

## AGENDA

### 2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 2011, AT 4:00 P.M.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM (12th Floor)  
CITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
202 C STREET  
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

Web: <http://www.sandiego.gov/redistricting>  
Email: [redistricting\\_2010@sandiego.gov](mailto:redistricting_2010@sandiego.gov)  
Phone: (619) 533-3060

---

**NOTE:** *Agendas, reports and records are available in alternative formats upon request. To order information or request an agenda in an alternative format, please contact the Commission office at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting to ensure availability. If a Sign Language Interpreter, aids for the visually impaired, or Alternative Listening Devices (ALD's) are required, please also contact the Commission office at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting to ensure availability. The Commission office can be reached by phone (619) 533-3060 (voice) or by email at [redistricting\\_2010@sandiego.gov](mailto:redistricting_2010@sandiego.gov).*

### **ROLL CALL**

### **NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT**

This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the Redistricting Commission on items of interest within the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Time allotted to each speaker is determined by the Chair and, in general, is limited to two (2) minutes. Organized presentations are generally limited to no more than fifteen (15) minutes.

**Submit requests to speak to the Commission's Chief of Staff before the item is called. If you wish to comment on the preparation of the redistricting plan, you will be called to speak under Item 3, "Development of preliminary plan."**

Pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act, no discussion or action, other than a referral, shall be taken by the Redistricting Commission on any issue brought forth under Non-Agenda Comment.

### **COMMISSION COMMENT**

### **CITY ATTORNEY AND CITY STAFF ASSIGNED TO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION COMMENT**

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- ITEM 1: Approval of minutes from June 9, 2011 Redistricting Commission meeting.
- ITEM 2: Discussion and approval to finalize negotiations and contract with National Demographics Corporation for technical consulting services, including data processing, GIS analysis, and mapping support to develop the preliminary and final redistricting plans.
- ITEM 3: Development of preliminary redistricting plan.

*The Redistricting Commission will accept public comment and suggestions regarding preparation of the preliminary redistricting plan. Time allotted to each speaker is determined by the Chair and, in general, is limited to two (2) minutes. Organized presentations are generally limited to no more than fifteen (15) minutes. Submit requests to speak to the Commission's Chief of Staff before the item is called.*

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- ITEM 4: Revised Redistricting Commission meeting schedule.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

ITEM 1

**MINUTES  
FOR THE 2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO**

**THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2011**

**CITY METRO OPERATIONS CENTER (MOC II) - AUDITORIUM  
9191 TOPAZ WAY, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123**

**CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dalal at 4:00 p.m. 35 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 5:27 p.m. to the next scheduled meeting of the Redistricting Commission on Tuesday, June 14, 2011, at 6:00 p.m. in the MOC II Auditorium.

**ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:**

(C) Chair Anisha Dalal  
(VC) Vice Chair Carlos Marquez  
(M) Ani Mdivani-Morrow  
(M) Frederick Kosmo  
(M) Arthur Nishioka  
(M) David Potter  
(M) Theresa Quiroz

**ROLL CALL:**

Chair Anisha Dalal called the roll:

(C) Chair Anisha Dalal - present  
(VC) Vice Chair Carlos Marquez - present  
(M) Ani Mdivani-Morrow - present  
(M) Frederick Kosmo - present  
(M) Arthur Nishioka - present  
(M) David Potter - present  
(M) Theresa Quiroz - present

**NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:**

This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the Redistricting Commission on items of interest within the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Comments are limited to no more than three minutes per speaker. Submit requests to speak to the Midori Wong, Redistricting Commission Chief of Staff, before the item is called. Pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act, no discussion or action, other than a referral, shall be taken by the Redistricting Commission on any issue brought forth under Non-Agenda Comment.

Comment 1 – Jim Varnadore, presented maps of City Heights.

Comment 2 – Chris Cate, on behalf of the San Diego County Taxpayers Association (SDCTA), offered clarification on the map given to the Commission at the May 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. He stated that the data was from the County GIS and the City of San Diego.

Comment 3 – Deborah Knight, Executive Director of the Friends of Rose Canyon, presented a proposal on the community of University City and asked that University City and La Jolla stay together in one Council District.

Comment 4 – Matt Kriz, urged the Commission to see the process through and not let the Republican Party discourage them.

Comment 5 – Michael Sprague, spoke about other parties that are trying to interfere with the process and encouraged the Commission to continue do their work.

Comment 6 – Barrett Tetlow, on behalf of the Republican Party of San Diego, gave a presentation on the importance of compactness.

