

The following includes the text of the public comment made at the Redistricting Commission meeting on October 21, 2021 at 5:30 PM by Sherri S. Lightner and its supporting material.

I am speaking on behalf of District 1 United.

The purpose of this redistricting commission is to create city council districts which satisfy certain parameters. As a former City Councilmember, I can attest to the importance of respecting communities of interest. By assuring that council districts are comprised of whole neighborhoods and planning group areas, it makes it much easier for the Councilmember to be responsive to the community and represent their interests. I once had a gatekeeper who thought that I could materialize for events in the 30 seconds between events. I often wished I could appear as Samantha and Jeannie did. So I do know and respect the importance of compactness, contiguousness and the ability to easily move from one population center to another in the district. This is greatly enhanced by using natural and human made boundaries. By not having planning areas split you increase the likelihood of responsive representation. I encourage you to follow closely the guidelines that you have set for this redistricting.

I had the honor of representing District one for eight years and I know the people and neighborhoods. They care deeply about environmental protection and have been instrumental in creating master planned communities in the north of the district that respect the environment and have created volunteer groups that protect, preserve and enhance environmental areas such as the Carmel Mountain preserve, Del Mar Mesa Preserve, the Torrey Pines State Park, the extension, the Los Penasquitos Lagoon, Pottery Canyon or Rose Canyon Open Space Park. The areas are important to the City's Multiple Species Conservation Plan and are better served if they continue to remain in the same council district.

District 1 United documented our communities of interest in a report which was submitted to the Commission. (District 1 United, "Coast & Canyons," Report to the 2021 San Diego Redistricting Commission) All of our planning groups submitted letters with specific communities of interest and in support of the goals of District 1 United. Letters were submitted by the University Community Planning Group, the Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board, the Torrey Pines Planning Board, the Carmel Valley Community Planning Group, the Torrey Hills Community Planning Board, the La Jolla Community Planning Association and the Bird Rock Community Council. Public testimony is critically important because local communities are best positioned to identify the alternatives that are the least disruptive to the COIs they know best.

The consultant interpreted the Commission's instructions which compressed all of our testimony into a Yes or No check mark. The maps clearly demonstrate that our public testimony was not heard. In considering the maps presented by Haystaq, it is clear that the consultant is unfamiliar with the area and that the instructions provided by the Commission were woefully inadequate.

The wholesale destruction of our district by these maps is inexplicable. Especially in light of the fact that the 2011 Redistricting Report made significant findings to support the district as configured. Why has the consultant gone outside the current district boundaries to replace adjacent populations with more distant ones, thereby removing in some cases more than half the current district residents?

The resulting disenfranchisement of our voters should be of concern to the commissioners and basis enough to throw out these maps and draft new instructions that reflect actual public testimony.

In the effort to rip UCSD from D1, the compactness of the remaining district has been destroyed, even to the extent of using a nonexistent road for connectivity.

These maps clearly demonstrate that it is all about the numbers no matter how many people are disenfranchised in the process, no matter how many COIs are destroyed and no matter how much gerrymandering is needed to get District 6 into University City. The UC planning area is a particular target for abuse in this redistricting exercise. The planning group for this area is in the third year of a plan update that will add significant density to the area and, yet, contrary to the “instructions,” which stated that you wished to keep community planning areas together ESPECIALLY, if the community is currently updating or recently had their update approved. That was not done for the University Community which is split into two and three districts depending upon which Map is selected. UCSD is split from SIO in three of the maps and the best word to describe the remaining D1 is gerrymandered.

In the 2011 Redistricting Report, “...There was testimony seeking to add North University City to. D6; however, there was also testimony that University City should be kept whole and forms a community of interest with the University of California – San Diego(UCSD) and La Jolla. The Commission determined that University City should not be split and that it wished to keep UCSD, University City, and La Jolla united in a community of interest related to the university.”

I know that District 1 United defined this community of interest multiple times. UCSD owns or leases a significant amount of property in the La Jolla planning area and the University Community planning areas including the La Jolla Village Square area, Torrey Pines Mesa, La Jolla Farms and North UC. UCSD affects the daily lives of the folks in the adjacent neighborhoods.

Major institutions should be in the same district with the communities that deal with them on a daily basis. To put the institution in one district and its impacts in another smacks of gerrymandering.

The 2011 Redistricting Commission also determined that Carmel Valley is connected to and shares similarities with the western portions of D1 and other coastal and coastal-influenced communities. They also determined that Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Hills, Via de la Valle and Fairbanks Ranch Country Club planning areas needed to be kept together in one council district. What has changed?

