

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

SATURDAY, JULY 9, 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 10:12 a.m. 158 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 4:48 p.m. to the next scheduled meeting of the Redistricting Commission on Thursday, July 14th, 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

ROLL CALL:

Chair Anisha Dalal called the roll:

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

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

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

Comment 1 – Ben Rivera spoke in favor of the Community in Unity map, specifically for the creation of a second majority-Latino district. He referenced the 33% Latino population in San Diego. He also advocated for the enhancement of the African American, Asian, and LGBT empowerment districts and for keeping the Historic Barrio neighborhoods together. He stated that there was not enough outreach for this meeting, including no television public announcements.

Comment 2 – Graham Forbes asked that Mission Bay Park be kept together. He stated that Point Loma has different interests than those of the beach communities. He prefers Point Loma be with Downtown in a different district, so that neither community diverts attention from the beaches.

COMMISSION COMMENT:

Chair Dalal wished Commissioner Morrow a happy birthday on behalf of the Commission.

CITY ATTORNEY AND CITY STAFF ASSIGNED TO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION COMMENT:

None.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 25, 2011 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION MEETING

Motion by Commissioner Nishioka: To approve the Minutes for June 25, 2011. Second by Commissioner Quiroz.

Commissioner Potter asked that on pages 11 and 12, Scripps Ranch and Miramar Ranch be changed to Scripps Miramar Ranch where required. He asked for an instance of “Allied Gardens” to be corrected to “San Carlos.”

Commissioner Nishioka requested that on page 5, two instances of “Rancho Bernardo” be corrected to “Rancho Peñasquitos,” and that a sentence be added stating that freeway 56 was completed in 2004.

Commissioner Morrow requested that the first page of the minutes where her absence is noted be amended to include that there was a “lack of appropriate handicap accommodations previously requested.”

Motion to approve the Minutes for June 25, 2011 with Commissioners' changes, passed unanimously 7-0.

ITEM 2: PRESENTATION ON THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT AND GUIDLELINES FOR LINE-DRAWING BY ATTORNEY MARGUERITE MARY LEONI OF NIELSEN MERKSAMER PARRINELLO GROSS & LEONI LLP

Ms. Leoni presented an overview of the laws regarding voting rights protection and fielded questions from Commissioners.

ITEM 3: DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

Commissioner Morrow presented a map for purpose of discussion and testing.

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

Commissioner Potter presented the changes in the most recent version of his map for further discussion. He also provided a graphic showing where the bay and beaches are visible in Bay Ho and Bay Park areas. He suggested this graphic be used if these areas are divided between a Clairemont district and a Beaches and Bay district.

Mr. Johnson explained what to expect in the proposed maps and accompanying documentation.

Mr. Levitt presented the Core Areas map that incorporates all the Commission's directions, but has large population deviation. For this reason, the Core Areas map is for discussion purposes only and to complete the request by Commissioner Quiroz to create such a map.

Mr. Levitt presented Plans 1, 2, and 3. <<<Recording Time Reference 2:00>>

Comment 1 – Jane Bausa, an Oak Park resident, spoke in favor of keeping Oak Park in District 4. She favors Plan 3 because it keeps Oak Park with District 4 and creates a district with 38.2% API population.

Comment 2 – Jose Lopez, a Fox Canyon resident, spoke against splitting Fox Canyon in two. He'd like to see Ridgeview back with City Heights and he asks that Chollas Creek be used as a boundary.

Comment 3 – Deborah Hall, a resident of Point Loma, is not against plans 1, 2, or 3 because they includes the Airport with Point Loma, therefore giving them influence over noise abatement., their beach and bay issues, and traffic issues.

Comment 4 – Brian Pollard spoke on behalf of residents of District 4 and the Southeastern community in support of the Community in Unity map, Plan 3, and Commissioner Quiroz's map, as well. They each keep Webster and Oak Park in District 4. He stated that the Ridgeview residents

were asked which district they'd prefer to be a part of, and they chose to be joined with City Heights in a new district. He asked community testimony be honored. He mentioned the June 25th meeting minutes where Commissioners Potter and Kosmo stated they do not support separating Mt. View and Mt. Hope from District 4 because it further fragments Southeast Planning Group. Mr. Pollard stated that the boundary shift proposed would in fact consolidate Mt. View and Mt. Hope with other communities covered in the Southeast Planning Group. He asked that District 4 remain as District 4 for historical reasons as well as election reasons.

Comment 5 – Linda Perine thanked Commission for their work and especially Commissioner Quiroz for listening to public testimony and drawing a map that reflected that. She also thanked the consultants for creating Plan 3 according to public testimony. She wanted to make some corrections to that, including that Golden Hill be included with the new Latino empowerment district. She mentioned Commissioner Quiroz's map has the ideal District 3.

Comment 6 – Matt Corrales spoke in support of the Community in Unity map and also commended Commissioner Quiroz for adhering to public testimony when creating her map. He also spoke in favor of a second Latino district as shown in Plan 3 and in Commissioner Quiroz's map, and asked that the new Latino district have an odd number so that it can have an election next cycle. He asked that Golden Hill and Shelltown be united into the Latino district. He stated that Kensington and College areas may not fit into the final version of the Latino district because of class and ethnic differences.

Comment 7 – Dr. Kitty Reed spoke in favor of keeping Webster and Oak Park in District 4. She stated that Oak Park helped Webster form their Town Council in 1982 and they remain sisters. Together they have advocated for the communities since then.

Comment 8 – Mateo Camarillo, chairman of the Latino Redistricting Committee, spoke in favor of Commissioner Quiroz's map and suggested the Commission use her map as a starting point. He referred the Commission to the Voting Rights Act and the census data to see where the protected classes reside. He asked for more consideration for the language minorities.

