

The following was prepared by Sherri S. Lightner on behalf in preparation for testimony at the October 28, 2021 Redistricting Commission meeting which discussed the Interim Preliminary Map 5870 and the Commission Chair's Updated Preliminary Map Proposal Map P6030.

I am an analytical person and long time resident of San Diego. I am a graduate of Crawford HS; a graduate of Revelle College at UCSD with a double major in Mathematics and Sociology, a Masters in Applied Mechanics and Engineering Sciences from UCSD: I am a licensed Mechanical Engineer in the state of CA for over 40 years. I worked analyzing, modeling and testing nonlinear events including high velocity impact bird strikes and fan debladements for airplanes and I cannot explain how it is rational for District 1 to go from the highest population to the lowest population in this redistricting process: to have huge numbers of the population moved around and 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.

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 (COIs). By not splitting communities of interest into different districts you increase the likelihood of responsive representation. Public testimony in this process 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 continued 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 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?

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 and have created volunteer resource 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. These 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.

During the last hearing Haystaq presented four maps and the Commission took public testimony before activating District 1 and moving boundaries and numbers around. Thanks to all the commissioners for attempting to get Bird Rock right. It is still not correctly included despite written and oral comments. The change includes too much of D2. Thanks also to Commissioner Hoy for pushing at least part of UCSD back into D1.

Both of the maps presented this evening have arbitrarily and unnecessarily significantly cut D1's original population – taking it from the highest population to the lowest in both. These maps split the University Community plan area which is contrary to the instruction 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.

Both of this evening's maps have introduced D6 into the North and South University Community plan area. 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 much more compact and connected district. Travel between the various population centers within the proposed district is difficult if not impossible without traversing other districts.

These maps still demonstrate that the commissioners believe that redistricting 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 Interim Preliminary Map 5870 which I will refer to as the Commission's map is clear that there is no interest in keeping D1 United. It is a modification of Haystaq's Map 1. 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.

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." However in the Commission's Map, the UCSD campus remains split in two districts on either side of the I-5. 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. Major institutions should be in the same district with the communities that deal with them on a daily basis. To put an institution such as UCSD in one district and its impacts in another smacks of gerrymandering.

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.

The suggested Commission map splits D1 into 3 Districts (1, 2, and 6) and adds population to an eviscerated D1 by ignoring adjacent population centers with clear connectivity and stretching beyond the original district boundaries to include 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 to a four-year term in 2020.

In the Commission's Map, D1 is pushed into Bay Ho, parts of Bay Park, North Clairemont, part of Clairemont Mesa East, Clairemont Mesa West and Pacific Beach to bring the population numbers up after losing over 30% of the original D1 population. District 1 has gone from having the largest population to the smallest. This map is not compact and uses human made boundaries not natural boundaries. The district boundaries in Bay Park and Clairemont Mesa East are surface streets. The district boundary in Pacific Beach uses surface streets and puts the entrance to Pacific Beach in D1.

Torrey Highlands is split from the Rancho Penasquitos planning area and D5 to put this area and its population in D1. Why not leave it in D5?

In the Commission's map, 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 and Pacific Beach. This is not compact and uses human made boundaries not natural boundaries.

In the Commission's map 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 Community is split between D1 and D6; Torrey Pines Mesa is whole in D1 (this provides the contiguousness and connectivity to the northern portion of D1; the Torrey Pines planning area is split between D1 and D6 as the Penasquitos Lagoon watershed is removed from the planning group and D1 to facilitate "compactness;" Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Hills, Carmel Valley, and Pacific Highlands Ranch are in D1. The Commission's map adds parts of the Clairemont and Penasquitos planning areas to D1.

The Chair's map gets closer to District 1 United's map and disenfranchises fewer people than the Commission's map, but it still disenfranchises close to 18,000 original residents and destroys D1 communities of interest. It splits District 1 into 2 districts (1 and 6). The Chair's map splits only two of the planning areas of D1: Del Mar Mesa and University Community. The Chair's map removes the Del Mar Mesa Preserve from D1 and the Del Mar Mesa planning area. This removal is to facilitate the connection of Torrey Highlands to D6. Although the map shows this as a contiguous area, there is no road to cross the preserve. It has no population and should remain in D1 as it has since its inception. To get from D6 in Park Village to Torrey Highlands residents would need to cross either D1 or D5. Torrey Highlands belongs to the Rancho Penasquitos Planning area and is in the Poway Unified School District unlike Carmel Valley and Pacific Highlands Ranch which are in the San Dieguito, Solana Beach and Del Mar school districts.

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 or the common name for the Golden Triangle. This map includes splitting a San Diego Unified School District Cluster, and removing from D1 the North University Community Library which is touted as serving the communities of University City, La Jolla Crossroads, Golden Triangle and UC San Diego, the 31 acre Nobel Athletic Area with its playing fields, picnic areas, leash free dog park, children's playground and the Park and Recreation Center which features several community meeting rooms and an outdoor courtyard, the 16,088-square-foot facility frequently hosts concerts, performances and cultural events. This facility was built as a result of strong community organization and effort. The new Fire Station 50 will also be removed from D1. The chair's map also splits the Rose Canyon Open Space Park which is a community of interest and the FBA for the north and the DIF in the south between D1 and D6.

In the south, the Chair's Map removes from D1 the Shoreham business district and another library, the University Community Library, which was built in 1978 to serve the community of University City. The 10,000-square-foot facility replaced a small but heavily used storefront library in a nearby shopping center because the Community worked to bring it into existence. The library offers programs for patrons of all ages, including a monthly concert featuring local music performers and a weekly video game club for youth. The Chair's map also removes University Village Park, the Tot Lot Recreational Park and University Gardens Park from D1. The fields at University Gardens Park are used for youth sports. University City High School will be removed from D1 along with Curie Elementary even though both are an integral part of D1 and the University Community now. The Chairs' map will put the Eruv associated with Chabad Center of UC in two council districts.

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

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, they are not as compact, contiguous or connected as they could be. 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 removing close to 18,000 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 is 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.