


San Diego Preliminary Map 3B

Link to map:

<https://portal.sandiego-mapping.org/submission/p5733>



Methodology

This is the second version of the third draft map and again it is not truly a distinct map. It is identical to Map 3A (and of course has some of the same districts as Maps One and Two as Map 3A was already a compilation). This map cleared the outlines of Districts 1 and 6 in Map 3A and redrew them to attempt to keep District 1 as similar to the existing District 1 as possible. This map represents the tradeoffs between keeping District 1 whole and creating an AAPI empowerment district.

Population

District	Total	%Latino	%Asian	%Black	CVAP	CVAP	CVAP
	Population				%Latino	%Asian	%Black
1	153,363	10.56%	26.99%	1.36%	8.83%	19.12%	1.41%
2	155,181	17.46%	5.10%	4.32%	13.65%	4.82%	4.78%
3	152,812	24.59%	11.11%	5.01%	20.70%	8.53%	5.57%
4	154,459	48.56%	21.60%	15.16%	38.48%	22.07%	21.32%
5	155,045	11.09%	28.53%	2.12%	9.59%	21.74%	2.47%
6	154,067	15.82%	32.49%	2.49%	13.61%	25.98%	3.10%
7	153,850	20.92%	11.82%	5.71%	16.63%	11.99%	5.62%
8	154,395	73.35%	7.41%	4.57%	63.59%	9.44%	6.57%
9	156,727	44.23%	12.73%	10.17%	31.11%	13.07%	11.64%
Totals	1,389,899						

Compactness

[Understanding Compactness](#)

District	Perimeter	Area_Sq_Mi	Polsby	Schwartzberg	Convex_Hull	Reock
			Popper			
1	49.9	43	0.2187	0.4677	0.5834	0.2855
2	43.1	35	0.2347	0.4844	0.7012	0.3554
3	32.4	20	0.2359	0.4857	0.7011	0.5202
4	28.3	18	0.2792	0.5284	0.7579	0.605
5	101.5	63	0.0769	0.2773	0.3972	0.239
6	40.2	33	0.2604	0.5103	0.6347	0.2403
7	57.3	79	0.3014	0.549	0.8263	0.5343
8	60.5	37	0.1275	0.3571	0.3009	0.1586
9	23.1	14	0.3257	0.5707	0.6697	0.3559
Avg			0.2289	0.4701	0.6192	0.3660

Splits Summary

Community Planning Areas		Neighborhoods	
Split across number of districts	Number of CPAs	Split across number of districts	Number of neighborhoods
1	47	1	95
2	9	2	28
3	2	3	2
4	1	6	1

CITYWIDE INSTRUCTIONS

Instruction from commission	Followed?																																																								
Draft 2-3 maps based on the following instructions below.	Patial- this is technically a 4th map, but it is a copy of Map3A which was already a compilation map, and only changes districts 1 and 6.																																																								
Aim for a maximum citywide deviation of 5-7%.	<p>Yes- this map maintains a deviation of 2.54% from the ideal person per district size</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>District</th> <th>Total Population</th> <th>Raw Deviation</th> <th>% Deviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>153,363</td> <td>-1,070</td> <td>-0.69%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>155,181</td> <td>748</td> <td>0.48%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>152,812</td> <td>-1,621</td> <td>-1.05%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>154,459</td> <td>26</td> <td>0.02%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>155,045</td> <td>612</td> <td>0.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>154,067</td> <td>-366</td> <td>-0.24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>153,850</td> <td>-583</td> <td>-0.38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>154,395</td> <td>-38</td> <td>-0.02%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>156,727</td> <td>2,294</td> <td>1.49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Column_ Total</td> <td>1,389,899</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ideal</td> <td>154433.2222</td> <td>Deviation</td> <td>2.54%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	District	Total Population	Raw Deviation	% Deviation	1	153,363	-1,070	-0.69%	2	155,181	748	0.48%	3	152,812	-1,621	-1.05%	4	154,459	26	0.02%	5	155,045	612	0.40%	6	154,067	-366	-0.24%	7	153,850	-583	-0.38%	8	154,395	-38	-0.02%	9	156,727	2,294	1.49%	Column_ Total	1,389,899											Ideal	154433.2222	Deviation	2.54%
District	Total Population	Raw Deviation	% Deviation																																																						
1	153,363	-1,070	-0.69%																																																						
2	155,181	748	0.48%																																																						
3	152,812	-1,621	-1.05%																																																						
4	154,459	26	0.02%																																																						
5	155,045	612	0.40%																																																						
6	154,067	-366	-0.24%																																																						
7	153,850	-583	-0.38%																																																						
8	154,395	-38	-0.02%																																																						
9	156,727	2,294	1.49%																																																						
Column_ Total	1,389,899																																																								
Ideal	154433.2222	Deviation	2.54%																																																						
Communities that were previously split in 2010 should be taken into consideration (when feasible) to reunite the community, provided that doing so isn't in conflict with the 6 criteria.	Yes- our best effort was made to not split neighborhoods or CPAs while redrawing districts in our drafts, except where necessary for creating population equalization																																																								
Consider evaluating citywide maps, and partial maps submitted by the public with significant public comment for how the maps meet the	Yes- we ran reports to evaluate all public-submitted maps to the Districtr sites and integrated components of community maps as directed by the commission																																																								