Comment 9 – Doug Odom spoke in opposition to the proposed boundaries that exclude Webster and Oak Park from District 4, stating that these areas have the highest percentage of African American professionals in San Diego, who have chosen to stay and reside in the area. Separating these areas from District 4 would be separating community leaders from the rest of District 4. He favors Plan 3 out of the consultant plans, and spoke in favor of Commissioner Quiroz's plan.

Comment 10 – Cecelia Carrick with the Point Loma Association spoke in favor of uniting Point Loma with the airport and the entire peninsula into one district because of noise abatement, traffic, fishing and boating communities, and beach and bay protection.

Comment 11 – Linda Fox, a Point Loma resident, seconds everything Cecelia said. She is also a member of Point Loma Association. She likes all three consultant plans because they keep the airport with Point Loma. She is concerned about one of the map that has Liberty Station in a different district than Point Loma.

Comment 12 – Andy Berg, president of the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council, thanked the Commission. Of the consultant plans, he prefers map 2 because keeps Rancho Peñasquitos and PUSD together, but he thinks that Commissioner Quiroz’s plan has a better version of the southern part of the city. He would like to see a combination of both; he stated that they are not mutually exclusive. He noted that Plan 2 creates an Asian empowerment district with a 34% API population in the northern part of the city, as well.

Comment 13 – Scott Hasson, president of the Tierrasanta Community Council, supports the Taxpayers Association’s proposed map. He thanked the Commission for keeping Tierrasanta united in all the proposed plans but one, but stated he is opposed to the placement of Tierrasanta with neighborhoods south of the 8. He objected to calling the district the "fire risk area district," as they are not happy that their neighborhoods burned.

Comment 14 – Debra Makela asked that the Commission listen to the community and adhere to public testimony when drawing the maps, including the Latino, African-American, LGBT and environmental communities.

Comment 15 – Dr. Murtaza Baxamusa thanked the Commission for their outreach and for incorporating public testimony in their direction to the mapping consultant. He stated that proposed Plan 3 is the only plan that respects the African-American community. He advocated for the Community in Unity map, referencing the Voting Rights Act and the volume of public testimony.

Comment 16 – Eric Robles thanked the Commission for directing the mapping consultant to keep Kensington and Talmadge together. He asked that KenTal be united with the College area and even with Mission Valley, because of public safety issues, shared resources, shared thoroughfares, and similar development priorities.

Comment 17 – Judy McCarty spoke in favor of keeping Navajo, Allied Gardens and Scripps Ranch together as a community of interest because of Mission Trails Regional Park. She stated that the Navajo communities are tied together and should not be separated. She stated the removing Allied Gardens and Grantville from the rest of District 7, they would lack the support the other communities give to their issues. She prefers Plan 2 of the consultant maps.

Comment 18 – John Pilch from the San Carlos Area Council stated the Lake Murray is not a community; it is a lake. He said that area is actually San Carlos East, but it is not a community and has no representation on the Navajo Planners. It is a part of San Carlos and a service area for the Police Department. He asked that the Commission not divide any neighborhoods.

Comment 20 – Ricardo Navarro prefers the proposed Plan 3 because it best represents the needs of the southern part of the city. He thanked the Commission for uniting City Heights in this map. He is not in favor of uniting it with College, Talmadge and Kensington. He asked that the Commission unite Southcrest and Golden Hill with City Heights and keep College, Talmadge, and Kensington with Mission Valley.

Comment 21 – Dr. James Paterniti representing Scripps Ranch Civic Association, Scripps Ranch Planning Group, Miramar Ranch North Planning Group, stated that the three communities – Scripps Ranch, Miramar Ranch North and Rancho Encantada – would like to be united in whatever district they fall into. They favor Plans 1 and 3 because Plan 2 separates Scripps Ranch and Rancho Encantada. Of Plans 1 and 3, they prefer Plan 3 because it links communities of interest in the fire hazard areas.

Comment 22 – Jay Wilson, a resident of the Navajo communities, spoke about the Navajo community of interest, referring to their Planning Group, the youth sports, and the shared resources, shopping areas and community events.

Comment 23 – Lisa Ross on behalf of the Del Mar Mesa Planning Board spoke against splitting Del Mar Mesa’s Community Plan. She advocated for the Coast and Canyons plan because it keeps the Community Plan intact, and unites them with the communities invested in the Del Mar Mesa Preserve. She submitted a plan to the Commission.

Comment 24 – Anne Harvey on behalf of the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board gave a background of the open space within their Planning Area and spoke in favor of keeping those spaces united in one district.

Comment 25 – Steven Whitburn spoke in favor of uniting inner-city neighborhoods along the 15 and 805 freeways, from City Heights south to Shelltown. He stated that Plans 2 and 3 come close to achieving this. He asked the Commission to refine these plans by keeping the City Heights Planning Area united all the way down to the 94, including Ridgeview, and pairing it with the Southeastern Planning Area’s eastern area between the 805 and 15 freeways, including Mt. Hope, Mt. View, Southcrest, and Shelltown. This way the Southeastern Planning Area is split into only two districts with the freeways providing clear boundaries. He referenced unifying factors including the freeway corridor, the unemployment rates, home foreclosures, and gang problems, in addition to the ethnic diversity.

Comment 26 – Nicanora Montenegro spoke in favor of Commissioner Quiroz’s plan and thanked the Commission for listening to the public. Of the consultant plans, she prefers proposed Plan 3, but she would like to see Southcrest and Golden Hill united with City Heights.

