

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

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 2011

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

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Marquez at 4:09 p.m. 60 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 7:48 p.m. to the next scheduled meeting of the Redistricting Commission on Saturday, July 16th, 2011 at the Balboa Park Club in the Santa Fe 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:

Vice Chair Carlos Marquez called the roll:

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

Comments are limited to no more than two minutes per speaker. Submit requests to speak to 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 – Michael Sprague thanked the staff for updating the website. He stated that he has requested to be notified by mail of the meeting schedules a few times. He has not received any notifications by mail.

Comment 2 – Emily Serafy Cox with EMPOWER San Diego stated that at the previous meeting because the meeting started at 10:00 am but public comment wasn't taken until 1:00 pm, half of the crowd and many people who had wanted to speak had left by the time their name was called. She asked that the Commission keep this in mind when creating the agendas for future meetings, so that it does not happen again.

COMMISSION COMMENT:

Commissioner Potter clarified a statement he made last meeting regarding race. He stated that race is a factor considered by the Commission amongst others. He read an excerpt from Section 5.1 of the City Charter.

Commissioner Morrow stated that she watched the remaining of the July 9th meeting. She was concerned by a statement she heard that all maps submitted on Esri would not be reviewed by NDC. She stated that the public spent many hours creating the maps and she thinks it's important that each is reviewed. She also stated that she is having trouble distinguishing between communities of interests and special interest groups. She believes special interest groups are bringing speakers in and giving them speaking points. She is not comfortable assuming that the testimony of people that speak here over and over again is the will of the public. She opposes creating a new district in the southeast corner because the Commission is not considering other options. She thinks splitting District 2 is more practical. She asked Ms. Leoni to evaluate the creation of District 9 in the southeast corner of the city for violations of the Voting Rights Act.

Chair Dalal stated that the Commission has to look at all the rules and pieces, including contiguity, compactness, public testimony, socio-economic data, population data and other sources of data. Public testimony is important but not the only factor in their decision making.

Commissioner Quiroz would like to know who the special interest groups are. She feels that all the public testimony is from different groups with different interests and goals for the process, but they are not special interest groups.

Commissioner Marquez stated that the Voting Rights Act says that race cannot be the predominant factor when forming a district, but that the passage of the act and the spirit of the law and every other stipulation of the law are to avoid the abridgement of the representation of groups who have been underrepresented. He asked the public to continue to provide testimony so that Commissioner's interpretations of the law can take into consideration the public's testimony.

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

None.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 1: DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

Mr. Johnson addressed a comment he made at the last meeting. He clarified by saying that the maps submitted online via the Esri tool are reviewed by NDC and the Commission, but not all maps will be referred to outside legal counsel for legal review. He assured the public that every map submitted is reviewed and provided to the Commissioners and all are available on the online mapping tool and on the Redistricting Commission website.

Mr. Johnson gave an introduction and overview of the most recent plans and what to expect from this meeting.

Mr. Levitt presented Plans 4, 5, and 6.

Comment 1 – Jim Varnadore thanked the Commission for their dedication. He repeated his written recommendation that the Commission start with one map and adjust it from there. He thinks Map 3 or the one presented by Dr. Baxamusa are suitable. He stated he would bring on Saturday an exact map of City Heights, as there is a lot of confusion regarding its boundaries.

Comment 2 – Jan Iverson thanked the Commission for their work and the open process. She stated that she reviewed plans 4, 5, and 6 online. She stated that Tierrasanta is isolated with one way in and out. She feels it's best for them to be kept with similar areas like the Navajo communities. She referenced their connection with Mission Trails Regional Park. She likes MCAS Miramar being included in District 7 so they can influence its development. She prefers Plan 5.

Comment 3 – Jose Lopez stated that he believed the room is not handicap accessible; it would be hard for a wheelchair to reach the podium, and that talking so close to screen is hard for visually impaired people. He reviewed redistricting guidelines and stated that the City Heights–centered district presented by the Fox Canyon neighbors fits these guidelines.

