresa has spent hours and hours reading all the minutes of the Redistricting Committee to try to understand your motivation for the College Grove Shopping Center move. She found two instances when the issue was brought before you. On October 25, 2000, Council Member George Stevens stood before you and asked that just College Grove be moved, none of the residents, solely for economic purposes. He also said that the Center is surrounded by District 4. According to the City Clerk's office, District 4 surrounds 26% of College Grove and District 7 surrounds 74%. On April 23, 2001, Council Member Stevens noted that College Grove is a concern. He suggested that College Grove be placed in District 4 because there are no residents in College Grove so there should be no effect on any census numbers whatsoever. That is it. Let us remember, you are not supposed to be a puppet of the Council. You were formed specifically to stop this kind of political negotiating. District 4 has a new wonderful shopping center called Market Creek Plaza. This is an economic boom for District 4 and it is still growing with office buildings currently going up with companies such as Sony and SAIC. By moving College Grove, you seem to have broken every rule in the book and have consistently refused to explain why you would do it. You cannot move it for economic purposes, so you add a reason that you are reuniting the community of Oak Park. You were not asked to do that by the community. By doing it you were put in the position where you had to move other people out of District 4. You chose Ridgeview, which happened to be the only place in District 4 that is also in City Heights thereby stacking the Council once again against the poor and minorities of the City. All I ask is that you put College Grove back where it belongs in District 7 and put Ridgeview back where it belongs in District

4. If not, give us a reason that we can understand. It wasn't done to equalize the numbers, quite the opposite occurred. It didn't help with the racial inequities. It did put together communities of interest or protected groups. The citizens did not request it and the law did not require it. The Council Member for District 4 did what he was elected to do. He fought for what was in the best interest of his constituents by trying to convince you to move the money maker into his district. It is your job to do what is in the best interest of everyone in this City. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location B597-B660.)

SPEAKER 19: Darrell Williams

I am currently the Vice President of the Webster Community Council for the last two years. I've been president from 1988 up until 1999 so I'm here to represent my own community as well as other members who have been here before you articulating what our position has been. First off, I would like to let you know that we are in favor of keeping the two communities Webster and Oak Park together in the 4th District because we are both communities with like interests. The current map that you have dated June 29th does not utilize the natural boundaries. In fact, it is not even contiguous on the borderlines. What you have before you is a map that the Police Department has drawn of our community and it does not at all come close to representing Webster. In fact, the boundary line that it utilizes 54th and Euclid divides our community. This map that you have before you divides our community in two other sections. It lends part of Webster to Ridgeview and also to another group over in the 3rd District. You need to understand that Webster, the natural boundaries are Kelton Avenue, 94 Freeway, Home Avenue, and then it comes right through the canyon which is a natural boundary for our community. I take great offense to the jokes that have been made throughout these various hearings about Webster being the finger, the hanging chad, what have you. I do realize that you haven't had the opportunity to hear a number of our residents speak because we have been loyal, sitting back thinking that we're going to be able to maintain our position within the 4th District and waiting our turn as you came around to our community. When it came to these jokes that are being made about us and how we're being divided up so it would benefit other communities in other districts, we felt that we better start to get out here and have our word mentioned. Webster is a single family community that has light industrial and it has retail and single family homes. That's all we have here. I believe that this map of June 29, in fact if you give it a significant amount of thought, it's in violation of the voter's right because it takes a large

group of our African American population and it puts it in another district where we will be — our voice will be diluted. Not taking anything away from the current council member or whoever might be in there, but it also will disenfranchise a number of our people. One other thing that you need to understand is that I personally participated prior to this commission being created back in 1991, in the redistricting effort where actually Webster and Oak Park were the determining factors on the very last night of negotiations that caused the entire map to be drawn because it moved it into the 4th District and kept us together. Now, here we are once again, and you're playing with this hanging chad, this finger that people call it, and all these other things and it's going to drive this map. No doubt there are others that are disenfranchised in other districts as a direct result of the way this map is drawn. Moving Webster and Oak Park out of the 4th District will have a very high impact both on the communities and it's unacceptable to us as neighbors within our area.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C026-069.)