Comment 27 – Manjeet Ranu, Vice Chair of the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board, representing the Pacific Highlands Ranch community reiterated their endorsement of the Coast and Canyons Plan. He stated that the consultant’s maps are generally good because they adheres to the Coast and Canyons plan. He asked the Commission to make sure the district boundaries reflect the CPA boundaries. He also advocated for keeping the open space adjacent to their CPAs within their district.

Comment 28 – Joe LaCava thanked the Commission for supporting the Coast and Canyons plan in their proposed plans. He spoke against removing Torrey Hills Community Planning Area from District 1 or District B in the proposed plans. He spoke in favor of linking the open spaces and canyons with zero populations to the communities that are most affected by them and have worked

to protect them. He asked the Commission to focus first on communities of interest and consider deviation last.

Comment 29 – Laura Riebau favors Dave Potter’s map and Plan 1. She thinks it’s important that planning group boundaries be respected and kept intact, because of financing and services are through planning groups. She feels that Plan 3 and Commissioner Quiroz’s plan took into account ethnic diversity but it overrides a balance. She prefers higher deviations than separating communities.

Comment 30 – David Moty, Chair of the Kensington Talmadge Planning Group, on behalf of the Planning Group and the neighborhoods spoke in opposition to uniting Kensington and Talmadge to communities north of I-8 or to the College area. He cited differences in infrastructure and culture. He asks the Commission to keep them with the other communities in the Mid-city Planning Area.

Comment 31 – Suhail Khalil, Chair of the Peninsula Community Planning Board, thanked the Commission for considering Planning Boards and engaging the Voting Rights and mapping consultants, but suggest that a Land Use planning consultant is needed. He encouraged the Commission to seek professional advice on Land Use planning. He stated that Point Loma has many ties and similar interests binding them to the beach communities. He asked the Commission to keep the peninsula together.

Comment 32 – Deborah Knight with the Friends of Rose Canyon thanked the Commission for listening to the communities and incorporating the Coast and Canyons plan into the proposed plans. She spoke in favor of keeping the University Community Planning Group together, including the non-populated industrial area to the east of 805. It is important to include that “elbow.” She asked that the final plan respect the Community Plan boundaries, including the southern boundary, south of the 52 and the eastern boundary, east of the 805.

Comment 33 – Kathryn Burton, Chair of the Torrey Hills Community Planning Board, reiterated their endorsement of the Coast and Canyons plan. She stated that Torrey Hills and Del Mar Mesa are not just planning areas but neighborhoods as well. She asked that Torrey remain in District 1 with their sister communities and their open spaces.

Comment 34 – Mike Shoecraft, a member of the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council, the Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board, and the Rancho Peñasquitos Fire Safe Council requested that the Commission add Rancho Peñasquitos to their definition of fire hazard areas. A Fire Department representative expressed concern for Black Mountain as an extreme fire risk. The Fire Safe council is active and has fire watches in the Peñasquitos Preserve. For the northern part of the city, he supports Plan 2 or any plan that unites the PUSD and the Pomerado Health District.

Comment 35 – Michelle Wise prefers Plan 3 because it most closely adheres to public testimony and protects communities of interest. She asked the Commission not to use freeways as definite boundaries; some freeways run through the middle of neighborhoods. She asks the Commission use the District H in Plan 3.

Comment 36 – Liliana Garcia Rivera representing of the Latino Redistricting Committee is in favor of establishing the new District 9 between the 15 and 805 corridor, from City Heights to Shelltown. She advocated for the Community in Unity map, because it provides for equal representation for the growing Latino population. She stated that the Latino population is protected by the Voting Rights Act. She also asked the Commission not to include Downtown with the Historic Barrio district.

Comment 37 – Charles Alexander representing the Mt. Hope community spoke of Mt. Hope's contributions to District 4 and described their struggles with violence, education, public facilities and services. He would like Mt. Hope to remain in the 4th District.

Comment 38 – Carmen Lopez, President of Latino/Latina Unity Coalition and member of the Latino Redistricting Committee, urged the Commission to level the field for historically underrepresented groups in San Diego. She believes the presentation from the Voting Rights consultant delineated ways in which the Commission could get around the Voting Rights acts and not be sued. She also stated that the Census count has historically been under for immigrant communities and people of color. She stated that the inclusion of citizenship age data is aimed at the Latino community, and that the data provided by the American Survey is outdated.

Comment 39 – Phillip Liburd thanked the Commission for their outreach and many public hearings. He is a member of NAACP, BAPAC and others. He is in support of Commissioner Quiroz's plan because it best represents the needs of the 4th District. He asked the Commission to adopt a plan very similar to Commissioner Quiroz's plan.

Comment 40 – Derryl Williams echoed the sentiments of previous speakers, asking that Webster remain with District 4. He expressed support for Commissioner Quiroz's plan, stating that it best represents the Webster boundaries. He asked that Webster's boundaries be respected and that it remain united with their sister community Oak Park in District 4.

Chair Dalal thanked the speakers and called a 10-minute recess.

Upon reconvening, Chair Dalal asked that the Commissioners focus on the plans that NDC is creating with Commission direction and move forward toward one plan.

Commissioner Marquez stated he'd like to see some concrete decisions made today and asked that they start with Plan 3.

Commissioner Potter would like to be able to reference his map when discussing the coastal areas.

Chair Dalal said referencing to Commissioner's maps is fine; she'd just like to avoid further creation of individual maps.

Commissioner Quiroz agreed that no further maps from Commissioners, but she is very uncomfortable with the three plans proposed by NDC. She feels these are just neighborhood maps and there is no reference to the Voting Rights act or the race and language minority communities of interest.

Commissioner Nishioka asked if NDC was using Maptitude and why.

