

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
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

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 1 – 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, 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

Noticing of 2PM, Saturday, November 13th Meeting to Adopt a New Preliminary MAP & PLAN