criteria.	
Try to keep community planning groups intact, especially if the community is currently updating or recently had their update approved.	Yes- our best effort was made to not split neighborhoods or CPAs while redrawing districts in our drafts, except where necessary for creating population equalization. Note: often the CPA and neighborhood lines would diverge slightly. In this case we always follow the CPA line.
Prioritization of criteria: San Diego is not subject to the prioritization of redistricting criteria in the California Fair Maps Act. The Commission recognizes, however, that court rulings have placed importance on ensuring that the population of districts do not exceed a total deviation of 10%, as per the Gaffney v Cummings case. Additionally, the Commission must follow federal and state laws regarding voting rights, and within those constraints consider communities of interest, neighborhoods, compactness, etc.	To the best of our knowledge and ability, this draft map complies with redistricting criteria laid out in both local and federal law

DISTRICT 1	
Instruction from commission	Followed?
Consider keeping UCSD/University City in District 1.	Mostly - UCSD is kept in District 1, but for population reasons only part of University City was retained
Try to keep Torrey Hills in District 1.	Yes- Torrey Hills remains in District 1
Attempt to keep Carmel Valley in District 1.	Yes- Carmel Valley CPA is whole and remains in District 1
For population balance if necessary, consider splitting the University City area north and south of Rose Canyon.	Partial -- University City is split, but it is split east/west instead of north south. This is done to allow District 6 to

	connect to Clairemont (and pick up population)
The Commission received feedback from a group of District 1 residents and community organizations requesting no changes be made to the current District 1 boundaries.	Yes -- This map tried to keep as much of District 1 intact as possible. It draws 90+% of its old population from the old District 1
Lower the population deviation from its current standing of 7.91%	Yes- the population deviation for District 1 as proposed in this draft map is -.69% with a raw deviation of -1070 people from the ideal district size

DISTRICT 2	
Instruction from Commission	Followed?
Try to maintain 2 coastal Council districts.	Yes- the coastal component of existing District 1 and 2 has been maintained in this map
Attempt to reunite Clairemont into one Council district (currently in District 2 and District 6).	No- Clairemont Mesa CPA is divided between District 6 and District 7 in order to maintain population balance
Attempt to reunite Linda Vista into one Council district (currently in District 2 and District 7).	Yes- Linda Vista is reunited in District 3
Consider adding Mission Hills to District 2.	Mission Hill is defined as a neighborhood and crosses the boundaries defined by the Old Town and Uptown CPA. We largely keep Mission Hills intact but it will show some population in District 2, we did this because we prioritized CPA Boundaries over Neighborhood Boundaries
Consider adding Old Town to District 2.	Yes- Old Town neighborhood is in District 2