Mr. Johnson stated that desktop software is faster than using the internet and provides more tools. He stated that every plan presented will be made available on the Esri online tool.

Commissioner Nishioka asked for a timeline for the revised maps.

Mr. Johnson hopes to get them into the agenda packets, available to the Commissioners on Tuesday.

Commissioner Marquez responded to Commissioner Quiroz's comment by saying that he does think the Voting Rights Act should remain at the forefront of the discussions but he believes the three maps presented are a good starting point and noted that many speakers from the public referenced them while addressing the Commission. He expects the legal counsel to do a Voting Rights Act review on any map created this day.

Chair Dalal agreed with Commissioner Marquez's sentiments.

Mr. Johnson ensured the Commission that they have taken the Voting Rights Act into account when formulating all the proposed plans. He asked if the Commission could choose one map to work from.

Commissioner Marquez suggested using Plan 3 as their starting point. He stated that public testimony from people in the southern areas of the City seems to indicate that they are less concerned about Community Planning Areas because these planning areas don't take into account the social and economic needs of the community members. His opinion has shifted in that although CPAs are important, they are not the first priority in the southern part of the city.

Commissioner Nishioka would prefer starting with Plan 1.

Commissioner Potter stated that the Commission has not yet decided which plan to use as a starting point.

Commissioner Kosmo would like to use Plan 1 as a starting point as well.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that it seems residents that live south of I-8 prefer Plan 3, and residents north of I-8 prefer Plan 1. She suggested that a map including the south of Plan 3 and the north of Plan 1 would be the best starting point. She would choose Plan 3 to start with, but stated that she is not as familiar with northern part of the city.

Chair Dalal stated that she'd like to start with regions as see if they could progress.

Mr. Johnson said that it is possible to grab the northern boundaries from Plan 1 or 2 and drop it into Plan 3.

Commissioner Quiroz feels that is a good idea. She'd like Districts A and C to be joined together and for the Commission to then give direction as to how to divide it.

Commissioner Nishioka feels that although that is a good idea it would result in a delay. He would like to start giving direction now. He asked the Commissioners what their preferences are. Commissioner Potter believes there are at least two districts that can be agreed upon, with some minor tweaking. Those are District B, the coastal district, and the Southbay area. He asked that those be locked in.

Chair Dalal agreed with Commissioner Potter's approach.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he lives south of I-8 and he likes Commissioner Potter's approach.

Mr. Levitt clarified the direction for District B – to make sure that all of the University Planning Area and Del Mar Mesa Planning area are within the boundaries of District B. Those are the areas with no population.

Chair Dalal agreed with those additions.

Commissioner Quiroz responded to a speaker regarding Torrey Hills; she originally misspoke – she included Torrey Highlands, not Torrey Hills, in District 5. She asked Mr. Levitt if Torrey Hills and the bottom of La Jolla are included in District 1.

Mr. Levitt stated both are included but because of Census blocks there is a tiny part of the southern end of La Jolla is excluded.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she is not stuck on CPAs, but she is stuck on neighborhood boundaries. She asked Mr. LaCava to address the Commission on the boundary issues.

Mr. LaCava stated that Torrey Hills is correctly defined in all the consultant maps. He stated that the southern boundary of La Jolla should be the CPA as shown on the Esri tool.

Mr. Levitt stated that the plan does follow the CPA boundary.

Commissioner Potter asked that the area of University City to the east of 805 be included, as well as the small area of Torrey Pines CPA that has no population and the Del Mar Mesa Planning Area.

Mr. Levitt stated that District I includes all of the Historic Barrio neighborhoods and the South Bay areas.

Commissioner Marquez asked that Shelltown be included with the communities of Southcrest and Mt. View.

Mr. Levitt stated that there are 4,135 residents in Shelltown. The District I as drawn has a population of 144,830 with 0.14% deviations.

Commissioner Kosmo thinks Shelltown is consistent with District I and the population is ideal. He's inclined to leave it as is.

Mr. Levitt noted that if no one is suggesting adding something else, only removing Shelltown and the only issue is deviation, they can return to that later without affecting other districts.

Commissioner Marquez stated that depending on what is done with the regions adjacent to it, he'd like the Commission to consider it for compactness reasons, but it is not essential.

Commissioner Potter proposed leaving Shelltown in District I for now.

Chair Dalal supports leaving Shelltown in District I.

Commissioner Marquez would like to start adopting regions of the map that have general consensus amongst the Commissioners for certainty and progress.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that in working with her maps she realizes that it's a constant give and take. She thinks the Commissioners should give direction but leave districts open to revisions.

Chair Dalal, Commissioner Nishioka, and Commissioner Kosmo agree with Commissioner Quiroz's sentiments.

Mr. Levitt asked the Commission to return to considering the northern part of the city. Commissioners Kosmo and Potter like District A in Plan 1.

Commissioner Marquez wants Navajo to remain intact. He is interested in what Plan 1 would look like if District D included the Navajo area, the College area, Mission Valley, Talmadge and Kensington.

Mr. Levitt stated the key decision is whether to keep the Plan 1 and 2 versions of the north, or the Plan 3 version. He stated that Plan 1 and 2 offer the flexibility to move Navajo around. He discussed what District C would look like.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she feels that the Commission needs to determine whether the Asian community is a community of interest and one that needs to be considered. She would like to unite the Asian communities to represent their culture. She stated that to her neighborhoods are the most important factor, followed by population, but she also would like to represent cultural communities of interest.

Mr. Johnson stated that it could be difficult to defend that Asians all share one culture; he stated that Japanese may share a culture, Filipinos may share a culture --but it could be a hard case to prove that all Asians share one culture. He stated the Commission could choose to make it a goal to unite neighborhoods that have high Asian populations.

