

## AGENDA

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

SATURDAY, JULY 9, 2011, AT 10:00 A.M.

SILVER ROOM (2<sup>nd</sup> Floor)  
SAN DIEGO CONCOURSE  
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. 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 redistricting 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 the June 25, 2011 Redistricting Commission meeting.
- ITEM 2: Presentation on the Voting Rights Act and guidelines for line-drawing by attorney Marguerite Mary Leoni of Nielsen Merksamer Parrinello Gross & Leoni LLP.
- 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. Submit requests to speak to the Commission's Chief of Staff before the item is called.*

## **STAFF REPORTS**

- ITEM 4: Midori Wong, Chief of Staff

## **ADJOURNMENT**

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

**SATURDAY, JUNE 25, 2011**

**SAN DIEGO CONCOURSE – SILVER ROOM  
202 C STREET, SAN DIEGO CA 92101**

**CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dalal at 10:10 a.m. 23 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 2:48 p.m. to the next scheduled meeting of the Redistricting Commission on Saturday, July 9th, 2011 at San Diego Concourse in the Silver Room.

**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

\*Commissioner Mdivani-Morrow was present prior to the beginning of the meeting, but was not present at time of roll call and for the duration of the meeting.

**ROLL CALL:**

Chair Anisha Dalal called the roll:

(C) Chair Anisha Dalal - present  
(VC) Vice Chair Carlos Marquez - present  
(M) Ani Mdivani-Morrow – not 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 – Barrett Tetlow spoke on the Voting Rights Act regarding influenced districts, and provided a hand-out to the Commissioners.

**COMMISSION COMMENT:**

Chair Dalal noted that Item 1 on the Special Meeting agenda had been pulled and would not be discussed.

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

Deputy City Attorney Sharon Spivak spoke in response to the public request at the previous Commission meeting that public speakers be required to disclose affiliation to any groups when speaking at Commission meetings. The request was referred to the Bylaws Subcommittee and City Attorney's Office. Ms. Spivak reported that the bylaws would not be amended to require disclosure because such disclosure would violate the Brown Act, particularly Government Code Section 54953.3.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 14, 2011 AND JUNE 16, 2011, REDISTRICTING COMMISSION MEETING**

**Motion by Commissioner Potter: To approve the Minutes for June 14, 2011, and June 16, 2011. Second by Commissioner Nishioka.**

Commissioner Quiroz asked that the June 16<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes document her request that any map submitted by EMPOWER San Diego be brought to the attention of the Commission.

**Motion to approve the Minutes for June 14, 2011, and June 16, 2011 with Commissioner Quiroz's changes, passed unanimously 6-0. Commissioner Morrow is not present.**

**ITEM 2: DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN**

Comment 1 – Loretta Spano spoke in favor of keeping the University City Community Planning Area together and united with La Jolla in one council district. She supports the Coast and Canyons map and asked the Commission to reject any plans dividing University City.

Comment 2 – Brian Pollard reemphasized the process used in creating his District 4 proposal and the Unity Community map. He urged the Commission to use his map as the foundation for creating the citywide and District 4 map.

Comment 3 – Chris Cate on behalf of the San Diego Taxpayers Association presented more options developed after meeting with community members.

Comment 4 – Kirk Starr spoke regarding a link between Bay Park, Bay Ho and the beach communities. He presented a print out of Bay Ho rentals from Craigslist, all indicating their beach and bay views.

Comment 5 – Max Chou, a student at UCSD, highlighted the cultural diversity of City Heights via a picture slideshow.

Comment 6 – Michael Costello advocated for the Coast and Canyons plan. He stated that population variances should come secondary to keeping communities together.

Comment 7 – Deborah Knight with Friends of Rose Canyon called to the attention of the Commission an error in population in the APAC map, stating that the area in question can remain in University City without as much deviation as the APAC map suggests. She spoke against the revisions to the Taxpayers map, stating that I-5 is not a natural boundary but the backbone of the University City community plan and the UCSD campus.

Comment 8 – Dr. Allen Chan spoke in favor of APAC's proposed District 9, referencing shared transit stations, transportation routes, and Asian population percentages.

Comment 9 – Barbara Scheidker spoke in strong favor of the Coast and Canyons plan, and keeping University City together and united with La Jolla in one council district.

Comment 10 – Joe LaCava asked the Commission to adopt the Coast and Canyons plan for District 1, to keep communities together, respect communities of interest, and consider population deviation last.

Comment 11 – Bari Vaz asked that Mira Mesa Community Planning Area, as well as other CPAs, be kept together. She submitted a letter and proposed map on behalf of the Mira Mesa Town Council to the Commission.

Chair Dalal thanked the public for attending. She introduced Mr. Douglas Johnson from National Demographics Corporation. She also stated that as Chair of both the Commission and Mapping Subcommittee, she wished to extend additional thanks to the City Purchasing & Contracting Department for their assistance. In particular, she recognized Mr. Hildred Pepper and Ms. Pam Glover, noting that staff took on Commission requests in addition to their regular workloads and without additional compensation, and expressed appreciation for their time, support, and responsiveness.

Mr. Johnson laid out the first steps of the process, indicating that the first step would be to walk through the communities of interest. He presented a map illustrating all San Diego neighborhood areas, overlaid with the Community Planning Areas. He noted that there are differences between Census blocks and neighborhood lines.

Commissioner Quiroz asked the public to submit input as to what they consider their neighborhood lines to be if they vary from boundaries shown by the City Planning department maps.

Commissioner Marquez asked that the Commission first hear Mr. Johnson's interpretation of the community input prior to beginning Commissioner discussion.

Commissioner Kosmo presented a map he developed for discussion purposes, along with supporting material provided at the meeting.

Commissioner Potter also presented a map for purpose of discussion and testing.

Commissioner Nishioka thanked Commissioners Potter and Kosmo for taking the initiative.

Commissioner Kosmo echoed his sentiments, as thanked Commissioner Potter.

Commissioner Quiroz also thanked Commissioners Potter and Kosmo, but stated that it seemed to her that there was "packing and cracking" going on with the Latino Vote. She would have liked the City Attorney present to address Voting Rights Act issues up front. She'd like the Commission comes to an understanding about what they agree on, first.

Commissioner Marquez asked about the Municipal Code that Mr. Potter mentioned as rationale for keeping Bay Park out of the beach community district.

Ms. Spivak stated that the Municipal Code can be altered by the City Council; amendments to the Charter require a vote of the people. She also responded to Commissioner Quiroz's comment, stating that it is the intent of the City Attorney's Office to provide a Voting Rights Act primer at the beginning of the next meeting on July 9<sup>th</sup> before Commission delving into creating maps.

Commissioner Quiroz began commenting on the maps. She stated that the Ridgeview neighborhood is not part of the Webster neighborhood, although in the maps the Police maps received they have been grouped. Webster has asked to be in District 4 and Ridgeview has asked to be in the City Heights district. She requests lines be drawn to identify Ridgeview as separate from Webster. There are only 450 homes in Ridgeview and splitting it into three council districts seems excessive to her. She suggested using the District 4 map on the City website as guidance, since it has Ridgeview and Webster shown separately.

Commissioner Potter stated that he used the boundaries used in the Community Plan and the City's website only when community neighborhoods were undefined. Commissioner Kosmo said he did the same.

Commissioner Quiroz suggested that the Commission is at a point where they could use the areas in which they agree as guidelines for the beginning of a map.

She believes the Coast and Canyons map should be adopted as District 1 because community members from all areas affected by the plan were in agreement and in favor of the plan, including all the CPAs. She suggested directing NDC to incorporate the Coast and Canyons map.

She mentioned that the beach communities might also be an area of agreement, with room for debate regarding incorporating Bay Ho and Bay Park areas. She thinks grouping all the beaches and bays into one council is something the Commission can agree on.

She also stated that the Commission could agree that all of South Bay needs to remain united in one district.

She suggested motioning on points of agreement.

Commissioner Potter stated that each Commissioner expressing their position would work to reach a consensus. He also agreed that he would like to see the Coast and Canyons map as presented go forward as District 1. He supports a plan that is based on the beaches and the bay, and he supports keeping all of South Bay in one district.

Chair Dalal also agrees on those three points.

Commissioner Kosmo agrees that the Coast and Canyons is a good plan, although his map varies slightly from that. He also supports tying the beach communities together, as well as keeping the Southbay together. He prefers stating his opinion, as opposed to motioning.

Commissioner Marquez also strongly supports the Coast and Canyons map. He has concerns about including Downtown with District 3, but he is in support of uniting Bay Ho and Bay Park with the beach communities. He suggested adding Downtown and Bay Ho/Bay Park to District 2.

Chair Dalal asked that Mr. Johnson come back with a map next meeting, incorporating these ideas.

Mr. Johnson stated that he plans to have the interactive ability to add and detract areas to proposed districts at the next meeting, for discussion and comparison.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that in his mind the 56 freeway does not constitute a natural boundary and he would not like to see Rancho Bernardo dividing by it. He referenced the Poway Unified School District map which unites Rancho Bernardo. He stated that Kearny Mesa and Mira Mesa are natural communities of interest for the Asian community. He stated that Coast and Canyons plan has merit; that keeping the Historic Barrio District united in District 8 is important; and keeping Downtown united in one district. He supports Commissioner Quiroz's suggestion that a vote be taken on specific areas of disagreements, so that majority wins and the process move forward.

Chair Dalal called a break, to reconvene at 12:30 p.m.

Upon reconvening, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Levitt facilitated a discussion of regions of the City to obtain direction on to create a draft map, focusing on communities of interest. The following is a consolidated summary of these directions.

### **South Bay**

Commissioners agreed and directed Mr. Johnson to keep the entire Southbay region united in one district.

### **Southwestern**

Commissioners agreed and directed Mr. Johnson to keep the Historic Barrio neighborhoods together in District 8, without Downtown, and all were in consensus that Shelltown could stay in District 8 or be moved into another district. Commissioner Quiroz stated that this is a Latino district and it should not be fragmented.

Commissioner Kosmo supported the 94 being a boundary for District 8 and keeping all of Golden Hill with Balboa Park. Commissioners Dalal and Quiroz agreed with the sentiment, but also stated that Golden Hill could remain or be moved if needed for population reasons.

### **Southeastern**

Chair Dalal supports keeping Webster in District 4. Commissioner Quiroz supports moving Ridgeview into the City Heights district, but depending on population needs, is flexible. She suggests moving Mountain View, Mount Hope, Oceanview Park and Gateway Plaza out of District 4 to meet population criteria.

Commissioner Potter is against separating Mountain View and Mount Hope from District 4 because it would further fragment the Southeastern Planning Area. Commissioner Kosmo concurs.

Commissioner Kosmo would like to further define the Ridgeview community.

Commissioner Quiroz commented that the Chollas Creek is where Ridgeview and Webster meet. She also mentioned that she'd like to adhere as much as possible to the community testimony regarding District 4, stating their organization in the redistricting process testifies to their status as a community of interest.

### **Coastal**

Chair Dalal supports keeping all the beaches and Point Loma together with the airport. Commissioner Kosmo concurs. He suggested that this district could flow into downtown or east into the Bay Ho/Bay Park areas.

Commissioner Potter would like to include the Pacific Highway corridor in this district, so that I-5 becomes the boundary line.

Commissioner Quiroz disagrees, stating that the beach communities had been clear that they did not want to be in the same district as Downtown, as some are now, because their needs are overshadowed by those of Downtown. She would like to see Mission, Ocean, Pacific Beaches with Point Loma and Bay Ho/Bay Park, although the numbers are not quite there.

Chair Dalal directed Mr. Johnson to develop maps of the different scenarios, including and excluding Downtown and Bay Ho/Bay Park from the beach district.

Commissioner Marquez asked that the Commission remain flexible on where to place Downtown, since Clairemont Mesa residents also expressed a connection with Bay Ho/Bay Park and a desire to remain united with these communities.

Chair Dalal supports using the La Jolla/Pacific Beach boundary as the division boundary of the districts.

Commissioner Kosmo prefers using Mount Soledad as a divider between Pacific Beach and La Jolla.

Commissioner Potter stated that keeping the current division of Mission Bay Park gives people on both sides of the park stewardship over the Park.

Commissioner Quiroz feels Mission Bay Park is flexible because of not much public testimony was heard about it.

Commissioner Kosmo agrees with Commissioner Potter that Bay Park communities have a joint interest with Mission Bay. So if Bay Park and the beaches end up in one district, keep Mission Bay with that district. If they end up divided, Mission Bay should be split amongst those two districts.

### **North Central**

The Commissioner agreed to use the CPA boundary to divide University City and Mira Mesa, as opposed to the I-805.

Chair Dalal convened the Special Meeting at 1:00 p.m., and noted this item would continue following the Special Meeting.

### **SPECIAL MEETING**

The special meeting was called to order by Chair Dalal at 1:00 p.m.

### **ROLL CALL:**

Chair Anisha Dalal called the roll:

- (C) Chair Anisha Dalal - present
- (VC) Vice Chair Carlos Marquez – present
- (M) Ani Mdivani-Morrow – not present
- (M) Frederick Kosmo - present
- (M) Arthur Nishioka - present
- (M) David Potter - present
- (M) Theresa Quiroz - present

**ACTION ITEMS**

**ITEM 1: DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR CITY ATTORNEY’S OFFICE TO NEGOTIATE AND ENTER AN AGREEMENT WITH THE LAW FIRM OF REMCHO, JOHANSEN & PURCELL TO PROVIDE SPECIALIZED LEGAL ADVICE REGARDING REDISTRICTING AND THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT NOT TO EXCEED \$50,000.00.**

Chair Dalal again noted that this item had been pulled from consideration.

**ITEM 2: DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION REGARDING SCHEDULING OF POST-MAP HEARINGS**

Chief of Staff Midori Wong presented an update on the proposed meeting schedule and asked for direction regarding timing of post-map hearings.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that bringing the meetings down to five instead of nine would give time to the public to provide feedback and for the Commissioners to incorporate it.

Commissioner Marquez is in favor of consolidating the meetings. He’d like to adhere to the August 25<sup>th</sup> deadline.

Chair Dalal is also in favor of consolidating meetings to give time to reflect between meetings.

Commissioner Quiroz is concerned about time for the legal review; between August 21<sup>st</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> is not enough time for the attorneys to review the legalities. She prefers holding meetings in all eight districts. However, she asks that if the meetings are consolidated the Chair make a comment at each meeting and that the Chief of Staff send out a notice to the email distribution list about the short time frame between adoption of the preliminary plan and the beginning of post-map hearings so that the public can prepare. She asked that the meetings requiring translation not be cut from the schedule. She also suggested that meetings cut should be in districts where there are fewer conflicts.

Commissioner Potter largely agrees with Commissioner Quiroz; he prefers holding in hearings in all eight meetings, but he understands the arguments for consolidating.

Commissioner Potter would also like to see enough time for legal review. He wouldn't like to go beyond August 25<sup>th</sup>. He asked if the Commission could take public comment on the suggested schedule.

Chair Dalal agreed and called for any public comment.

Comment 1: Joe LaCava suggested clarifying the intention for the post-map meetings. He is in favor of having all nine meetings.

Comment 2: Linda Perine agreed with Commissioner Quiroz. She is in favor of having a post-map in each district, stating that truncating the opportunities to comment on a prepared map would look bad to the public. She inquired as to why there was such a large gap of time between this meeting and the next.

Commissioner Nishioka asked if City TV could have meetings up the same or next day; that would help with communicating information. That would influence his vote towards condensing or keeping all nine meetings.

Ms. Wong stated that City Council has priority with City TV at all meetings. If the meeting or hearing is being held offsite (not in Council Chambers or the Committee Room), those meetings will not be broadcast in real-time and may take an additional day to upload to the web site.

Ms. Spivak responded to a written comment submitted by a member of the public. She stated that this is a special meeting and as such has different noticing requirements under the Brown Act, all of which were all met.

Commissioner Marquez stated that from a PR perspective, eight meetings is best. He asked if during the post map meetings, maps would be revised in real-time before the public.

Ms. Wong stated that the intent is to present the adopted preliminary plan and filing statement, and to hear public comment on those two items. The map should not be revised at each public hearing because different information would be presented to different communities. However, Commissioners will be asked to provide direction to the mapping consultant team based on testimony received at each post-map hearing.

**Motion by Commissioner Nishioka: To consolidate the post-map hearings from nine meetings to five meetings. Seconded by Commissioner Marquez.**

Commissioner Marquez would like to take into account Commissioners Potter and Quiroz's concerns and not cut hearings that require translation services and host the hearings in areas with the least consensus.

Ms. Wong requested that she be allowed to work with the Outreach Subcommittee and outreach team to finalize locations.

**The motion to consolidate the post-map hearings from nine meetings to five meetings passed 4–2, with Commissioners Dalal, Marquez, Potter, Nishioka in favor and Commissioners Kosmo and Quiroz opposed. Commissioner Morrow is not present.**

Commissioner Dalal adjourned the Special Meeting and 1:24 p.m. and called the regular meeting back to order.

## **REGULAR MEETING**

### **ITEM 2: DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN (continued)**

#### **North Central (continued)**

Commissioner Quiroz is in favor of keeping La Jolla whole, but would like to know why La Jolla was separated by the previous Redistricting Commission.

Commissioner Kosmo is in favor of keeping north and south University City together. However, he stated that Sorrento Mesa and northern University City share similar economics, so he doesn't think it's unreasonable to consider uniting these two.

Commissioner Potter stated that Sorrento Mesa has more in common with Mira Mesa and is in their Community Plan, therefore does not suggest uniting it with University City.

Commissioner Quiroz is also in favor of keeping University City united, referencing the medical/educational community of interest.

Commissioner Quiroz recalls hearing testimony from Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Hills and Pacific Highlands Ranch residents saying they wanted to be together, as well as Carmel Valley residents stating they wanted to be with San Dieguito Valley, Villa de La Valle, and Fairbanks Ranch.

Commissioner Potter says they should all be combined although some only stated wanting to be joined with one or the other. He would like to see all of Del Mar Mesa in that same district.

Commissioner Kosmo agrees with Commissioner Potter's statements.

Chair Dalal also agrees; she recalls hearing public testimony asking that Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Hills, Carmel Valley, and Pacific Highlands Ranch stay together.

#### **Northeastern**

Mr. Levitt referenced comments from Carmel Mountain Ranch and Sabre Springs about their shared community of interest, as well as Black Mountain Ranch and Torrey Highlands. He noted that Carmel Valley Ranch and Sabre Springs expressed their shared community of interest with Rancho Bernardo.

Chair Dalal is in favor of uniting the communities in the Poway Unified School District.