SPEAKER 20: Jose Lopez

I live in the community of Fox Canyon. As a matter of fact, I am the president of the Fox Canyon Neighborhood Association. Support of the preliminary map with the exception the communities of Chollas Creek, Fox Canyon and Colina Del Sol are the communities to the east of Euclid Avenue in the portion of City Heights that belongs to District 7. These communities depend on the College Grove Shopping center for redevelopment and revitalization. Therefore, please leave the shopping center in District 7 and leave us to the east of Euclid Avenue and at that point in which Euclid Avenue turns and goes east leave District 4 at what we know as Ridgeview. With that I thank you for listening to me. I want to point out something else, what we really cherish is City Heights being in two districts we can be at two different hearings. We'll see you around the 4th District hearing. Thank you for the work that you're doing.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C072-091.)

SPEAKER 21: Steve Loubé

I reside in the College Area. I'm Vice President of the College Area Community Council and a 15 year resident of the College Area which around my peers and neighbors makes me the newbie on the block. I first want to congratulate you on the exemplary way you have sat throughout this process for public participation by reaching out into each of the eight districts. I know you far exceed the requirements of the Charter and I think that's a wonderful example for you to set and I hope future redistricting commissions will follow that. I want to thank you for that. I'm here to talk about the changes in the southern boundary of District 7, particularly the swap of the College Grove Darnall area for the Webster area. I'd just like to point out as I understand I have not seen that police beat boundaries is indicated any where in the charter as one of the objectives for you to follow in setting your district boundaries. The preservation of communities of interest I see is as a resident of the College Area I would like to point out that those of us that live here north of El Cajon Boulevard in District 7 to us that is part of our community of interest. We drive past that on our way to the South Bay and on our way to downtown. We shop at the College Grove Shopping Center. Frankly, with no offense to my good friends from the Webster area, before two weeks ago, I wasn't too familiar with that. I had not heard the term Webster Area before. I'm very familiar with the College Grove Area because I'm there all the time, so on that basis I'd like to join the many people here tonight that have asked you to preserve the existing southern district boundary of District 7. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C092-113.)

SPEAKER 22: Maxine Sherard

I am an alternate on the Commission and I have attended most of the meetings that have been held. I want to commend this Board. I am happy to be in the position I am in not having to vote. I can give you the benefit of the experience that I have being at the hearings and also filling a part of the public. I want to commend you for your dedication because I've seen your hard work and I know you're trying to do the best thing. I know it's an awesome job. There are two plans there. I don't like either one. I don't like the fact that Webster is where it is in District 7 and for that very same reason, I don't like the fact that City Heights is also there. I think that's hypocritical to speak out for City Heights for Webster and not say a thing about the disenfranchised voters who are in 7, City Heights

who are perhaps the lowest turn out of voters in San Diego. Keeping them in City Heights is certainly diluting their vote and keeping reunification of City Heights is why I support the alternate plan. I support the alternate plan, but I think it needs to be tweaked some. I think that both plans need to be tweaked. I am very pleased that you are having these hearings so that I can tell you why I feel that City Heights should be reunited. City Heights has a population of about 80,000 people, half of a council district. It would contain more than 70,000 people of color, protected groups. I would think that most of you sitting here tonight would be speaking out because it is the law. I would hope that most of you would not look the other way and say that look first of all City Heights should be reunited first before we look any where else and if you're not I don't think that you're really thinking about what really happens during redistricting. Redistricting is about voting. It's about equal representation. It's about fair representation. One man one vote and then the laws of the land. Historically, it's about protected groups not really being treated fairly in terms of voting. The lowest turn out of voters is in City Heights and it's represented by 3 people. Those voices are silenced there. They don't know the political core. They don't even know who the City Council person is. We need to enfranchise those voters. We need to empower those voters. They have the ability, 50%, to vote for someone of their choice. We need to empower those people; we need to bring City Heights together and give them the quality of representation that they deserve. I have much more to say. I'll say it at the next hearing. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C114-154.)