Chair Dalal stated that she would like to see Kearny Mesa, Miramar West, and Mira Mesa together, possibly joined with a portion of Scripps Rancho or Rancho Peñasquitos. She would not like to get locked into anything yet, but she does see merit in uniting those three neighborhoods. She also sees merit in keeping the PUSD together in a council district. She is torn in that northern part, but agrees to keep Mira Mesa, Miramar, and Kearny Mesa together to preserve those communities of interest.

Mr. Levitt stated that they can also keep District C as it is in Plan 3.

Commissioner Potter is not ready to accept Districts A or C in Plan 3. He can support these districts in Plans 1 or 2.

Mr. Levitt stated that if the changes were made, the southern part of Scripps Ranch that is cut away from the northern in Plan B would be joined with Mira Mesa; it would not be by itself in the north with the rest of its district to the south.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he would of preferred to start with Plan 2, because it keeps Tierrasanta whole and allows for the PUSD to stay together. However, since it seems that they are now working from Plan 1, he stated that he is concerned that adding all the areas to the west of the heavily API populated into District C dilutes API voting strength. He asked how the Commission felt about adding Rancho Encantada to District A.

Commissioner Kosmo agreed with Commissioner Potter in that he is fine with District A and C in both Plan 1 and 2. He stated that we would like to see Rancho Encantada in the northern district.

Commissioner Potter agrees with Commissioner Kosmo about keeping Rancho Encantada in the north.

Chair Dalal supports that sentiment.

Commissioner Quiroz does not agree with splitting Scripps Ranch and thinks it should remain whole and with Rancho Encantada. She is not comfortable moving forward with District A until decisions regarding District C's Asian community are addressed.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he is comfortable moving forward with District A because he feels that they will be able to address the Asian community's concern when forming on the District C. He stated it is an important consideration for him.

Commissioner Nishioka noted that Mr. Johnson made a statement saying the Asian community is fragmented. He asked Mr. Johnson if he is qualified to make that statement.

Mr. Johnson clarified that the question was: Could you protect yourself from the predominant charge by saying that Asians are one culture? He has not seen that work in his experience. He does agree that there is a strong voting propensity. He believes it could be legally risky to simply draw a district around an Asian "thematic." The Commission could consider trying to group neighborhoods with high Asian populations.

Commissioner Marquez asked what part of Rancho Peñasquitos could be considered if the Commission were to decide to try and empower API voters in central San Diego.

Mr. Levitt stated it's the 56 freeway and that there are two elementary schools south of the 56 that are in the PUSD. He stated that District A uses school attendance boundaries.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that in his opinion, people in that southern area of Rancho Peñasquitos go north to shop.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the City of San Diego representatives don't have anything to do with the school districts and that the goal is to give fair and equal representation to San Diego citizens. She stated that she thinks school district boundaries are important but should not be the major boundaries of the districts, because those elected as a result of this redistricting will not have any influence over the school districts.

Commissioner Nishioka understands Commissioner Quiroz sentiments but states that he supports the configuration of District A because of the commonalities amongst those communities.

Mr. Johnson stated that the issue is whether to split along the freeway and keep both Rancho Peñasquitos and Scripps Ranch whole, or keep District A as in Plans 1 or 2 and split either Rancho Peñasquitos or Scripps Ranch; the deviation would be above 7% if both are kept whole in one district.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he prefers the northern part of the city as in Plan 1 because it allows for a part of Rancho Peñasquitos to be with Mira Mesa as requested by the Asian community.

Commissioner Marquez asked what the population be if the southern part of Rancho Peñasquitos and all of Scripps Ranch were removed.

Mr. Johnson stated the district would be very underpopulated.

Commissioner Nishioka asked Mr. Levitt regarding the logic regarding the division.

Mr. Levitt stated it follows Scripps Lake Road which goes along the south side of Miramar Lake.

Commissioner Quiroz asked why they are drawing the lines this way, besides PUSD.

Commissioner Potter stated that in Plan 3 there is a too long of a distance from the north end of District A to the south that to him makes it an unacceptable district. He prefers splitting it north and south rather than east and west, because it better groups similar neighborhoods.

Commissioner Marquez said that while he's mindful of the communities of interest adjacent to District A, he takes into consideration one of the only communities of interest that came and spoke

to the Commission from that region, and that was the community of parents who care what school district their children attend and who share home values. He feels that because they were the only community of interest in the region that came to speak to the Commission it is the Commission's obligation to address their concerns.

Chair Dalal added that the activities and athletics that they share coupled with the fact that their children feed into the same school district is her reasoning.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that these areas are his front and back yards and he is looking at the totality.

Commissioner Potter supports keeping PUSD whole, but stated it's not just the number of people that come to see the Commission. He stated that if that were the case, this would be put up to a vote and there would be no reason for the Commission. He stated that they have to consider not only the public testimony but what else they know about the city of San Diego.

Commissioner Kosmo is familiar with the northern city and thinks that the neighborhoods are similar, the backgrounds of the people are similar, and they fit together well.

Mr. Johnson asked which version of District A they could move forward with, Plan 1 or 2.

Commissioner Kosmo asked Commissioner Nishioka, since he lives in the area, what is his preference.

Commissioner Nishioka stated he needed to study the versions out more.

Commissioner Potter compared the two versions and where the populations are. He stated that in Plan 1, the southern portion of Rancho Peñasquitos that is cut off is adjacent to other residential areas. In Plan 2, the southern part of Scripps Ranch that is cut away from District A is far from other residential areas. For that reason, he prefers Plan 1 which keeps Scripps Ranch whole.