Comment 3 – Leonardo Manrique, a member of SEIU and resident of City Heights, spoke in favor uniting City Heights with communities south of the I-8 to create a second Latino district.

Comment 4 – Jay Wilson, president of Del Cerro Action Council, spoke in favor of keeping the Navajo communities united in one district. He referenced all the shared resources including Mission Trails and Planning Group. He supports Plan 5.

Comment 5 – David Moty on behalf the Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group endorsed Fox Canyon’s plan for east San Diego. He referenced the compactness and the inclusion of most of the Mid-City Planning area.

Comment 6 – Judy McCarty thanked the Commission for listening and responding to community comments and questions. She prefers Plan 5 because it keeps the Navajo Community Planning Area together. She stated that Mission Trails binds the Navajo Community with Scripps Ranch and Rancho Encantada because of its planned expansion into that area. She stated that Linda Vista is far from Mission Trails.

Comment 7 – Waskah Whelan does not want to be Point Loma carved apart. She does not want Point Loma included with Downtown. The airport is a shared issue with other beach communities. She prefers Plans 4 and 5 because it connects the beaches and bays and noise affected areas.

Comment 8 – Chris Cate on behalf of San Diego County Taxpayers Association (SDCTA) thanked the Commission and NDC for releasing the maps in time for the public to review. SDCTA prefers Plan 5 as a starting point for the final map. He thinks its most inclusive of all the requirements and public testimony.

Comment 9 – Lori Shellenberger with ACLU referenced a comment made by Commissioner Potter at the last meeting that she believed may have been misconstrued. She stated that compactness is one of many factors in redistricting and stated that the shapes of all districts proposed so far would currently stand up in court. She stated communities of interest sometimes coincide with race or language because of common interests and issues. As long as community testimony supports a district, even if it is mostly one race, it can be deemed a community of interest. She also stated that although some districts may not be required by the Voting Rights Act, it doesn’t mean that they shouldn’t be created.

Comment 10 – Michael Sprague stated that the black and white printed agendas make it hard to distinguish districts. He stated that the agenda incorrectly lists Planning Areas; there is a difference between Planning Groups and Planning Areas. He stated that a lot of Africans in City Heights are marked as African American even though they are ethnically white. He also stated that the median age for Latino families is 18, meaning that half of most families are too young to vote.

Comment 11 – Anna Orzel-Arnita representing the Redwood Village Community Council stated that Redwood Village is a College neighborhood and would like to stay with Rolando, El Cerrito, and the College Area. She asked that Redwood not be split. They could endorse the Fox Canyon plan.

Comment 12 – Alberto Pulido with the Latino Redistricting Committee urged the Commission to adopt their proposed plan for the City Heights-centered district. He referenced the requirements of the Charter, the U.S. Constitution, and the Voting Rights Act. He stated that the Latino Redistricting Committee map unifies communities with low voter turnout and uniting them with places with high voter turnout would dilute the Latino and immigrant vote.

Comment 13 – Matthew Adams, Chair of the Grantville Stakeholder’s Committee, supports Plan 5 as a starting point because it best represents the Navajo Community. He referenced all the links shared by the Navajo Community and advocated their continued unity.

Comment 14 – Ralph Peters, a Rancho Peñasquitos resident and co-chair of the North City Inland Redistricting Committee, supports Plan 6 because it respects the Poway Unified School District (PUSD) community of interest, the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) area, and Pomerado Health District, and has natural boundaries. He stated that Plan 6 District C has a 32% API population district and District A has a 27% API population.

Comment 15 – Barrett Tetlow with the Republican Party of San Diego County stated that certain Commissioners are working with certain groups to promote an agenda to build six safe Democrat districts. He stated that Brian Pollard and Steven Whitburn are planning to run for office. He stated that Steven Whitburn coaches people in the hallway and gives them slips. He stated that Mitz Lee plans to run for office. He stated that Marti Emerald of selling her house to run in another district.