DISTRICT 3	
Instruction from Commission	Followed?
Recognize that District 3 has a strong LGBT presence and has elected several LGBT	Yes- kept the following areas united due to LGBTQ interests (Majority of Mission Hills,

members to the local and state legislature.	Hillcrest, University Heights, North Park)
Consider a map where Golden Hill stays in District 3.	No- this version of the map places Golden Hill in District 8
Try to provide a map where the Normal Heights Community Planning Area is wholly within District 3 or District 9.	Yes- Mid Town Normal Heights CPA is wholly within this map's District 9
Consider assigning the Districtr-defined neighborhoods of Adams North and Normal Heights to different districts if necessary, for population balance	Adams North neighborhood is in District 9 along with Normal heights as balancing population balance was not necessary in this area
Try to keep downtown San Diego intact and in one council district.	Yes- Downtown is intact within District 2
Try to keep University Heights in one district, preferably District 3.	Yes- University Heights is within a single district (District 3)

DISTRICT 4	
Instruction from Commission	Followed?
Consider a map where Ridgeview is transferred from District 9 to District 4.	Yes- Ridgeview Webster was moved out of District 9 into District 4
Consider a map where Mt. Hope (east of Boundary St) is transferred from District 9 to District 4.	Mt. Hope did not need to be split for this map. It is in District 9
Consider a map where Mountain View is transferred from District 9 to District 4.	Mountain View has about half of its population in District 4, and the other half in District 9
If population deviation is too high, and District 9 is too low, consider transferring Rolando Park and Redwood Village from District 4 to District 9.	Yes- for population considerations, both Rolando Park and Redwood were moved into District 9
Try to maintain the current district boundaries while expanding the district.	Yes- to the extent possible, old boundaries for District 4 were maintained, and where it expanded, we attempted to keep Neighborhoods whole

DISTRICT 5

Instructions from Commission	Followed?
Consider a map where Park Village is transferred from District 6 to District 5.	No- For Population reasons the Park Village area of Rancho Penasquitos is moved to District 1
Consider transferring Torrey Highlands Community Planning Area from District 5 to District 1.	Torrey Highlands CPA remains in District 5 in this proposed map
Try to keep Scripps Ranch in District 5.	Yes- Scripps Ranch remains in District 5
Consider adding Carmel Valley to District 5.	Carmel Valley is in District 1

DISTRICT 6	
Instructions from Commission	Followed?
Try to maintain District 6 as a district with a significant AAPI population.	No -- The Asian Population percentage drops to 32.5% in this map
Consider transferring UCSD/University City to District 6.	No -- UCSD and much of University City remain in District One in this map
Consider adding Clairemont to District 6.	Clairemont is split between District 6 and District 7
Consider adding Carmel Valley and Torrey Pines to District 6.	No - These areas remain in District 1

DISTRICT 7	
Instructions from Commission	Followed?
Try to keep Navajo in District 7.	Yes- Navajo remains in District 7
Consider a map where Mission Valley neighborhoods west of I-15 are transferred to District 3; consider adding Kearny Mesa from District 6 to District 7 in compensation.	Kearny Mesa was moved into District 7, however Mission Valley is kept whole within District 3 in this map
Consider a map where Scripps Ranch is transferred from District 5 to District 7 in exchange for Mission Valley or Serra Mesa neighborhoods being transferred from District 7 to District 6, or if Mission Valley is	Scripps Ranch remains in District 5, the other neighborhoods were not moved in compensation

transferred to District 3 as described above.	
---	--

DISTRICT 8	
Instructions from Commission	Followed?
Try to maintain District 8 as a district with a significant LatinX population.	Yes- District 8 has 70.2% HVAP in this proposed configuration
Consider a map where Southcrest and/or Shelltown is transferred from District 9 to District 8.	Southcrest and Shelltown are both in District 4
Consider a map where Golden Hill is transferred to District 8.	Yes- Golden Hill was moved to District 8