Commissioner Marquez is concerned that Plan 1 version of District A will constrain what they will be able to do in the central and southern regions of the city and in District C. He prefers District A in Plan 2.

Chair Dalal also prefers Plan 2's District A, but is open to variations of Rancho Peñasquitos.

Commissioner Kosmo prefers Plan 1, but is also open.

Commissioner Nishioka prefers Plan 2 because those Rancho Peñasquitos residents in District C would be represented well by both District A and C representatives. Scripps Ranch should remain whole because it is more established and shares fire hazards.

Mr. Johnson stated that because there is consensus on the western boundary and this only affects two districts, this area is easy to change positions on after hearing more public testimony.

Commissioner Marquez is concerned that in Plan 1, Scripps Ranch would be taken out of play for inclusion in District D.

Mr. Johnson stated that in either plan Scripps Ranch would be out of play for District D. Commissioner Nishioka clarified that District A that keeps Scripps Ranch in whole is his preference for today.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that is his preference as well.

Commissioner Quiroz does not pick either because she would like to decide other issues before this decision is made. She would prefer to discuss the public testimony about linking Mira Mesa with Rancho Peñasquitos.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that the testimony was not lost on him; it is part of his decision making.

Chair Dalal echoed Commissioner Nishioka's statement.

Commissioner Marquez stated that going with Plan 1, a piece of Rancho Peñasquitos is being included with Mira Mesa as requested by the API community. He asked Commissioner Quiroz what other part of District A could help to create an API empowerment district.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the testimony that she heard did not specify that only the southern part of Rancho Peñasquitos was part of the Asian community of interest. She would like to see District C decided before District A is decided.

Commissioner Marquez stated that it's been deemed a priority to keep Black Mountain with District A. If all of Rancho Peñasquitos is ceded to District C, Black Mountain is cut off from the rest of District A. He prefers District A in Plan 2, but he will concede to use District A in Plan 1 for now.

Commissioner Potter supports District A as shown in Plan 1.

Chair Dalal also supports it in Plan 1, knowing that it can later be changed.

Mr. Levitt asked the Commission to discuss District H.

Chair Dalal referenced public testimony, stating that Oak Park and Webster would like to remain in District 4.

Mr. Levitt stated that the District H is based on the District 4 Town Councils' proposal and the Community in Unity's District 4, but it does not incorporate the changes presented this day from the public.

Commissioner Marquez stated that Ridgeview should be kept with City Heights because it is part of their community plan, but Oak Park and Webster should be in District H according to public testimony.

Commissioner Potter stated that they'll have to go north of 94, but the question is can they move to the west. He referenced the impassioned speaker today asking that Mt. Hope be kept in District 4 and he would like to keep Mt. Hope, Mountain View and Southcrest in District 4. He is not in favor of splitting this Community Planning Area into three.

Commissioner Quiroz disagrees with Commissioner Potter. She believes Mt. Hope, Mountain View, and Southcrest need to be removed for population reasons. She stated that Chollas Creek is part of City Heights and she'd like to see it with City Heights. She stated that City Heights doesn't have a planning area. It is part of the Mid-City Community Plan, so she is not sure where the City Heights planning lines are coming from. She stated the grey area from the corner of F to the "red line" and Ridgeview need to be taken out of District H and Fairmount Park would have to be put back in.

Commissioner Kosmo is in agreement with Commissioner Potter that keeping Mt. Hope, Mountain View and Southcrest within District H makes for a compact, contiguous district. He prefers Commissioner Potter's map's version, where District H goes west and keeps Oak Park.

Commissioner Marquez is in favor of uniting Mountain View, Mt. Hope, and Southcrest with City Heights. He agrees that the testimony that was heard was so moving that it put into question hundreds of people who came before the speaker today, asking to unit Mt. Hope, Mountain View and Southcrest with City Heights. But he believes the communities share a many similar interests and prefers connecting them with City heights. He'd like Ridgeview removed from District H as well.

Commissioner Potter stated the boundaries correctly represent the Mid-City Community Plan.

Mr. Levitt added that the red lines are from the City's website.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the lines are not correct.

Commissioner Potter stated that the lines correctly reflect the Community Plan.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that those lines are what Commissioner Potter is going by. She lives in Ridgeview and it is not right. She stated that what the people want is most important and that just because those are the lines in the Community Plan doesn't mean they have to adhere to those lines. She is surprised that the community has come out and asked for what they want, but because of Community Plan lines the Commission is not doing it. She is in favor of adhering to public

testimony to keep Oak Park and Webster in District 4, and to take out Mt. Hope, Mountain View and Southcrest.

Chair Dalal would like to see Oak Park and Webster in District 4.

Commissioner Potter stated that this conversation is leading into the formation of District 9. He believes the district looks gerrymandered and is not compact. He will not support any district formed strictly using race as the sole basis.

Commissioner Marquez stated that people who have been traditionally disengaged have come to the Commission and spoken about how they'd like their districts to be formed. They have identified themselves by ethnicity or race because that's how they most strongly identify themselves and with their community. But he stated that income, area of residence, and levels of opportunity are all connected to race. Therefore, race is a factor, though it's not the most predominant one. He believes the debate has been framed that way because regular citizens have come to speak to them and used as identifiers what they most closely associate with. He is opposed to any map that doesn't honor the clear population growth of the Latino community. He stated one way to do that is to include Mt. Hope and Mountain View with City Heights and he will not support a map that doesn't do that.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the people in City Heights have not been represented. Their representative has always been part of the LGBT community. That is not bad, but they haven't been represented. She stated that just because they are of color and poor doesn't mean that they cannot stand up and get their fair representation. She thinks that not to give it to them because they are of one race is unacceptable. They are all low income; they are all in CDBG low income Census blocks. They should be joined together because of their all other shared issues.

