

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

SATURDAY, JULY 16, 2011

**BALBOA PARK CLUB – SANTA FE ROOM
2144 PAN AMERICAN ROAD WEST, SAN DIEGO, 92101**

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dalal at 10:06 a.m. 43 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 1:53 p.m. to the next scheduled meeting of the Redistricting Commission on Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at the City Administration Building in the Committee 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
(M) Arthur Nishioka – present
(M) David Potter – present
(VC) Vice Chair Carlos Marquez – present
(M) Theresa Quiroz – present
(M) Frederick Kosmo – present
(M) Ani Mdivani-Morrow – 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 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.

There we no non-agenda comments.

COMMISSION COMMENT:

Commissioner Nishioka made opening remarks regarding his Asian heritage and ancestry and the Asian American community. He talked about his culture and referenced his support of UPAC, ABA, SDAFF, and Friendship Garden. He stated that he has reviewed the maps on Esri, the public testimony and all his notes and takes into consideration all these when making his decisions.

CITY ATTORNEY AND CITY STAFF ASSIGNED TO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION COMMENT:

Sharon Spivak, Deputy City Attorney, answered four legal questions that had been referred to her office and to the legal consultant, Marguerite Leoni of Nielsen Merksamer.

(1) Census Units and Compactness: First, Ms. Spivak responded to a question from Doug Johnson of NDC. NDC had asked the City Attorney's Office for direction regarding City Charter requirements related to using whole census units and how this might conflict with the Charter's other direction regarding compactness of districts. Ms. Spivak recited the relevant portion of Charter section 5.1: "To the extent it is practical to do so, districts shall: preserve identifiable communities of interest; be geographically compact—populous contiguous territory shall not be bypassed to reach distant populous areas; be composed of whole census units as developed by the United States Bureau of the Census; be composed of contiguous territory with reasonable access between population centers in the district, and not be drawn for the purpose of advantaging or protecting incumbents."

Ms. Spivak said Charter section 5.1 puts the concepts of compactness and not splitting Census units on equal footing. Significantly, however, she said it states these are requirements "to the extent it is practical to do so." Thus, if it is practical to split a Census unit, a block or a tract, to achieve another purpose under the redistricting laws, the Commission has the flexibility to do so. And thus, if it is practical not to have a district be as compact as another alternative in another proposed map, for other reasons that are in full compliance with redistricting law, the Commission has flexibility regarding a district's compactness.

Ms. Spivak noted that Charter section 5.1 must be read along with Charter section 5. Section 5 again states the importance of compactness in a City redistricting plan. She said one could argue that having two references in the Charter to compactness makes it slightly more important than the single reference to keeping Census units whole. Section 5 also has a modifier. It says the districts must be made as geographically compact "as possible." Thus, Ms. Spivak indicated that the phrases "as possible" and "to the extent it is practical to do so" give the Commission flexibility. Thus, when

Commissioners asked if they could split a block or a tract, Ms. Spivak said they can do so and fully adhere to the Charter, provided the Commission is adhering to other aspects of redistricting law.

(2) Voting Rights Act Analysis: Second, Commissioners had asked if there were Voting Rights Act implications in the decision whether to include either Kensington/Talmadge or Golden Hill in the draft District 9. The City Attorney's office and outside legal counsel concluded that there were no Voting Rights Act implications in that choice. Ms. Spivak noted that her office had retained Marguerite Leoni, a nationally recognized expert in the Voting Rights Act, to assist with VRA analysis, and that she had reviewed this issue. She said they examined the demographics of the draft District 9 in Plans 4 and 5 (not Plan 6 because they were not asked to do so). Ms. Spivak said they concluded there does not appear to be potential voting rights implications under Section 2 of the Act in making that choice one way or the other. District 9 will not be a single race, majority/minority district of citizens of voting age population under either configuration. Under Plan 4, District 9, including Kensington and Talmadge, would be approximately 27.2% Hispanic, 14.1% African American, and 11.4% Asian American in citizen voting age population. Under Plan 5, District 9, including Golden Hill, would be approximately 28.7% Hispanic, 14.4% African American, and 10.5% Asian American in citizen voting age population. Under both configurations, District 9 would be a racially-diverse district in which no racial group would constitute a majority of the eligible voters. Minority groups in combination, however, would constitute a majority of the eligible voters in the district under both configurations.

(3) District 9 in NDC Plan 5 and the 14th Amendment: Third, Ms. Spivak answered the question: Does District 9 as depicted in NDC's Plan 5 violate the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution? Based on the information they reviewed, the City Attorney's office and outside legal counsel concluded that it does not appear to violate the 14th Amendment. The 14th Amendment prohibits redistricting in which race is the predominant consideration in the design of district boundaries and other traditional redistricting criteria are subordinated to that discussion. The 14th Amendment, however, does not prohibit all consideration of race. For example, race must be taken into account to avoid a violation of Section 2 of Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965. An oddly-shaped district has no constitutional significance unless that shape is evidence of impermissible racial gerrymandering. An oddly-shaped district can be perfectly legal. Like all districts in Plan 5, she said, District 9 must continue to be evaluated under all redistricting criteria. These are the redistricting criteria set forth in the City Charter, reasonable population equality, compactness, contiguity, intra-district access between population centers, use of whole census units, and natural and street-line boundaries, and the achievement of fair and effective representation. The commission may exercise its discretion in balancing and applying those criteria. However, at this time, and based on the record, District 9 as drafted does not violate the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

(4) Numbering of Council Districts: Fourth, Ms. Spivak responded to Commissioner Nishioka's question about the numbering of districts on Draft NDC Maps 4 and 5, while letters remained on Draft Map 6. She said the City Attorney's Office had spoken to NDC to assign preliminary numbers so that the public would know as soon as possible how districts will be numbered, so they can have input. She said numbering will need to consider the existing territory in the current City Council Districts, as well as the population in the current City Council Districts that is going to be transferred into a new district. She said her office is working with NDC to get the Commission

information it can overlay onto any plan the Commission is adopting to show where the critical mass of existing geographic territory and population is that will be transferred into a new district. She said the numbers assigned have to have a rational basis. Charter sections 10 and 12 require that certain districts be up for reelection or election in 2012, and others in 2014. She said that also has to inform the process without considering anyone who is an incumbent or anyone who is running for Council, because that is not allowed. She said there has to be a rational relationship of the population in the existing districts to what numbers are assigned. She said ultimately it is the Commission's decision what numbers will be put on the districts.

