

Dear Redistricting Commission and Staff Attorney,

I recently received the, below at end, email on the analysis of the Chairman's Initiative Map [sic Commission Chair's Updated Preliminary Map]

I am requesting that a more complete comparison be made of this sua sponte proposal from the Commission Chair.

Specifically, I request that a chart be prepared which compares this new proposal to the CURRENT 2010 DISTRICT; THE INITIAL PRELIMINARY MAP; and the CHAIRMAN'S INITIATIVE MAP

Such a presentation would provide the public with perspective on what the results of each of the proposals for new maps actually does.

Earlier, this week, I sent an email, to the Commission and its Attorney raising serious concerns that the Initial and Chairman's Initiative Map had the result of seriously diluting the voting rights participation of Hispanics in proposed D9 and diminishing Communities of Interest in D3 and D4. Those concerns and objectives continue in this new proposal to dilute D3, D4, and D9, by the Commission Chairman.

Please Post this EMAIL, like all of my public correspondence on the Commission's Comment site.

Here is my earlier email:

From: [John Stump](#)

Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2021 2:51 PM

To: [Redistricting Commission Staff](#); csteele@rwglaw.com <csteele@rwglaw.com>; [CLK City Clerk](#); [Oliva, Mailei](#); cityattorney@sandiego.gov

Subject: Chairman's Initiative Map that dilutes voting in D3, D4, & D9. Must the Public use the "FORM" for the Commission to receive input?

I recently received a kind and apparently routine email from the Redistricting Staff concerning whether I would like my letter of October 25, 2021, attached, posted to the Commission. I responded "YES" and filled out some form, that was new to me

Please confirm that all of my past letters to the Commission have been received by them, made part of the record, and posted.

Confirmation of the posting is particularly critical, now, as the Commission will be considering a very directed new map submitted by the Commission Chair that directs the Commission into adoption of a map that uses different mapping standards and presents data concerning the Asian voting population for District 6 but does not present the same analysis for the other districts that this directed map changes.

My letter, attached, raises serious concerns that the former initial map diluted racial voting characteristics and diluted the LGBTQ D3 and the Black D4 vote. The Chairman's map pushes this initiatives even further. What makes it worse is the selective presentation of only one District's Racial Voting results!

I believe, that after the Chairman's submission of late; that the Commission should consider it in a motion for an amended Initial Map, Discuss it, and then take a vote to consider it as a new Initial Map for at least a week of Public Review. The Chairman's map must contain some critical data as to how it changes the District by District voting participation from the current 2010 District Maps to the new Chairman's Initiative Map.

I particularly find offensive that the African American populations I D9 and D4 have not been analyzed along the Euclid and 54th Street couplet corridor to substantiate the significant current populations of African Americans and Blacks. This analysis should include residential at San Diego State University , as was done for D1 & D6 .

The Chairman's Initiative Map pushes into a whole new area for D3 and D9 with speculative development inferences and no commitment to maintaining the undiluted existing Communities of Interest and Racial Voting dominance in D9 and D4. The Chairman's Initiative Map appears to reshuffle the San Diego political map back to the 1970's when there a single racial district for each race group but the majority of Districts are again White and upper class.

I also, again, suggest that the column order presentation of the "COMPACTNESS" analysis mis presents the conflicting data on compactness. The Columns should be reordered to present data from low to high compactness. I further have suggested and provided the commission information on more current and scientific measures of compactness, which I urge the Commission use.

Please publish all of my correspondence directed to the commission, including this email

All the best,
John Stump