For District 6”The Commission determined that there is a community of interest among the Asian population in this proposed district that shares business interests, cultural activities, and social ties and concerns. That population is sufficiently geographically compact. To comprise 33.5% of the district’s population (the largest in the City), thus combining neighborhoods to provide fair and effective representation to the community, insofar as practicable while balancing the Commission’s other redistricting goals, and adhering to redistricting law and principles.”

The suggested maps add population by ignoring adjacent population centers and clear connectivity and stretching, in some cases very thinly, the district boundaries to include parts of Clairemont and Park Village so that D1 extends from close to I-8 to the northern city boundary and inland almost to I-15.

I will speak to some of the mapping irregularities. There are a number of details I will not be able to cover given the time constraints, but I have plenty of spreadsheets, reports and maps I used, if you are interested. I will talk about the instructions, boundaries, compactness, connectivity, planning groups and voter disenfranchisement.

In all of the maps the Bird Rock neighborhood in Council District 1 is still left out of the district despite written and oral comments to the Commission. All of the maps split the University Community plan area into at least 2 or 3 districts which is contrary to the instructions from the Commission which was to keep planning groups together if they were undergoing a plan update. Similarly, the master planned Carmel Valley community of Pacific Highlands Ranch is still undergoing build out and should not be split from the oversight of the Carmel Valley Community Planning Group which is still responsible for it.

The mapping tool fails to correctly define the La Jolla Community plan area, thereby severing it in Map 2.

MAPPING INSTRUCTIONS

Haystaq used the instructions to come up with a checklist: This checklist for D1 had in the:

First box was “Consider keeping UCSD/University City in District 1.” UCSD was kept in D1 for one map and University City was split in all of the maps.

Second box was “Try to keep Torrey Hills in D1.” It was in 3 out of 4 maps.

Third box “Attempt to keep Carmel Valley in D1.” It was in 3 out of 4 maps.

Fourth box “For population balance if necessary, consider splitting the University City area north and south of Rose Canyon.” This was not done on any of the maps..

Fifth box, “the commission received feedback from a group of District 1 residents and community organizations requesting no changes be made to the current District 1 boundaries.” In all cases the response to this was NO. Even the yes means NO. By relegating all of the public comment from District 1 United to a Yes or No our public testimony has been marginalized or totally ignored, as have the comments from all of our planning groups.

Sixth box, “lower the population deviation from its current standing of 7.91%” That was achieved with a vengeance for all maps.

Three of the maps are clear that there is no interest in keeping D1 United. The fourth map, while it claims to listen to the requests of District 1 United, does not respect our communities of interest. The district was split in 3 or 4 pieces thereby disenfranchising in some cases more than half of the current D1 population.

UCSD including Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO) is deeply integrated with the communities of University City and La Jolla and all should remain in the same district. The UCSD campus and its affiliates directly affect transportation, public safety and quality of life in the adjacent communities of La Jolla and University City.

In Maps 1 and 3A UCSD is split with Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), student housing, Venter Institute and NOAA in D1, while the balance of the campus is in D6. It also splits UCSD owned or leased property at Villa La Jolla, Black Horse Farms, La Jolla Farms, along the west side of No. Torrey Pines Road, the Glider Port, and in Torrey Pines Mesa into districts 1 and 6.

In Map 2 UCSD is split with SIO, student housing, Venter Institute and NOAA in D1 while the balance of the campus is in D6. It also splits UCSD owned or leased property in the UC plan area between D1 and D6, while in Map 3B UCSD is in D1.

BOUNDARIES

The Haystaq Maps have shocking boundary changes and as a result will cause the disenfranchisement of voters who just elected their Councilmember to a four-year term in 2020. In some cases the boundary changes mean that more than half the district's population is removed.

In Map 1 D1 is pushed into Bay Ho, parts of Bay Park, North Clairemont, part of Clairemont Mesa East and Clairemont Mesa West to bring the population numbers up after losing 38% (see Table 1) of the original population. This is not compact and uses human made boundaries not natural boundaries. The district boundaries in Bay Park and Clairemont Mesa East are surface streets.

In Map 2 the district boundary meanders through North University City – along La Jolla Village Drive, to Genesee then jumping to Nobel where it heads east to I 805 thereby putting residential communities in different districts from either their park, recreation center and library or their fire station. This also splits the area which is covered by the FBA into two council districts.

Also in Map 2 the La Jolla Community planning area is split between D1 and D6. The Poole Street neighborhood is in D1 and across the two lane surface street, Scripps Estates Associates and La Jolla Farms are in D6. This map causes disenfranchisement of 56% of D1's population (see Table 1).