SPEAKER 23: Clive Richards

I have watched you do this redistricting for sometime. I was at your earlier meetings so I have been watching you for quite a while. My concern is that as you became concerned with the idea of uniting communities in the same district, placing them in the same district, it became a good idea or good policy to becoming dogma that every community throughout the City of San Diego had to be united and had to be placed in the same district, even communities that didn't ask to be united. Well they couldn't know what they wanted, they're just the electorate. The little less it became important. Oak Park became important to link this one community in place to one district. Oak Park at all the meetings I went to, I never heard Oak Park come out and say we're divided. We're being under-represented. We're being un-represented, link us in one district. Every meeting that I ever attended of your commission, I heard City Heights residents

come to you and say, "Whatever you do don't unite us." The reason they don't want to be reunited is number one we've learned how to deal with having more than one district council member and I think it comes down to what happens to Census Tract 34.01 and that is defined as Webster. I don't know what the people that live there call it, but on the map it is described as Webster and my concern is not anything other than I look at it and I see this is a district that originally in 1980 was in District 3. For whatever reason they were moved into District 4. The convenience of being moved into District 4 actually was an inconvenience to that census tract because they had to wait for six years before they could cast a vote for a candidate of their choice. Now, it also happened again this time. Now I know that it has happened before. It's happened out of the 14, four of your changes are for this from an even numbered district to an odd numbered district, but this has only happened in this Webster area. This has happened twice to them in the last 20 years. I don't know if that's a trend, but everywhere else it has only happened once maybe, but when it happens to you twice, I think there is something that has to be re-examined. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C155-205.)

Mr. Johnson: Maxine was just ahead of you and she said very clearly from her view that City Heights should be united. Am I hearing you say that we should leave it alone; we should not even consider it.

Mr. Richards: I'm saying that I listen to people who came in and said they lived in that community who said they did not wish to be united. I can only listen to the people who speak. I don't know who else to hear.

SPEAKER 24: Don Mullen

I am the executive director of the College Area Business Improvement District. I've spoken before the Commission several times now, a couple of times on behalf of my community and Pacific Beach and Mission Bay where I live and one of the times on behalf of the College Business District along El Cajon Boulevard which is where I work. I had two concerns that I wanted to speak to you tonight and hopefully they are both appropriate. The first one is on behalf of the community that I serve, actually the communities. I spoke the first time when I spoke about the College Area asking you not to use El Cajon Boulevard as a dividing line no matter what you did because it caused enough separation between

communities. I've been at this job for about three years now and one of the main things I've had to learn about this area south of 8 in District 7, and I hope this isn't an offensive word to anybody, but peculiar coalitions are formed between the communities and they are coalitions that the people here really want and obviously they are very passionate and they are very willing to defend. It was very hard for me to understand these coalitions when I first came to work here, but I have come to know the people and know the communities and know they really do want to be kept together and I have had many calls at my office from residents and community members all asking that the south of 8 boundaries for District 7 be left in tact because they have built these relationships and coalitions and we are working together. Secondly, I wanted to speak from an economic standpoint because that is what by real background and career is, is helping these communities reverse a trend, shall I say that not a lot of attention has been paid to these communities over a long number of years by the City of San Diego as the city has built out in other directions resources and especially dollars have gone to other communities. Here in District 7 there have been a number of projects that have been initiated to help bring some resources back to these blighted communities like Judy McCarty talked about on University Avenue, but it also extends all the way up here to El Cajon Boulevard. My concern to the Commission is that you leave in tact College Grove Center in District 7, although there are no voters involved there, there are significant financial resources there which are very important to the continuation of many of these projects that have been started in this area. I would ask you to consider those two points on behalf of the communities I work in and serve and once again I want to thank you all very much because you are volunteers and you give of yourself and there are nights like tonight when I bet you shake your head and wonder why you volunteered for this especially at the high pay you're getting.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C206-247.)

