JOHN STUMP

2411 SHAMROCK STREET, CITY HEIGHTS, CALIFORNIA 92105 619 281-4663 mrjohnstump@cox.net

November 9, 2021

City of San Diego Independent Redistricting Commission (record request #21-5780)

c/o: Ms. Laura J. Fleming, Executive Director Redistricting2020@sandiego.gov; LJFleming@sandiego.gov;

justine.nielsen@procopio.com; hello@trestlelaw.com; monica.hernandez@aalrr.com

202 C Street, San Diego, California 92101

Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2021 5:34 AM david.garrick@sduniontribune.com; Redistricting To: Commission Staff Cc: Derryl Williams; Ellen Nash; Eryn Wilson; Trinh Le; francine maxwell; Andrea Hetheru; Samantha Jenkins; Alyce Pipkin-allen; Pastor John Warren; Dr. John Warren; francinemaxwell@gmail.com; Samantha Jenkins; Pollard: Laila Aziz; 'Darin

Subject: All the focus is North of Adams Avenue Compromises but the Hispanic, Black and LGBTQ vote gets diluted

Dear Mr. Garrick and Redistricting Commissioners

Thank you for your reporting

http://enewspaper.sandiegouniontribune.com/infinity/article_share.aspx?guid=ecae2b67-359d-45ba-9899-d1cb09454439

Your article misses the main Voting Rights point of this whole effort. Redistricting is not about keeping one subdivision or commercial business district together or even where elite colleges are placed. It is about preventing political manipulation to gerrymander away the voting rights of racial minorities.

The Chairman's Map and the mislabeled Compromise map only deal with peripheral non voting rights questions. Both of these maps dilute the Hispanic, Black, and LGBTQ voting rights. These Middle Class subdivision maps are focused on housing development subdivions rather than fair political participation.

The very biased and frankly conflicted commission leadership [two commissioners the Chair and Kosmos are holdover Republican appointees on the SD Ethics Commission] have waited until this last Saturday meeting to even consider the Voting Rights race changes from the current 2010 Council Districts to the new Chairman's / Compromise maps. If the those maps continue then it would be better to not have the Commission get the 6 votes on a final map, [Population increases only require Council District changes North of Adams Avenue because of Coastal growth in District One] Four [4] Voting Rights committed Redistricting Commissioners need to state clearly that they are not going to vote for any map that dilutes the number of Hispanic districts and otherwise dilutes the Black and LGBTQ vote.

Both these subdivision shopping district maps are traditional white class power maps that return San Diego to the 1970's Mayor Wilson era control of the City. Both subdivision maps foster more developer growth and stifle neighborhood control. My City Heights community again becomes dominated by the North of Adams Avenue rich and our politics become, again, dominated by pollical contributions rather than the elected representative's progressive performance.

This commission took no time to apply equal student residency analysis for the other 3 colleges -SDSU, USD, & POINT LOMA but focused on only on La Jolla and the coast. Analysis of other colleges might have shown heavy attendance areas for Hispanic and Black students in the south.

The Chairman ran the clock out on this redistricting game because he had his own Map and Plan. He has had the other commissioners brain storming about dream houses in the sky without ever consulting an architect Noticing of 2PM, Saturday, November 13th Meeting to Adopt a New Preliminary MAP & PLAN

about the rules of construction. The Commission has yet to consult with their Voting Rights Attorney about gerrymandering rules!

It is obvious, to anyone that understands the principals of redistricting, concerning the use of natural boundaries to prevent artificial gerrymandering, that the two Chairman's maps are gerrymandering to dilute. Both these maps cross into the San Diego River Mission Valley areas and cross major streets and freeways to get the diluting populations the schemers want. Nobody in the Mid City thinks Mission Valley has ever been part of their neighborhoods!

On Saturday, after all the public shouting from coastal, ucsd alumni, and the wealthly is over; four commissioners need to make clear and unequivocal statements that they are not going to vote for the dilution of the voting rights progress already achieved with the current 2010 council districts. Without those 4 votes a new map can not be adopted.

Voting Rights is the NO JUSTICE NO PEACE issue

RE: Noticing of 2PM, Saturday, November 13th Meeting to Adopt a New Preliminary MAP & PLAN, based on findings, by the required Super Majority of 6 Votes AND Other Matters

Dear Honorable Redistricting Commissioners,

Last Friday, November 5th, I sent you a letter that raised concerns that the way your meetings were being managed and noticed were preventing and repressing the clear consensus of the Commissioners' will for a different Preliminary MAP & PLAN, than had been sua sponte imposed on the Commission, by its Chairman.

At the meeting, of Thursday, November 4th, the motion to adopt the Chairman's Map/Plan failed. That Chairman's Map/Plan is now off the table and cannot return, absent a successful motion to reconsider, requiring some complicated parliamentary procedure rules and a two stage voting process.

The Chairman's Map/Plan failed to gain the support, of the Commission, for many reasons, including its failure "...to ensure fair and equitable redistricting for all racial, ethnic and language minorities, and be in conformance with the requirements of the U.S. Constitution and federal statutes as amended and the San Diego Charter. "(BYLAWS & OPERATING PROCEDURES of the CITY OF SAN DIEGO 2020 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, ARTICLE I – Name and Purpose, Section 3.); that the Chairman's Map/Plan's had findings that were incorrect; that there was significant public testimony that the Chairman's Map/Plan may have violated BYLAWS ARTICLE V – Policies, Section 6 for failure to act with "...transparency, fairness, and openness with the public... " and "... publicly disclose all substantive communications they have regarding redistricting with any member of the public, or organizations or interest groups, regarding redistricting outside of public meetings."; caused violations of Section 5. Conflict standards & Section 6 non-partisan standards; that some Commissioners felt that they had been fast tracked managed to a leadership conclusion rather than being facilitated towards their own independent consensus; and other reasons expressed by the Commissioner's at the meeting of November 4th. The Chairman even attempted to adjourn the meeting without a majority vote of the Commission to adjourn

BYLAWS ARTICLE V – Policies, Section 4. Requires: "The final plan requires six (6) votes by the Commission to meet the vote threshold for approval." Given the rejection of the Chairman's Map/Plan, a new MAP/Plan must be carefully, openly, and transparently developed to meet this super majority 6 Vote threshold.

The conclusion of the Tuesday November 9th meeting must be to docket, Brown Act Notice and take whatever other steps necessary to allow the Commission to fully consider and adopt a significantly different "Preliminary Map" with an accompanying findings PLAN, at the Saturday November 13th meeting.

I hereby continue my Public Records Request for copies of all correspondence and documents, of any kind or nature, concerning the development of Chairman's Map/Plan as governed by **BYLAWS ARTICLE V – Policies**, Noticing of 2PM, Saturday, November 13th Meeting to Adopt a New Preliminary MAP & PLAN

Section 6; the San Diego City Charter Sections 215-216.1 (a)-(b) et al and California laws. Please publish all of the Chairman's Map/Plan Section 6 documents, all of my correspondence directed to the Commission, including this letter in the Commission's record. Publics' confidence is dependent on transparency and the absence of conflicts.

All the best, John Stump 619 281 4663

Copy: San Diego City Attorney Mara Elliot and San Diego City Clerk JBerry@sandiego.gov