DISTRICT 9		
Instructions from Commission	Followed?	
Try to maintain District 9 as a district with a significant LatinX population.	Yes- District 9 maintains 40.5% Hispanic VAP	
Redraw District 9 in conjunction with comments made for District 4, District 3, District 8:	Consider adding Normal Heights Community Planning Area from District 3 to District 9	Yes- Mid City Normal Heights CPA was moved into District 9
	Consider transferring Ridgeview from District 9 to District 4	Yes- Ridgeview/Webster neighborhood was moved into District 4
	Consider transferring Rolando Park and Redwood Village from District 4 to District 9	Yes- Rolando Park neighborhood was moved into District 9 along with Redwood Village
	Consider transferring Mt Hope and Mountain View from District 9 to District 4.	Mountain view had to be split in this map version, and is located in District 4 and District 9. Mt. Hope remains whole inside District 9
Try to reunite El Cerrito in District 9.	The boundaries we have for El Cerrito show it was whole within the existing district lines, and remains united within this draft version of District 9	

How to Read Map Reports

Full reports from the Haystaq-created draft maps, as well as community-submitted district plans (through 10/12) can be found on the city website as Excel files. These reports were created by proprietary python code written by HaystaqDNA. Here is a basic primer on the components/tabs of these reports:

Maps:

These are just images from the city's Districtr hosted website of each map.

Populations:

When we create a plan or export a plan from Districtr, we export it as a 'block equivalency file'. Basically the U.S. Census divided all of the geography of the City of San Diego up into 'blocks'. At its most basic, a block can correspond to a city block, but the census will also use permanent geographic features (a waterway, a canyon, a ridge, a highway) to define a block. The census then published population and demographic data associated with each block (a P.L 94-171 file). Then the Statewide Database on behalf of the state of California takes that PL file and does prisoner reallocation and reassigns in-state prisoners back to their original blocks. To create the 'Populations' report we match up the blocks of each district with the blocks in this file and summarize all of the population within this district.

Defining some of the abbreviations: NL = non-Latino, AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native, VAP = Voting Age Population (age 18+), CVAP19 = 2019 Citizen Voting Age Population (an estimate of eligible voters).

Deviations are calculated against an ideal population of each district. To find the ideal population we simply divide the population of San Diego (1,389,899) by the number of districts(9) to find 154,433. The raw deviation is how far off this number a district population is. The final deviation number is found by adding the absolute value of the lowest negative deviation to the highest absolute value of the highest positive deviation. Example: District 9 has the lowest negative deviation of -3.06%. District 5 has the highest positive deviation of 2.80%. So the final deviation is 3.06%+ 2.80% = 5.86%

Components:

The Component report is a list of all of the Community Planning Areas and Neighborhoods and their populations that make up a district.

OldDistrict:

This report lists what existing city council districts and their populations make up the new proposed districts.

Compactness:

For more information on the math behind compactness measures, here is a good resource: <https://fisherzachary.github.io/public/r-output.html>. For these tests, the closer the score is to 1, the more compact the district, and the closer to 0, the less compact the district is.

Splits

There are two versions of the splits report. One that looks at how many districts each Community Planning Association is in and one that looks at how many districts each Neighborhood is in.

Community Splits:

'Military Facilities', 'Reserve' and 'Not Identified' show up as splits, mostly because there are multiple areas with those names. They will show up as splits on almost every map.

Keep in mind physical geography when looking at neighborhood and CPA splits. For example, Los Penasquitos Canyon will show a 0 population split on some maps. This is because there is a very long and very narrow canyon that extends eastward from the community. It falls between Park Village and Mira Mesa and has 0 population. In many of the maps for reasons of compactness we will place this canyon in a different district than the area with residents.