Comment 7 – James Lawson, on behalf of the National Association of Industrial and Office Properties (NAIOP) San Diego chapter, expressed his support for the San Diego County Taxpayers Association map.

Comment 8 – Ryan Trabuco, spoke about a map that would keep Clairemont in one district and gave a brief presentation on a proposal for all City Council Districts.

Comment 9 – Julie Dillon, a resident of Point Loma, asked the Commission to support the Taxpayers Association map.

Comment 10 – Douglas Gray expressed his support of the San Diego County Taxpayers Association plan.

Comment 11 – Craig Benedetto, on behalf of the Business Leadership Alliance, and gave a brief description of the Business Leadership Alliance and the importance of keeping commercial areas together.

Comment 12 – Tony Krvaric, on behalf of the Republican Party of San Diego County, spoke to the Commission about Commissioner Marquez's residency.

Comment 13 – Janelle Riella, on behalf of the Downtown San Diego Partnership, expressed support for the Taxpayers Association neighborhood map.

Comment 14 – Ken Msemaji spoke to the Commission about the intimidation tactics and expressed his appreciation for the work the Commission is doing.

Comment 15 – Emily Serafy Cox, Executive Director of Empower San Diego, asked the Commission to hold meetings in places where there is public transportation. She also gave clarification that Empower San Diego did not create the Communities in Unity Map, and that Commissioner Quiroz is not on the Board of Directors with Empower San Diego.

Comment 16 – John Turpit, a commercial architect in San Diego and member of NAIOP, expressed his support as well as the support of the NAIOP for the Taxpayers Association map. He also expressed his concern about the Commission’s proceedings and how it will harm the business economy.

Comment 17 – Dr. Allen Chan, representing APAC, asked the Commission to consider the importance of seeing the difference between the needs of communities of interest and those of partisan political interest.

Comment 18 – Joe LaCava spoke about the endorsement of the Coast & Canyon Plan and asked the Commission to use Community Planning Areas, and not the Taxpayers Association map.

Comment 19 – Lani Lutar, President of the San Diego County Taxpayers Association, spoke about the map and how it was developed based on principles. She also spoke about giving groups that created maps a Q&A to get technical questions answered regarding the maps.

Comment 20 – Brian Pollard spoke about the Unity in Community map and how it represents the growth and the demographic change in the city.

**COMMISSION COMMENT:**

Commissioner Nishioka thanked all the presenters for their comments and opinions. He also asked the Chief of Staff to investigate the walking distance from MOC II & the Kearny Mesa Transit Center.

**CITY ATTORNEY AND CITY STAFF ASSIGNED TO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION COMMENT:**

None.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**ITEM - 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MAY 19, 2011 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION MEETING.**

**Motion by Commissioner Potter: To approve the Minutes for May 19, 2011 and correct page 7, Item 2, “Chief of State” to read “Chief of Staff.” Second by Commissioner Marquez. Motion passed 6-0. Commissioner Nishioka abstained.**

**ITEM – 2: DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF MAPPING CONSULTANT IN RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.**

Chair Dalal gave a brief summary of the status of the RFP by the Subcommittee.

Public Comment: Douglas Johnson, president of National Demographics Corporation, introduced himself to the Commission.

**ITEM – 3: OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON POST-MAP PUBLIC HEARINGS AND TRANSLATION SERVICES IN RESPONSE TO REQUESTS FROM THE PUBLIC.**

Commissioner Potter commented on the post-map public hearings locations and how the Commission is working to get translation services at those meetings.

Public Comment: Michael Sprague, expressed that 4:00 pm is not a good time for most people to come to community meetings.

**Motion by Commissioner Potter: To approve simultaneous interpretation services for two post-map hearings in District 3 and District 8. Second by Commissioner Nishioka. Motion passed unanimously 7-0.**

**ITEM – 4: INITIAL DISCUSSION REGARDING PRE-MAP PUBLIC HEARINGS, PUBLIC TESTIMONY RECEIVED, AND POTENTIAL DIRECTION FOR MAPPING CONSULTANT.**

Public Comment 1: Michael Sprague, commented on the population of City Heights.

Public Comment 2: Ben Rivera, representing the Latino Redistricting Committee, Historic Barrio District, and the Logan Heights, Sherman Heights Neighborhood Councils. Spoke about the communities in District 8.

Commissioners Quiroz and Marquez suggested having a meeting to interact with the public on the maps in their community planning areas.

Chair Dalal talked about the mapping software online and their goal to have maps by July.