Chair Dalal asked Mr. Johnson and Mr. Levitt what else the Commission can provide to them in the next few minutes to move the process forward.

Mr. Johnson stated they'd like to get direction on District H.

Commissioner Potter stated that he is not convinced that the people that came to speak about the new Latino District are from the City Heights area. He questions that they were speaking for the residents of this district.

Commissioner Marquez believes they do need to make one more recommendation before the end of the day. He stated that Commissioner Quiroz is right in that they Commissioners do not want to engage in the difficult debate about District 9. He asked Commissioners Kosmo and Nishioka about their position on these districts. He stated that he feels they have a consensus about keeping Webster in District 4.

Mr. Johnson stated that today is just about easily reversible direction. He stated that because of the time, they can move forward with both versions.

Chief of Staff Wong stated that they don't have to vacate by 5:00 pm but she'd like to be mindful of staff that do not work for the Commission, but who have been staffing the meeting since 8:00 am.

Mr. Johnson stated that there will probably be two versions, since there is not enough time to discuss the beaches and bay areas. He asked to clean up and clarify both version of District H and take a look at District F. He asked to start with direction if Oak Park is kept in.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that it would be good to have Commissioner Morrow present when this conversation is had and decided. On District 4, he believes Commissioner Potter's version of District 4 in his map is a good alternative – the one with part of Oak Park in District 4. He asked if either Webster or Oak Park had to be in District 4, which the public would prefer. He asked Commissioner Potter which he'd prefer.

Commissioner Potter stated that he heard more testimony about keeping Oak Park in District 4.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that in reviewing what he has seen, he thinks Commissioner Potter's configuration is compact with ideal population and in general it conforms to public testimony.

Commissioner Kosmo suggested using this as an alternative.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that after all the public testimony given to keep Oak Park and Webster in District 4, she wonders if the reason that the Commission is not adhering to it is because they are minorities. She stated that the people of District 4 are extremely underserved and they know what they need to better run their district. She feels that when District 1 came and asked for what they wanted they were given it, possibly because they are white. She'd like the reasons for not adhering to community input regarding District 4.

Chair Dalal stated that she feels it's good to keep both versions right now. Once she sees the big picture she can speak more specifically. She thinks it's important to keep the process moving.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he has full confidence that Commissioner Potter and Commissioner Kosmo and all of the Commissioners are well-intentioned. He doesn't think this is about animus towards any one minority but does he does feel that groups that have dealt with discrimination deserve special consideration. So, he is also perplexed and appreciates that there are two options. He stated that the commission has gone above and beyond to engage the public and gain their trust, and that adhering to CPA boundaries is not enough reason to go against strong public input.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that NDC has proposed a method to move forward; he would like see a visual of options A and B to make a decision. He stated that discrimination is touchy subject; people have encountered it all their lives and it's offensive.

Mr. Johnson asked Commissioner Quiroz for the correct boundary of Ridgeview.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that it is the Chollas Creek. She asked that the City Heights areas above Chollas Creek be included with City Heights. She is not sure about Redwood Village. She'd like to see all of Mountain View out of District 9.

Commissioner Marquez asked about the differences between Community in Unity and District 4 Town Councils' proposal. He asked if they were to start by removing all of Mountain View from District 4 and including some of Mt. Hope, would it help. He's suggesting this to incorporate the public comment heard today regarding Mt. Hope.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that the two alternative maps that the Commission should consider are the way Commissioner Quiroz's map shows the southern part of the city.

Commissioner Quiroz would like to see all of Southcrest removed.

Mr. Johnson stated that they would try to incorporate Commissioner Marquez's option to remove part of Mt. Hope.

Mr. Johnson asked whether Kensington/Talmadge should be swapped for Golden Hill in District 9.

Commissioner Marquez asked if what they do with Fox Canyon would then decide what they would do about Golden Hill.

Mr. Levitt stated that it would be a quick change to swap Kensington/Talmadge, and Golden Hill.

Commissioner Marquez stated he'd be comfortable with that switch.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that if you add Golden Hill you have to add the block adjacent to it.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he thinks South Park and Golden Hill are tied to Balboa Park, so he is not comfortable making a decision that it should be separated.

Commissioner Potter concurs stating that there is an entrance from Golden Hill into the Park.

Commissioner Marquez asked if they could provide two versions of this as well, because some testimony stated that Kensington/Talmadge should be joined with District 3.

STAFF REPORTS

ITEM 4: MIDORI WONG, CHIEF OF STAFF

Ms. Wong asked if the Commission would prefer to start the next meeting at 4:00 pm because of the pace of proceedings.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that if the meeting starts earlier as long as the people who cannot arrive till after work hours have a chance to speak.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairperson Dalal adjourned the meeting at 4:48 p.m.

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary
2010 Redistricting Commission

**Written Comments Received July 9, 2011
Redistricting Commission Meeting**

Comment 1: Joan M. Conliffe

I agree with Ms. Quiroz's map. She was very thorough. She took the citizens concerns in doing her map. I feel strongly that Oak Park and Webster should remain in District 4. Thank you.

Comment 2: Kathleen Culkin

I have taken ill and need to leave. Please read my talk I prepared to present to you. I waited several hours to speak. Thank you.

Good Morning,

My name is Kathleen Culkin and I have lived in the Navajo Community for most of my life. Currenantly, my husband and I reside at 5683 Adove Falls Road in Del Cerro. Several members of our family still own and reside in Allied Gardens and Del Cerro.

I am here today to share with you a little bit about my community, and to urge you to keep Navajo area together because we are one community.