Neighborhood Splits:

Specifically regarding neighborhood splits: when we reduced the number of splits on the map we optimized for CPAs. Many times CPAs and Neighborhoods follow similar but not identical boundaries. Often the CPA will have its line on one side of a highway and the neighborhood the other. So there are 'many' neighborhoods that will show 0 population splits. We hold that in general you should ignore the 0 population splits.

new_districts	orig_districts	Population_P2
1	1	139,265
1	6	10,232
1	5	3,715
1	2	151
2	2	109,778
2	3	45,317
2	8	86
2	1	0
2	7	0
3	3	91,689
3	7	50,189
3	2	10,897
3	6	37
3	9	0
4	4	136,999
4	9	13,547
4	8	3,913
5	5	155,045
6	6	97,550
6	2	29,126
6	1	27,391
7	7	109,311
7	6	44,539
7	1	0
8	8	145,314
8	3	9,081
8	9	0
9	9	132,657
9	3	15,361
9	4	8,709
9	7	0

**split across
number of districts**

**number of
neighborhoods**

1	95
2	28
3	2
6	1

NEIGHBORHOOD	DISTRICT	Total_Population	NEIGHBORHOOD	districts	DISTRICT
ADAMS NORTH	9	5,115		6	1
ALLIED GARDENS	7	12,020	AZALEA/HOLLYWOOD PARK	2	2
ALTA VISTA	4	2,519	BARRIO LOGAN	2	3
AZALEA/HOLLYWOOD PARK	9	3,682	BAY HO	2	4
AZALEA/HOLLYWOOD PARK	3	0	BIRDLAND	2	5
BALBOA PARK	3	617	CARMEL VALLEY	2	6
BARRIO LOGAN	8	11,242	CASTLE	2	7
BARRIO LOGAN	2	86	CHEROKEE POINT	2	8
BAY HO	6	12,244	CLAIREMONT MESA EAST	2	9
BAY HO	1	0	CORTEZ	2	
BAY PARK	6	16,957	EAST VILLAGE	2	
BAY TERRACES	4	31,386	GRANTVILLE	2	
BIRDLAND	7	2,915	LA JOLLA	2	
BIRDLAND	3	1,822	LITTLE ITALY	2	
BLACK MOUNTAIN RANCH	5	17,392	MIDTOWN	2	
BORDER	8	154	MIRA MESA	2	
BROADWAY HEIGHTS	4	596	MIRAMAR	2	
BURLINGAME	3	705	MISSION HILLS	2	
CARMEL MOUNTAIN	5	11,207	MISSION VALLEY WEST	2	
CARMEL VALLEY	1	52,114	MOUNTAIN VIEW	2	
CARMEL VALLEY	6	0	MT HOPE	2	
CASTLE	9	9,370	NORTH CLAIREMONT	2	

CASTLE	3	0	NORTH PARK	2
CHEROKEE POINT	9	4,672	OLD TOWN	2
CHEROKEE POINT	3	0	PACIFIC BEACH	2
CHOLLAS CREEK	9	4,233	RANCHO PENASQUITOS	2
CHOLLAS VIEW	4	4,523	SCRIPPS RANCH	3
CLAIREMONT MESA EAST	7	25,379	SERRA MESA	2
CLAIREMONT MESA EAST	3	487	SORRENTO VALLEY	2
CLAIREMONT MESA WEST	6	10,273	TORREY HIGHLANDS	2
COLINA DEL SOL	9	10,321	UNIVERSITY CITY	3
COLLEGE EAST	9	9,945		
COLLEGE WEST	9	11,830		
CORE-COLUMBIA	2	9,035		
CORRIDOR	9	7,607		
CORTEZ	2	3,943		
CORTEZ	3	0		
DEL CERRO	7	7,576		
DEL MAR HEIGHTS	1	6,736		
EAST VILLAGE	2	16,088		
EAST VILLAGE	8	0		
EGGER HIGHLANDS	8	9,564		
EL CERRITO	9	5,984		
EMERALD HILLS	4	4,395		
ENCANTO	4	9,520		
FAIRMOUNT PARK	9	2,855		
FAIRMOUNT VILLAGE	9	5,361		
FOX CANYON	9	2,165		
GASLAMP	2	863		
GOLDEN HILL	8	9,081		
GRANT HILL	8	3,939		