In Map 3A D1 moves into Bay Ho, Bay Park, part of North Clairemont and Clairemont Mesa West. The district boundary in North Clairemont is Genesee with D1 west of Genesee and D7 east of Genesee. This Map splits the Clairemont planning area in two and uses surface streets as boundaries. The boundary changes result in a loss of 38% of the original D1 population (See Table 1).

In Map 3B the University Community is split along Genesee in the north until the boundary reaches Nobel. Then the boundary goes west along Nobel Drive and then south along Regents Road. Regents Road does not cross the canyon and in fact was removed from the community plan a number of years ago. This boundary places Doyle Elementary School and the Doyle Recreation Center and Park in D6 which is across Regents Road from the homes which are in D1. It splits the FBA area.

Torrey Highlands and Park Village are split from the Rancho Penasquitos planning area and D6 to put this area and its population in D1. Why not leave it in D6 or put it in D5? As a part of D6 it actually increases the Asian population percentage.

CONNECTIVITY

In Maps 1 and 2 the new areas for D1 that are south of the 52 have limited connectivity with the rest of D1 without going through D2 or D6. I-5 or SR-52 can be used to connect UC west of the 5 and La Jolla with Clairemont. This is not compact and uses human made boundaries not natural boundaries. The district boundaries in Bay Park and East Clairemont Mesa are surface streets.

In Maps 2 and 3A the north portion of D1 is connected by No. Torrey Pines Road to Carmel Valley Road to La Jolla. As shown by the maps there is a spaghetti strap connecting La Jolla to north D1. It is 650 feet wide and has two islands of people with a total population 573 over 2.5 miles. The very definition of gerrymandering.

All of the maps have introduced D6 into North University City. It should be noted that the D6 connection is from Miramar Road and means that the connectivity between population centers is through a commercial district at a distance of at least 3 miles, while there are other closer population centers available to make a more compact district.

Travel between the various population centers within the proposed district is difficult if not impossible without traversing other districts.

PLANNING GROUPS

Commenting on each map in detail:

Map1: Splits District 1 into 3 districts (1, 2 and 6) and retains 62% of the original residents.

The La Jolla Community planning area is whole; the University Community planning area is split between D1 and D6; South University City is whole in D6; Rose Canyon Open Space Park is in D6; North University City is split between D1 and D6; Torrey Pines Mesa is whole in D1 (this provides the connectivity to the northern portion of D1); the Torrey Pines planning area is split between D1 and D6 – Penasquitos Lagoon watershed is removed from the planning group and D1 to facilitate “compactness;” Del Mar Mesa is in D1; Torrey Hills is in D1; Carmel Valley is in D1, and Pacific Highlands Ranch is in D1.

This Map adds parts of Clairemont planning area to D1.

Map 2: Splits District 1 into 4 districts (1, 2,5 and 6) and retains 44% of the original residents. The La Jolla Community planning area is split between D1 and D6; the University Planning area is split between D1 and D6; South University City is whole in D1; Rose Canyon Open Space Park is in D1; North University City is split between D1 and D6; Torrey Pines Mesa is whole in D6; Torrey Pines planning area is whole in D6; Torrey Hills is whole in D6; Del Mar Mesa is whole in D5; Carmel Valley is split between D5 and D6, and Pacific Highlands Ranch is whole in D5. This places the MSCP in 2 council districts and splits a wildlife corridor between districts 5 and 6.

This Map adds Clairemont planning area to D1.

Map 3A

Splits District 1 into districts (1, 2, and 6) and retains 62% of the original residents. The La Jolla Community planning area is in D1; the University Community planning area is split between D1 and D6; South University City is whole in D6; Rose Canyon Open Space Park is in D6; North University City is whole in D6; Torrey Pines Mesa is whole in D1; Torrey Pines planning area is split between D1 and D6 with the watershed for Penasquitos Lagoon in D1 and D6; Del Mar Mesa is whole in D1; Torrey Hills is whole in D1; Carmel Valley is whole in D1, and Pacific Highland Ranch is in D1.

This Map adds parts of Clairemont planning area to D1.

Map 3B

Splits District 1 into 4 districts (1, 2, and 6) and retains 84% of the original residents. The La Jolla Community planning area is in D1; the University Community planning area is split between D1 and D6; South University City is split between D1 and D6; North University City is split between D1 and D6; Torrey Pines Mesa is in D1; Torrey Pines planning area is split between D1 and D6 with the Penasquitos Lagoon watershed in D6; Del Mar Mesa is in D1; Torrey Hills is in D1; Carmel Valley is in D1, and Pacific Highlands Ranch is in D1.

This map attaches parts of D6 south of SR-56.