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

**ITEM – 5: REPORT ON REDISTRICTING SOFTWARE**

Ms. Wong gave a brief update on the software and noted that there will be a demonstration at the next meeting.

**STAFF REPORTS**

**ITEM - 5: MIDORI WONG, CHIEF OF STAFF**

Ms. Wong provided the monthly budget report as part of the agenda for Commissioners' review.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chairperson Dalal adjourned the meeting at 5:27 p.m.

---

Janet Comer, Executive Secretary  
2010 Redistricting Commission

**2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 2011**

**ITEM 2:**     *Discussion and approval to finalize negotiations and contract with National Demographics Corporation for technical consulting services, including data processing, GIS analysis, and mapping support to develop the preliminary and final redistricting plans.*

Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 10016342-11-GA was issued on May 26, 2011 and closed at 4:00 p.m. on June 6, 2011. Two responses were received and evaluated based on the requirements and criteria identified in the RFP by the Mapping Subcommittee. The Mapping Subcommittee also conducted oral interviews with the lead staff from both firms.

Based on this evaluation, the subcommittee is recommending the firm of National Demographics Corporation (NDC).

*Recommendation*

The subcommittee recommends that the Commission authorize the Mapping Subcommittee and Chief of Staff to finalize negotiations and contract with NDC for technical consulting services, including data processing, GIS analysis, and mapping support to develop the preliminary and final redistricting plans, for an amount not to exceed \$55,000.00.

*Budget Impact*

Existing approved budget*:	\$105,000.00
<u>Previous expenditures**:</u>	<u>\$74,085.00</u>
Balance:	\$30,915.00

\*The existing approved budget for “Consulting/mapping and outreach services” and “Redistricting/mapping software” is \$105,000.00.

\*\*Previous approved expenditures from this budget for contracts for outreach services (\$25,000.00) and redistricting software (\$49,085.00) total approximately \$74,085.00, leaving a balance of \$30,915.00.

To supplement remaining funding in the existing approved budget, staff has identified \$24,085.00 from savings in “staffing cost” line items to fully fund the total not to exceed value of the proposed contract with NDC of \$55,000.00.

Attachments: RFP No. 10016342-11-GA evaluation criteria.  
NDC proposed scope of work and fee schedule.

**RFP No. 10016342-11-GA evaluation criteria.**

1. Firm background and capability to provide services and expertise
  - Background of the firm and subcontractors
  - Local office base
  - Knowledge of City, its neighborhoods, and constituencies
  - Capability to meet needs in a timely manner
  
2. Relevant experience and past performance
  - Previous experience with completing redistricting processes, including outcomes
  - Current and comprehensive understanding of data, legal criteria, and analysis associated with completing the redistricting process
  
3. Understanding of proposal request as evidenced by information submitted in the RFP
  - Requested information included and thoroughness of response
  - Understanding of the project, including Commission stated goals and role of the consultant
  - Capability to serve in an impartial, nonpartisan role
  
4. Approach to completing scope of work and cost to the City
  - Scope of work, deliverables, and time and fee schedule
  - Ability to deliver and adjust information under specified time constraints
  
5. Equal Opportunity Contracting Program (EOCP) desirable

**NDC Proposed scope of work and fee schedule.**

	<b>Task</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>NDC Staff Lead</b>
1	Complete redistricting database including decennial Census, American Community Survey, and California Statewide Database data, and incorporate data into Online Redistricting system; incorporate any Geographic Information System (GIS) data that the Commission wishes to include and provides (often including school locations; school attendance areas; important local landmarks; or local neighborhood boundaries)	\$5,950.00 *	Incorporation of all data requested into ESRI redistricting tool; 1 admin log-in to ESRI redistricting software to be provided to Consultant	Douglas Johnson
2	Review summaries of public input from Commission meetings and pre-map public hearings	\$0.00		Douglas Johnson
3	Analyze and prepare reports on all whole or partial plans submitted by the public, including all plans submitted through online redistricting system; reports to include demographics, including total population, population by different ethnic groups, population deviation	\$6,162.50 *	Demographic reports for each plan submitted by the public in a format suitable to post to web site	Douglas Johnson
4	Convert all maps and reports submitted by the public and the Commission to web-friendly versions for posting on external web site managed and hosted by NDC, including Google Earth KML files for all plans at each stage in the process	\$1,487.50 *	JPEG, PDF, KML files of each plan submitted by the public and developed by the Commission	Douglas Johnson
5	Post all plans and reports submitted by the public and the Commission to external web site hosted and managed by NDC	\$1,700.00 *	Development, hosting, posting of all maps/reports, management of external web site throughout contract (example: <a href="http://drawyuma.org/">http://drawyuma.org/</a> )	Douglas Johnson
6	Facilitate during one Commission meeting to discuss summaries of public input; receive direction from Commission on development of preliminary plan	\$2,125.00 *	Draft written summary of direction received by Consultant and description of plans to be prepared to be submitted by July 2; final to be submitted Saturday, 7/9; uploaded by Tuesday, 7/5	Douglas Johnson