Commissioner Potter is also in favor of uniting communities in PUSD. He noted that PUSD includes Rancho Peñasquitos, Rancho Bernardo, Black Mountain Ranch, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Sabre Springs and Miramar Ranch North. Neither Mira Mesa nor Miramar Ranch are included in PUSD.

Commissioner Quiroz is in favor of reuniting Rancho Encantada with Scripps Ranch and Miramar Ranch.

Chair Dalal agrees with Commissioner Quiroz.

Commissioner Quiroz asked for NDC's guidance about exactly where the Asian communities of interest are.

Mr. Levitt noted that because to link Black Mountain ranch with Rancho Bernardo you have to go through Rancho Peñasquitos, uniting those two neighborhoods into one district would have to include at least a part of Rancho Peñasquitos.

Chair Dalal feels that the southern part of Rancho Peñasquitos can go either way.

NDC will develop options showing different mapping scenarios for Rancho Peñasquitos.

Commissioner Potter stated that if it were to split, he'd like to see it split along the 56.

Commissioner Quiroz feel strongly about united the fire hazard communities in one district.

Commissioner Marquez is more in favor of keeping Black Mountain and Rancho Peñasquitos connected and keeping Rancho Peñasquitos united, than connecting Black Mountain with Rancho Bernardo, using the northern half of Peñasquitos.

Commissioner Nishioka is in favor of keeping Rancho Peñasquitos united and not splitting along 56. He is concerned about accommodating the Asian communities' requests, but is not sure how best to do that.

NDC will provide options for review.

**Marine Corps Air Station Miramar Areas**

Chair Dalal is in favor of keeping Mira Mesa whole. She could see it joined with Miramar and Sorrento Mesa.

Commissioner Kosmo agrees that Mira Mesa and Sorrento Mesa should be united, along with Miramar and Kearny Mesa, as well as Tierrasanta and North Clairemont because of the MCAS Miramar.

Commissioner Potter feels that if Scripps Ranch is brought into this district, so should Rancho Encantada.

Chair Dalal is also in favor of Rancho Encantada remaining united with Scripps Ranch.

Commissioner Quiroz is in favor of keeping Mira Mesa united. She includes the Miramar Air Station with the fire hazard communities and doesn't see it as connected to Mira Mesa.

Commissioner Marquez is also in favor of keeping Mira Mesa whole. He is not convinced it should be united with Tierrasanta. If we group it with Kearny Mesa, it would cause conflict with the Tierrasanta residents who wanted that CPA united.

Commissioner Potter recalls hearing more testimony for keeping Kearny Mesa with Mira Mesa, especially from the Asian community.

Mr. Levitt asked for direction on splitting MCAS Miramar base. He noted that there are only six residents in Miramar East.

Commissioner Potter is fine splitting or uniting it; he believes it will depend on how the other areas north and west of it are divided.

Mr. Levitt mentioned the Navajo CPA and testimony to keep it together, as well as testimony from residents of Grantville and Allied Gardens regarding the I-8 corridor and development that affects their communities, connecting them to Mission Valley.

Commissioner Potter is flexible in including them in either, as long as Allied gardens and Grantville remain united.

Commissioner Kosmo agrees with Potter. He wants the Commission to take into account Mission Trails Regional Park, the I-8 corridor, and to consider moving the Navajo area with the College area.

Chair Dalal and Commissioner Quiroz also agree with Commissioner Kosmo. Commissioner Quiroz is also in favor of keeping the river areas together.

Commissioner Potter is in favor of keeping Del Cerro and Grantville tied with the College area because of planned developments.

Mr. Levitt asked for direction on where to place Tierrasanta, with Scripps Ranch, Navajo, or communities to the west.

Commissioner Marquez is more inclined to unite Tierrasanta with communities to the north, instead of west.

Chair Dalal said there are arguments for both and there was consensus that it depends on what is done with Kearny Mesa.

Commissioner Nishioka is in favor of going north or east with Navajo.

Commissioner Potter wants Tierrasanta included with Kearny Mesa and tying it with the north as well.

Mr. Levitt asked for direction on splitting Kearny Mesa from Serra Mesa either via I-805 or Aero Drive.

Chair Dalal agrees that south of Aero is Kearny Mesa, a very suburban area with military housing.

Commissioner Potter also agrees with keeping everything south of Aero Drive with Serra Mesa.

Commissioner Quiroz would like to keep this CPA united.

Mr. Levitt asked for direction regarding Mission Valley. Some testimony indicated a desire for Mission Valley to be united, while others suggested that communities around it would like to be united to parts of it, but not the whole.

Commissioner Potter agrees with splitting Mission Valley as long as it remains tied to the neighborhoods to the north because topography, schools, and access.

Commissioner Kosmo agrees with Commissioner Potter's comments.

Commissioner Quiroz would like to determine where the high-density areas in Mission Valley are and to keep them together.

Mr. Levitt asked for direction on Linda Vista, Morena and Clairemont. He mentioned that Clairemont Town Council asked that their CPA be kept whole; however residents of Bay Ho and Bay Park would prefer to be with coastal areas. Linda Vista has also testified that it has a strong Latino component and is different than the rest of the Clairemont area.

Commissioner Potter agrees that the population component is different in Linda Vista but recalls testimony that they'd like to be tied to Clairemont. He'd like to use Tecolote Canyon as a unifying factor, instead of a divide.

Commissioner Kosmo would like to consider Tecolote Canyon as a divider, especially when considering adding Bay Ho and Bay Park to the beach district. He also stated that districts sharing stewardship over a natural resource can be beneficial.

Commissioner Quiroz asked about a public comment stating that Linda Vista was actually two neighborhoods.

Mr. Levitt recalled that the comment distinguished between USD and the northern areas of Linda Vista. NDC will provide a rough approximation of that division in a future map.

**Central San Diego**

Mr. Levitt asked for direction regarding Balboa Park. In their public testimony, some members of the LGBT community asked for a community of interest centered around Balboa Park.

Chair Dalal is in favor of keeping Balboa Park area intact as much as possible.

Commissioner Potter also heard of expanding that district further west.

Mr. Levitt mentioned that if City Heights becomes the center of a Latino district, it would not be part of District 3.

Commissioner Marquez is in favor of keeping the core part of District 3 surrounding Balboa Park intact.

Commissioner Nishioka feels that the core should be kept intact and the district should move to the west.

Commissioner Quiroz feels that LGBT community has proven to be a community of interest by their voting behavior and wants to respect that community of interest.

Commissioner Kosmo also would like to keep the District 3 core together, and move it westward.

NDC will provide different variations of District 3 that goes to different extents westward.

Chair Dalal would like to include Mission Hills, Park West, Golden Hill, Little Italy, Cortez Hill, Mid-town, Old Town, and Banker's Hill in those westward variations.

Commissioner Marquez also mentioned Banker's Hill and Downtown. He feels there is not yet a consensus about moving it westward.

Mr. Levitt asked about a defined core.

Commissioner Marquez suggested North Park, Normal Heights, and westward as the core.

Commissioner Potter believes the core should include the Golden Hill area, and areas surrounding Balboa Park.

Commissioner Quiroz suggested the core be the LGBT community, wherever they have proposed it to be.

Mr. Levitt does not suggest using the Prop 8 map to define the LGBT community because of such a close vote. He suggested using the old Prop 22 map because it was much more polarized and highlighted LGBT core communities, however that was in 2000 so they'd need direction as to where it's expanded.

Commissioner Quiroz would prefer using something more current, possibly in conjunction with the Prop 8 map.

Mr. Johnson will look into other resources.

Commissioner Marquez referenced the LGBT Task Force's submission, which included many tools to identify the LGBT community, as well as the census data for same sex couples.

### **Mid-City**

Commissioner Potter agrees that Normal Heights ties in well with communities to the west, while Kensington and Talmadge tie in with the College areas.

Commissioner Quiroz would like to consider Adams Ave. – she'd like it be kept together. She thinks it could go either way, united to with communities to the east or west. She thinks Talmadge and Kensington are most similar to communities to the north, but if given the option of east or west, she would unite it with the College area to the east.

Chair Dalal and Commissioner Marquez are also in favor of keeping Talmadge and Kensington with College.

Mr. Levitt asked for direction regarding Rolando and Oak Park.

Commissioner Kosmo agrees that Rolando and El Cerrito are impacted by the College area. He'd like to see variations with Webster in District 4.

Commissioner Potter feels that Oak Park could go either south or north.

Commissioner Quiroz sides with public testimony that Oak Park stay in District 4. She needs to review the testimony regarding Ridgeview. She is flexible on where to place El Cerrito and Rolando.

Chair Dalal agrees with Commissioner Quiroz's position on Oak Park.

Commissioner Marquez agrees with Commissioner Kosmo's comments on Oak Park and Webster. He sides with public testimony that Oak Park stay in District 4.

Commissioner Potter recalls public testimony regarding redevelopment areas in El Cerrito and other eastern areas.

NCD will look into that comment.

### **City Heights**

Mr. Levitt recounted conflicting testimony regarding unifying the City Heights Planning Area, as well as keeping the City Heights areas currently in District 3 as is.

Chair Dalal mentioned all the conflicting testimony and stated that this is a hard decision. Ultimately, she is in favor of keeping City Heights in three different districts, but is open to other Commissioner input.

Commissioner Kosmo agrees with Chair Dalai's comments, but leans towards uniting City Heights; however, he is open to input.

Commissioner Quiroz is strongly in favor of keeping City Heights united, but would like to define what is and isn't City Heights. She noted that Ridgeview is part of City Heights; Webster isn't. She cites public testimony as her reason for voting to unite City Heights. She understands the Azalea Park residents' concerns, but in order to unify the immigrant and large Latino populations, Azalea Park cannot be split off.

Commissioner Marquez also cited the conflicting testimony but feels that the majority of testimony was in favor of uniting City Heights. He is in favor of creating a 2<sup>nd</sup> Latino district to honor Latino's growing population, now 1/3 of the population of San Diego. He stated that City Heights needs to be united in order to create the 2<sup>nd</sup> Latino district.

Commissioner Nishioka also recalls the conflicting testimony; however he feels that uniting City Heights has more merit.

Mr. Levitt opened up the conversation to Commissioners.

Commissioner Potter stated that he'd like to be able to use different colors in the neighborhood maps, as NDC's has. NDC said it can be made available.

Mr. Levitt used the neighborhood boundaries found on the City website.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that because of the large amount of testimony and collaboration between coalitions, the maps for Districts 4, District 8, the City Heights area, and District 3 should be adopted as presented.

NDC will provide maps showing why some tradeoffs will need to occur.

Commissioner Marquez asked if NDC could somehow give approximate numbers about how many people wanted what options.

Mr. Johnson stated that he doesn't recommend giving counts because groups will start flooding the Commission to tilt the counts.

Chair Dalal agreed with Mr. Johnson, stating the Commission could review the transcripts and correspondence to measure for themselves.

Commissioner Potter agreed with Mr. Johnson as well.

Commissioner Quiroz asked that NDC provide with each map not only the populations for each district, but the breakdown by race/ethnicities so that we can ensure that they abide by the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Johnson stated that by the 9<sup>th</sup> there will be more data available, including citizen voting age population data, voter registration by surnames, and more. The goal is to get all the maps and data requested up with the agenda on the 5<sup>th</sup> to allow maximum time for public review.

Mr. Johnson suggested lettering instead of numbering their plans. All Commissioners concurred.

Ms. Spivak stated that there is language in the Charter that will be affected by the numbering of the districts. If the lettering will change the numbers, it will need to be discussed with the City Attorney.

Chair Dalal is in favor of using letters, for internal uses with the cautions Ms. Spivak alluded to.

Mr. Johnson talked about what to expect of the maps presented on July 9<sup>th</sup>. He fielded questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Quiroz asked that NDC first provide a map including to the extent possible all the direction provided for informational purposes. NDC will comply with the request.

The Commissioners thanked Mr. Levitt and Mr. Johnson for their facilitation.

### **ITEM 3: STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Wong recapped the public software training, and discussed the fiscal yearend budget report and the next scheduled Commission meeting. She fielded questions from the Commissioners.

### **ADJOURNMENT:**

Chairperson Dalal adjourned the meeting at 2:48 p.m.

---

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary  
2010 Redistricting Commission

# **Voting Rights and Redistricting A Presentation for the Redistricting Commission of the City of San Diego by**

Marguerite Mary Leoni  
Nielsen Merksamer  
Parrinello Gross & Leoni LLP

## **Voting Rights Protection**

- ▶ 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the United States Constitution
- ▶ Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act
- ▶ Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act – Not Applicable to San Diego County
- ▶ The California Voting Rights Act – Not Applicable to the City of San Diego
- ▶ City of San Diego Charter, Art. II, 5 & 5.1

## **14<sup>th</sup> Amendment**

Prohibits purposeful discrimination.  
Requires proof of intent to discriminate, and discriminatory effects.

Little voting rights case law under the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment since the 1982 amendments to the federal Voting Rights Act, which eliminated the need to prove purposeful discrimination.

## **Charter, Art. II, § 5.1**

Each redistricting plan shall provide fair and effective representation for all citizens of the City, including racial, ethnic, and language minorities, and be in conformance with the requirements of the United States Constitution and Federal statutes.

No case law interpretation of this provision, but extensive judicial interpretation of the incorporated federal law.

**SECTION 2 of the  
VOTING RIGHTS ACT  
(42 U.S.C. § 1973)**

**Background of Section 2:  
Nationwide Application**

Section 2 applies nation-wide. It forbids any “qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure ... which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color” or membership in a language minority group.

Does not require intent to discriminate.

Applies to redistricting.

## Background of Section 2: Language of Section 2

- ▶ Section 2 provides:
  - “(a) No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 1973b(f)(2) of this title, as provided in subsection (b) of this section.
  - “(b) A violation of subsection (a) of this section is established if, based on the totality of circumstances, it is shown that the political processes leading to nomination or election in the State or political subdivision are not equally open to participation by members of a class of citizens protected by subsection (a) of this section in that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice. The extent to which members of a protected class have been elected to office in the State or political subdivision is one circumstance which may be considered: Provided, That nothing in this section establishes a right to have members of a protected class elected in numbers equal to their proportion in the population.”

## Background of Section 2: *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986)

Construed Section 2 in the context of a lawsuit concerning dilution in a multi-member (*i.e.*, “at-large”) legislative district. Although courts ultimately apply a totality of the circumstances test to determine whether a practice results in a denial or abridgement of the right to vote, 42 U.S.C. § 1973(b), *i.e.* vote dilution, a plaintiff bringing a claim under Section 2 must first establish the three *Gingles* threshold preconditions:

- “First, the minority group must be able to demonstrate that it is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district. . . .
- Second, the minority group must be able to show that it is politically cohesive. . . .
- Third, the minority must be able to demonstrate that the white majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it . . . to defeat the minority’s preferred candidate.”

*Id.* at 50-51 (internal citations and footnote omitted).

## **Background of Section 2 Other Limitations**

Race cannot be the predominant redistricting consideration with other traditional redistricting criteria subordinated.

Evidence that race predominates:

1. Shape of the district
2. Testimony
3. Other circumstantial evidence

## **Background of Section 2: Application of *Gingles* to Redistricting**

The Supreme Court has subsequently applied *Gingles* to single-member districts. “[A] claim of vote dilution in a single-member district requires proof meeting the same three threshold conditions for a dilution challenge to a multimember district.” *Johnson v. De Grandy*, 512 U.S. 997, 1006 (citing *Grove v. Emison*, 507 U.S. 25, 40 (1993)).

## **Background of Section 2: Application of *Gingles* to Redistricting**

No packing or cracking:

“[M]anipulation of district lines can dilute the voting strength of politically cohesive minority group members, whether by fragmenting the minority voters among several districts where a bloc-voting majority can routinely outvote them, or by packing them into one or a small number of districts to minimize their influence in the districts next door. ... Section 2 prohibits either sort of line-drawing where its result, interacting with social and historical conditions, impairs the ability of a protected class to elect its candidate of choice on an equal basis with other voters.”

*Johnson v. DeGrandy*, 512 U.S. 997, 1006 (1994), numerous citations omitted.

## **Background of Section 2: Application of *Gingles* to Redistricting**

“But some dividing by district lines and combining within them is virtually inevitable and befalls any population group of substantial size. Attaching the labels ‘packing’ and ‘fragmenting’ to these phenomena, without more, does not make the result vote dilution when the minority group enjoys substantial proportionality. ... [R]eading § 2 to define dilution as any failure to maximize tends to obscure the very object of the statute and to run counter to its textually stated purpose. One may suspect vote dilution from political famine, but one is not entitled to suspect (much less infer) dilution from mere failure to guarantee a political feast.”

*Id.*, at 1115 – 1118.

## 1<sup>st</sup> Gingles Precondition Deconstruction after *Thornburg v. Gingles*

1. “Majority-minority” districts, *i.e.*, one “in which a majority of the population is a member of a specific minority group.” *Voivovich v. Quilter*, 507 U.S. 146, 149 (1993).
2. “Coalition” districts, *i.e.*, one in which a minority group joins with voters from at least one other minority group to elect a candidate. *De Grandy*, 512 U.S. at 1020.
3. “Crossover” districts, *i.e.*, one in which a minority group has “support from a limited but reliable white crossover vote.” *Rodriguez v. Pataki*, 308 F. Supp. 2d 346, 376 (S.D.N.Y.) (per curiam) (three-judge court), *aff’d mem.*, 543 U.S. 997 (2004).
4. “Influence” districts, *i.e.*, one in which a minority group is merely large enough to influence the election of candidates but too small to determine the outcome. *Georgia v. Ashcroft*, 539 U.S. 461, 470 (2003) (defining an influence district as one in which a minority group “would be able to exert a significant—if not decisive—force in the election process”).