SPEAKER 25: Ann Ellis

I reside in the Talmadge Park area. I'm a San Diego native which there are very few of us remaining here. I'm also a homeowner in the Talmadge Park area. I'm here tonight, and I reside in District 3 in Toni Atkins' area. I do a bunch of community work. I'm here in regards to uniting the Talmadge area and putting it all into the District 3 council which is your preliminary redistricting plan adopted

June 29th. I've served on these committees for four years and also done a bunch of volunteer work besides those two organizations. My concern is if we do, as the Ken-Tel population goes into District 7, we have had very little representation from Jim Madaffer's office. I know for a fact that I have called that office in regards to doing tree plantings in our area, they have not returned my calls. They have not shown in participation in regards to just even showing up to the events. In regards to the Ken-Tel Planning Board, there has been very little representation. For a fact, this year we have only had one member one time in our meetings representative of his office came to our planning commission so that shows us that there has been no concern. I have also called a number of times to that particular office and they go, "Where is Talmadge?" That is kind of sad. There is a large number of houses that just don't even know they belong to District 7 because Toni Atkins' office or Council District 3 or prior Christine Kehoe has taken under their arm and guided them in regards to the issues of their concerns so again I as a resident of the Ken-Tel Planning Board, and Talmadge Maintenance Assessment District want to have the adopted June 29th map to bring our communities united.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C252-280.)

SPEAKER 26: Mellisa McKinley

I am a resident of District 7. I support the preliminary map except for the boundaries between District 4 and District 7 and suggest that Webster stay in District 4 and the College Shopping area stay in District 7, as you heard before. I strongly oppose the alternative map because it would divide communities of interest in District 3. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C281-288.)

SPEAKER 27: John Todd

I live in District 7 in the Allied Gardens area. I always wanted to change the name of Allied Gardens to Baja Del Cerro because I thought we would get a little more action downtown. I don't suppose it's your fault. First time I have been to one of these meetings in sometime, but I saw no representation at the front up there from District 7. I think there's a couple of members of the Board from District 6, and

I'm not going to talk to you tonight about College Grove Center because I do believe it should stay in District 7, but I want to talk to you about a little piece of property down there that you have wanted to add to District 6. It's a small portion of property that runs from Twain Avenue along Fairmount to the freeway. It includes Home Depot. It includes Honda. It includes Rose Toyota, and several other pieces of light industry in that area. There is a river that divides that property from District 6. There is absolutely no residency in that area. Everyone works at one of those other places and lives somewhere else in the City of San Diego. I am naturally a little suspicious of things. I've served as past president of Navajo Community Planners was on that board for 18 years. I'm a past president of the Allied Gardens Community Council and I can't think of how many other committees I've served on in the 7th District. By putting that little portion of property into District 7 isn't going to change my quality of life at all. I'll still stop at Home Depot and shop the other stores, but it's an area that Navajo Community Planners, Allied Gardens Community Planners all worked hard to improve. We tried to improve along Twain Avenue where Dan Smith owned a bunch of businesses in there and Dan cooperated and cleaned the area up and we now don't have wreaking yards and that sort of thing. The area is not pristine, but we're trying to make it that way. The river divides us from District 6. The Metropolitan Transit District will impact us with the trolley into Grantville and if you ask most people in the City of San Diego they won't even know where Grantville is. Grantville is a very small community that is a portion of the Navajo Community Planners. It was named Grantville because Ulysses S. Grant stationed troops out there during the Civil War and all during that time I was always afraid during the improvement we were going to find a canon ball and stop everything, but I think we get to a point where we just draw lines on maps and when the trolley was coming into that area, and they drew their line, they drew the line of trolley right between two buildings on church property, right between two different properties. I would request respectfully that you would change that map and that you would keep Grantville into the Navajo Community. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C289-348.)

SPEAKER 28: Ellis Rose

I reside in the neighborhood of Normal Heights and I wish to say that I strongly oppose the alternative map for what it would do to the neighborhoods of Normal Heights, Kensington and Talmadge. I am here tonight to support, once again, the