\*15% Basic Elements package discount has been applied to the cost of this task

**NDC Proposed scope of work and fee schedule.**

	<b>Task</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>NDC Staff Lead</b>
7	Based on Commission direction, prepare 3 or 4 "draft preliminary" plans, each presented in a standard map and demographic spreadsheet format; facilitate during one Commission meeting to present these plans and receive additional direction	\$5,287.00 *	3-4 draft preliminary plans (2 weeks to prepare; upload to web by Tuesday, 7/5)	Douglas Johnson
8	Based on Commission direction, revise and prepare 2-3 "second draft preliminary" plans; facilitate during one Commission meeting to present these plans and receive additional direction	\$5,312.50 *	2-3 second draft preliminary plans; upload to web by Tuesday, 7/12)	Douglas Johnson
9	Based on Commission direction, revise and prepare one "final draft preliminary" plan and filing statement; facilitate during one Commission meeting to present this plan and filing statement for Commission adoption	\$5,312.50 *	Final preliminary plan and filing statement	Florence Adams/ Justin Levitt
10	Review summaries of public input from post-map public hearings and Commission direction provided during hearings	\$0.00	Written summary of direction received by consultant and description of plans prepared by Saturday, 8/6	Douglas Johnson
11	Facilitate during one Commission meeting to discuss summaries of public input from post-map hearings; receive direction from Commission on refinements to adopted preliminary plan	\$2,750.00	Written summary of direction received by consultant and description of plans prepared by Saturday, 8/6	Douglas Johnson
12	Based on Commission direction from hearings, revise and prepare multiple revisions of adopted preliminary plan; facilitate during one Commission meeting to present "draft final" plans and receive any additional direction not provided during post-map hearings (no limit on number of plans)	\$2,750.00	Initial draft final plans; upload to web by Tuesday, 8/2	Douglas Johnson
13	Based on Commission direction, revise and prepare multiple revisions of adopted preliminary plan; facilitate during one Commission meeting to present "draft final" plans receive any additional direction not provided during post-map hearings (anticipate 1-2)	\$2,750.00	1-2 draft final plans and draft filing statement; upload to web by Tuesday, 8/9	Florence Adams/ Justin Levitt

\*15% Basic Elements package discount has been applied to the cost of this task

**NDC Proposed scope of work and fee schedule.**

	<b>Task</b>	<b>Cost</b>		<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>NDC Staff Lead</b>
14	Based on Commission direction, revise and prepare draft final plan; facilitate during one Commission meeting to present "draft final" plan and filing statement for Commission adoption	\$5,312.50	*	Final plan and filing statement; upload to web by Tuesday, 8/16	Douglas Johnson
15	Any conference calls to discussion the project's progress or answer any Commission or Staff questions that may arise	\$0.00	*	As needed until contract expiration	Douglas Johnson
16	Answer any public, media, or other calls as requested by the Commission, staff, or counsel questions that arise	\$0.00	*	As needed until contract expiration	Douglas Johnson
17	Any relatively minor changes requested to any draft plan created for above tasks in Scope of Work	\$0.00	*	As needed until contract expiration	Douglas Johnson
	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$46,899.50</b>			
	<b><u>OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL TASKS</u></b>				
18	Work with the County Registrar of Voters to implement the final adopted plan.	\$850.00	*	During 30 days after adoption of final plan or as requested by ROV until contract expiration	
19	Facilitation of additional in-person Commission and/or public meetings, per meeting day (includes all expenses)	\$5,500.00		As needed/agreed to by Commission and Consultant	
20	Provide expert testimony as requested (\$250/hour - Douglas Johnson, Florence Adams; \$125/hour - Justin Levitt, David Meyer) (includes all expenses)	\$1,750.50		During 30 days after adoption of final plan or as requested by Commission/ counsel until contract expiration	
	TOTAL OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL TASKS	\$8,100.50			
	<b>TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE (FIXED + OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL TASKS) NOT TO EXCEED:</b>			<b>\$55,000.00</b>	
	Anticipated contract expiration: December 31,2011				

\*15% Basic Elements package discount has been applied to the cost of this task

## ITEM 3: HANDOUT

### MEMORANDUM

To: Redistricting Commissioners

From: Theresa Quiroz

Date: June 16, 2011

Re: Item 3, June 16 Meeting

Below is a list of basic principles that could be used as a starting point for our discussions as we determine how to draw the map. They are based on the comments made at our pre-map hearings and comments that have been received by our office.