## 1<sup>st</sup> Gingles Precondition Influence Districts

- ▶ Prior to 2009, most federal courts had not sanctioned such districts.  
*See Metts v. Almond*, 217 F. Supp. 2d 252, 258 (D.R.I. 2002), *vac’d & rem’d sub nom. Metts v. Murphy*, 363 F.3d 8 (1st Cir. 2004) (en banc) (per curiam); *Rodriguez v. Pataki*, 308 F. Supp. 2d 346, 379 (S.D.N.Y. 2004) (influence claims have “no standards and would be judicially unmanageable. ‘Influence’ cannot be clearly defined or statistically proved.”); *Hall v. Virginia*, 385 F.3d 421 (4th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 2005 U.S. LEXIS 2973 (2005); *Thompson v. Glades County Bd. of County Comm’rs*, 493 F.3d 1253 (11th Cir. 2007), *vac’d by, reh’g en banc granted by, Thompson v. Glades County Bd. of County Comm’rs*, 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 27348 (11th Cir. Fla. Nov. 27, 2007); *Aldasoro v. Kennerson*, 922 F. Supp. 339, 376 (S.D. Cal. 1995); *DeBaca v. County of San Diego*, 794 F. Supp. 990, 996-97 (S.D. Cal. 1992); *Skorepa v. City of Chula Vista*, 723 F. Supp. 1384, 1391-92 (S.D. Cal. 1989); *Romero v. City of Pomona*, 665 F. Supp. 853, 864 (C.D. Cal. 1987), *aff’d*, 883 F.2d 1418, 1424 (9th Cir. 1989).
- ▶ Only three federal courts had ever held that the federal VRA requires, rather than merely permits, the creation of influence districts in the absence of a showing of intentional discrimination.  
*Armour v. Ohio*, 775 F. Supp. 1044 (N.D. Ohio 1991); *East Jefferson Coalition for Leadership & Dev. v. Parish of Jefferson*, 691 F. Supp. 991 (E.D. La. 1988); *Metts v. Murphy*, 363 F.3d 8 (1st Cir. 2004) (en banc) (per curiam).

## **1<sup>st</sup> Gingles Precondition**

### ***Wilson v. Eu* on Influence and Coalitional Districts**

Noting the lack of clear guidance on the issue of coalitional and influence districts, the Special Masters of the California Supreme Court in *Wilson v. Eu* took a cautious approach and “(1) endeavored to protect the combined voting strength of two or more minority groups in areas containing substantial numbers of such groups ..., and (2) recognized the propriety of forming minority influence districts to maximize the voting potential of geographically compact minority groups of appreciable size ..., even though the individual minority groups involved in categories (1) or (2) were an insufficient size to constitute a majority in their voting districts.”

*Wilson v. Eu*, I Cal.4<sup>th</sup> 707, 715 (1992).

## ***Bartlett v. Strickland*: Proceedings In The Trial Court**

- ▶ The North Carolina Constitution prohibits dividing counties to form state House and Senate districts (the “whole county” provisions), except to comply with the Voting Rights Act and one-man, one-vote requirements, and then county lines can be crossed only to the minimum degree necessary for compliance. N.C. Const., art. II, § 3(3) & §5(3).
- ▶ The case concerned North Carolina House District 18 that includes parts of New Hanover and Pender counties. It has an African-American voting age population of 39%. Since 1992, voters in House District 18 and its predecessor district have elected an African-American to the North Carolina General Assembly.
- ▶ In May 2004, Pender County brought an action challenging House District 18 as a violation of the “whole county” provision of the North Carolina Constitution. The state respondents asserted that it was necessary to cross county lines in order to comply with Section 2.
- ▶ A three-judge panel of the North Carolina Superior Court granted partial summary judgment to the State on the grounds, among others, that the first *Gingles* precondition does not require a minority group to meet a bright line 50% numerical majority of eligible voters in a district, but rather, the proper analysis is whether the political realities of a district render the minority group a *de facto* majority in that it is able to elect candidates of its choice.

### ***Bartlett v. Strickland:***

#### **The Holding: No § 2 Protection for Influence or Cross-over Districts**

“It remains the rule, however, that a party asserting § 2 liability must show by a preponderance of the evidence that the minority population in the potential election district is greater than 50 percent. ...Our holding does not apply to cases in which there is intentional discrimination against a racial minority.”

129 S.Ct. 1231, 1246.

### ***Bartlett v. Strickland:***

#### **The Measure of Ability to Create a Majority-Minority District**

This was decided earlier in a case called:

*League of United Latin American Citizens v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 399 (2006)

“[T]he relevant numbers must include citizenship. This approach fits the language of § 2 because only eligible voters affect a group’s opportunity to elect candidates.”

*Id.*, at 429.

## ***Bartlett v. Strickland:***

### **The Holding: No § 2 Protection for Influence or Cross-over Districts**

“*Section 2* does not impose on those who draw election districts a duty to give minority voters the most potential, or the best potential, to elect a candidate by attracting crossover voters. In setting out the first requirement for § 2 claims, the *Gingles* Court explained that ‘[u]nless minority voters possess the *potential* to elect representatives in the absence of the challenged structure or practice, they cannot claim to have been injured by that structure or practice.’ 478 U.S., at 50, n. 17, 106 S. Ct. 2752, 92 L. Ed. 2d 25. The *Grove* Court stated that the first *Gingles* requirement is ‘needed to establish that the minority has the potential to elect a representative of its own choice in some single-member district.’ 507 U.S., at 40, 113 S. Ct. 1075, 112 L. E.2d 388. Without such a showing, ‘there neither has been a wrong nor can be a remedy.’ *Id.*, at 41, 113 S. Ct. 1075, 112 L. E.2d 388. There is a difference between a racial minority group’s ‘own choice’ and the choice made by a coalition.”

129 S. Ct. 1231, 1243.

## ***Bartlett v. Strickland:***

### **What About Coalitional Districts?**

“We do not address that type of coalition district here.”

129 S.Ct., at 1242.

***Bartlett v. Strickland:***  
**What About Coalitional Districts?**

On the other hand, the vast majority of lower courts to consider a coalition claim, including in this Circuit, has assumed it to be valid and allowed it to proceed under the first *Gingles* precondition and has adjudicated the claim under the second and third preconditions, minority political cohesion and majority bloc voting.

***Bartlett v. Strickland:***  
**What About Coalitional Districts?**

Tea-leaf Reading:

The Court defined a coalition district claim as one in which “two minority groups form a coalition to elect the candidate of the coalition’s choice.” *Id.*, citing *Nixon v. Kent County*, 76 F.3d 13811393 (1996), which denied a coalition claim by African Americans and Hispanics under the first *Gingles* precondition.

## ***Bartlett v. Strickland:*** **What About Coalitional Districts?**

The Court went on to say:

“African-Americans ... have the opportunity to join other voters – including other racial minorities, or whites, or both – to reach a majority and elect their preferred candidate. They cannot, however, elect that candidate based on their own voter and without assistance from others. Recognizing a § 2 claim in this circumstance would grant minority voters ‘a right to preserve their strength for the purposes of forging an advantageous political alliance.’ [Citations omitted.] Nothing in § 2 grants special protection to a minority group’s right to form political coalitions.” *Bartlett v. Strickland*, 129 S.Ct., at 1243.

## ***Bartlett v. Strickland:*** **And the 2011 Redistricting**

- ▶ To be entitled to § 2 protection, the minority group must be able to form the majority of eligible voters (i.e. citizens of voting age) in a reasonably compact single-member district.
- ▶ No “packing” or “fragmenting” if the result is vote dilution judged by the totality of the circumstances.
- ▶ No obligation to “maximize” voting strength of minorities.
- ▶ Creation of influence and cross-over districts not required.
- ▶ Creation of influence and cross-over districts not prohibited, unless race is the predominant consideration.
- ▶ Unclear whether the creation of coalition districts is required.
- ▶ Creation of coalition districts is not prohibited, unless race is the predominant criterion.
- ▶ Certainly any coalition district must also meet all three of the *Gingles* preconditions.

**Voting Rights and Redistricting  
A Presentation for the  
Redistricting Commission of  
the City of San Diego**  
by

Marguerite Mary Leoni  
Nielsen Merksamer  
Parrinello Gross & Leoni LLP

**2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
SATURDAY, JULY 9, 2011**

**ITEM 3:        *Development of preliminary redistricting plan.***

Based on Commission direction at the June 25 meeting, the mapping consultant team has prepared one “Core Areas” discussion map and three draft preliminary plans for consideration and further direction.

The “Core Areas” discussion map was prepared per a Commissioner request. However, the districts shown in this map do not meet equal population requirements. The map was prepared solely to complete the Commissioner’s request and is not to be construed as a preliminary redistricting plan under consideration by the Commission.

The following information is provided in the agenda packet for the “Core Areas” discussion map and each “Draft Preliminary Plan” 1 – 3:

- District maps
- District demographics tables, including:
  - Total population
  - Population deviation
  - Population by race and ethnicity
  - Voting age population by race and ethnicity
  - Citizen Voting Age Population (Special Tabulation and American Community Survey data)
- List of Community Planning Areas (CPAs) and Neighborhoods (as defined by City of San Diego Planning Department boundaries) assigned to each district

Additional, street level detail of district boundaries in each draft preliminary plan is accessible using the ESRI online redistricting tool. To access each map:

- Access [sd-redistricting.esri.com](http://sd-redistricting.esri.com) (create log-in if first time user)
- “File” --> “Open” --> “Shared Plans” --> “Everyone”
- Select the plan you wish to access:

| Plan ID | Plan Name  |
|---------|------------|
| 23614   | Core Areas |
| 23615   | Plan 1     |
| 23616   | Plan 2     |
| 23617   | Plan 3     |

To ensure full functionality of the online tool, enable pop-up windows on the browser and install Adobe Flash Player version 10.2.

Attachments: Summary of Commission direction from June 25 meeting  
“Core Areas” Discussion Map and reports  
Draft Preliminary Plan 1 and reports  
Draft Preliminary Plan 2 and reports  
Draft Preliminary Plan 3 and reports

*(Reports include: district maps, district demographics tables, CPAs/neighborhoods list, as described in body of this report)*

| Item | Direction  | Plan 1         | Plan 2         | Plan 3 |
|------|--|----------------|----------------|--------|
| 1    | Keep South Bay (San Ysidro, Otay, Nestor, Palm City, Egger Highlands) together   | Y              | Y              | Y      |
| 2    | Keep the Historic Barrio District (Sherman Heights/Logan Heights/Stockton/ Memorial/Grant Hill) and Barrio Logan together  | Y              | Y              | Y      |
| 3    | Keep Downtown in a separate district from Barrio Logan and the Historic Barrio District  | Y              | Y              | Y      |
| 4    | Keep Golden Hill separate from the Historic Barrio District (Use Highway 94 if possible)   | Y              | Y              | Y      |
| 5    | Respect the African-American community areas in Southeastern San Diego   |                | N <sup>1</sup> | Y      |
| 6    | Ridgeview and Webster should be divided; Ridgeview should go with City Heights, Webster with Southeastern area   | Y              | Y              |        |
| 7    | Keep beaches (Ocean Beach, Mission Beach, Pacific Beach) together  | Y <sup>2</sup> | Y              | Y      |
| 8    | Point Loma has a community of interest with both the airport and the beaches   | Y              |                | Y      |
| 9    | Bay Ho and Bay Park share a community of interest with the beaches   |                | Y              | Y      |
| 10   | La Jolla should be in a separate district from the beaches   | Y              | Y              | Y      |
| 11   | La Jolla and University City share a common community around UCSD and these areas should be together   | Y              | Y              | Y      |
| 12   | Use the Community Planning Area border for the University/Mira Mesa division   | Y              | Y              |        |
| 13   | Use the freeway (I-805) for the University/Mira Mesa division  |                |                | Y      |
| 14   | Carmel Valley, Del Mar Heights, and Fairbanks Ranch should be together   | Y              | Y              | Y      |
| 15   | Del Mar Mesa, Pacific Highlands Ranch, and Torrey Hills should be together   | Y              | Y              | Y      |
| 16   | Keep Poway Unified neighborhoods in one district (San Pasqual, Rancho Bernardo, Black Mountain Ranch, Torrey Highlands, Rancho Penasquitos, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Sabre Springs). |                | Y              |        |
| 17   | Unite the Scripps Ranch, Miramar Ranch, and Rancho Encantada Planning Areas  | Y              | Y <sup>3</sup> | Y      |
| 18   | Keep the Fire District areas (San Pasqual, Rancho Bernardo, Miramar Ranch, Scripps Ranch, Rancho Encantada, MCAS Miramar (esp. eastern part), and Tierrasanta) together            |                |                | Y      |
| 19   | Keep northern areas east of I-15 (Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Sabre Springs, Scripps Ranch, Miramar Ranch, and Rancho Encantada) together                              |                |                | Y      |

<sup>1</sup> This plan does not follow the “District 4 Town Councils” proposal (that proposal divides City Heights; this plan unifies it) but it does contain Oak Park

<sup>2</sup> Mission Bay Park is divided into Districts D and E along the current District 2/6 border


<sup>3</sup> In this plan, Scripps Ranch is divided into Districts A and D, but part of Scripps Ranch and all of Miramar Ranch and Rancho Encantada are in District A.

| Item | Direction   | Plan 1 | Plan 2 | Plan 3         |
|------|---|--------|--------|----------------|
| 20   | Keep Mira Mesa whole (subject to different definitions of Mira Mesa/University border)  | Y      | Y      | Y              |
| 21   | Mira Mesa together with Scripps Ranch makes sense   |        |        |                |
| 22   | Keep the areas affected by MCAS Miramar (Kearny Mesa, Sorrento Mesa/Mira Mesa together). Kearny Mesa has more ties to the north (MCAS Miramar/Mira Mesa) than to Tierrasanta or Clairemont    | Y      | Y      | Y              |
| 23   | MCAS Miramar, particularly the areas east of I-15, is part of the fire district   |        |        | Y              |
| 24   | Use Aero Drive to delineate Kearny Mesa from Serra Mesa   | Y      |        | Y              |
| 25   | Keep Navajo neighborhoods (Lake Murray, San Carlos, Del Cerro, Allied Gardens, and Grantville) together   |        | Y      |                |
| 26   | If Navajo area must be divided, Allied Gardens and Grantville have strong ties to Mission Valley and should be kept together. Del Cerro and San Carlos have stronger ties to the College Area | Y      |        |                |
| 27   | Keep Tierrasanta united   | Y      | Y      | Y              |
| 28   | Keep Mission Valley together  | Y      |        | Y              |
| 29   | Mission Valley has stronger ties to the north (and east) than the south. Do not cross south from Mission Valley between Mission Hills and Kensington.   | Y      | Y      | Y              |
| 30   | Unify areas on both sides of Tecolote Canyon in Clairemont Mesa (Keep the Clairemont Community Planning Area whole)   |        | Y      |                |
| 31   | Linda Vista is comprised of two distinct communities of interest. One is wealthier and centered on USD (the Morena neighborhood), the other is less well-off (Linda Vista neighborhood).      | Y      | Y      | Y              |
| 32   | Keep core of District 3 (LGBT areas) intact   | Y      |        | Y              |
| 33   | Move the LGBT district westward—take in Mission Hills, Bankers Hill, Park West, and possibly downtown   | Y      |        | Y              |
| 34   | Keep historic areas around Balboa Park together   | Y      |        | Y              |
| 35   | Normal Heights is flexible; has ties to both LGBT community and College Area  | Y      |        | Y              |
| 36   | Adams Avenue corridor (through University Heights, North Park, Normal Heights, and Kensington) should stay united   | Y      |        |                |
| 37   | Kensington and Talmadge should stay together  |        | Y      | Y              |
| 38   | Eastern areas of Rolando and El Cerrito (including Redwood Village and the College Area) should be together   | Y      | Y      | N <sup>4</sup> |
| 39   | City Heights should be kept together  |        | Y      | N <sup>5</sup> |
| 40   | Azalea Park should be with the LGBT community   | Y      |        |                |

<sup>4</sup> Following the District 4 Town Councils proposal, parts of Redwood Village, El Cerrito, and Rolando are in District H. The remainder (and majority) of these neighborhoods are wholly in District F.


<sup>5</sup> Following the District 4 Town Councils proposal, part of City Heights is in District H. The remainder is wholly in District F.

## "CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\*




**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

**"CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\***




**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

## "CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\*




**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

**"CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\***




**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

# "CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\*




**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

## "CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\*




**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

## "CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\*




**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

## "CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\*




**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

## "CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\*



**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

## "CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\*



**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

| Dist  | Tot. Pop. | Dev.    | % Dev.  | NH      |         |        |         |         |       |       |        |
|-------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|-------|-------|--------|
|       |           |         |         | Hisp    | Wht     | Blk    | DOJ Ind | Asn     | Hwn   | Oth   | OthMR  |
| A     | 154,604   | 9,980   | 6.90%   | 14,362  | 92,294  | 4,300  | 656     | 40,962  | 552   | 454   | 1,024  |
| B     | 147,356   | 2,732   | 1.89%   | 12,564  | 93,252  | 1,998  | 482     | 37,531  | 284   | 600   | 645    |
| C     | 80,427    | -64,197 | -44.39% | 11,038  | 27,288  | 3,778  | 382     | 35,982  | 646   | 287   | 1,026  |
| D     | 120,299   | -24,325 | -16.82% | 28,129  | 62,721  | 7,011  | 934     | 19,132  | 840   | 436   | 1,096  |
| E     | 187,083   | 42,459  | 29.36%  | 27,748  | 137,142 | 7,403  | 1,510   | 10,634  | 699   | 895   | 1,052  |
| F     | 202,082   | 57,458  | 39.73%  | 64,868  | 90,322  | 17,142 | 1,273   | 25,205  | 902   | 609   | 1,761  |
| G     | 96,015    | -48,609 | -33.61% | 27,745  | 52,525  | 7,298  | 795     | 6,149   | 421   | 336   | 746    |
| H     | 168,921   | 24,297  | 16.80%  | 79,884  | 16,484  | 31,922 | 567     | 35,865  | 1,711 | 316   | 2,172  |
| I     | 144,830   | 206     | 0.14%   | 108,630 | 14,776  | 6,671  | 402     | 12,859  | 482   | 209   | 801    |
| Total | 1,301,617 | 121,655 | 84.12%  | 374,968 | 586,804 | 87,523 | 7,001   | 224,319 | 6,537 | 4,142 | 10,323 |
| Ideal | 144,624   |         |         |         |         |        |         |         |       |       |        |

| Dist  | % Hisp. | % NH  |         |         |         |         |         |           |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
|       |         | Wht   | DOJ Blk | DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR |
| A     | 9.3%    | 59.7% | 2.8%    | 0.4%    | 26.5%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.7%      |
| B     | 8.5%    | 63.3% | 1.4%    | 0.3%    | 25.5%   | 0.2%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%      |
| C     | 13.7%   | 33.9% | 4.7%    | 0.5%    | 44.7%   | 0.8%    | 0.4%    | 1.3%      |
| D     | 23.4%   | 52.1% | 5.8%    | 0.8%    | 15.9%   | 0.7%    | 0.4%    | 0.9%      |
| E     | 14.8%   | 73.3% | 4.0%    | 0.8%    | 5.7%    | 0.4%    | 0.5%    | 0.6%      |
| F     | 32.1%   | 44.7% | 8.5%    | 0.6%    | 12.5%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.9%      |
| G     | 28.9%   | 54.7% | 7.6%    | 0.8%    | 6.4%    | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      |
| H     | 47.3%   | 9.8%  | 18.9%   | 0.3%    | 21.2%   | 1.0%    | 0.2%    | 1.3%      |
| I     | 75.0%   | 10.2% | 4.6%    | 0.3%    | 8.9%    | 0.3%    | 0.1%    | 0.6%      |
| Total | 28.8%   | 45.1% | 6.7%    | 0.5%    | 17.2%   | 0.5%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      |

