

Testimony by Sherri S. Lightner at the October 28, 2021 Meeting.

I have time ceded by Bruce Lightner, Claudia Baranowski and Evie Baez.

I'm speaking IN SUPPORT of D1 United Updated Alternative Map.

I am an analytical person, a graduate of Crawford HS with a Masters in Applied Mechanics from UCSD: I am a licensed Mechanical Engineer and yet I cannot explain how it is rational for District 1 to go from the highest to the lowest population: to have huge numbers of the population who voted for their Councilmember just a year ago moved around and thereby disenfranchised.

Something stinks.

As a former Councilmember and Council President I know that there is most likely something pretty powerful driving this and it is not the residents.

I had the honor of representing District 1 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. They have created and support volunteer resource groups that protect, preserve and enhance environmental areas that are important to the City's Multiple Species Conservation Plan. These areas should remain in D1.

As a former City Councilmember, I can attest to the importance of respecting communities of interest in this redistricting process. By keeping communities of interest intact you increase the likelihood of responsive representation.

The continued destruction of our COI 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 does D1 go from the highest population to the lowest in these maps? Why is it necessary to go outside the current district boundaries to replace adjacent populations with more distant ones, thereby disenfranchising current district residents?

Thanks to all the commissioners for attempting to get Bird Rock right at the last hearing although it is still not correctly included. Thanks also to Commissioner Hoy for putting at least part of UCSD back into D1.

In the Chair's Map, UCSD is as it should be, once again united in one district, D1, as it was when this process started.

Both of these maps split the University Community plan area which is contrary to your instructions to keep planning groups together if they were undergoing a plan update.

This evening's maps have introduced D6 into North and South University Community. The connection to D6 is Miramar Road which 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 much more compact and connected district.

The Interim Preliminary Map 5870 is clear that there is no interest in keeping D1 United. It is a modification of Haystaq's Map 1 and most of the comments from that map apply to this slight permutation. I have submitted written details on that map. The only differences for D1 are that D1 is no longer tied together by a narrow land bridge adjacent to UCSD; population has been added from D2 to Bird Rock and the entrance of Pacific Beach, and that the community of Torrey Highlands is tacked onto D1 through its connection to PHR. This resulting map stretches beyond adjacent population centers with clear connectivity to include the more distant parts of Clairemont, Pacific

Beach and Torrey Highlands so that D1 extends from close to I-8 to the northern city boundary. It will cause the disenfranchisement of over 30% of the voters who just elected their Councilmember. Why do this?

The Commission Chair's Updated Preliminary Map Proposal Map P6030, which I will call the Chair's map, demonstrated some interest in keeping D1 United but does not respect our communities of interest. It may offer a view into the mind set behind this redistricting. It differs from the current district by removing close to 17,000 people from the University Community and takes unpopulated areas with major business interests in the North and in the Shoreham business district to the south. There is no justification for removing this many people from D1. Is the consolidation of a good portion of the D1 business interests into D6 an objective of this redistricting and the population is going along for the ride?

The Chair's map splits only two of the planning areas of D1: Del Mar Mesa and University Community. It removes the Del Mar Mesa Preserve from D1 and the Del Mar Mesa planning area. This area has no population and should remain in D1 as it has since its inception.

The Chair's map removes population from both the north and south areas of the University Community – everything east of Genesee and south of Eastgate Mall. In the north it removes UTC – the Westfield Mall. This map includes splitting a San Diego Unified School District Cluster by removing the High School and an elementary school. It removes 2 libraries, 4 parks including the 31 acre Nobel Athletic Area with its dog park, and Park and Rec Center. This map also removes the new Fire Station 50. The chair's map also splits the Rose Canyon Open Space Park which is a community of interest along with its associated Friends group, and splits the FBA for the north and the DIF in the south.

The District 1 portion of the University Community, north or south, will not have any libraries.

In summary these maps fail to respect the Communities Of Interest presented by District 1 United. In addition, the proposed D1's are not as compact, contiguous or connected as they could be and as they are now. It is not easy to move between population centers. But these maps do meet the population requirement by drastically reducing our population and disenfranchising up to 31% of our current residents and gerrymandering the district or by arbitrarily and capriciously (or it could be strategically) removing nearly 17,000 people, breaking communities of interest and removing multiple neighborhood serving infrastructure improvements from D1.

"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 the D1 United Updated Alternative Map, P6185, which reflects some of the Commission changes and was submitted on October 27, 2021.