I look forward to hearing the Commissions' opinions of each item. They are numbered for ease of discussion, and are in no particular order.

1. The city has set up a well-organized group of communities and neighborhoods. This has created strong communities of interest that work together to further their interests, and keeping each planning group and neighborhood (as defined by the neighbors) intact to the greatest extent possible is preferable.
2. The South Bay area - because of its separation from the rest of the city - is a community of interest in itself. The South Bay should not be split during redistricting.
3. The areas of Sherman Heights, Grant Hill, Stockton, Memorial and Logan Heights make up the Historic Barrio Logan area which have much in common, and a need for a specific representation. They also have a maintenance assessment district that covers the whole area, so they should be kept together.
4. The current D8 should not be added to downtown. The areas are unlike and the strength of downtown would overwhelm the needs of the Historic Barrio Logan.
5. D8 is currently majority Latino and that majority should not be fragmented.
6. D1 is currently a cohesive unit that works well to elect representatives of its choice. It should be kept intact where possible.
7. After having looked into why the last Commission separated out Bird Rock, it may be appropriate to add that small part of La Jolla back into the same district as the rest of La Jolla.
8. Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Hills and Pacific Highland Ranch are connected by their planning groups and long term plans and should be kept together.

9. Similarly, Carmel Valley, San Dieguito Valley, Via de la Valle and Fairbanks Ranch should be kept in the same district.
10. La Jolla and University City should be kept together in their entirety. This is one of the city's best business areas and that should not be harmed. The faculty, staff, students, employees and alum are all a community of interest that works very well for the health of the city.
11. Tourism is a very large part of the city's business and the beach areas feel that they have been under-represented. Mission Beach, Ocean Beach, Pacific Beach and Point Loma should be placed together to keep a focus on our beaches and tourism.
12. Bay Ho, Bay Park, and Clairemont Mesa believe they are part of the beach environment and should be kept in the beach district.
13. The beach areas were specific that they were not well represented when they were a part of the downtown district. They should not be connected to downtown.
14. The LGBT community is a community of interest. They have proven that they vote as a group to further their interests. The LGBT community should not be fragmented.
15. Although other areas have specifically stated that they are not well represented when attached to downtown, the LGBT community should be attached to downtown.
16. The residential areas around Balboa Park should be kept together to ensure that this regional treasure is properly represented.
17. Moving the LGBT district west increases the ability of that community of interest to be represented and stops the fragmentation of the Latino population.
18. The current D4 is well represented as it currently stands and should be kept as close as possible to the current lines.
19. To reduce the size of D4 to meet the goal, Ocean View Park, Mountain View, Mount Hope and Gateway Plaza should be removed and College Grove should be added.
20. D4 should remain as the 4th district as the name has become part of their identity.
21. City Heights is a community of interest in that it has the largest immigrant and refugee population, it is a minority/majority area, has extremely low median income levels and should be kept as a whole.
22. The City Heights area has very high Latino population which requires consideration to ensure that the lines do not fragment their voting strength.

23. Ridgeview would be better represented as a part of the new City Heights district than the new D4.
24. The neighborhoods removed from D4 and D8 should be placed into the new district that includes City Heights.
25. We should unite the flood-prone and traffic-prone areas of Mission and Fashion Valley and Qualcomm stadium.
26. Many people of Asian descent have a similar culture and way of life that supports viewing them as a community of interest. That way of life should be respected and people who follow it should be considered a community of interest.
27. Consideration should be given while drawing the maps to ensuring that that community of interest is large enough to create an environment in which they have a meaningful say in who is elected.
28. The neighborhoods of Allied Gardens, Del Cerro, Grantville, Navajo and San Carlos should be kept together when possible.
29. Attention should be paid to ensure that the fire hazard areas are represented by a single district.
30. Scripps Ranch, Miramar Ranch and Stonebridge (Rancho Encantada) should be kept together.
31. Mira Mesa should be kept whole.
32. There is a large military presence in Mira Mesa that should be respected.