Abbreviations:  
 Dev. = Deviation  
 Hisp = Hispanic  
 NH = "Non-Hispanic"  
 Wht = White  
 Blk = Black / African American  
 Ind = Native American  
 Asn = Asian American  
 Haw or Hwn = Hawaiian and Pacific Islander  
 Oth = Other  
 OthMR or MR = Multi-Race  
 Fil = Filipino  
 "DOJ" = Aggregated according to U.S. Department of Justice guidance  
 Reg = Voter Registration  
 CVAP = Citizen Voting Age Population

**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

| Dist  | NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ |          |           |               |         |         |         |         |           | Asn +     |            |           |           | Asn +  |           |            |           |           |           |
|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|       | 18+ Pop                       | H18+ Pop | NH18+ Wht | NH18+ DOJ Blk | DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR | Tot. Reg. | Hisp. Reg. | Asn. Reg. | Fil. Reg. | Reg.   | Tot. Vote | Hisp. Vote | Asn. Vote | Fil. Vote | Fil. Vote |
| A     | 115,107                       | 9,354    | 71,801    | 2,895         | 477     | 29,323  | 389     | 301     | 567       | 85,473    | 7,009      | 6,796     | 2,390     | 9,186  | 58,774    | 4,108      | 3,743     | 26        | 3,769     |
| B     | 119,956                       | 9,524    | 76,909    | 1,587         | 369     | 30,477  | 215     | 420     | 455       | 78,244    | 4,206      | 7,369     | 594       | 7,963  | 53,225    | 2,418      | 3,584     | 12        | 3,596     |
| C     | 63,769                        | 7,653    | 23,360    | 2,757         | 323     | 28,379  | 478     | 189     | 630       | 33,522    | 5,077      | 4,378     | 2,570     | 6,948  | 19,893    | 2,664      | 2,035     | 28        | 2,063     |
| D     | 97,506                        | 19,627   | 54,885    | 5,003         | 773     | 15,541  | 680     | 332     | 665       | 58,792    | 7,499      | 3,438     | 938       | 4,376  | 37,129    | 4,005      | 1,694     | 26        | 1,720     |
| E     | 165,718                       | 22,394   | 124,399   | 6,236         | 1,338   | 9,234   | 567     | 753     | 797       | 106,018   | 8,046      | 2,038     | 889       | 2,927  | 67,067    | 4,212      | 1,153     | 15        | 1,168     |
| F     | 153,770                       | 41,943   | 77,178    | 11,931        | 1,006   | 19,640  | 678     | 406     | 988       | 94,309    | 13,875     | 4,923     | 990       | 5,913  | 57,450    | 6,338      | 2,437     | 26        | 2,463     |
| G     | 83,260                        | 20,921   | 49,058    | 5,946         | 711     | 5,435   | 357     | 285     | 547       | 55,284    | 7,986      | 1,244     | 550       | 1,794  | 34,662    | 4,212      | 743       | 17        | 760       |
| H     | 119,864                       | 51,143   | 14,425    | 23,079        | 453     | 28,076  | 1,278   | 210     | 1,200     | 64,768    | 21,858     | 2,200     | 3,948     | 6,148  | 31,831    | 9,691      | 967       | 62        | 1,029     |
| I     | 103,299                       | 72,895   | 13,285    | 5,276         | 342     | 10,456  | 402     | 148     | 495       | 46,452    | 29,751     | 371       | 2,109     | 2,480  | 22,521    | 13,439     | 146       | 23        | 169       |
| Total | 1,022,249                     | 255,454  | 505,300   | 64,710        | 5,792   | 176,561 | 5,044   | 3,044   | 6,344     | 622,862   | 105,307    | 32,757    | 14,978    | 47,735 | 382,552   | 51,087     | 16,502    | 235       | 16,737    |

| Dist  | % NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ |           |               |               |         |         |         |           | % Asn        |             |             |             | % Asn        |             |             |             |
|-------|---------------------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|       | % H18+ Pop                | NH18+ Wht | NH18+ DOJ Blk | NH18+ DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR | % Hisp. Reg. | % Asn. Reg. | % Fil. Reg. | + Fil. Reg. | % Hisp. Vote | % Asn. Vote | % Fil. Vote | + Fil. Vote |
| A     | 8.1%                      | 62.4%     | 2.5%          | 0.4%          | 25.5%   | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.5%      | 8.2%         | 8.0%        | 2.8%        | 10.7%       | 7.0%         | 6.4%        | 0.0%        | 6.4%        |
| B     | 7.9%                      | 64.1%     | 1.3%          | 0.3%          | 25.4%   | 0.2%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%      | 5.4%         | 9.4%        | 0.8%        | 10.2%       | 4.5%         | 6.7%        | 0.0%        | 6.8%        |
| C     | 12.0%                     | 36.6%     | 4.3%          | 0.5%          | 44.5%   | 0.7%    | 0.3%    | 1.0%      | 15.1%        | 13.1%       | 7.7%        | 20.7%       | 13.4%        | 10.2%       | 0.1%        | 10.4%       |
| D     | 20.1%                     | 56.3%     | 5.1%          | 0.8%          | 15.9%   | 0.7%    | 0.3%    | 0.7%      | 12.8%        | 5.8%        | 1.6%        | 7.4%        | 10.8%        | 4.6%        | 0.1%        | 4.6%        |
| E     | 13.5%                     | 75.1%     | 3.8%          | 0.8%          | 5.6%    | 0.3%    | 0.5%    | 0.5%      | 7.6%         | 1.9%        | 0.8%        | 2.8%        | 6.3%         | 1.7%        | 0.0%        | 1.7%        |
| F     | 27.3%                     | 50.2%     | 7.8%          | 0.7%          | 12.8%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.6%      | 14.7%        | 5.2%        | 1.0%        | 6.3%        | 11.0%        | 4.2%        | 0.0%        | 4.3%        |
| G     | 25.1%                     | 58.9%     | 7.1%          | 0.9%          | 6.5%    | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.7%      | 14.4%        | 2.3%        | 1.0%        | 3.2%        | 12.2%        | 2.1%        | 0.0%        | 2.2%        |
| H     | 42.7%                     | 12.0%     | 19.3%         | 0.4%          | 23.4%   | 1.1%    | 0.2%    | 1.0%      | 33.7%        | 3.4%        | 6.1%        | 9.5%        | 30.4%        | 3.0%        | 0.2%        | 3.2%        |
| I     | 70.6%                     | 12.9%     | 5.1%          | 0.3%          | 10.1%   | 0.4%    | 0.1%    | 0.5%      | 64.0%        | 0.8%        | 4.5%        | 5.3%        | 59.7%        | 0.6%        | 0.1%        | 0.8%        |
| Total | 25.0%                     | 49.4%     | 6.3%          | 0.6%          | 17.3%   | 0.5%    | 0.3%    | 0.6%      | 16.9%        | 5.3%        | 2.4%        | 7.7%        | 13.4%        | 4.3%        | 0.1%        | 4.4%        |

**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

| Dist  | Special Tabulation |               |             |             |             |             |             |            | American Community Survey (ACS) |               |             |             |             |             |             |            |             |
|-------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
|       | Total CVAP         | Hispanic CVAP | NH Wht CVAP | NH Blk CVAP | NH Asn CVAP | NH Ind CVAP | NH Hwn CVAP | NH MR CVAP | Total CVAP                      | Hispanic CVAP | NH Wht CVAP | NH Blk CVAP | NH Asn CVAP | NH Ind CVAP | NH Hwn CVAP | NH MR CVAP | NH Oth CVAP |
| A     | 102,277            | 7,678         | 71,146      | 2,816       | 18,281      | 336         | 211         | 1,827      | 101,187                         | 7,604         | 70,140      | 2,888       | 18,179      | 426         | 213         | 2,676      | 1,861       |
| B     | 99,986             | 7,007         | 74,453      | 1,033       | 15,817      | 77          | 45          | 1,555      | 100,179                         | 7,060         | 74,495      | 1,027       | 15,949      | 97          | 64          | 1,943      | 2,400       |
| C     | 55,028             | 6,084         | 25,143      | 2,285       | 19,615      | 124         | 265         | 1,472      | 55,015                          | 6,086         | 25,002      | 2,252       | 19,656      | 184         | 306         | 1,920      | 2,563       |
| D     | 85,675             | 13,317        | 57,251      | 3,320       | 8,609       | 596         | 918         | 1,665      | 85,905                          | 13,391        | 57,186      | 3,425       | 8,780       | 760         | 930         | 2,749      | 3,864       |
| E     | 148,520            | 14,564        | 120,808     | 4,672       | 5,346       | 457         | 550         | 2,058      | 148,145                         | 14,461        | 120,236     | 4,741       | 5,423       | 874         | 590         | 3,102      | 2,694       |
| F     | 129,198            | 21,450        | 81,589      | 10,574      | 11,874      | 663         | 348         | 2,694      | 128,780                         | 21,427        | 81,023      | 10,475      | 12,148      | 968         | 384         | 3,715      | 5,796       |
| G     | 74,311             | 13,452        | 49,992      | 5,147       | 3,068       | 553         | 220         | 1,823      | 74,438                          | 13,570        | 49,722      | 5,165       | 3,171       | 1,025       | 279         | 2,977      | 3,539       |
| H     | 87,997             | 26,079        | 14,427      | 23,295      | 20,507      | 170         | 1,763       | 1,730      | 88,181                          | 25,908        | 14,557      | 23,554      | 20,708      | 320         | 1,996       | 2,549      | 6,924       |
| I     | 72,199             | 41,567        | 15,840      | 6,033       | 7,335       | 233         | 133         | 1,018      | 72,390                          | 41,568        | 15,906      | 6,311       | 7,579       | 594         | 158         | 2,115      | 9,207       |
| Total | 855,192            | 151,199       | 510,647     | 59,174      | 110,451     | 3,209       | 4,453       | 15,842     | 854,220                         | 151,076       | 508,267     | 59,839      | 111,592     | 5,249       | 4,919       | 23,746     | 38,847      |

| Dist  | Special Tabulation |                 |               |               |               |               |               |              | American Community Survey (ACS) |                 |               |               |               |               |               |              |               |
|-------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
|       | % Total CVAP       | % Hispanic CVAP | % NH Wht CVAP | % NH Blk CVAP | % NH Asn CVAP | % NH Ind CVAP | % NH Hwn CVAP | % NH MR CVAP | % Total CVAP                    | % Hispanic CVAP | % NH Wht CVAP | % NH Blk CVAP | % NH Asn CVAP | % NH Ind CVAP | % NH Hwn CVAP | % NH MR CVAP | % NH Oth CVAP |
| A     | 88.9%              | 7.5%            | 69.6%         | 2.8%          | 17.9%         | 0.3%          | 0.2%          | 1.8%         | 87.9%                           | 7.5%            | 69.3%         | 2.9%          | 18.0%         | 0.4%          | 0.2%          | 2.6%         | 1.8%          |
| B     | 83.4%              | 7.0%            | 74.5%         | 1.0%          | 15.8%         | 0.1%          | 0.0%          | 1.6%         | 83.5%                           | 7.0%            | 74.4%         | 1.0%          | 15.9%         | 0.1%          | 0.1%          | 1.9%         | 2.4%          |
| C     | 86.3%              | 11.1%           | 45.7%         | 4.2%          | 35.6%         | 0.2%          | 0.5%          | 2.7%         | 86.3%                           | 11.1%           | 45.4%         | 4.1%          | 35.7%         | 0.3%          | 0.6%          | 3.5%         | 4.7%          |
| D     | 87.9%              | 15.5%           | 66.8%         | 3.9%          | 10.0%         | 0.7%          | 1.1%          | 1.9%         | 88.1%                           | 15.6%           | 66.6%         | 4.0%          | 10.2%         | 0.9%          | 1.1%          | 3.2%         | 4.5%          |
| E     | 89.6%              | 9.8%            | 81.3%         | 3.1%          | 3.6%          | 0.3%          | 0.4%          | 1.4%         | 89.4%                           | 9.8%            | 81.2%         | 3.2%          | 3.7%          | 0.6%          | 0.4%          | 2.1%         | 1.8%          |
| F     | 84.0%              | 16.6%           | 63.2%         | 8.2%          | 9.2%          | 0.5%          | 0.3%          | 2.1%         | 83.7%                           | 16.6%           | 62.9%         | 8.1%          | 9.4%          | 0.8%          | 0.3%          | 2.9%         | 4.5%          |
| G     | 89.3%              | 18.1%           | 67.3%         | 6.9%          | 4.1%          | 0.7%          | 0.3%          | 2.5%         | 89.4%                           | 18.2%           | 66.8%         | 6.9%          | 4.3%          | 1.4%          | 0.4%          | 4.0%         | 4.8%          |
| H     | 73.4%              | 29.6%           | 16.4%         | 26.5%         | 23.3%         | 0.2%          | 2.0%          | 2.0%         | 73.6%                           | 29.4%           | 16.5%         | 26.7%         | 23.5%         | 0.4%          | 2.3%          | 2.9%         | 7.9%          |
| I     | 69.9%              | 57.6%           | 21.9%         | 8.4%          | 10.2%         | 0.3%          | 0.2%          | 1.4%         | 70.1%                           | 57.4%           | 22.0%         | 8.7%          | 10.5%         | 0.8%          | 0.2%          | 2.9%         | 12.7%         |
| Total | 83.7%              | 17.7%           | 59.7%         | 6.9%          | 12.9%         | 0.4%          | 0.5%          | 1.9%         | 83.6%                           | 17.7%           | 59.5%         | 7.0%          | 13.1%         | 0.6%          | 0.6%          | 2.8%         | 4.5%          |

**\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request. However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.**

## “CORE AREAS” DISCUSSION MAP\*

### District A

#### Community Planning Areas

Black Mountain Ranch  
Carmel Mountain Ranch  
Del Mar Mesa (partial—area in Poway Unified School District)  
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—portion in Poway Unified School District)  
Miramar Ranch North  
Rancho Bernardo  
Rancho Encantada  
Rancho Peñasquitos  
Sabre Springs  
San Pasqual  
Scripps Ranch  
Torrey Highlands

#### Neighborhoods

Black Mountain Ranch  
Carmel Mountain Ranch  
Miramar Ranch North  
Rancho Bernardo  
Rancho Encantada  
Rancho Peñasquitos  
Sabre Springs  
San Pasqual  
Scripps Ranch  
Torrey Highlands

---

### District B

#### Community Planning Areas

Carmel Valley  
Del Mar Mesa (partial—portion in Del Mar Union School District)  
Fairbanks Ranch Country Club  
La Jolla  
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—portion in Del Mar Union School District)  
NCFUA Subarea II  
Pacific Highlands Ranch  
Torrey Hills  
Torrey Pines  
University  
Via de la Valle

#### Neighborhoods

Carmel Valley  
Del Mar Heights  
La Jolla (partial—area in La Jolla CPA)  
La Jolla Village  
Mira Mesa (partial—area in University CPA)  
North City  
Pacific Beach (partial—area in La Jolla CPA)  
Sorrento Valley (partial—area in University CPA)  
Torrey Pines  
Torrey Preserve  
University City

---

### District C

#### Community Planning Areas

Kearny Mesa (partial—area north of Aero Drive)  
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—portion in San Diego Unified School District)  
MCAS Miramar  
Mira Mesa

#### Neighborhoods

Kearny Mesa  
MCAS Miramar  
Mira Mesa  
Sorrento Valley (partial—area in Mira Mesa CPA)

*\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request.*

***However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.***

## "CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\*

### District D

#### Community Planning Areas

Clairemont Mesa (partial—areas east of Tecolote Canyon)  
Kearny Mesa (partial—area south of Aero Drive)  
Linda Vista  
Mission Valley (partial—area west of I-15)  
Serra Mesa

#### Neighborhoods

Birdland  
Clairemont Mesa East  
Clairemont Mesa West  
Linda Vista  
Mission Valley East  
Mission Valley West  
Morena  
North Clairemont  
Serra Mesa

---

### District E

#### Community Planning Areas

Centre City  
Clairemont Mesa (partial—area west of Tecolote Canyon)  
Midway-Pacific Highway  
Mission Bay Park  
Mission Beach  
Ocean Beach  
Old Town San Diego  
Pacific Beach  
Peninsula  
Uptown (partial—neighborhoods of Mission Hills, Park West, and Bankers Hill)

#### Neighborhoods

Bankers Hill  
Bay Ho  
Bay Park  
Core-Columbia  
Cortez Hill  
East Village  
Gaslamp Quarter  
Harborview/Little Italy  
Horton Plaza  
La Jolla (partial—area in Pacific Beach CPA)  
La Playa  
Loma Portal  
Midtown  
Midway  
Mission Hills  
Mission Beach  
Ocean Beach  
Old Town  
Pacific Beach (partial—area in Pacific Beach CPA)  
Park West  
Point Loma Heights  
Roseville/Fleet Ridge  
Sunset Cliffs  
Wooded Area

*\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request.*

*However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.*

## “CORE AREAS” DISCUSSION MAP\*

### District F

#### Community Planning Areas

City Heights (partial—all but area south of Home in Fairmont Park and east of Auburn Dr/Altadena Ave in Chollas Creek)  
College Area  
East Elliott  
Eastern Area (partial—area north of University to 58<sup>th</sup> St to Streamview Dr to Vista Grande Dr to Celia Vista Dr)  
Kensington-Talmadge  
Mission Valley (partial—area east of I-15)  
Navajo  
Tierrasanta

#### Neighborhoods

Allied Gardens  
Azalea/Hollywood Park  
Castle  
Cherokee Point  
Chollas Creek (partial—west of Altadena Ave)  
Colina del Sol  
College East  
College West  
Corridor  
Del Cerro  
El Cerrito (partial—north of University Ave.)  
Fairmont Village (partial—west of Home Ave)  
Fox Canyon  
Grantville  
Islenair  
Kensington  
Lake Murray  
Redwood Village (partial—all but area between Chollas Pkwy and 58th St)  
Rolando  
Rolando Park (partial—area north of Celia Vista Dr. and west of Racine Rd.)  
San Carlos  
Swan Canyon  
Talmadge  
Teralta East  
Teralta West  
Tierrasanta