wishes of City Heights activists that you maintain the current boundaries between Districts 3, 4, and 7 in the City Heights region, and even though it may be repetitious, please notice that I said region, not neighborhood. City Heights is a region that contains 16 neighborhoods and sometimes I truly wonder if the Commission hears us. I would like to say by the way, thank you Shirley for your comments tonight. Regardless of what you decide it makes us feel better to know that we are being listened to and our concerns are being taken seriously. Thank you. Like many City Heights activists, I oppose the placement of Ridgeview and Webster in District 7 instead of in District 4. I am the one who has called this move the hanging chad of redistricting and it is not meant to have been an insult to the people of Webster. It is meant to refer to what is really a poor decision in terms of redistricting. Its dangling shape violates your stated goal of geographic compactness and its affect is to silence and disenfranchise citizens in Webster and Ridgeview for six years. As Clive Richards pointed out before, ten years ago, they had to wait six years between Council elections because of redistricting. This move again will do the very same thing. The opportunity to vote should always take precedence over so called neighborhood unification. I would also ask you to take into consideration what your chair has said several times and that is people in these communities that have developed ties over ten years, that's something that you should consider. In terms of neighborhoods sometimes having to take turns because sometimes redistricting offends some people sometimes it offends others you can't please everybody. Why should these people have to go through it two times in a row? Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C349-384.)

SPEAKER 29: Judy Bonilla

I live right in the heart of this and feel truly affected. My husband and I have lived here one year. We celebrated in July so we're very excited to be part of the community of Darnall. Our concern is that you talk about keeping a community together. We understand the ups and downs of the neighborhood. This past week we got a notice in the mail there is a tree planning on College Avenue. How exciting for us. Our neighborhood is coming back. There is money being allocated. There are new people there. My neighbor to the right of me has been there something like 45 years. My neighbor to the left of me has been there maybe a year. The neighbor across has been maybe three years. The neighbors to the south of me are my community. They are my neighborhood. I'm really asking you not to tear the heart of Darnall out keep College Grove. Keep our area

together. It's starting to come back we're really looking forward to seeing this community develop. Please, I ask that you not tear the heart of Darnall out.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C393-413.)

SPEAKER 30: John Piltch

I live in the San Carlos Area of San Diego which is part of District 7. Currently, I'm the president of the San Carlos Area Council and Vice Chair of the Navajo Community Planners and I'm not here in either of those positions because we haven't had time to take a position on this map because of the newness of it. However, I want to go on record tonight not having spoken at the Tierrasanta hearing at which time I told the Council Member that all I was going to say is I was going to ask you to be fair. Don't divide communities and use common sense and I doubt that would be redundant. He thought you needed to hear that more often. I'll admit on record he was right and I was wrong because what I'm seeing here defies logic in certain areas. You're dividing communities. I don't think this map is fair to the people in Webster, to the people who have businesses in Grantville, to the Navajo Community Planners, Allied Gardens and Grantville Community Council for several reasons. I see the term adjusting the population used many times in your publication and I liken that to what the County Redistricting Panel used called rounding out the numbers. I told them when I testified before them when they were cutting out two little census tracts to move it from District 2 to District 3 in the County supervisorial district that it was inappropriate because those numbers were people. In this case you are rounding out the population is people. What you are doing is dividing community, defying logic. I realize you have a tough job, but you have to use some common sense and listen to these people here tonight. The people in Grantville, the Navajo Community Planners, have busted their butt to get that area square away that you now want to cut out and give to District 6 that hasn't given a hoot about it and won't. We got Home Depot in there. We got the place cleaned up. We forced businesses to clean up so that Cush Honda and Rose Toyota look pristine now in comparison to what was there earlier. What I would ask you to do is keep Grantville in District 7. Keep our hard work in District 7. Keep the College Grove Shopping Center which also was a result of a lot of hard work from people in District 7 in that district.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C415-468.)

SPEAKER 31: Kevin Davis

I believe with the exception of Alternate Commission Member Sherard, three people spoke in favor of the alternate map, but I think the reason they spoke in favor of this map is that it keeps Webster in District 4 so I don't believe that is a reason in itself to go with the alternate map. I believe you can go with the preliminary map as adopted but make the change and put Webster in District 4. I just wanted to make that clear. I don't believe they were speaking in favor of the alternative map except that it keeps Webster in District 4. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C469-482.)

