

The below portrayal is the status quo ante from the San Diego Redistricting Commissions WEB site at: [current_council_districts_-_total_population.pdf](#). This presentation has a TOTAL "POPULATION DEVIATION OF 7.89%". This TOTAL "POPULATION DIAVTION" is under ten percent (10%) and within the legally acceptable deviation limits, overall.

The Deviation for District Nine (D 9) is calculated as -5.32% ($154,433.22-146,204=8,229.22/154,433.22=5.32\%$) The current Compromise Chairman's map proposes to add some 10,693 residents to District Nine to balance it closer to the ideal. [See [Districtr](#) Map 87744) Thus the new map 87744 has a District Nine (D 9) population of 156. 897 or 6.92 % greater than the idea.

The unfortunate circumstance presented by the Compromise/Chairman's Map 87744 is that it dilutes the minority Hispanic and coalition races in the new map. I believe that this effort to fails the Mission of the Commission 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.**) Map 87744, as far as D9, further violates the principal dilution as it gerrymanders to accomplish this goal of dilution by crossing significant geographical and infrastructure boundaries – Map 87744 reaches across all of the San Diego River Valley and the I-8 Freeway to capture a diluting population to the current D9 population. It raises the "...essence of a Section 2 claim" in "... that a certain electoral law, practice, or structure interacts with social and historical conditions to cause an inequality in the opportunities enjoyed by [minority] and white voters to elect their preferred representatives." *Thornburg v. Gingles*, (1986) 478 U.S. 30, 47 Map 8744 dilutes the existing population in D9 and cracks minority voting power by stacking in some 10,693 residents of a different nature, class, and distant location.

I request that the Commission request analysis of the current 2011 D9 boundaries; so as to determine if maintenance of the historic boundaries could meet the requirements of the law. Further I recommend that the some 10,693 residents that were proposed to be added to D9, by map 87744, be considered for a new adjusted District Seven (D 7) along with San Diego State University -SDSU. Linking SDSU WEST with SDSU EAST in District 7 would accomplish the Chairman's goals and not dilute D 9.