---

### District G

#### Community Planning Areas

Balboa Park  
Greater Golden Hill  
Greater North Park  
Normal Heights  
Uptown (partial—neighborhoods of Hillcrest and University Heights)

#### Neighborhoods

Adams North  
Balboa Park  
Burlingame  
Golden Hill  
Hillcrest  
Normal Heights  
North Park  
South Park  
University Heights

*\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request.*

*However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.*

## "CORE AREAS" DISCUSSION MAP\*

### District H

#### Community Planning Areas

Eastern Area (partial—area south of University to 58<sup>th</sup> St to Streamview Dr to Vista Grande Dr to Celia Vista Dr)  
Encanto Neighborhoods  
Skyline-Paradise Hills  
Southeastern San Diego (partial—neighborhoods of Mt Hope, Mountain View, and Southcrest)

#### Neighborhoods

Alta Vista  
Bay Terraces  
Broadway Heights  
Chollas Creek (partial—east of Altadena Ave)  
Chollas View  
El Cerrito (partial—south of University Ave.)  
Emerald Hills  
Encanto  
Fairmont Village (partial—east of Home Ave)  
Jamacha  
Lincoln Park  
Lomita  
Mt Hope  
Mountain View  
Oak Park  
Paradise Hills  
Redwood Village (partial—area between Chollas Pkwy and 58th St)  
Ridgeview/Webster  
Rolando Park (partial—area south of Celia Vista Dr. and east of Racine Rd.)  
Skyline  
Southcrest  
Valencia Park

---

### District I

#### Community Planning Areas

Barrio Logan  
Otay Mesa  
Otay Mesa-Nestor  
San Ysidro  
Southeastern San Diego (partial—neighborhoods of Grant Hill, Logan Heights, Memorial, Shelltown, Sherman Heights, and Stockton)  
Tijuana River Valley


#### Neighborhoods

Barrio Logan  
Border  
Egger Highlands  
Grant Hill  
Logan Heights  
Memorial  
Nestor  
Ocean Crest  
Otay Mesa  
Otay Mesa West  
Palm City  
San Ysidro  
Shelltown  
Sherman Heights  
Stockton


*\*This map was prepared at Commissioner request.*

*However, the districts shown do not meet equal population requirements. This map is not to be construed as a draft preliminary plan under consideration by the Redistricting Commission.*


# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1




DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1



# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1



# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1



# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1



| Dist  | Tot. Pop. | Dev.   | % Dev. | NH      |         |         |            |         |            |            |              |  |
|-------|-----------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|------------|------------|--------------|--|
|       |           |        |        | Hisp    | Wht     | DOJ Blk | NH DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | NH DOJ Hwn | NH DOJ Oth | NH DOJ OthMR |  |
| A     | 144,899   | 275    | 0.19%  | 13,745  | 87,532  | 4,171   | 636        | 36,852  | 531        | 444        | 988          |  |
| B     | 147,354   | 2,730  | 1.89%  | 12,564  | 93,252  | 1,996   | 482        | 37,531  | 284        | 600        | 645          |  |
| C     | 144,813   | 189    | 0.13%  | 23,901  | 64,241  | 5,867   | 831        | 47,048  | 972        | 494        | 1,459        |  |
| D     | 141,841   | -2,783 | -1.92% | 28,571  | 81,358  | 8,616   | 1,171      | 19,270  | 957        | 512        | 1,386        |  |
| E     | 145,257   | 633    | 0.44%  | 20,686  | 107,100 | 6,278   | 1,170      | 7,960   | 537        | 713        | 813          |  |
| F     | 144,587   | -37    | -0.03% | 47,781  | 56,594  | 15,199  | 758        | 21,970  | 618        | 425        | 1,242        |  |
| G     | 143,202   | -1,422 | -0.98% | 47,890  | 69,983  | 11,570  | 1,100      | 10,470  | 604        | 479        | 1,106        |  |
| H     | 144,834   | 210    | 0.15%  | 71,200  | 11,968  | 27,155  | 451        | 30,359  | 1,552      | 266        | 1,883        |  |
| I     | 144,830   | 206    | 0.14%  | 108,630 | 14,776  | 6,671   | 402        | 12,859  | 482        | 209        | 801          |  |
| Total | 1,301,617 | 5,513  | 3.81%  | 374,968 | 586,804 | 87,523  | 7,001      | 224,319 | 6,537      | 4,142      | 10,323       |  |
| Ideal | 144,624   |        |        |         |         |         |            |         |            |            |              |  |

| Dist  | % Hisp. | % NH  |         |         | % NH    |         |         |           |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
|       |         | Wht   | DOJ Blk | DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR |
| A     | 9.5%    | 60.4% | 2.9%    | 0.4%    | 25.4%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.7%      |
| B     | 8.5%    | 63.3% | 1.4%    | 0.3%    | 25.5%   | 0.2%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%      |
| C     | 16.5%   | 44.4% | 4.1%    | 0.6%    | 32.5%   | 0.7%    | 0.3%    | 1.0%      |
| D     | 20.1%   | 57.4% | 6.1%    | 0.8%    | 13.6%   | 0.7%    | 0.4%    | 1.0%      |
| E     | 14.2%   | 73.7% | 4.3%    | 0.8%    | 5.5%    | 0.4%    | 0.5%    | 0.6%      |
| F     | 33.0%   | 39.1% | 10.5%   | 0.5%    | 15.2%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.9%      |
| G     | 33.4%   | 48.9% | 8.1%    | 0.8%    | 7.3%    | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      |
| H     | 49.2%   | 8.3%  | 18.7%   | 0.3%    | 21.0%   | 1.1%    | 0.2%    | 1.3%      |
| I     | 75.0%   | 10.2% | 4.6%    | 0.3%    | 8.9%    | 0.3%    | 0.1%    | 0.6%      |
| Total | 28.8%   | 45.1% | 6.7%    | 0.5%    | 17.2%   | 0.5%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      |

Abbreviations:  
 Dev. = Deviation  
 Hisp = Hispanic  
 NH = "Non-Hispanic"  
 Wht = White  
 Blk = Black / African American  
 Ind = Native American  
 Asn = Asian American  
 Haw or Hwn = Hawaiian and Pacific Islander  
 Oth = Other  
 OthMR or MR = Multi-Race  
 Fil = Filipino  
 "DOJ" = Aggregated according to U.S. Department of Justice guidance  
 Reg = Voter Registration  
 CVAP = Citizen Voting Age Population

| Dist  | NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ |          |           |               |         |         |         |         |           | Asn +     |            |           |           |        | Asn +     |            |           |           |        |
|-------|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------|
|       | 18+ Pop                       | H18+ Pop | NH18+ Wht | NH18+ DOJ Blk | DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR | Tot. Reg. | Hisp. Reg. | Asn. Reg. | Fil. Reg. | Reg.   | Tot. Vote | Hisp. Vote | Asn. Vote | Fil. Vote | Vote   |
| A     | 108,070                       | 8,946    | 68,355    | 2,815         | 463     | 26,290  | 371     | 293     | 537       | 79,613    | 6,396      | 5,878     | 2,058     | 7,936  | 54,801    | 3,738      | 3,210     | 25        | 3,235  |
| B     | 119,954                       | 9,524    | 76,909    | 1,585         | 369     | 30,477  | 215     | 420     | 455       | 78,243    | 4,206      | 7,369     | 594       | 7,963  | 53,225    | 2,418      | 3,584     | 12        | 3,596  |
| C     | 115,199                       | 16,644   | 54,517    | 4,250         | 689     | 37,102  | 745     | 350     | 902       | 69,856    | 9,271      | 6,703     | 3,291     | 9,994  | 44,386    | 5,136      | 3,308     | 39        | 3,347  |
| D     | 113,034                       | 19,576   | 69,379    | 5,940         | 925     | 15,349  | 725     | 366     | 774       | 70,266    | 7,806      | 3,311     | 1,038     | 4,349  | 45,209    | 4,086      | 1,713     | 25        | 1,738  |
| E     | 129,662                       | 17,007   | 97,695    | 5,277         | 1,046   | 6,971   | 435     | 613     | 618       | 80,004    | 5,724      | 1,491     | 678       | 2,169  | 49,203    | 2,827      | 817       | 12        | 829    |
| F     | 110,455                       | 31,064   | 49,603    | 10,584        | 609     | 17,084  | 489     | 282     | 740       | 66,750    | 10,350     | 4,677     | 610       | 5,287  | 39,065    | 4,592      | 2,207     | 16        | 2,223  |
| G     | 119,819                       | 34,173   | 65,071    | 9,072         | 986     | 8,859   | 495     | 385     | 778       | 75,873    | 11,895     | 2,094     | 727       | 2,821  | 46,958    | 6,028      | 1,157     | 23        | 1,180  |
| H     | 102,757                       | 45,625   | 10,486    | 19,911        | 363     | 23,973  | 1,167   | 187     | 1,045     | 55,805    | 19,908     | 863       | 3,873     | 4,736  | 27,184    | 8,823      | 360       | 60        | 420    |
| I     | 103,299                       | 72,895   | 13,285    | 5,276         | 342     | 10,456  | 402     | 148     | 495       | 46,452    | 29,751     | 371       | 2,109     | 2,480  | 22,521    | 13,439     | 146       | 23        | 169    |
| Total | 1,022,249                     | 255,454  | 505,300   | 64,710        | 5,792   | 176,561 | 5,044   | 3,044   | 6,344     | 622,862   | 105,307    | 32,757    | 14,978    | 47,735 | 382,552   | 51,087     | 16,502    | 235       | 16,737 |

| Dist  | % NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ |           |         |               |         |         |         |           | % Asn        |             |             |             | % Asn        |             |             |             |
|-------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|       | % H18+ Pop                      | NH18+ Wht | DOJ Blk | NH18+ DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR | % Hisp. Reg. | % Asn. Reg. | % Fil. Reg. | + Fil. Reg. | % Hisp. Vote | % Asn. Vote | % Fil. Vote | + Fil. Vote |
| A     | 8.3%                            | 63.3%     | 2.6%    | 0.4%          | 24.3%   | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.5%      | 8.0%         | 7.4%        | 2.6%        | 10.0%       | 6.8%         | 5.9%        | 0.0%        | 5.9%        |
| B     | 7.9%                            | 64.1%     | 1.3%    | 0.3%          | 25.4%   | 0.2%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%      | 5.4%         | 9.4%        | 0.8%        | 10.2%       | 4.5%         | 6.7%        | 0.0%        | 6.8%        |
| C     | 14.4%                           | 47.3%     | 3.7%    | 0.6%          | 32.2%   | 0.6%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      | 13.3%        | 9.6%        | 4.7%        | 14.3%       | 11.6%        | 7.5%        | 0.1%        | 7.5%        |
| D     | 17.3%                           | 61.4%     | 5.3%    | 0.8%          | 13.6%   | 0.6%    | 0.3%    | 0.7%      | 11.1%        | 4.7%        | 1.5%        | 6.2%        | 9.0%         | 3.8%        | 0.1%        | 3.8%        |
| E     | 13.1%                           | 75.3%     | 4.1%    | 0.8%          | 5.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.5%    | 0.5%      | 7.2%         | 1.9%        | 0.8%        | 2.7%        | 5.7%         | 1.7%        | 0.0%        | 1.7%        |
| F     | 28.1%                           | 44.9%     | 9.6%    | 0.6%          | 15.5%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.7%      | 15.5%        | 7.0%        | 0.9%        | 7.9%        | 11.8%        | 5.6%        | 0.0%        | 5.7%        |
| G     | 28.5%                           | 54.3%     | 7.6%    | 0.8%          | 7.4%    | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.6%      | 15.7%        | 2.8%        | 1.0%        | 3.7%        | 12.8%        | 2.5%        | 0.0%        | 2.5%        |
| H     | 44.4%                           | 10.2%     | 19.4%   | 0.4%          | 23.3%   | 1.1%    | 0.2%    | 1.0%      | 35.7%        | 1.5%        | 6.9%        | 8.5%        | 32.5%        | 1.3%        | 0.2%        | 1.5%        |
| I     | 70.6%                           | 12.9%     | 5.1%    | 0.3%          | 10.1%   | 0.4%    | 0.1%    | 0.5%      | 64.0%        | 0.8%        | 4.5%        | 5.3%        | 59.7%        | 0.6%        | 0.1%        | 0.8%        |
| Total | 25.0%                           | 49.4%     | 6.3%    | 0.6%          | 17.3%   | 0.5%    | 0.3%    | 0.6%      | 16.9%        | 5.3%        | 2.4%        | 7.7%        | 13.4%        | 4.3%        | 0.1%        | 4.4%        |

| Dist  | Special Tabulation |           |             |             |             |             |             |            | American Community Survey (ACS) |           |             |             |             |             |             |            |             |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
|       | Total CVAP         | Hisp CVAP | NH Wht CVAP | NH Blk CVAP | NH Asn CVAP | NH Ind CVAP | NH Hwn CVAP | NH MR CVAP | Total CVAP                      | Hisp CVAP | NH Wht CVAP | NH Blk CVAP | NH Asn CVAP | NH Ind CVAP | NH Hwn CVAP | NH MR CVAP | NH Oth CVAP |
| A     | 94,384             | 7,243     | 66,753      | 2,760       | 15,338      | 336         | 211         | 1,760      | 93,879                          | 7,198     | 65,878      | 2,837       | 15,708      | 394         | 213         | 2,545      | 1,833       |
| B     | 99,985             | 7,007     | 74,452      | 1,033       | 15,816      | 77          | 45          | 1,555      | 100,178                         | 7,060     | 74,494      | 1,027       | 15,948      | 97          | 64          | 1,943      | 2,400       |
| C     | 102,889            | 12,226    | 58,921      | 2,798       | 25,979      | 345         | 340         | 2,218      | 102,333                         | 12,212    | 58,570      | 2,769       | 25,574      | 501         | 395         | 3,261      | 4,237       |
| D     | 105,727            | 14,300    | 73,167      | 5,463       | 8,967       | 585         | 1,008       | 2,248      | 105,705                         | 14,044    | 73,352      | 5,539       | 9,178       | 807         | 1,023       | 3,097      | 3,641       |
| E     | 115,358            | 10,906    | 93,930      | 3,981       | 3,777       | 439         | 550         | 1,722      | 114,862                         | 10,996    | 93,100      | 4,061       | 3,793       | 767         | 590         | 2,437      | 1,937       |
| F     | 88,267             | 16,196    | 50,526      | 9,081       | 10,105      | 447         | 214         | 1,660      | 88,539                          | 16,417    | 50,288      | 9,232       | 10,217      | 603         | 281         | 2,596      | 4,805       |
| G     | 101,473            | 19,242    | 66,350      | 7,397       | 5,387       | 607         | 224         | 2,218      | 101,232                         | 19,078    | 65,855      | 7,520       | 5,486       | 1,197       | 291         | 3,689      | 5,226       |
| H     | 74,910             | 22,511    | 10,707      | 20,628      | 17,747      | 140         | 1,728       | 1,444      | 75,102                          | 22,502    | 10,823      | 20,544      | 18,109      | 290         | 1,904       | 2,063      | 5,558       |
| I     | 72,199             | 41,567    | 15,840      | 6,033       | 7,335       | 233         | 133         | 1,018      | 72,390                          | 41,568    | 15,906      | 6,311       | 7,579       | 594         | 158         | 2,115      | 9,207       |
| Total | 855,192            | 151,199   | 510,647     | 59,174      | 110,451     | 3,209       | 4,453       | 15,842     | 854,220                         | 151,076   | 508,267     | 59,839      | 111,592     | 5,249       | 4,919       | 23,746     | 38,847      |

| Dist  | Special Tabulation |             |               |               |               |               |               |              | American Community Survey (ACS) |             |               |               |               |               |               |              |               |
|-------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
|       | % Total CVAP       | % Hisp CVAP | % NH Wht CVAP | % NH Blk CVAP | % NH Asn CVAP | % NH Ind CVAP | % NH Hwn CVAP | % NH MR CVAP | % Total CVAP                    | % Hisp CVAP | % NH Wht CVAP | % NH Blk CVAP | % NH Asn CVAP | % NH Ind CVAP | % NH Hwn CVAP | % NH MR CVAP | % NH Oth CVAP |
| A     | 87.3%              | 7.7%        | 70.7%         | 2.9%          | 16.3%         | 0.4%          | 0.2%          | 1.9%         | 86.9%                           | 7.7%        | 70.2%         | 3.0%          | 16.7%         | 0.4%          | 0.2%          | 2.7%         | 2.0%          |
| B     | 83.4%              | 7.0%        | 74.5%         | 1.0%          | 15.8%         | 0.1%          | 0.0%          | 1.6%         | 83.5%                           | 7.0%        | 74.4%         | 1.0%          | 15.9%         | 0.1%          | 0.1%          | 1.9%         | 2.4%          |
| C     | 89.3%              | 11.9%       | 57.3%         | 2.7%          | 25.2%         | 0.3%          | 0.3%          | 2.2%         | 88.8%                           | 11.9%       | 57.2%         | 2.7%          | 25.0%         | 0.5%          | 0.4%          | 3.2%         | 4.1%          |
| D     | 93.5%              | 13.5%       | 69.2%         | 5.2%          | 8.5%          | 0.6%          | 1.0%          | 2.1%         | 93.5%                           | 13.3%       | 69.4%         | 5.2%          | 8.7%          | 0.8%          | 1.0%          | 2.9%         | 3.4%          |
| E     | 89.0%              | 9.5%        | 81.4%         | 3.5%          | 3.3%          | 0.4%          | 0.5%          | 1.5%         | 88.6%                           | 9.6%        | 81.1%         | 3.5%          | 3.3%          | 0.7%          | 0.5%          | 2.1%         | 1.7%          |
| F     | 79.9%              | 18.3%       | 57.2%         | 10.3%         | 11.4%         | 0.5%          | 0.2%          | 1.9%         | 80.2%                           | 18.5%       | 56.8%         | 10.4%         | 11.5%         | 0.7%          | 0.3%          | 2.9%         | 5.4%          |
| G     | 84.7%              | 19.0%       | 65.4%         | 7.3%          | 5.3%          | 0.6%          | 0.2%          | 2.2%         | 84.5%                           | 18.8%       | 65.1%         | 7.4%          | 5.4%          | 1.2%          | 0.3%          | 3.6%         | 5.2%          |
| H     | 72.9%              | 30.1%       | 14.3%         | 27.5%         | 23.7%         | 0.2%          | 2.3%          | 1.9%         | 73.1%                           | 30.0%       | 14.4%         | 27.4%         | 24.1%         | 0.4%          | 2.5%          | 2.7%         | 7.4%          |
| I     | 69.9%              | 57.6%       | 21.9%         | 8.4%          | 10.2%         | 0.3%          | 0.2%          | 1.4%         | 70.1%                           | 57.4%       | 22.0%         | 8.7%          | 10.5%         | 0.8%          | 0.2%          | 2.9%         | 12.7%         |
| Total | 83.7%              | 17.7%       | 59.7%         | 6.9%          | 12.9%         | 0.4%          | 0.5%          | 1.9%         | 83.6%                           | 17.7%       | 59.5%         | 7.0%          | 13.1%         | 0.6%          | 0.6%          | 2.8%         | 4.5%          |