GRANTVILLE	7	5,806
GRANTVILLE	3	4,876
HARBORVIEW	2	1,348
HILLCREST	3	14,961
HORTON PLAZA	2	641
ISLENAIR	9	1,074
JAMACHA LOMITA	4	10,198
KEARNY MESA	7	5,488
KENSINGTON	9	5,963
LA JOLLA	1	35,324
LA JOLLA	2	602
LA PLAYA	2	2,367
LAKE MURRAY	7	17,388
LINCOLN PARK	4	9,484
LINDA VISTA	3	24,263
LITTLE ITALY	2	4,090
LITTLE ITALY	3	18
LOGAN HEIGHTS	8	13,725
LOMA PORTAL	2	5,996
MARINA	2	7,190
MIDTOWN	3	4,509
MIDTOWN	2	59
MIDWAY DISTRICT	2	7,799
MIRA MESA	6	73,843
MIRA MESA	1	0
MIRAMAR	7	8,008
MIRAMAR	6	338
MIRAMAR RANCH NORTH	5	12,738
MISSION BAY	2	582

MISSION BEACH	2	3,460
MISSION HILLS	3	5,593
MISSION HILLS	2	955
MISSION VALLEY EAST	3	11,597
MISSION VALLEY WEST	3	2,605
MISSION VALLEY WEST	2	0
MORENA	3	10,897
MOUNTAIN VIEW	4	7,774
MOUNTAIN VIEW	9	7,552
MT HOPE	9	5,184
MT HOPE	4	0
NESTOR	8	16,636
NORMAL HEIGHTS	9	10,246
NORTH CITY	1	8,471
NORTH CLAIREMONT	6	9,251
NORTH CLAIREMONT	7	5,664
NORTH PARK	3	38,693
NORTH PARK	9	0
O'FARRELL	4	6,848
OAK PARK	4	14,742
OCEAN BEACH	2	12,289
OCEAN CREST	8	16,580
OLD TOWN	2	982
OLD TOWN	3	145
OTAY MESA	8	2,914
OTAY MESA WEST	8	30,112
PACIFIC BEACH	2	40,304
PACIFIC BEACH	1	313
PALM CITY	8	5,316

PARADISE HILLS	4	17,263
PARK WEST	3	8,751
PETCO PARK	2	885
POINT LOMA HEIGHTS	2	20,238
QUALCOMM	3	1,108
RANCHO BERNARDO	5	42,925
RANCHO ENCANTADA	5	3,404
RANCHO PENASQUITOS	5	30,124
RANCHO PENASQUITOS	1	14,306
REDWOOD VILLAGE	9	4,868
RIDGEVIEW/WEBSTER	4	5,711
ROLANDO	9	10,040
ROLANDO PARK	9	3,841
ROSEVILLE / FLEET RIDGE	2	5,884
SABRE SPRINGS	5	10,786
SAN CARLOS	7	13,494
SAN PASQUAL	5	189
SAN YSIDRO	8	28,290
SCRIPPS RANCH	5	20,252
SCRIPPS RANCH	7	41
SCRIPPS RANCH	6	0
SERRA MESA	7	22,142
SERRA MESA	3	3,498
SHELLTOWN	4	3,913
SHERMAN HEIGHTS	8	2,787
SKYLINE	4	8,764
SORRENTO VALLEY	6	3,870
SORRENTO VALLEY	1	0
SOUTH PARK	3	5,391

SOUTHCREST	4	6,084
STOCKTON	8	3,322
SUNSET CLIFFS	2	3,531
SWAN CANYON	9	4,143
TALMADGE	9	9,443
TERALTA EAST	9	6,259
TERALTA WEST	9	4,957
TIERRASANTA	7	27,929
TIJUANA RIVER VALLEY	8	733
TORREY HIGHLANDS	5	6,028
TORREY HIGHLANDS	1	0
TORREY PINES	1	11,084
TORREY PRESERVE	1	12
UNIVERSITY CITY	6	27,291
UNIVERSITY CITY	1	25,003
UNIVERSITY CITY	7	0
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS	3	12,276
VALENCIA PARK	4	10,739
WOODED AREA	2	3,703
	2	2,261
	9	17
	1	0
	5	0
	6	0
	8	0