Other than the dairy farmers, my family was on of the 1st families to settle in Grantville in 1950. My father was a truck driver, he came to this area to work for JB Stringfellow, saw the growth potential and moved his family. He bought a lot of property at 6159 Misssion Gorge Road and, my father started our family business "Valley Garge" at 6320 Mission Gorge Rd and I went to school in a three room school house before going to Catholic School. With the area rapidly growing in 1960 my father bought more property adjacent to the garge and built a new building with a garge, parts store and two rental units. I married and moved away for a short while before moving into our home at 5201 Orcutt St. in Allied Gardens where my children could walk to school, we had a great shopping area. My favorite memory of the neighborhood is opening the San Diego paper and seeing a picture of my children walking down the street with all the flags blowing that the Kiwanis Club had donated to our commuunity. That was there 1st time raising them on a holiday but it is still a beautiful tradition and wonderful sight to see today.

The Navajo community is a wonderful community with a great sense of pride. Growing up I remember that there was a little bit of rivalry between the older neighborhoods. Grantville was older than Allied Gardens. Then in 1955 Del Cerro built the 1st section and, now they were the affluent community. Then San Carlos came along. You get the idea, I'm sure this is common and happens everywhere but, as a community we have worked hard through the decades to bridge those gaps. We have been one single community with everyone working together for decades now. Navajo, our community has been the heart and soul of District 7. We have been District 7 since we started district elections in the sixties.

Please, I implore you don't divide my community. I want to share this one last thing with you. This is how drawing lines do matter and they impact everyone's life even the children. When we moved to the Grantville in 1951 our church was the San Diego Mission de Alcalá. I made my 1st communion there, my confirmation and attend services there several times a week. To me, it was and still is my second home. As the community of Navajo grew the lines were drawn! Everyone east of Mission Gorge Road would have to attend mass at St Theres in Del Cerrro. I now lived on the wrong side of the street. I lost contact with the priest and nuns some of my friends from church but, this is how the community grew, it grew east and in time our sense of community was with the neighborhoods to the east NOT the west.

Thank you for your time and listening to me and please keep Navajo together in District 7 because we are – that one community.

Comment 3: Emma Turner

Why was the eligible voter criteria question not answered from single public comment that followed Ms. Leoni's presentation? If I missed it, what was the response?

Comment 4: Ralph Peters

I support Map 2.

Comment 5: Eric D Brown

Please choose Community in Unity #3.

Comment 6: Mike Shoecraft

Prefer Plan 2.

Comment 7: Carla Kirkwood

Please support the Community in Unity map. It does represent the broadest range of community interests in San Diego. Thank you.

Comment 8: Jessica Hymes

I STRONGLY support the Community in Union map!

Comment 9: Rachel Scoma

City Heights should be unified and made part of the new Latino/immigrant/coalition empowerment district.

Comment 10: Jaclyn Stecker

I support the Community in Unity map. Golden Hill should be part of the new Latino/immigrant coalition empowerment district. City heights should be united and made part of the new Latino/immigrant coalition empowerment district.

Comment 11: Larry Baza

Support for the Community of Unity Map!

Comment 12: Rex Fender and Rudi Redman

I support CIUM. City Heights should be unified and made part of the Latino/immigrant/coalition empowerment.

Comment 13: Melissa Espinal

I support the Community in Unity plan. Golden Hill and City Heights should be part of the Latino/immigrant coalition empowerment district.

Comment 14: Jennifer Sieber

I support the Community in Unity plan. Golden Hill and City Heights should be part of the Latino/immigrant coalition empowerment district.

Comment 15: Estrella Castillo

I support the Community in Unity!

Comment 16: Irma Fernandez

I support the Community in Unity map 3.

Comment 17: David Warmoth

Adopt Community in Unity map.

Comment 18: Arturo Gandarilla

I support the Community in Unity map.

Comment 19: Chad M. Terry

I would like to support the work of the LGBT Task Force. Keeping that community of interest intact.

Comment 20: Sonja Anderson

I support the Community in Unity map.

Comment 21: Michelle Deutsch

I support the Community in Unity map. Golden Hill should be part of a new Latino/immigrant coalition empowerment district. City Heights should be unified and made part of the new Latino/coalition empowerment district.

Comment 22: Shannon M. Dove

Please keep the LGBT Community represented by one district!

Comment 23: Rachel Parish

I support the Community in Unity map.

Comment 24: Steve Bower

I support the Community in Unity map/Plan 3.

Comment 25: Tom Luhnnow, Greater San Diego Business Association

Representing 851 local businessmen, the GSDBA supports the Community in Unity Map, Plan 3.

Comment 26: Charles Alexander

We do not want to be moved out of Mt. Hope 4th District.

Comment 27: Terrie Vorono, PFLAG

I support the Community in Unity map – Plan 3. As the mother of a gay son, I recognize his community needs a voice.

Comment 28: Andrew Latham Staples

City Heights should be unified and made part of a Latino/immigrant coalition empowerment district.

Comment 29: Brent Kostelecky

Golden Hill should be part of the new Latino/Immigrant Coalition Empowerment District.

Comment 29: Matt Corrales

As a gay latino, I support the Community in Unity map, which includes the unification of diverse community in City Heights AND a strong LGBT district including all our core areas.

Comment 30: James Brady

I support the Community in Unity map/Plan 3. Golden Hill should be part of the new Latino/Immigration Coalition Empowerment district. City Heights should be unified and made part of a Latino/immigrant coalition empowerment district.

Comment 31: Jacqueline Palmer

I support the LGBT/Community in Unity map/Plan 3.

Comment 32: Mel Merrill

I support the community in unity map (Map 3).