Comment 16 – Jolaine Harris stated that she doesn’t have any agenda, just herself and her husband. They have lived in Oak Park for over 30 years. She doesn’t want to have Oak Park split because of their lake, resources, and community services. She works in the community to keep at-risk youth busy and active to prevent gang involvement, to create Navy housing, to build parks and fields, and develop youth sports. She is opposed to removing Oak Park from District 4 or splitting it.

Chair Dalal stated for the record that Commissioner Nishioka arrived at 5:17 p.m.

Comment 17 – John Pilch, President of San Carlos Area Council, advocated for keeping the four Navajo communities intact and united. He is opposed to Plan 4 because it splits San Carlos in half, and keeps Lake Murray with Mira Mesa. He stated that Lake Murray is not a neighborhood; it’s a lake, and that area should be referred to as San Carlos East. He would like to keep Navajo together and join with Scripps Ranch because of the shared Mission Trails Park. He prefers Plan 5 to start with. He wants his district to remain north of I-8.

Comment 18 – Andy Berg thanked the Commission for listening to the public. He urged the Commission not to split Rancho Peñasquitos for four reasons: 1) You can split Scripps Ranch where there is little to no population; 2) Splitting Peñasquitos would remove children who attend PUSD, while the communities in Scripps Ranch that are split are in SDUSD; 3) Pomerado Health District is building a clinic that would be separated from the rest of the district if Rancho Peñasquitos were split; 4) Rancho Peñasquitos is a high-fire hazard area.

Comment 19 – Erik Marquis prefers Plan 6 to start with because he would like to see the continued preservation of Peñasquitos Preserve. He would like to see it covered and protected by three council members.

Comment 20 – Michelle Nash-Hoff, resident of the Navajo area, prefers Plan 5 to start with because it keeps the Navajo communities united in one district. She referred the shared interests of Mission Trails Park, youth sport leagues, and the planning area.

Comment 21 – Paul Webster with the San Diego Chamber of Commerce spoke regarding the principles of keeping business districts whole and keeping downtown whole. The plan that best reflects these principles is Plan 5, because it keeps Sorrento Valley, Mission Valley and the Morena business districts in one district.

Comment 22 – Brian Pollard stated that Plan 3 is the best plan to start with because it keeps Oak Park and Webster in District 4. It needs more work but best reflects the community’s needs, because it respects communities of interests, neighborhood boundaries and the deviation is appropriate. He stated that the public is more concerned with uniting communities of interest than deviation. He urged the Commission to empower the historically invisible members of the community.

Comment 23 – Mateo Camarillo, Chair of the Latino Redistricting Committee, echoed Alberto Pulido’s earlier comments. He asked the Commission to review the testimony and the map submitted in early May. He asked the Commission to consider the underserved and underrepresented people in the city. He asked what the special interests are that have been referred to? Are Latinos or African Americans “special interests?” He asked not to add majority-Anglo communities of Kensington-Talmadge to minority areas because it would dilute their vote. Please switch them out for Golden Hills, which has the same population but is majority-minority.

Comment 24 – Geoffery Chan, a 25-year resident of Rancho Peñasquitos, recalled the evolution of Black Mountain Road from a small winding road to a large major artery from Rancho Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa. He advocated uniting Mira Mesa and Rancho Peñasquitos, citing banks, supermarkets, and restaurants that are lacking in Rancho Peñasquitos but available in Mira Mesa, and noted that he conducts business in Mira Mesa. He prefers Plan 3 as a starting point.

Comment 25 – Tim Nguyen with APAC expressed his support for Plan 3 as the starting point and presented APAC’s ideas on redistricting. He advocated for uniting the fire district and provided background information on previous fires. He provided background on the first-ever San Francisco and Oakland Asian empowerment districts, and spoke about the growth of Asian populations in San Diego throughout California. He pointed out the resources and businesses shared by the Asian communities of interest. He urged the Commission to create an API-influenced district.