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1

### District A

#### Community Plan Areas

Black Mountain Ranch  
Carmel Mountain Ranch  
Del Mar Mesa (partial—area in Poway Unified School District)  
Miramar Ranch North  
Rancho Bernardo  
Rancho Encantada  
Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area north of CA-56 and west of Salmon River Rd)  
Sabre Springs  
San Pasqual  
Scripps Ranch  
Torrey Highlands

#### Neighborhoods

Black Mountain Ranch  
Carmel Mountain Ranch  
Miramar Ranch North  
Rancho Bernardo  
Rancho Encantada  
Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area north of CA-56 and west of Salmon River Rd)  
Sabre Springs  
San Pasqual  
Scripps Ranch  
Torrey Highlands

---

### District B

#### Community Plan Areas

Carmel Valley  
Del Mar Mesa (partial—portion in Del Mar Union School District)  
Fairbanks Ranch Country Club  
La Jolla  
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—portion in Del Mar Union School District)  
NCFUA Subarea II  
Pacific Highlands Ranch  
Torrey Hills  
Torrey Pines  
University  
Via de la Valle

#### Neighborhoods

Carmel Valley  
Del Mar Heights  
La Jolla (partial—area in La Jolla CPA)  
La Jolla Village  
Mira Mesa (partial—area in University CPA)  
North City  
Pacific Beach (partial—area in La Jolla CPA)  
Sorrento Valley (partial—area in University CPA)  
Torrey Pines  
Torrey Preserve  
University City

---

### District C

#### Community Plan Areas

Clairemont Mesa (partial—area north of Balboa Ave and east of Genesee Ave)  
East Elliott  
Kearny Mesa (partial—area north of Aero Drive)  
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—portion in San Diego Unified School District)  
MCAS Miramar  
Mira Mesa

#### Neighborhoods

Bay Ho  
Clairemont Mesa East  
Clairemont Mesa West (partial—area north of Balboa Ave)  
Kearny Mesa  
MCAS Miramar  
Mira Mesa  
North Clairemont  
Sorrento Valley (partial—area in Mira Mesa CPA)

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1

### District D

#### Community Plan Areas

Clairemont Mesa (partial—area south of Balboa Ave and west of Genesee Ave)  
Kearny Mesa (partial—area south of Aero Drive)  
Linda Vista  
Mission Bay Park (partial—area east of Ingraham St)  
Mission Valley  
Navajo (partial—area north of Navajo Rd and west of Margerum Ave)  
Serra Mesa  
Tierrasanta

#### Neighborhoods

Allied Gardens  
Bay Park  
Birdland  
Grantville  
Linda Vista  
Mission Beach (partial—area east of Ingraham St)  
Mission Valley East  
Mission Valley West  
Morena  
Serra Mesa  
Tierrasanta

---

### District E

#### Community Plan Areas

Centre City  
Midway-Pacific Highway  
Mission Bay Park (partial—area west of Ingraham St)  
Mission Beach  
Ocean Beach  
Old Town San Diego  
Pacific Beach  
Peninsula  
Uptown (partial—neighborhood of Mission Hills)

#### Neighborhoods

Core-Columbia  
Cortez Hill  
East Village  
Gaslamp Quarter  
Harborview/Little Italy  
Horton Plaza  
La Jolla (partial—area in Pacific Beach CPA)  
La Playa  
Loma Portal  
Midway  
Mission Hills  
Mission Beach (partial—area west of Ingraham St)  
Ocean Beach  
Old Town  
Pacific Beach (partial—area in Pacific Beach CPA)  
Point Loma Heights  
Roseville/Fleet Ridge  
Sunset Cliffs  
Wooded Area

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1

### District F

#### Community Plan Areas

City Heights (partial—neighborhoods of Chollas Creek, Colina del Sol, Fairmont Village, Fox Canyon, Islenair, Ridgeview, Swan Canyon, Teralta East, Teralta West, and Castle north of Wrightwood Ave)

College Area

Eastern Area (partial—all but the Webster area)

Kensington-Talmadge (partial—the Talmadge neighborhood)

Navajo (partial—area south of Navajo Rd and east of Margerum Ave)

#### Neighborhoods

Castle (partial—area north of Wrightwood Ave)

Chollas Creek

Colina del Sol

College East

College West

Del Cerro

El Cerrito

Fox Canyon

Grantville

Islenair

Lake Murray

Oak Park

Redwood Village

Ridgeview

Rolando

Rolando Park

San Carlos

Swan Canyon

Talmadge

Teralta East

Teralta West

---

### District G

#### Community Plan Areas

Balboa Park

City Heights (partial—neighborhoods of Azalea/Hollywood Park, Cherokee Point, Corridor, Fairmont Park, and Castle south of Wrightwood Ave)

Greater Golden Hill

Greater North Park

Kensington-Talmadge (partial—the Kensington neighborhood)

Normal Heights

Uptown (partial—all but the Mission Hills neighborhood)

#### Neighborhoods

Adams North

Azalea/Hollywood Park

Balboa Park

Burlingame

Castle (partial—area north of Wrightwood Ave)

Cherokee Point

Corridor

Fairmont Village

Golden Hill

Hillcrest

Kensington

Normal Heights

North Park

South Park

University Heights

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 1

### District H

#### Community Plan Areas

Eastern Area (partial—the Webster area)  
Encanto Neighborhoods  
Skyline-Paradise Hills  
Southeastern San Diego (partial—neighborhoods of Mt Hope, Mountain View, and Southcrest)

#### Neighborhoods

Alta Vista  
Bay Terraces  
Broadway Heights  
Chollas View  
Emerald Hills  
Encanto  
Jamacha  
Lincoln Park  
Lomita  
Mt Hope  
Mountain View  
Paradise Hills  
Skyline  
Southcrest  
Valencia Park  
Webster

---

### District I


#### Community Plan Areas

Barrio Logan  
Otay Mesa  
Otay Mesa-Nestor  
San Ysidro  
Southeastern San Diego (partial—neighborhoods of Grant Hill, Logan Heights, Memorial, Shelltown, Sherman Heights, and Stockton)  
Tijuana River Valley


#### Neighborhoods

Barrio Logan  
Border  
Egger Highlands  
Grant Hill  
Logan Heights  
Memorial  
Nestor  
Ocean Crest  
Otay Mesa  
Otay Mesa West  
Palm City  
San Ysidro  
Shelltown  
Sherman Heights  
Stockton


# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2




DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2




DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2



DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2



# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2



# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2



| Dist  | Tot. Pop. | Dev.   | % Dev. | NH      |         |         |            |         |            |            |              |  |
|-------|-----------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|------------|------------|--------------|--|
|       |           |        |        | Hisp    | Wht     | DOJ Blk | NH DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | NH DOJ Hwn | NH DOJ Oth | NH DOJ OthMR |  |
| A     | 143,573   | -1,051 | -0.73% | 13,369  | 83,785  | 4,006   | 598        | 39,906  | 521        | 414        | 974          |  |
| B     | 147,356   | 2,732  | 1.89%  | 12,564  | 93,252  | 1,998   | 482        | 37,531  | 284        | 600        | 645          |  |
| C     | 142,333   | -2,291 | -1.58% | 26,850  | 55,122  | 8,571   | 870        | 47,577  | 1,151      | 502        | 1,690        |  |
| D     | 144,220   | -404   | -0.28% | 25,071  | 91,158  | 9,417   | 1,065      | 15,075  | 728        | 471        | 1,235        |  |
| E     | 144,933   | 309    | 0.21%  | 24,143  | 101,889 | 3,725   | 1,090      | 11,948  | 648        | 657        | 833          |  |
| F     | 143,583   | -1,041 | -0.72% | 76,772  | 32,307  | 15,894  | 801        | 15,777  | 522        | 391        | 1,119        |  |
| G     | 145,621   | 997    | 0.69%  | 25,334  | 98,963  | 8,498   | 1,211      | 9,414   | 578        | 621        | 1,002        |  |
| H     | 145,168   | 544    | 0.38%  | 62,235  | 15,552  | 28,743  | 482        | 34,232  | 1,623      | 277        | 2,024        |  |
| I     | 144,830   | 206    | 0.14%  | 108,630 | 14,776  | 6,671   | 402        | 12,859  | 482        | 209        | 801          |  |
| Total | 1,301,617 | 5,023  | 3.47%  | 374,968 | 586,804 | 87,523  | 7,001      | 224,319 | 6,537      | 4,142      | 10,323       |  |
| Ideal | 144,624   |        |        |         |         |         |            |         |            |            |              |  |

| Dist  | % Hisp. | % NH  |         |         | % NH    |         |         |           |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
|       |         | Wht   | DOJ Blk | DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR |
| A     | 9.3%    | 58.4% | 2.8%    | 0.4%    | 27.8%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.7%      |
| B     | 8.5%    | 63.3% | 1.4%    | 0.3%    | 25.5%   | 0.2%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%      |
| C     | 18.9%   | 38.7% | 6.0%    | 0.6%    | 33.4%   | 0.8%    | 0.4%    | 1.2%      |
| D     | 17.4%   | 63.2% | 6.5%    | 0.7%    | 10.5%   | 0.5%    | 0.3%    | 0.9%      |
| E     | 16.7%   | 70.3% | 2.6%    | 0.8%    | 8.2%    | 0.4%    | 0.5%    | 0.6%      |
| F     | 53.5%   | 22.5% | 11.1%   | 0.6%    | 11.0%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      |
| G     | 17.4%   | 68.0% | 5.8%    | 0.8%    | 6.5%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%    | 0.7%      |
| H     | 42.9%   | 10.7% | 19.8%   | 0.3%    | 23.6%   | 1.1%    | 0.2%    | 1.4%      |
| I     | 75.0%   | 10.2% | 4.6%    | 0.3%    | 8.9%    | 0.3%    | 0.1%    | 0.6%      |
| Total | 28.8%   | 45.1% | 6.7%    | 0.5%    | 17.2%   | 0.5%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      |

Abbreviations:  
 Dev. = Deviation  
 Hisp = Hispanic  
 NH = "Non-Hispanic"  
 Wht = White  
 Blk = Black / African American  
 Ind = Native American  
 Asn = Asian American  
 Haw or Hwn = Hawaiian and Pacific Islander  
 Oth = Other  
 OthMR or MR = Multi-Race  
 Fil = Filipino  
 "DOJ" = Aggregated according to U.S. Department of Justice guidance  
 Reg = Voter Registration  
 CVAP = Citizen Voting Age Population

| Dist  | NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ |           |           |               |         |         |         |         |           | Asn +     |            |           |           |                 | Asn +     |            |           |           |                 |
|-------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
|       | H18+ 18+ Pop                  | NH18+ Pop | NH18+ Wht | NH18+ DOJ Blk | DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR | Tot. Reg. | Hisp. Reg. | Asn. Reg. | Fil. Reg. | Asn + Fil. Reg. | Tot. Vote | Hisp. Vote | Asn. Vote | Fil. Vote | Asn + Fil. Vote |
| A     | 106,814                       | 8,703     | 65,236    | 2,696         | 432     | 28,560  | 366     | 278     | 543       | 78,141    | 6,622      | 6,557     | 2,339     | 8,896           | 53,261    | 3,878      | 3,585     | 26        | 3,611           |
| B     | 119,956                       | 9,524     | 76,909    | 1,587         | 369     | 30,477  | 215     | 420     | 455       | 78,244    | 4,206      | 7,369     | 594       | 7,963           | 53,225    | 2,418      | 3,584     | 12        | 3,596           |
| C     | 112,903                       | 18,406    | 47,740    | 6,125         | 726     | 37,668  | 881     | 343     | 1,014     | 60,099    | 8,801      | 6,312     | 3,060     | 9,372           | 35,595    | 4,517      | 2,950     | 42        | 2,992           |
| D     | 115,310                       | 17,394    | 76,801    | 6,738         | 825     | 12,009  | 548     | 303     | 692       | 83,161    | 8,192      | 3,029     | 839       | 3,868           | 54,864    | 4,268      | 1,619     | 19        | 1,638           |
| E     | 125,166                       | 18,135    | 91,504    | 2,858         | 931     | 10,081  | 535     | 540     | 582       | 85,043    | 7,509      | 2,475     | 813       | 3,288           | 54,560    | 4,163      | 1,347     | 20        | 1,367           |
| F     | 104,602                       | 49,426    | 29,520    | 11,461        | 679     | 12,136  | 401     | 288     | 691       | 50,231    | 13,498     | 2,902     | 561       | 3,463           | 25,988    | 5,714      | 1,384     | 16        | 1,400           |
| G     | 129,788                       | 20,786    | 90,655    | 7,187         | 1,097   | 8,289   | 479     | 536     | 759       | 82,193    | 7,690      | 1,765     | 790       | 2,555           | 53,014    | 4,134      | 1,010     | 17        | 1,027           |
| H     | 104,411                       | 40,185    | 13,650    | 20,782        | 391     | 26,885  | 1,217   | 188     | 1,113     | 59,298    | 19,038     | 1,977     | 3,873     | 5,850           | 29,524    | 8,556      | 877       | 60        | 937             |
| I     | 103,299                       | 72,895    | 13,285    | 5,276         | 342     | 10,456  | 402     | 148     | 495       | 46,452    | 29,751     | 371       | 2,109     | 2,480           | 22,521    | 13,439     | 146       | 23        | 169             |
| Total | 1,022,249                     | 255,454   | 505,300   | 64,710        | 5,792   | 176,561 | 5,044   | 3,044   | 6,344     | 622,862   | 105,307    | 32,757    | 14,978    | 47,735          | 382,552   | 51,087     | 16,502    | 235       | 16,737          |

| Dist  | % NH18+ % NH18+ % NH18+ % NH18+ % NH18+ |           |         |               |         |         |         |           | % Asn +      |             |             |                   | % Asn +      |             |             |                   |
|-------|---|-----------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
|       | % H18+ Pop                              | NH18+ Wht | DOJ Blk | NH18+ DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR | % Hisp. Reg. | % Asn. Reg. | % Fil. Reg. | % Asn + Fil. Reg. | % Hisp. Vote | % Asn. Vote | % Fil. Vote | % Asn + Fil. Vote |
| A     | 8.1%                                    | 61.1%     | 2.5%    | 0.4%          | 26.7%   | 0.3%    | 0.3%    | 0.5%      | 8.5%         | 8.4%        | 3.0%        | 11.4%             | 7.3%         | 6.7%        | 0.0%        | 6.8%              |
| B     | 7.9%                                    | 64.1%     | 1.3%    | 0.3%          | 25.4%   | 0.2%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%      | 5.4%         | 9.4%        | 0.8%        | 10.2%             | 4.5%         | 6.7%        | 0.0%        | 6.8%              |
| C     | 16.3%                                   | 42.3%     | 5.4%    | 0.6%          | 33.4%   | 0.8%    | 0.3%    | 0.9%      | 14.6%        | 10.5%       | 5.1%        | 15.6%             | 12.7%        | 8.3%        | 0.1%        | 8.4%              |
| D     | 15.1%                                   | 66.6%     | 5.8%    | 0.7%          | 10.4%   | 0.5%    | 0.3%    | 0.6%      | 9.9%         | 3.6%        | 1.0%        | 4.7%              | 7.8%         | 3.0%        | 0.0%        | 3.0%              |
| E     | 14.5%                                   | 73.1%     | 2.3%    | 0.7%          | 8.1%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%    | 0.5%      | 8.8%         | 2.9%        | 1.0%        | 3.9%              | 7.6%         | 2.5%        | 0.0%        | 2.5%              |
| F     | 47.3%                                   | 28.2%     | 11.0%   | 0.6%          | 11.6%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.7%      | 26.9%        | 5.8%        | 1.1%        | 6.9%              | 22.0%        | 5.3%        | 0.1%        | 5.4%              |
| G     | 16.0%                                   | 69.8%     | 5.5%    | 0.8%          | 6.4%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%    | 0.6%      | 9.4%         | 2.1%        | 1.0%        | 3.1%              | 7.8%         | 1.9%        | 0.0%        | 1.9%              |
| H     | 38.5%                                   | 13.1%     | 19.9%   | 0.4%          | 25.7%   | 1.2%    | 0.2%    | 1.1%      | 32.1%        | 3.3%        | 6.5%        | 9.9%              | 29.0%        | 3.0%        | 0.2%        | 3.2%              |
| I     | 70.6%                                   | 12.9%     | 5.1%    | 0.3%          | 10.1%   | 0.4%    | 0.1%    | 0.5%      | 64.0%        | 0.8%        | 4.5%        | 5.3%              | 59.7%        | 0.6%        | 0.1%        | 0.8%              |
| Total | 25.0%                                   | 49.4%     | 6.3%    | 0.6%          | 17.3%   | 0.5%    | 0.3%    | 0.6%      | 16.9%        | 5.3%        | 2.4%        | 7.7%              | 13.4%        | 4.3%        | 0.1%        | 4.4%              |