NEIGHBORHOOD_count

14

27

24

18

11

11

14

17

27

split across number of districts	number of CPAs
1	47
2	9
3	2
4	1

COMMUNITY	DISTRICT	Total_Population	COMMUNITY	districts	DISTRICT	COMMUNITY_count
BALBOA PARK	3	617		2	1	13
BARRIO LOGAN	8	4,222	CLAIREMONT MESA	2	2	11
BLACK MOUNTAIN RANCH	5	15,795	GREATER GOLDEN HILL	2	3	6
CARMEL MOUNTAIN RANCH	5	11,207	MID-CITY:CITY HEIGHTS	2	4	5
CARMEL VALLEY	1	35,889	MID-CITY:EASTERN AREA	2	5	12
CLAIREMONT MESA	6	48,725	MILITARY FACILITIES	4	6	5
CLAIREMONT MESA	7	31,043	NOT IDENTIFIED	2	7	7
COLLEGE AREA	9	24,969	RANCHO PENASQUITOS	2	8	9
DEL MAR MESA	1	1,409	RESERVE	3	9	7
DOWNTOWN	2	44,169	SOUTHEASTERN SAN DIEGO	3		
EAST ELLIOTT	7	98	TORREY PINES	2		
ENCANTO NEIGHBORHOODS	4	48,624	UNIVERSITY	2		
FAIRBANKS RANCH COUNTRY	1	468				
GREATER GOLDEN HILL	8	9,081				
GREATER GOLDEN HILL	3	5,226				
KEARNY MESA	7	12,169				
LA JOLLA	1	29,783				
LINDA VISTA	3	35,647				
LOS PENASQUITOS CANYON	1	606				
MID-CITY:CITY HEIGHTS	9	66,699				
MID-CITY:CITY HEIGHTS	4	2,284				
MID-CITY:EASTERN AREA	9	22,461				

MID-CITY:EASTERN AREA	4	18,169
MID-CITY:KENSINGTON-TALM	9	14,484
MID-CITY:NORMAL HEIGHTS	9	15,361
MIDWAY-PACIFIC HIGHWAY	2	7,569
MILITARY FACILITIES	7	8,049
MILITARY FACILITIES	8	7,020
MILITARY FACILITIES	5	108
MILITARY FACILITIES	6	0
MIRA MESA	6	77,935
MIRAMAR RANCH NORTH	5	11,880
MISSION BAY PARK	2	1,688
MISSION BEACH	2	3,292
MISSION VALLEY	3	25,581
NAVAJO	7	53,486
NCFUA SUBAREA II	1	766
NORTH PARK	3	46,715
NOT IDENTIFIED	2	2,264
NOT IDENTIFIED	8	0
OCEAN BEACH	2	12,922
OLD TOWN SAN DIEGO	2	1,234
OTAY MESA	8	19,494
OTAY MESA-NESTOR	8	61,284
PACIFIC BEACH	2	40,658
PACIFIC HIGHLANDS RANCH	1	14,379
PENINSULA	2	41,276
RANCHO BERNARDO	5	42,902
RANCHO ENCANTADA	5	3,404
RANCHO PENASQUITOS	5	29,071
RANCHO PENASQUITOS	1	13,947

RESERVE	2	109
RESERVE	1	43
RESERVE	5	0
SABRE SPRINGS	5	10,786
SAN PASQUAL	5	212
SAN YSIDRO	8	28,444
SCRIPPS MIRAMAR RANCH	5	21,002
SERRA MESA	7	18,376
SKYLINE-PARADISE HILLS	4	67,611
SOUTHEASTERN SAN DIEGO	8	23,773
SOUTHEASTERN SAN DIEGO	4	17,771
SOUTHEASTERN SAN DIEGO	9	12,736
TIERRASANTA	7	30,629
TIJUANA RIVER VALLEY	8	1,077
TORREY HIGHLANDS	5	8,678
TORREY HILLS	1	6,916
TORREY PINES	1	6,745
TORREY PINES	6	74
UNIVERSITY	1	41,953
UNIVERSITY	6	27,333
UPTOWN	3	39,026
VIA DE LA VALLE	1	459
	9	17
	2	0