Comment 26 – Mitz Lee urged the Commission to unite Rancho Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa to create an API-influenced district. She presented the Commission with additional signatures for a total of 2,300 petition signatures. She referenced similar demographics, shared services and transportation. She asked the Commission to start with Plan 3 and to at least discuss the merit of uniting Mira Mesa and Rancho Peñasquitos. She stated that redistricting school districts is separate and unrelated to council redistricting.

Comment 27 – Dr. Allen Chan, a 20-year Rancho Peñasquitos resident and APAC member, stated that redistricting is about empowering voters, not special interests or community planning boards. He stated that at the Mira Mesa July 4th celebration APAC collected 500 signatures for their petition to unite Rancho Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa. Over 200 of the signers that day were Rancho Peñasquitos residents, evidence of the link between the two communities. He expressed support for using Plan 3 as a starting point for the final redistricting map.

Comment 28 – Laura Riebau asked the Commission to take into as much consideration the written comments and submitted maps. She is opposed to splitting the eastern areas of San Diego into two or more districts. She provided some suggestions as to how best split that area.

Comment 29 – Charles Alexander representing Mt. Hope stated that he does not want Mt. Hope removed from District 4. He stated that there have been 93 deaths in Mt. Hope in the last ten years; he stated that Mt. Hope needs more public facilities, more school funding for programs, and more social services. He stated that Mt. Hope community members provided the “Safe Zones” in District 4 amongst other contributions.

Comment 30 – Aurora Cudal with APAC spoke in favor of their proposed map. She asked that the Asian community not be disenfranchised. She referenced the Voting Rights Act. She informed the Commission that APAC has retained a legal team to help guide them through the remaining redistricting process.

Comment 31 – John Cuthbertson from Talmadge spoke against separating Talmadge and Kensington. Talmadge used Kensington parks and library. He agrees that it should be with similar communities in District 3.

Comment 32 – Janelle Riella with the Downtown Partnership asked the Commission to keep Downtown whole in an urban district with uptown areas. They’d like to be part of District 3, and not connected to the beaches and bays or Point Loma.

Comment 33 – Anne Schoeller spoke in favor of keeping Rolando, El Cerrito, Redwood Village, Oak Park and Webster. She’d like to see these neighborhoods together with College in District 7. She would also like to be joined with Talmadge and Kensington.

Chair Dalal called a 10 minute recess.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he’d like to start discussion with the beach districts or the north districts.

Commissioner Quiroz referenced an email received from Joe LaCava asking for some minor changes in two blocks with zero population so that Del Mar Mesa can be whole in District 1. Mr. Levitt acknowledged that the changes will be made.

Commissioner Quiroz would like to discuss the minority empowerment districts before moving on, because she would like to make sure that minority votes are not diluted before moving on.

Commissioner Morrow stated that it seems like the Commission has decided to create the new district in the southeast corner of the city. She is opposed to that because she thinks there should be other alternatives, including trying moving District 3 towards the east. Since District 2 is the most populated she thinks it would make sense to start with that area. She presented some changes in her map.

Commissioner Marquez asked whether the Commission should enter into discussion of creating a new district elsewhere in the city.

Chair Dalal stated that the mapping consultant would guide them through the process of discussing the city region by region and that Commissioner Morrow's points could be made during this process.

Commissioner Potter agreed to start the discussion with the beach communities.

Commissioner Quiroz would rather start with identifying communities of interest. She thinks that starting in District 2 would cause the Commission to start drawing into and around the LGBT community of interest before discussing where that is.

Chair Dalal asked Mr. Johnson to begin guiding the discussion.

Mr. Levitt discussed two options for the beach district. One would be to have Bay Ho and Bay Park in the beach district, the other would be to have Downtown with the beach districts.

Commissioner Marquez stated that Plan 6 least reflects the public testimony from the beach communities. He'd like to disregard that option. He prefers the beach districts in Plans 4 and 5.

Commissioner Potter agreed with Commissioner Marquez's sentiments.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that one of the most crucial points is to keep Point Loma with the airport because of noise abatement issues. He sees ties between Point Loma and Downtown as well as with the beach. He prefers Plans 4 and 5 for the coastal district.