| Dist  | Special Tabulation |           |             |             |             |             |             |            | American Community Survey (ACS) |           |             |             |             |             |             |            |             |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
|       | Total CVAP         | Hisp CVAP | NH Wht CVAP | NH Blk CVAP | NH Asn CVAP | NH Ind CVAP | NH Hwn CVAP | NH MR CVAP | Total CVAP                      | Hisp CVAP | NH Wht CVAP | NH Blk CVAP | NH Asn CVAP | NH Ind CVAP | NH Hwn CVAP | NH MR CVAP | NH Oth CVAP |
| A     | 94,933             | 7,193     | 65,090      | 2,673       | 17,815      | 336         | 102         | 1,750      | 93,834                          | 7,125     | 64,256      | 2,719       | 17,605      | 417         | 106         | 2,548      | 1,711       |
| B     | 99,986             | 7,007     | 74,453      | 1,033       | 15,817      | 77          | 45          | 1,555      | 100,179                         | 7,060     | 74,495      | 1,027       | 15,949      | 97          | 64          | 1,943      | 2,400       |
| C     | 96,277             | 12,592    | 50,180      | 4,982       | 24,642      | 468         | 1,065       | 2,318      | 96,246                          | 12,580    | 49,938      | 5,035       | 24,771      | 622         | 1,101       | 3,225      | 4,602       |
| D     | 110,459            | 13,563    | 80,013      | 6,641       | 7,004       | 368         | 408         | 2,447      | 110,302                         | 13,530    | 79,366      | 6,727       | 7,322       | 544         | 421         | 3,269      | 2,927       |
| E     | 118,700            | 13,199    | 95,345      | 1,635       | 6,072       | 402         | 283         | 1,714      | 118,488                         | 13,189    | 94,898      | 1,660       | 6,196       | 575         | 295         | 2,739      | 3,315       |
| F     | 69,826             | 21,456    | 29,517      | 9,861       | 6,974       | 554         | 63          | 1,353      | 69,925                          | 21,168    | 29,419      | 10,199      | 7,053       | 1,121       | 91          | 2,320      | 6,445       |
| G     | 112,912            | 13,291    | 86,332      | 5,265       | 4,630       | 600         | 605         | 2,144      | 112,750                         | 13,368    | 85,998      | 5,275       | 4,667       | 1,024       | 700         | 3,271      | 2,372       |
| H     | 79,900             | 21,331    | 13,877      | 21,051      | 20,162      | 170         | 1,750       | 1,543      | 80,106                          | 21,487    | 13,991      | 20,886      | 20,449      | 256         | 1,983       | 2,317      | 5,867       |
| I     | 72,199             | 41,567    | 15,840      | 6,033       | 7,335       | 233         | 133         | 1,018      | 72,390                          | 41,568    | 15,906      | 6,311       | 7,579       | 594         | 158         | 2,115      | 9,207       |
| Total | 855,192            | 151,199   | 510,647     | 59,174      | 110,451     | 3,209       | 4,453       | 15,842     | 854,220                         | 151,076   | 508,267     | 59,839      | 111,592     | 5,249       | 4,919       | 23,746     | 38,847      |

| Dist  | Special Tabulation |             |               |               |               |               |               |              | American Community Survey (ACS) |             |               |               |               |               |               |              |               |
|-------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
|       | % Total CVAP       | % Hisp CVAP | % NH Wht CVAP | % NH Blk CVAP | % NH Asn CVAP | % NH Ind CVAP | % NH Hwn CVAP | % NH MR CVAP | % Total CVAP                    | % Hisp CVAP | % NH Wht CVAP | % NH Blk CVAP | % NH Asn CVAP | % NH Ind CVAP | % NH Hwn CVAP | % NH MR CVAP | % NH Oth CVAP |
| A     | 88.9%              | 7.6%        | 68.6%         | 2.8%          | 18.8%         | 0.4%          | 0.1%          | 1.8%         | 87.8%                           | 7.6%        | 68.5%         | 2.9%          | 18.8%         | 0.4%          | 0.1%          | 2.7%         | 1.8%          |
| B     | 83.4%              | 7.0%        | 74.5%         | 1.0%          | 15.8%         | 0.1%          | 0.0%          | 1.6%         | 83.5%                           | 7.0%        | 74.4%         | 1.0%          | 15.9%         | 0.1%          | 0.1%          | 1.9%         | 2.4%          |
| C     | 85.3%              | 13.1%       | 52.1%         | 5.2%          | 25.6%         | 0.5%          | 1.1%          | 2.4%         | 85.2%                           | 13.1%       | 51.9%         | 5.2%          | 25.7%         | 0.6%          | 1.1%          | 3.4%         | 4.8%          |
| D     | 95.8%              | 12.3%       | 72.4%         | 6.0%          | 6.3%          | 0.3%          | 0.4%          | 2.2%         | 95.7%                           | 12.3%       | 72.0%         | 6.1%          | 6.6%          | 0.5%          | 0.4%          | 3.0%         | 2.7%          |
| E     | 94.8%              | 11.1%       | 80.3%         | 1.4%          | 5.1%          | 0.3%          | 0.2%          | 1.4%         | 94.7%                           | 11.1%       | 80.1%         | 1.4%          | 5.2%          | 0.5%          | 0.2%          | 2.3%         | 2.8%          |
| F     | 66.8%              | 30.7%       | 42.3%         | 14.1%         | 10.0%         | 0.8%          | 0.1%          | 1.9%         | 66.8%                           | 30.3%       | 42.1%         | 14.6%         | 10.1%         | 1.6%          | 0.1%          | 3.3%         | 9.2%          |
| G     | 87.0%              | 11.8%       | 76.5%         | 4.7%          | 4.1%          | 0.5%          | 0.5%          | 1.9%         | 86.9%                           | 11.9%       | 76.3%         | 4.7%          | 4.1%          | 0.9%          | 0.6%          | 2.9%         | 2.1%          |
| H     | 76.5%              | 26.7%       | 17.4%         | 26.3%         | 25.2%         | 0.2%          | 2.2%          | 1.9%         | 76.7%                           | 26.8%       | 17.5%         | 26.1%         | 25.5%         | 0.3%          | 2.5%          | 2.9%         | 7.3%          |
| I     | 69.9%              | 57.6%       | 21.9%         | 8.4%          | 10.2%         | 0.3%          | 0.2%          | 1.4%         | 70.1%                           | 57.4%       | 22.0%         | 8.7%          | 10.5%         | 0.8%          | 0.2%          | 2.9%         | 12.7%         |
| Total | 83.7%              | 17.7%       | 59.7%         | 6.9%          | 12.9%         | 0.4%          | 0.5%          | 1.9%         | 83.6%                           | 17.7%       | 59.5%         | 7.0%          | 13.1%         | 0.6%          | 0.6%          | 2.8%         | 4.5%          |

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2

### District A

#### Community Plan Areas

Black Mountain Ranch  
Carmel Mountain Ranch  
Del Mar Mesa (partial - area in Poway Unified School District)  
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial - portion in Poway Unified School District)  
Miramar Ranch North  
Rancho Bernardo  
Rancho Encantada  
Rancho Peñasquitos  
Sabre Springs  
San Pasqual  
Scripps Ranch (partial—area north of Mira Mesa Blvd, Scripps Lake Dr to Timberlake Dr to Scripps Trl to Semillon Blvd to Pomerado Rd)  
Torrey Highlands

#### Neighborhoods

Black Mountain Ranch  
Carmel Mountain Ranch  
Miramar Ranch North  
Rancho Bernardo  
Rancho Encantada  
Rancho Peñasquitos  
Sabre Springs  
San Pasqual  
Scripps Ranch (partial—area north of Mira Mesa Blvd, Scripps Lake Dr to Timberlake Dr to Scripps Trl to Semillon Blvd to Pomerado Rd)  
Torrey Highlands

---

### District B

#### Community Plan Areas

Carmel Valley  
Del Mar Mesa (partial—portion in Del Mar Union School District)  
Fairbanks Ranch Country Club  
La Jolla  
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—portion in Del Mar Union School District)  
NCFUA Subarea II  
Pacific Highlands Ranch  
Torrey Hills  
Torrey Pines  
University  
Via de la Valle

#### Neighborhoods

Carmel Valley  
Del Mar Heights  
La Jolla (partial—area in La Jolla CPA)  
La Jolla Village  
Mira Mesa (partial—area in University CPA)  
North City  
Pacific Beach (partial—area in La Jolla CPA)  
Sorrento Valley (partial—area in University CPA)  
Torrey Pines  
Torrey Preserve  
University City

---

### District C

#### Community Plan Areas

Kearny Mesa  
Linda Vista (partial—neighborhood of Linda Vista)  
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—portion not in Del Mar Union School District)  
MCAS Miramar (partial—west of I-15)  
Mira Mesa  
Mission Valley (partial—area between CA-163 and I-15)  
Serra Mesa

#### Neighborhoods

Birdland  
Kearny Mesa  
Linda Vista  
MCAS Miramar (partial—west of I-15)  
Mira Mesa  
Mission Valley East  
Serra Mesa  
Sorrento Valley (partial—area in Mira Mesa CPA)

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2

### District D

#### Community Plan Areas

College Area  
East Elliott  
Eastern Area (partial—the neighborhoods of El Cerrito Rolando, and Rolando Park)  
Kensington-Talmadge  
MCAS Miramar (partial—east of I-15)  
Mission Valley (partial—area east of I-15)  
Navajo  
Scripps Ranch (partial—area south of Mira Mesa Blvd, Scripps Lake Dr to Timberlake Dr to Scripps Trl to Semillon Blvd to Pomerado Rd)  
Tierrasanta

#### Neighborhoods

Allied Gardens  
College East  
College West  
Del Cerro  
El Cerrito  
Grantville  
Kensington  
Lake Murray  
MCAS Miramar (partial—east of I-15)  
Rolando  
Rolando Park  
San Carlos  
Scripps Ranch (partial—area south of Mira Mesa Blvd, Scripps Lake Dr to Timberlake Dr to Scripps Trl to Semillon Blvd to Pomerado Rd)  
Talmadge  
Tierrasanta

---

### District E

#### Community Plan Areas

Clairemont Mesa  
Linda Vista (partial—the Morena neighborhood)  
Mission Bay Park  
Mission Beach  
Mission Valley (partial—area west of CA-163)  
Ocean Beach  
Pacific Beach

#### Neighborhoods

Bay Ho  
Bay Park  
Clairemont Mesa East  
Clairemont Mesa West  
La Jolla (partial—area in Pacific Beach CPA)  
Mission Beach  
Mission Valley West  
Morena  
North Clairemont  
Ocean Beach  
Pacific Beach (partial—area in Pacific Beach CPA)

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2

### District F

#### Community Plan Areas

City Heights  
Greater Golden Hill  
Greater North Park (partial—area south of Madison and east of Arizona St to University Ave to Grim Ave to Upas St)  
Normal Heights (partial—area south of Adams Blvd)  
Southeastern (partial—area north of Market St, west of Boundary Rd and east of I-15)

#### Neighborhoods

Azalea/Hollywood Park  
Burlingame  
Castle  
Cherokee Point  
Chollas Creek  
Colina del Sol  
Corridor  
Fairmont Village  
Fox Canyon  
Golden Hill  
Islenair  
Mt Hope (partial—area north of Market St and west of Boundary Rd)  
Mountain View (partial—area west of Boundary Rd)  
Normal Heights  
North Park (partial—area south of Madison and east of Arizona St to University Ave to Grim Ave to Upas St)  
Ridgeview  
South Park  
Southcrest  
Swan Canyon  
Teralta East  
Teralta West

---

### District G

#### Community Plan Areas

Balboa Park  
Centre City  
Greater North Park (partial—area north of Madison and west of Arizona St to University Ave to Grim Ave to Upas St)  
Midway-Pacific Highway  
Normal Heights (partial—area north of Adams Blvd)  
Old Town San Diego  
Peninsula  
Uptown

#### Neighborhoods

Adams North  
Bankers Hill  
Core-Columbia  
Cortez Hill  
East Village  
Gaslamp Quarter  
Hillcrest  
Harborview/Little Italy  
Horton Plaza  
La Playa  
Loma Portal  
Midtown  
Midway  
Mission Hills  
North Park (partial—area north of Madison, west of Arizona St to University Ave to Grim Ave to Upas St)  
Old Town  
Park West  
Point Loma Heights  
Roseville/Fleet Ridge  
Sunset Cliffs  
University Heights  
Wooded Area

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 2

### District H

#### Community Plan Areas

Eastern Area (partial—neighborhoods of Oak Park, Redwood Village, and Webster)  
Encanto Neighborhoods  
Skyline-Paradise Hills  
Southeastern San Diego (partial—area south of Market St and east of Boundary Rd)

#### Neighborhoods

Alta Vista  
Bay Terraces  
Broadway Heights  
Chollas View  
Emerald Hills  
Encanto  
Jamacha  
Lincoln Park  
Lomita  
Mt Hope (partial—area south of Market St and east of Boundary Rd)  
Mountain View (partial—area east of Boundary Rd)  
Oak Park  
Paradise Hills  
Redwood Village  
Skyline  
Valencia Park  
Webster

---

### District I


#### Community Plan Areas

Barrio Logan  
Otay Mesa  
Otay Mesa-Nestor  
San Ysidro  
Southeastern San Diego (partial—neighborhoods of Grant Hill, Logan Heights, Memorial, Shelltown, Sherman Heights, and Stockton)  
Tijuana River Valley


#### Neighborhoods

Barrio Logan  
Border  
Egger Highlands  
Grant Hill  
Logan Heights  
Memorial  
Nestor  
Ocean Crest  
Otay Mesa  
Otay Mesa West  
Palm City  
San Ysidro  
Shelltown  
Sherman Heights  
Stockton


# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3




# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3



# DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3



DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3



**DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3**



| Dist  | Tot. Pop. | Dev.   | % Dev. | NH      |         |         |            |         |            |            |              |  |
|-------|-----------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|------------|------------|--------------|--|
|       |           |        |        | Hisp    | Wht     | DOJ Blk | NH DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | NH DOJ Hwn | NH DOJ Oth | NH DOJ OthMR |  |
| A     | 143,364   | -1,260 | -0.87% | 15,977  | 91,100  | 5,562   | 832        | 27,739  | 623        | 419        | 1,112        |  |
| B     | 147,354   | 2,730  | 1.89%  | 12,564  | 93,252  | 1,996   | 482        | 37,531  | 284        | 600        | 645          |  |
| C     | 144,077   | -547   | -0.38% | 18,055  | 61,867  | 5,620   | 663        | 54,977  | 916        | 498        | 1,481        |  |
| D     | 144,649   | 25     | 0.02%  | 30,851  | 81,319  | 8,250   | 1,102      | 20,436  | 949        | 489        | 1,253        |  |
| E     | 144,332   | -292   | -0.20% | 19,947  | 109,864 | 3,894   | 1,112      | 7,419   | 588        | 758        | 750          |  |
| F     | 143,604   | -1,020 | -0.71% | 72,376  | 34,741  | 15,328  | 667        | 18,468  | 509        | 383        | 1,132        |  |
| G     | 145,239   | 615    | 0.43%  | 36,731  | 84,132  | 11,011  | 1,239      | 9,945   | 560        | 508        | 1,113        |  |
| H     | 144,168   | -456   | -0.32% | 59,837  | 15,753  | 29,191  | 502        | 34,945  | 1,626      | 278        | 2,036        |  |
| I     | 144,830   | 206    | 0.14%  | 108,630 | 14,776  | 6,671   | 402        | 12,859  | 482        | 209        | 801          |  |
| Total | 1,301,617 | 3,990  | 2.76%  | 374,968 | 586,804 | 87,523  | 7,001      | 224,319 | 6,537      | 4,142      | 10,323       |  |
| Ideal | 144,624   |        |        |         |         |         |            |         |            |            |              |  |

| Dist  | % Hisp. | % NH  |         |         | % NH    |         |         |           |
|-------|---------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
|       |         | Wht   | DOJ Blk | DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR |
| A     | 11.1%   | 63.5% | 3.9%    | 0.6%    | 19.3%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      |
| B     | 8.5%    | 63.3% | 1.4%    | 0.3%    | 25.5%   | 0.2%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%      |
| C     | 12.5%   | 42.9% | 3.9%    | 0.5%    | 38.2%   | 0.6%    | 0.3%    | 1.0%      |
| D     | 21.3%   | 56.2% | 5.7%    | 0.8%    | 14.1%   | 0.7%    | 0.3%    | 0.9%      |
| E     | 13.8%   | 76.1% | 2.7%    | 0.8%    | 5.1%    | 0.4%    | 0.5%    | 0.5%      |
| F     | 50.4%   | 24.2% | 10.7%   | 0.5%    | 12.9%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      |
| G     | 25.3%   | 57.9% | 7.6%    | 0.9%    | 6.8%    | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      |
| H     | 41.5%   | 10.9% | 20.2%   | 0.3%    | 24.2%   | 1.1%    | 0.2%    | 1.4%      |
| I     | 75.0%   | 10.2% | 4.6%    | 0.3%    | 8.9%    | 0.3%    | 0.1%    | 0.6%      |
| Total | 28.8%   | 45.1% | 6.7%    | 0.5%    | 17.2%   | 0.5%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      |