SPEAKER 32: Laura Rebo

I am the president of El Cerrito Heights, but we haven't had a chance to put the map before our group so I can't speak on behalf of the whole group. I'm also a member of the Eastern Area Planning Committee and I want to thank you for all your hard work. I know that for you when you start you're drawing lines and you give us an opportunity to let you know about our communities at this kind of a meeting. I want to tell you that District 7 as it is now is a community. We have worked very hard as a community to improve the area. Like you heard from Don Mullen, we haven't had a lot of money coming from any where and we've had to do a lot of things and work hard and think of alternatives and even worked just as communities helping plant trees and different projects. Oak Park has worked very very hard to get the lake out in the College Grove area, Chollas Lake. We worked hard on College Grove Shopping Center. The shopping center's mascot, if you will, is the majorette from the College Area and it belongs with the College Area. We've also — we are still at this point reviewing plans for improvements in the College Grove Shopping Center. I'm just here to support Webster and Oak Park and Ridgeview in their desire to remain as drawn on the map. Thank you.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location C483-507.)

SPEAKER 33: Deputy Mayor George Stevens

Once again I wanted to thank you for holding these hearings out in the community where people can come and voice their opinion. To me that's the way it should take place. To have eight of these meetings is very taxing on you and I understand

that but I still want to thank you for the courage that you have and certainly the fortitude to listen to people. I'm going to read most of my statement because the comments that have been made regarding what I have said at previous meetings has misrepresented me so I wanted to make sure what I have written down someone can come and ask me what I said and I will be able to tell them later exactly what I said. I'm also sure that you're recording these meetings I believe and proceedings. There are some people who made reference tonight of what I said about the district boundaries being drawn are not correct. Some of these that have also been said to you tonight about manufacturing reasons for drawing the boundaries on College Avenue, putting College Grove Shopping Center back into District 4 has been said to you tonight that you had to manufacture reasons, but you and I both know that's not true as I will show you in my presentation. This issue here that Council District 4 to the north and District 7 moving south of University to Federal Boulevard, it's certainly a better way to do that. Because if you only go to the natural boundaries which Michael Sprague pointed out in his presentation of using the canyon which is south of Ridgeview leaving Oak Park in the 4th Council District and not leaving District 4 north of University, I believe you can pick up the numbers that you need to leave Webster in the 4th Council District. I hope that you understood what I have just said. You have moved District 4 north to University and you have moved District 7 south to Federal Boulevard. If you use the natural boundary of the canyon itself as Michael pointed out earlier, I believe you can get your numbers and you use the canyon as a natural boundary because there is no connection between Ridgeview and Webster and certainly there is no connection between Webster and City Heights -- I can't think of the area we wanted to combine the whole area, okay. Let me now speak to the division between District 7 presenters tonight and what you already heard from District 4 as relates to College Grove. First of all, it's College Grove Avenue. The boundaries were drawn, not by this Commission but the were drawn by the City Council in 1990. The division was drawn of College Grove Avenue between District 7 and District 4 in 1990. What I have presented to you was a request to correct what the mistake was made and a gerrymander was made in 1990. I have drawn you a picture in really in essence of it. This picture shows, and for anyone else who is interested, it shows District 7 to the east and District 4 to the west showing College Grove Avenue which is the dividing line between District 7 and District 4. The peculiar part is for anybody that would like to see, in that gray circle, those who drew the line they came across College Avenue, leaving District 7, went into District 4 and drew out the circle that is called now College Grove, and that is wrong. That gerrymandering. The line should have kept straight. The line should have gone straight down College Avenue to your northern which is your northeast boundary and that's what's right. It was not an

economic issue that I brought to your attention. I was asked questions by members of the panel about the economic issue and I said, "Yes, those issues are good because it does include tax increments which could go to the development of the 90 acre park which is west of the Chollas Lake." That's good for that purpose to do that but the line as I showed here before, that's what I presented to you. That line and that big circle and that's wrong. That is not a political issue. That is not the desire of just a person who is in an elected office and you yield to his request, that's not what that is about and don't let anybody shame you into saying that's what it's about. I think everybody in this room knows that I'm definitely very politically incorrect and I don't plan to be different, but that's wrong. This is wrong. You can't support that and say that's right. Now, the developer in terms of my participation which has also been misrepresented here tonight. I was contacted by Vestar who is the developer of this Center that is there now. I have been in every meeting every planning session that Vestar has had about the College Grove Shopping Center from the start. I have been at every ribbon cutting to cut the ribbon. I was there last week when House to Home opened. The only elected official there invited by House to Home. They know that it sits in the 4th Council District, but it's just drawn out with a line around it. Also, emphasis has been placed upon Council Member McCarty's participation that has lead to naming the street after her going into the Center. I think you'll also find that on the north side, you'll find a street that also says George Stevens Way going into the Center. I didn't ask for the street to be named after me. Vestar named the street because of my participation in the development of the Center. I don't have to apologize tonight to anyone because there has been misrepresentation made, but I don't think you have to apologize either for doing what is right by drawing the line that is clear to do that boundary between District 4 and District 7 as they should have been done in 1990 and I'm here only to correct that. I hope that you will correct it.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location C513-D023.)