Commissioner Nishioka asked if NDC is now able to overlay maps to show contrasts between two plans.

NDC said that is available. Commissioner Marquez asked to see Plans 5 and 6 overlaid.

Chair Dalal agreed that the beach communities should be kept together. She also sees merit to keeping Point Loma with the airport.

Mr. Levitt showed Plan 5 districts defined by colors, overlaid with the Plan 6 districts defined by a thick black border.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that the shaded version of District 2 (Plan 5) best reflects public testimony he's heard.

Commissioner Kosmo presented changes he made in his map. He placed Old Town back in District 3 and kept Little Italy in District 2. He suggested those changes be made to Plans 4 and 5.

Commissioner Quiroz liked Commissioner Kosmo's suggestions.

Commissioner Nishioka asked for District 2 population totals. Mr. Levitt stated that the deviation was under populated by 0.2%. Commissioner Nishioka then stated he was in support of the inclusion of Little Italy in this district.

Commissioner Potter also supports including Little Italy in District 2, but he is concerned about the small piece of La Jolla that falls into Pacific Beach.

Commissioner Kosmo proposed moving forward with District 2 with the Little Italy and Old Town modifications.

Commissioner Potter supports Commissioner Kosmo's proposal.

Mr. Johnson asked the Commission to consider the Tierrasanta area. He displayed Plan 4 districts defined by colors, overlaid with the Plan 5 districts defined by a thick black border. Plan 4 splits the area north and south; Plan 5 splits the area north and west. Mr. Levitt asked which option the Commissioners prefer.

Commissioner Potter prefers Plan 5 because it unites the Navajo areas and includes Miramar East where Mission Trails Park will be expanded.

Commissioner Kosmo prefers Plan 5 based on public testimony. He stated the open space could go to either District 7 or District 6. He also stated that District 6 has over 30% API population.

Commissioner Nishioka asked that NDC point out USD in the Linda Vista area, and asked to see where the Bayside Community Center was on the map.

Mr. Levitt highlighted USD on the map and stated that USD is in the Morena area.

Chair Dalal stated that she sees merit in keeping Serra Mesa aligned with the Navajo communities and Mission Valley.

Mr. Johnson asked the Commissioners which plan they prefer for this area, Plan 4 or 5. He contrasted them on the screen. Mr. Johnson stated that the options are whether Linda Vista, Serra Mesa, and Mission Valley are with Kearny Mesa or with Navajo.

Commissioner Marquez prefers Plan 5 because it unites Navajo and allows a portion of Linda Vista with Asian population to be united with Mira Mesa.

Mr. Levitt asked the Commissioners to consider the City Heights area. Plans 3 and 4 are identical in this area. Plan 5 trades out Kensington-Talmadge for Golden Hill; they are equal in population. Plan 6 unites Navajo with areas south of the 8 and includes South Park and Golden Hill with City Heights.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he objects to the use of numbers; he'd like to have the conversation about numbering before numbers are assigned to districts.

Ms. Spivak stated that numbers were added to the maps in consultation with the City Attorney's office and in the interest of the public, so that they would not be confused with numbers being assigned at the last minute. They thought it would be good for the public to know what the numbers will most likely be, although the final decision will not be made until after legal review.

Commissioner Potter supports Plan 4 because it keeps all the neighborhoods around Balboa Park together, including Golden Hill.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the current maps are created using traditional redistricting principles but they now have to start looking at minorities and how they can not dilute their vote. She stated she'd like to see Golden Hill with District 9 because it is minority-driven. She also mentioned the Adams Avenue business district and asked they stay together. She stated that moving the district over the east would dilute the minority vote in City Heights. She'd like to discuss this area in terms of minority empowerment.

Commissioner Kosmo asked NDC to pull up his Plan B, but he is in favor of Plan 4 over Plan 5. He stated that Balboa Park should be the center of District 3.

Commissioner Marquez prefers Plan 5 because Kensington and Talmadge residents have testified that they relate more to the single-family neighborhoods to the west of them. He also stated that Golden Hill borders Barrio Logan and therefore cultural influence should be considered. He stated Kensington and Talmadge have less in common with Mid-city, than does Golden Hill.