SUMMARY

In summary these maps fail to protect the Communities Of Interest that District 1 United carefully detailed for this commission in ([District 1 United, “Coast & Canyons.” Report to the 2021 San Diego Redistricting Commission](#)). In addition, it is not compact, contiguous or connected. It is not easy to move between population centers. It does not respect natural or human made boundaries. But it does meet the population requirement by disenfranchising 38%, 56%, or 16% of our current residents and works only by gerrymandering the district.

“The 2011 Commission intended to keep the coast and canyons communities together because they share common interests and concerns.” This was the goal of District 1 United and we have made some painful choices to present the Commission with an alternative map that respects as many of our COIs as possible and reduces our population. That is District 1 United Alternative Map, P 5748, submitted on October 18, 2021.

TABLE 1

POPULATION RETAINED IN DISTRICTS

District	Original Population	Map 1	Map 2	Map 3A	Map 3B
1	166,656	62.33%	43.85%	62.16%	83.56%
2	149,952	86.23%	73.20%	73.21%	73.20%
3	161,448	90.47%	56.90%	56.79%	56.79%
4	145,708	91.67%	86.20%	94.02%	94.02%
5	158,760	100.00%	77.08%	97.66%	97.66%
6	152,358	57.88%	51.16%	57.88%	64.03%
7	159,500	78.88%	68.53%	68.53%	68.53%
8	149,313	99.94%	97.30%	97.32%	97.31%
9	146,204	83.58%	90.73%	90.73%	90.73%

**TABLE 2
SUMMARY POPULATION DATA FROM HAYSTQ REPORTS**

Map 1	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	D9	Original Population	Original Population %	Number of Districts
D1	103,870	0	0	0	0	62,786	0	0	0	166,656	62.33%	2
D2	20,649	129,303	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149,952	86.23%	2
D3	0	0	146,057	0	0	0	30	0	15,361	161,448	90.47%	2
D4	0	0	0	133,571	0	0	0	0	12,137	145,708	91.67%	2
D5	0	0	0	0	158,760	0	0	0	0	158,760	100.00%	1
D6	33,273	37	0	0	0	88,183	30,865	0	0	152,358	57.88%	4
D7	0	24,713	8,980	0	0	0	125,807	0	0	159,500	78.88%	3
D8	0	0	86	0	0	0	0	149,227	0	149,313	99.94%	2
D9	0	0	0	17,916	0	0	0	6,084	122,204	146,204	83.58%	3
Map 2												
D1	73,072	0	0	0	19,574	74,010	0	0	0	166,656	43.85%	3
D2	29,277	109,778	10,897	0	0	0	0	0	0	149,952	73.20%	3
D3	0	45,317	91,689	0	0	0	0	9,081	15,361	161,448	56.90%	4
D4				136,999	0	0	0	0	8,709	145,708	86.20%	2
D5					122,366	0	36,394	0		158,760	77.08%	2
D6	50,642		37		10,232	77,951	13,496	0	0	152,358	51.16%	5
D7			50,189				109,311			159,500	68.53%	2
D8		86		3,913				145,314		149,313	97.30%	3
D9				13,547					132,657	146,204	90.73%	2
Map 3A												
D1	103,859	0	0	0	0	62,797	0	0	0	166,656	62.16%	2
D2	29,277	109,778	10,897	0	0	0	0	0	0	149,952	73.21%	3
D3	0	45,317	91,689	0	0	0	0	9,081	15,361	161,448	56.79%	4
D4	0	0	0	136,999	0	0	0	0	8,709	145,708	94.02%	2
D5	0	0	0	0	155,045	3,715	0	0	0	158,760	97.66%	2
D6	19,599	0	37	0	0	88,183	44,539	0	0	152,358	57.88%	4
D7	0	0	50,189	0	0	0	109,311	0	0	159,500	68.53%	2
D8	0	86	0	3,913	0	0	0	145,314	0	149,313	97.32%	3
D9	0	0	0	13,547	0	0	0	0	132,657	146,204	90.73%	2
Map 3B												
D1	139,265	0	0	0	0	27,391	0	0	0	166,656	83.56%	2
D2	151	109,778	10,897	0	0	29,126	0	0	0	149,952	73.20%	4
D3	0	45,317	91,689	0	0	0	0	9,081	15,361	161,448	56.79%	4
D4	0	0	0	136,999	0	0	0	0	8,709	145,708	94.02%	2
D5	3,715	0	0	0	155,045	0	0	0	0	158,760	97.66%	2
D6	10,232	0	37	0	0	97,550	44,539	0	0	152,358	64.03%	2
D7	0	0	50,189	0	0	0	109,311	0	0	159,500	68.53%	2
D8	0	86	0	3,913	0	0	0	145,314	0	149,313	97.31%	2
D9	0	0	0	13,547	0	0	0	0	132,657	146,204	90.73%	2