SPEAKER 34: Jim Madaffer

Good evening Commissioner. Boy, you certainly earned your pay tonight. Thank you for your time. You know we had a marathon 12-hour hearing the other day with Sea World. I don't think this one is going to come close to it. I first wanted to commend you guys for all the work you do and staff as well, I see both Joey and Staa you guys I know

have put in the time and Lisa who has to always be there to make sure everything stays legal. There is no question, you have heard tonight, and I want to thank also those that are still here in the audience that have spoken and those that have already left. You have heard from a wide diversity of people and I am very appreciative of them. As a Council Member and as a long term resident, having lived in San Diego all my life born in Mercy Hospital. I am a community activist at heart and is probably one of the more reasons to be here tonight and having followed redistricting over the years. My position tonight as it's been in the past is really to keep District 7 as it is, keep it in tact, including the southern boundary. The southern boundary should remain as it is and keep City Heights as it is in District 3, in District 4, and in District 7. The people want to do this and so do their current elected leaders as well. I oppose the alternative map, July 6th map. College Grove should stay in District 7 and Webster should remain in District 4. Today we had at City Council and example of this in action. This project formerly known as the Fox Hollow Apartments now renamed as Hollywood Palms. Three Council Members sharing a geographic area by working with the community made the Fox Hollow project go from extinction to a good workable project that is actually going to be beneficial with affordable housing for folks in the 3rd Council District. The College Grove Shopping Center has grown to it's current economic vitality while being part of the 7th City Council District. I understand as I said, you have had a diversity of speakers. I understand Council Member McCarty was here earlier this evening as well. We had, I think, three false starts with College Grove until we finally got it right. College Grove is a role model of how communities should benefit from a successful partnership and in the case of the partnership we had with the developer Vestar, Council District 7 retailers and service providers as well as the neighborhood residents. I'll share with you a couple of ways that they have all benefitted. The College Grove Shopping Center provides career opportunity with nearly 800 jobs for local residents. The College Grove Shopping Center provides the convenience of goods and local services, proof that neighbors enjoy the conveniences the shopping center is now generating sales in excess of \$160 million much to the chagrin of Lemon Grove, La Mesa, and other surrounding communities. The College Grove Shopping Center has spurred community improvements including medians along College Avenue from the Martin Luther King Freeway north to University Avenue construction will be beginning in September. I have a few hand-outs that I wanted to walk through with you very briefly. The San Diego Daily Transcript did an article on the College Grove Shopping Center on August 31st of last year and in it they quoted Council Member McCarty whose efforts over the years have been instrumental to the redevelopment. Included in the handouts, I would like to walk through with you some of the things that are germane to some of the testimony that you have heard tonight. The highlighting on the page you have matches the highlighting that I have. This first letter dated June 14th, again it's a written letter wanting to keep Darnall the way it is. If you go to the next page the next packet is a petition signed by folks within the community objecting to