Commissioner Potter has an issue with the connectivity in Plan 5, District 9. He referred to his District 9, which has over a 50% Hispanic population.

Commissioner Morrow stated she preferred Plan 4 because it unites the neighborhoods around Balboa Park.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the conversation regarding fair representation needs to be had. She posed the question: Are we trying to get fair and equitable representation for Balboa Park or for the people of Golden Hill? She does not want to dilute the minority vote.

Mr. Johnson stated that in Plan 4 the Latino voting age population of District 9 is 44.5%. In Plan 5 it is 45.4%. In terms of Citizen Voting Age Population, Latinos are 27.2% in Plan 4 and 28.7% in Plan 5.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he's heard a lot of testimony regarding keeping Talmadge and Kensington together and united with neighborhoods to the west. He's curious about the rationale for not complying with those wishes. He also stated that what the Commission chooses to do with Kensington-Talmadge will affect what they can or cannot do with District 9, therefore Kensington-Talmadge is his greatest concern for the area. If Golden Hills is added to District 3, then the

decision has been made not to include Kensington-Talmadge. He also stated that Kensington-Talmadge voters vote in every election; the communities with which it's united in Plan 4 do not. He prefers keeping Kensington-Talmadge with District 3 and Golden Hill with District 9.

Commissioner Potter asked what had changed from Commissioner Quiroz's June 16th memo that stated neighborhoods surrounding Balboa Park should be kept together.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he's heard conflicting testimony about where Kensington-Talmadge should go and the Commission needs to look at the totality of the situation. He referred to testimony that Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group voted to stay with Fox Canyon. He stated that City Heights blends right into the southern part of Talmadge. He stated Golden Hill is diverse and tied right into Balboa Park. He believes there are several options proposed that fairly and equitably represent the Latino community, which he thinks is important. He prefers Plan 4.

Mr. Johnson stated to keep Kensington and Talmadge together in District 3, they'd have to move out Golden Hills and South Park, or 5,000 people from North Park or elsewhere.

Commissioner Quiroz referenced the coalition of people in the areas in question, who came to the Commission and told them what they wanted their districts to look like. She stated that these groups stated who they represented. They presented the map they had collaborated on and agreed would give the best representation to minorities. She would like their map put up and discussed.

Commissioner Marquez stated that there is a community center at the border between South Park and Golden Hill whose service population is not the north but down into District 8 and to the east. He'd like to talk about service provisions and where rec centers are located and the communities they serve. He also referenced votes on Prop 22 and Prop 8, stating that Kensington-Talmadge are more aligned with the LGBT community of interest than Golden Hills. He asked for the same deference given to other Commissioners when speaking about their district of residence when he is speaking about District 3. He does not want to move on to other areas until District 3 is cemented.

Commissioner Potter recalled Brian Pollard stating that he preferred Plan 3. He asked Mr. Johnson to pull up Plan 3.

Mr. Levitt noted that District G in Plan 3 is identical to District 3 in Plan 4.

Commissioner Potter stated that District G in Plan 3 does not extend across Interstate 805.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he has reviewed all testimony and takes it all into account. Regarding Kensington and Talmadge, he prefers they be united with areas to the west.

Mr. Johnson asked for a straw vote to see where the Commissioners are in this area regarding Plan 4 versus 5. He suggested that if it's a 50/50 vote it be decided later. District 4 and District 1 will be discussed on Saturday. He stated that to unify South Park, you'd have to split Normal Heights.

Commissioner Marquez stated he is comfortable keeping South Park out of District 3, because most of what he stated earlier about Golden Hill is also true of South Park.

Mr. Johnson led the Commissioners in a straw vote. He asked which Commissioners preferred Plan 4, with Golden Hill and South Park in District 3 and Kensington-Talmadge in District 9, and which Commissioners prefer Plan 5, with Kensington-Talmadge in District 3 and Golden Hill in District 9. Commissioners indicated a 4-3 preference for Plan 4 version.