Abbreviations:  
 Dev. = Deviation  
 Hisp = Hispanic  
 NH = "Non-Hispanic"  
 Wht = White  
 Blk = Black / African American  
 Ind = Native American  
 Asn = Asian American  
 Haw or Hwn = Hawaiian and Pacific Islander  
 Oth = Other  
 OthMR or MR = Multi-Race  
 Fil = Filipino  
 "DOJ" = Aggregated according to U.S. Department of Justice guidance  
 Reg = Voter Registration  
 CVAP = Citizen Voting Age Population

| Dist  | NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ |           |           |               |         |         |         |         |           | Asn +     |            |           |           |                 | Asn +     |            |           |           |                 |
|-------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
|       | H18+ 18+ Pop                  | NH18+ Pop | NH18+ Wht | NH18+ DOJ Blk | DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR | Tot. Reg. | Hisp. Reg. | Asn. Reg. | Fil. Reg. | Asn + Fil. Reg. | Tot. Vote | Hisp. Vote | Asn. Vote | Fil. Vote | Asn + Fil. Vote |
| A     | 107,669                       | 10,119    | 72,275    | 3,644         | 580     | 19,816  | 434     | 258     | 543       | 78,823    | 6,099      | 4,517     | 1,429     | 5,946           | 54,969    | 3,463      | 2,498     | 18        | 2,516           |
| B     | 119,954                       | 9,524     | 76,909    | 1,585         | 369     | 30,477  | 215     | 420     | 455       | 78,243    | 4,206      | 7,369     | 594       | 7,963           | 53,225    | 2,418      | 3,584     | 12        | 3,596           |
| C     | 110,362                       | 12,280    | 49,485    | 3,936         | 529     | 42,245  | 663     | 333     | 891       | 67,727    | 8,548      | 7,753     | 3,858     | 11,611          | 42,509    | 4,712      | 3,908     | 40        | 3,948           |
| D     | 117,115                       | 21,463    | 70,497    | 5,922         | 899     | 16,470  | 761     | 357     | 746       | 76,386    | 8,717      | 3,650     | 1,075     | 4,725           | 50,337    | 4,792      | 1,843     | 33        | 1,876           |
| E     | 125,767                       | 15,418    | 98,530    | 2,975         | 965     | 6,252   | 464     | 629     | 534       | 83,069    | 6,006      | 1,489     | 665       | 2,154           | 53,377    | 3,182      | 866       | 12        | 878             |
| F     | 105,071                       | 46,139    | 31,453    | 10,991        | 576     | 14,538  | 404     | 277     | 693       | 51,910    | 12,912     | 3,564     | 580       | 4,144           | 26,105    | 5,303      | 1,631     | 18        | 1,649           |
| G     | 129,204                       | 28,908    | 79,029    | 9,380         | 1,129   | 8,962   | 486     | 441     | 869       | 81,216    | 10,407     | 1,883     | 818       | 2,701           | 50,095    | 5,419      | 1,074     | 20        | 1,094           |
| H     | 103,808                       | 38,708    | 13,837    | 21,001        | 403     | 27,345  | 1,215   | 181     | 1,118     | 59,036    | 18,661     | 2,161     | 3,850     | 6,011           | 29,414    | 8,359      | 952       | 59        | 1,011           |
| I     | 103,299                       | 72,895    | 13,285    | 5,276         | 342     | 10,456  | 402     | 148     | 495       | 46,452    | 29,751     | 371       | 2,109     | 2,480           | 22,521    | 13,439     | 146       | 23        | 169             |
| Total | 1,022,249                     | 255,454   | 505,300   | 64,710        | 5,792   | 176,561 | 5,044   | 3,044   | 6,344     | 622,862   | 105,307    | 32,757    | 14,978    | 47,735          | 382,552   | 51,087     | 16,502    | 235       | 16,737          |

| Dist  | % NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ |           |         |               |         |         |         |           | % Asn +      |             |             |                   | % Asn +      |             |             |                   |
|-------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
|       | % H18+ Pop                      | NH18+ Wht | DOJ Blk | NH18+ DOJ Ind | DOJ Asn | DOJ Hwn | DOJ Oth | DOJ OthMR | % Hisp. Reg. | % Asn. Reg. | % Fil. Reg. | % Asn + Fil. Reg. | % Hisp. Vote | % Asn. Vote | % Fil. Vote | % Asn + Fil. Vote |
| A     | 9.4%                            | 67.1%     | 3.4%    | 0.5%          | 18.4%   | 0.4%    | 0.2%    | 0.5%      | 7.7%         | 5.7%        | 1.8%        | 7.5%              | 6.3%         | 4.5%        | 0.0%        | 4.6%              |
| B     | 7.9%                            | 64.1%     | 1.3%    | 0.3%          | 25.4%   | 0.2%    | 0.4%    | 0.4%      | 5.4%         | 9.4%        | 0.8%        | 10.2%             | 4.5%         | 6.7%        | 0.0%        | 6.8%              |
| C     | 11.1%                           | 44.8%     | 3.6%    | 0.5%          | 38.3%   | 0.6%    | 0.3%    | 0.8%      | 12.6%        | 11.4%       | 5.7%        | 17.1%             | 11.1%        | 9.2%        | 0.1%        | 9.3%              |
| D     | 18.3%                           | 60.2%     | 5.1%    | 0.8%          | 14.1%   | 0.6%    | 0.3%    | 0.6%      | 11.4%        | 4.8%        | 1.4%        | 6.2%              | 9.5%         | 3.7%        | 0.1%        | 3.7%              |
| E     | 12.3%                           | 78.3%     | 2.4%    | 0.8%          | 5.0%    | 0.4%    | 0.5%    | 0.4%      | 7.2%         | 1.8%        | 0.8%        | 2.6%              | 6.0%         | 1.6%        | 0.0%        | 1.6%              |
| F     | 43.9%                           | 29.9%     | 10.5%   | 0.5%          | 13.8%   | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.7%      | 24.9%        | 6.9%        | 1.1%        | 8.0%              | 20.3%        | 6.2%        | 0.1%        | 6.3%              |
| G     | 22.4%                           | 61.2%     | 7.3%    | 0.9%          | 6.9%    | 0.4%    | 0.3%    | 0.7%      | 12.8%        | 2.3%        | 1.0%        | 3.3%              | 10.8%        | 2.1%        | 0.0%        | 2.2%              |
| H     | 37.3%                           | 13.3%     | 20.2%   | 0.4%          | 26.3%   | 1.2%    | 0.2%    | 1.1%      | 31.6%        | 3.7%        | 6.5%        | 10.2%             | 28.4%        | 3.2%        | 0.2%        | 3.4%              |
| I     | 70.6%                           | 12.9%     | 5.1%    | 0.3%          | 10.1%   | 0.4%    | 0.1%    | 0.5%      | 64.0%        | 0.8%        | 4.5%        | 5.3%              | 59.7%        | 0.6%        | 0.1%        | 0.8%              |
| Total | 25.0%                           | 49.4%     | 6.3%    | 0.6%          | 17.3%   | 0.5%    | 0.3%    | 0.6%      | 16.9%        | 5.3%        | 2.4%        | 7.7%              | 13.4%        | 4.3%        | 0.1%        | 4.4%              |

| Dist  | Special Tabulation |           |             |             |             |             |             |            | American Community Survey (ACS) |           |             |             |             |             |             |            |             |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
|       | Total CVAP         | Hisp CVAP | NH Wht CVAP | NH Blk CVAP | NH Asn CVAP | NH Ind CVAP | NH Hwn CVAP | NH MR CVAP | Total CVAP                      | Hisp CVAP | NH Wht CVAP | NH Blk CVAP | NH Asn CVAP | NH Ind CVAP | NH Hwn CVAP | NH MR CVAP | NH Oth CVAP |
| A     | 100,813            | 8,762     | 73,244      | 3,834       | 12,502      | 260         | 309         | 1,944      | 99,273                          | 8,490     | 71,953      | 3,961       | 12,353      | 404         | 308         | 2,412      | 2,084       |
| B     | 99,985             | 7,007     | 74,452      | 1,033       | 15,816      | 77          | 45          | 1,555      | 100,178                         | 7,060     | 74,494      | 1,027       | 15,948      | 97          | 64          | 1,943      | 2,400       |
| C     | 96,403             | 9,929     | 51,595      | 3,168       | 28,476      | 334         | 367         | 2,473      | 96,696                          | 9,961     | 51,644      | 3,136       | 28,611      | 478         | 403         | 3,561      | 3,440       |
| D     | 105,053            | 14,752    | 73,089      | 4,548       | 9,281       | 728         | 873         | 1,781      | 105,618                         | 14,988    | 73,116      | 4,595       | 9,594       | 888         | 907         | 2,856      | 4,082       |
| E     | 119,741            | 11,350    | 99,919      | 2,263       | 3,753       | 432         | 435         | 1,548      | 119,661                         | 11,360    | 99,636      | 2,337       | 3,840       | 642         | 473         | 2,262      | 2,360       |
| F     | 71,493             | 18,448    | 33,058      | 9,886       | 8,060       | 380         | 172         | 1,496      | 70,784                          | 18,375    | 32,415      | 9,801       | 8,139       | 614         | 192         | 2,239      | 5,180       |
| G     | 109,341            | 17,737    | 75,517      | 7,661       | 4,922       | 620         | 370         | 2,439      | 109,269                         | 17,772    | 75,041      | 7,692       | 5,022       | 1,305       | 432         | 3,999      | 4,056       |
| H     | 80,164             | 21,647    | 13,933      | 20,749      | 20,307      | 145         | 1,750       | 1,589      | 80,353                          | 21,502    | 14,061      | 20,979      | 20,506      | 225         | 1,983       | 2,359      | 6,039       |
| I     | 72,199             | 41,567    | 15,840      | 6,033       | 7,335       | 233         | 133         | 1,018      | 72,390                          | 41,568    | 15,906      | 6,311       | 7,579       | 594         | 158         | 2,115      | 9,207       |
| Total | 855,192            | 151,199   | 510,647     | 59,174      | 110,451     | 3,209       | 4,453       | 15,842     | 854,220                         | 151,076   | 508,267     | 59,839      | 111,592     | 5,249       | 4,919       | 23,746     | 38,847      |

| Dist  | Special Tabulation |             |               |               |               |               |               |              | American Community Survey (ACS) |             |               |               |               |               |               |              |               |
|-------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
|       | % Total CVAP       | % Hisp CVAP | % NH Wht CVAP | % NH Blk CVAP | % NH Asn CVAP | % NH Ind CVAP | % NH Hwn CVAP | % NH MR CVAP | % Total CVAP                    | % Hisp CVAP | % NH Wht CVAP | % NH Blk CVAP | % NH Asn CVAP | % NH Ind CVAP | % NH Hwn CVAP | % NH MR CVAP | % NH Oth CVAP |
| A     | 93.6%              | 8.7%        | 72.7%         | 3.8%          | 12.4%         | 0.3%          | 0.3%          | 1.9%         | 92.2%                           | 8.6%        | 72.5%         | 4.0%          | 12.4%         | 0.4%          | 0.3%          | 2.4%         | 2.1%          |
| B     | 83.4%              | 7.0%        | 74.5%         | 1.0%          | 15.8%         | 0.1%          | 0.0%          | 1.6%         | 83.5%                           | 7.0%        | 74.4%         | 1.0%          | 15.9%         | 0.1%          | 0.1%          | 1.9%         | 2.4%          |
| C     | 87.4%              | 10.3%       | 53.5%         | 3.3%          | 29.5%         | 0.3%          | 0.4%          | 2.6%         | 87.6%                           | 10.3%       | 53.4%         | 3.2%          | 29.6%         | 0.5%          | 0.4%          | 3.7%         | 3.6%          |
| D     | 89.7%              | 14.0%       | 69.6%         | 4.3%          | 8.8%          | 0.7%          | 0.8%          | 1.7%         | 90.2%                           | 14.2%       | 69.2%         | 4.4%          | 9.1%          | 0.8%          | 0.9%          | 2.7%         | 3.9%          |
| E     | 95.2%              | 9.5%        | 83.4%         | 1.9%          | 3.1%          | 0.4%          | 0.4%          | 1.3%         | 95.1%                           | 9.5%        | 83.3%         | 2.0%          | 3.2%          | 0.5%          | 0.4%          | 1.9%         | 2.0%          |
| F     | 68.0%              | 25.8%       | 46.2%         | 13.8%         | 11.3%         | 0.5%          | 0.2%          | 2.1%         | 67.4%                           | 26.0%       | 45.8%         | 13.8%         | 11.5%         | 0.9%          | 0.3%          | 3.2%         | 7.3%          |
| G     | 84.6%              | 16.2%       | 69.1%         | 7.0%          | 4.5%          | 0.6%          | 0.3%          | 2.2%         | 84.6%                           | 16.3%       | 68.7%         | 7.0%          | 4.6%          | 1.2%          | 0.4%          | 3.7%         | 3.7%          |
| H     | 77.2%              | 27.0%       | 17.4%         | 25.9%         | 25.3%         | 0.2%          | 2.2%          | 2.0%         | 77.4%                           | 26.8%       | 17.5%         | 26.1%         | 25.5%         | 0.3%          | 2.5%          | 2.9%         | 7.5%          |
| I     | 69.9%              | 57.6%       | 21.9%         | 8.4%          | 10.2%         | 0.3%          | 0.2%          | 1.4%         | 70.1%                           | 57.4%       | 22.0%         | 8.7%          | 10.5%         | 0.8%          | 0.2%          | 2.9%         | 12.7%         |
| Total | 83.7%              | 17.7%       | 59.7%         | 6.9%          | 12.9%         | 0.4%          | 0.5%          | 1.9%         | 83.6%                           | 17.7%       | 59.5%         | 7.0%          | 13.1%         | 0.6%          | 0.6%          | 2.8%         | 4.5%          |

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3

### District A

#### Community Plan Areas

Carmel Mountain Ranch  
Del Mar Mesa (partial—area in Poway Unified School District)  
MCAS Miramar (partial—area east of I-15)  
Miramar Ranch North  
Navajo (partial—the Lake Murray neighborhood and areas in the Tierrasanta CPA)  
Rancho Bernardo  
Rancho Encantada  
Sabre Springs  
San Pasqual  
Scripps Ranch  
Tierrasanta

#### Neighborhoods

Carmel Mountain Ranch  
Grantville (partial—area north of Friars Rd)  
Lake Murray  
Miramar Ranch North  
Rancho Bernardo  
Rancho Encantada  
Sabre Springs  
San Pasqual  
Scripps Ranch  
Tierrasanta

---

### District B

#### Community Plan Areas

Carmel Valley  
Del Mar Mesa (partial—portion in Del Mar Union School District)  
Fairbanks Ranch Country Club  
La Jolla  
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—portion in Del Mar Union School District)  
NCFUA Subarea II  
Pacific Highlands Ranch  
Torrey Hills  
Torrey Pines  
University (Partial—all but area east of I-805)  
Via de la Valle

#### Neighborhoods

Carmel Valley  
Del Mar Heights  
La Jolla (partial—area in La Jolla CPA)  
La Jolla Village  
North City  
Pacific Beach (partial—area in La Jolla CPA)  
Torrey Pines  
Torrey Preserve  
University City

---

### District C

#### Community Plan Areas

Black Mountain Ranch  
Clairemont Mesa (partial—area north of Clairemont Mesa Blvd and east of Genesee Ave)  
Kearny Mesa (partial—area north of Aero Drive)  
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—all but area in Del Mar Union School District)  
MCAS Miramar (partial—area east of I-15)  
Mira Mesa  
Rancho Peñasquitos  
Torrey Highlands

#### Neighborhoods

Black Mountain Ranch  
Kearny Mesa  
MCAS Miramar  
Mira Mesa  
North Clairemont (partial—area east of Genesee Ave)  
Rancho Peñasquitos  
Sorrento Valley (partial—area in Mira Mesa CPA)  
Torrey Highlands

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3

### District D

#### Community Plan Areas

Clairemont Mesa (partial—areas east of Tecolote Canyon, except the area north of Clairemont Mesa Blvd and east of Genesee Ave)  
East Elliott  
Kearny Mesa (partial—area south of Aero Drive)  
Linda Vista (partial—neighborhood of Linda Vista)  
Mission Valley  
Navajo (partial—all but the Lake Murray neighborhood and the area in the Tierrasanta CPA)  
Serra Mesa

#### Neighborhoods

Allied Gardens  
Birdland  
Clairemont Mesa East  
Clairemont Mesa West  
Del Cerro  
Grantville (partial—portion south of Friars Rd)  
Linda Vista  
Mission Valley East  
Mission Valley West  
North Clairemont (partial—area west of Genesee Blvd)  
San Carlos  
Serra Mesa

---

### District E

#### Community Plan Areas

Clairemont Mesa (partial—area west of Tecolote Canyon)  
Linda Vista (partial—the Morena neighborhood)  
Midway-Pacific Highway  
Mission Bay Park  
Mission Beach  
Ocean Beach  
Old Town San Diego  
Pacific Beach  
Peninsula  
Uptown (partial—the Heritage Park area of Mission Hills)

#### Neighborhoods

Bay Ho  
Bay Park  
La Jolla (partial—area in Pacific Beach CPA)  
La Playa  
Loma Portal  
Midway  
Mission Hills (partial—the Heritage Park area)  
Mission Beach  
Morena  
Ocean Beach  
Old Town  
Pacific Beach (partial—area in Pacific Beach CPA)  
Point Loma Heights  
Roseville/Fleet Ridge  
Sunset Cliffs  
Wooded Area

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3

### District F

#### Community Plan Areas

City Heights (partial—all but area south of Home in Fairmont Park and east of Auburn Dr/Altadena Ave in Chollas Creek)  
College Area  
Eastern Area (partial—area north of University to 58<sup>th</sup> St to Streamview Dr to Vista Grande Dr to Celia Vista Dr)  
Kensington-Talmadge  
Mission Valley (partial—area east of I-15)  
Southeastern San Diego (partial—Area east of I-15 except Shelltown and the area east of Franklin Ave/42<sup>nd</sup> St between Imperial Ave and Logan Ave)

#### Neighborhoods

Azalea/Hollywood Park  
Castle

Cherokee Point  
Chollas Creek (partial—west of Altadena Ave)  
Colina del Sol  
College East  
College West  
Corridor  
El Cerrito (partial—north of University Ave.)  
Fairmont Village (partial—west of Home Ave)  
Fox Canyon  
Islenair  
Kensington  
Mt Hope  
Mountain View (partial—all but area east of Franklin Ave/42<sup>nd</sup> St between Imperial Ave and Logan Ave)  
Redwood Village (partial—all but area between Chollas Pkwy and 58th St)  
Rolando  
Rolando Park (partial—area north of Celia Vista Dr. and west of Racine Rd.)  
Southcrest  
Swan Canyon  
Talmadge  
Teralta East  
Teralta West

---

### District G

#### Community Plan Areas

Balboa Park  
Centre City  
Greater Golden Hill  
Greater North Park  
Normal Heights Uptown (partial—all but the Heritage Park area of Mission Hills)

#### Neighborhoods

Adams North  
Balboa Park  
Bankers Hill  
Burlingame  
Core-Columbia  
Cortez Hill  
East Village  
Gaslamp Quarter  
Golden Hill  
Harborview/Little Italy  
Hillcrest  
Horton Plaza  
Midtown  
Mission Hills (partial—all but the Heritage Park area)  
Normal Heights  
North Park  
Park West  
South Park

## DRAFT PRELIMINARY PLAN 3

### District H

#### Community Plan Areas

Eastern Area (partial—area south of University to 58<sup>th</sup> St to Streamview Dr to Vista Grande Dr to Celia Vista Dr)  
Encanto Neighborhoods  
Skyline-Paradise Hills  
Southeastern San Diego (partial—Area east of Franklin Ave/42<sup>nd</sup> St between Imperial Ave and Logan Ave)

#### Neighborhoods

Alta Vista  
Bay Terraces  
Broadway Heights  
Chollas Creek (partial—east of Altadena Ave)  
Chollas View  
El Cerrito (partial—south of University Ave.)  
Emerald Hills  
Encanto  
Fairmont Village (partial—east of Home Ave)  
Jamacha  
Lincoln Park  
Lomita  
Mountain View (partial—area east of Franklin Ave/42<sup>nd</sup> St between Imperial Ave and Logan Ave)  
Oak Park  
Paradise Hills  
Redwood Village (partial—area between Chollas Pkwy and 58th St)  
Ridgeview/Webster  
Rolando Park (partial—area south of Celia Vista Dr. and east of Racine Rd.)  
Skyline  
Valencia Park

---

### District I

#### Community Plan Areas

Barrio Logan  
Otay Mesa  
Otay Mesa-Nestor  
San Ysidro  
Southeastern San Diego (partial—neighborhoods of Grant Hill, Logan Heights, Memorial, Shelltown, Sherman Heights, and Stockton)  
Tijuana River Valley

#### Neighborhoods

Barrio Logan  
Border  
Egger Highlands  
Grant Hill  
Logan Heights  
Memorial  
Nestor  
Ocean Crest  
Otay Mesa  
Otay Mesa West  
Palm City  
San Ysidro  
Shelltown  
Sherman Heights  
Stockton