considering removing College Grove Shopping Center or the Darnall community or any part of it from the existing boundaries of the 7th District. The next one is a letter from the president of the Oak Park Community Council where she says that she supports the keeping the boundaries exactly the way they are now. They want the current boundaries in District 7 to stay in District 7 and they want the current boundaries in District 4 to stay in District 4. And like the Fox Hollow, Hollywood Palms project, she goes on to say we greatly benefit from having both districts represent us. She also goes on to say that she believes the Commission should keep the Webster Community in District 4 and not change District 7. That is signed by the president of the Oak Park Community Council. The Darnall Community Council president also writes a letter where they state they feel strongly that Darnall should stay in District 7 and they also feel that the College Grove Shopping Center located in the same census tract 27.03 should stay as part of the community within District 7. The article that I referenced from the Daily Transcript is attached. One of the quotes indicates that College Grove Center is a very important anchor in maintaining the stability of the College neighborhoods. There are a few other articles attached talking about the history of the work that we did putting together College Grove into what it is today. Lastly I want to call your attention to a map I have provided you from a SANGIS system. It doesn't take anybody too much to look at these boundaries and you'll see census tract 27.03 highlighted in the red, with all due respect to my colleague there was no gerrymandering. This is simply following the census tract lines. College Grove Shopping Center is within the Federal Census Tract 27.03. Also as far as homes across the street from College Grove, I think by looking at this map you will see the parcel lines that depict the homes and where they reside and in what council district. Pretty clear. District 7 has to gain about 7,800 people. Therefore, it is inevitable that we will be bringing new neighborhoods into the district and I certainly welcome that. In fact with the exception of the map at the southern end of the district and with the amount of the changing, I'd generally support the map that you have. I do think it's important that you hear from me as other speakers have indicated from the Navajo Community. You have heard speakers from Navajo Community Planners as well as Allied Gardens and other leaders that you should maintain the line that is currently in place following the river. That's just simple. It's history for many years in excess of 20 years, and it's one that follows the community plan boundaries. The Mission Valley folks while I understand that's the direction that you were going in, we certainly work very well with District 6 over the years just like we work well with all of the council districts in the city. So just in closing, I just want to reiterate to you, as said by so many of the letters that I have submitted to you, that Webster should stay in District 4, College Grove should stay within District 7, adjust the lines between District 6 and 7 along the river and reject the alternative map that was shown. I would be more than happy at a future date to present to you a map, if you get closer showing you how this could work. I will move in that direction. Again, if you just look at the map, and I probably have extra copies for anyone

in the audience that wants to see it, but I'll hold it above my head. It's pretty — we've heard so much talk about College Grove and it's almost funny in a sense. I won't go into any other details other than to say that I do appreciate your time listening to so many speakers tonight. I would venture to say you've gotten a very clear message tonight a great preponderance of the folks here would like to see College Grove stay the way it is and like to see Darnall stay the way it is. Like to see Webster stay the way it is and would like to see Districts 3, 4, and 7 within the City Heights area stay the way it is as well. I urge you to please keep that in mind as you get closer to finalizing your decisions. Thank you so very much.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION

(Tape location D026-134.)

Question by Commissioner ODell:

If the consultant comes back and says we have a voting rights violation in City Heights what thought have you given to what you might recommend for the solution there?

Answer by Madaffer: I would be really curious to read exactly the legal basis for this voting rights issue. As of right now I cannot see how anybody could make that ascertainment. I've studied the numbers. I've been provided the June 29th scratch map. I've been studying it. I don't see how it is going to come out that way. If it did, I would be more than happy to comment on it once I see something to comment on.

Commissioner ODell:

I think our talented attorney can give you a bit of information as to what consists in this issue that should be of importance to you

Mr. Madaffer:

I would love the opportunity to weigh in on that once we see the report.

Commissioner ODell:

It is something from some testimony that we've had that something is needed over there. I don't know what it is. I haven't been there, but I've had work in that activity, that kind all over the United States and even in Puerto Rico, different group but somewhat the same conditions, and I would be interested to see what happens there. It's not going to go away.

Mr. Madaffer:

I understand and as I previously testified Council Member Atkins and I both, the last time I spoke before you at the City Council Chambers keeping all of Kensington and Talmadge within District 3 is something

that I would certainly support as well.

Commissioner Ulloa:

I really do want to thank everybody for being here. I know it's been a long meeting but your input is being taken into consideration and we thank everyone for coming and even though some folks may not agree with other folks, I think it is important that everybody has a voice and that it be heard here tonight. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Saito:

On that note I would like to adjourn the meeting and thank everybody for coming tonight.

ITEM 4 ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chairman Leland Saito adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION ACTION (Tape location: D171.)

Leland Saito, Vice Chairman
2000 Redistricting Commission

Esther Ramos
Legislative Recorder