Mr. Johnson suggested that unless a larger consensus could be reached today, they might want to move forward with two versions of this area.

Commissioner Potter asked to see a version of Plan 5 that evens out the boundary lines along the freeway, and he'd like the connectivity between Golden Hills and South Park and the rest of District 9 spelled out.

Mr. Johnson stated that a bigger connection could be created by taking a part of North Park and possibly going a bit into Stockton.

Commissioner Quiroz agrees with Commissioner Potter about the connectivity issues. She thinks this might be the one area of the city where they might have to split a census block, because that particular block is strangely shaped.

Mr. Johnson asked the City Attorney's office if they could provide guidance at the next meeting about the provisions regarding compactness and census blocks.

Ms. Spivak stated that they'd look into it.

Mr. Johnson asked that the public come speak about these deciding issues, because Saturday should consist of finalizing changes.

Commissioner Morrow stated that if no one is in favor of Plan 6, that is should be disregarded. She also stated for the record that her map had nothing to do with Plan 6, except that current District 6 is moved west. She is disappointed that the Commission is not willing to look at that alternative.

Chair Dalal asked what the Commission would see next, as far as plans.

Mr. Johnson said Plans 4 and 5 would be consolidated and the direction given today incorporated into Plans 4b and 5b. Plan 6 would remain as is. He wanted to discuss if to keep Plan 6 in the conversation, as it incorporates Commissioner Potter's and Commissioner Kosmo's ideas for Oak Park and District 4.

Commissioner Marquez stated that the next meeting on Saturday falls on LGBT Pride Day and he is concerned that the LGBT community won't make it out to speak about what they'd like to see done. He is uncomfortable with Saturday being the last day to make major decisions.

Commissioner Kosmo would like to discuss the difference between Districts 9 and 4. He stated that Barry Pollard and Mateo Camarillo both supported Plan 4, and that Plan 4 keeps Oak Park and Webster together and District 9 would have a strong Latino population. He stated that he is not opposed to that and he'd like the Commission to think about that.

Mr. Levitt asked about District 8, and whether or not Shelltown should be included in District 8.

Commissioner Quiroz stated because of the large deviation, Shelltown should remain in District 8.

Commissioner Kosmo agreed and thinks Shelltown should stay with the traditional District 8.

Commissioner Potter is in favor of keeping Shelltown in District 8 and would like to see the population totals if Stockton was put into District 9 for connectivity to Golden Hill.

Commissioner Nishioka asked that Ms. Wong advise when the meeting is available for viewing online so that he can watch the part of the meeting he missed before his arrival. He asked Mr. Johnson to go over what to expect on Saturday.

Mr. Johnson stated that he hopes that the Commission would settle on a big picture map, so that the following Tuesday would be about fine tuning the boundaries and identifying service centers that might need to be included or excluded from specific districts.

STAFF REPORTS

ITEM 4: MIDORI WONG, CHIEF OF STAFF

Ms. Wong stated that CityTV has been providing coverage of the Commission meetings at no cost. However, the length and number of meetings has reached the point that CityTV can no longer cover the meetings for free. The cost of meetings going forward will be \$400 per meeting and the Commissioners will be seeing that in the next monthly budget report, unless the Commission chooses to use only audio recordings. She also confirmed whether the start times for remaining regular Commission meetings should be moved to 4:00 p.m.

Ms. Wong went over the Public Hearing dates and times and informed the Commission that Spanish translation services will be available at two hearings.

She provided information regarding Saturday's meeting at Balboa Park and offered tips regarding accessibility and parking in light of the Pride festivities on the same date.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairperson Dalal adjourned the meeting at 7:48 p.m.

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary
2010 Redistricting Commission

**Written Comments Received
July 14, 2011 Redistricting Commission Meeting**

Comment 1: Judith Pilch

I am a San Carlos resident (since April 1978) and ask that the Commission keep the four (4) Navajo communities in the same City Council District.