Finally, Ms. Spivak stated that the City Attorney's Office has tried to help the Commission keep on a straight legal track throughout this process by providing legal advice in public, both through her office and a recognized expert in the field, as to all of the critical redistricting laws, from the Charter, to the Constitution, to the Voting Rights Act. She said she is confident that the Commission has been armed with the law it needs to properly do its job. She stated that any misinterpreted or controversial comments made by individual Commissioners in the process cannot be attributed to the Commission as a whole. It is the final plan and its evidentiary support that will be meaningful at the end of the process.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 1: DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

Mr. Johnson summarized what to expect from Plans 4b and 5b. He stated that the request to incorporate the Fox Canyon proposal into Plan 6 could not be done because in that plan the Navajo district comes below I8. Incorporating the Fox Canyon proposal into Plan 6 would increase the population significantly; however, NDC came up with an option which moves Redwood Village as requested by the Fox Canyon plan proponents and that can be inserted into either Plan 4b or Plan 5b.

Mr. Levitt proposed NDC Plans 4b, 5b and 6. <<Recording Time Reference 24:20>>

Comment 1 – Raquel Moran stated that the Hispanic community is pleased that there will be a 9th district, but wants the Commission to understand that the City needs a second Latino council member that will work in conjunction with the District 8 Councilmember to address the needs of the Latino community. She feels the Latino community and especially San Ysidro have been neglected in the past. This has been greatly remedied by appointing a Latino Councilmember, and that creating a second Latino district would further remedy it.

Comment 2 – Alicia Jimenez stated that according to the 2010 Census data the Latino population has increased dramatically. For this reason, there needs to be another Latino district that unites City Heights with communities to the south of I-8. She asked for the Commission's support in creating one.

Comment 3 – Steve Rivera, a Golden Hill resident, stated that Golden Hill is more similar to City Heights than South Park for reasons including more households living below the poverty line and speaking a language other than English, and a greater population under the age of 18. He asked to be grouped with other communities facing the same issues as theirs and advocated for the Community in Unity map.

Comment 4 – Linda Perine with the LGBT Redistricting Task Force thanked the Commission for making an effort to adhere to their submitted map. She mentioned that Kensington and Talmadge would fit better in District 3, along with all of Downtown. She resubmitted their map to the Commission.

Comment 5 – Laura Riebau spoke regarding the College neighborhoods, including El Cerrito, Redwood Village, and Rolando Park. She stated they do not fit in with City Heights and Fox Canyon, and stated they are largely English speaking. She'd prefer to be with the Navajo communities.

Comment 6 – Jolaine Harris stated that El Cerrito and the other College areas have barely started some important renovations. She feels that if these neighborhoods are grouped with the eastern areas, their projects and needs could slip through the cracks. She also advocated for keeping Oak Park together in whatever district.

Comment 7 – Rhea Kuhlman, representing the College Area Community Council, stated that they met and decided which areas are most important to keep together. She appreciates that College East and West are kept together. She'd like to see Rolando and El Cerrito included in their district, as well as Talmadge and Redwood Village. She stated that Redwood Village is part of the College Area Foundation. She stated that Del Cerro has a lot in common with areas to the north, but SDSU is a greater tie to the communities to the south.

Comment 8 – Anne Schoeller stated that Rolando Park should remain together with Redwood Village in the College area district. She is concerned about their voting rights protection. She'd like Kensington and Talmadge also included with their district. She'd like to see these communities grouped with Navajo.

Comment 9 – Bob Ilko with the Scripps Ranch Civic Association spoke in favor of keeping Scripps Ranch whole with Miramar Ranch North and Rancho Encantada in one district. He referenced their shared public facilities, resources, traffic concerns, and youth sports. He asked the Commission to keep the 92131 zip code together in one district.

Comment 10 – Andy Huelskamp spoke against Plans 4 and 4b. He'd like to keep the El Cerrito and Redwood Village together. He doesn't want Oak Park split.

Comment 11 – Lee Rittner presented a map with less than 200 people deviations throughout the City.

Comment 12 – Brian Pollard presented his most recent map. He asked the Commission to respect the wishes of the community councils and stated that this map is similar to Plans 3 and 5b, and suggests using these maps as a starting point, since they best respects the minority communities of interest.

Comment 13 – Pat Shields and Rachell Alvarez with the Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee stated that Golden Hill and South Park have most in common with North Park. She referenced shared transportation and the strong economic benefit that Golden Hill has from being connected to South Park and North Park. She also stated the large geographical divides of the freeway and the overpass make it hard for Golden Hill residents to make it over to City Heights.

Comment 14 –David Moty with the Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group favors being united with communities to the south and west because they have similar problems. Although the demographics and economics might be different, a lot of the problems are the same.

Comment 15 – Jay Wilson with the Del Cerro Action Council prefer Plans 4b and 5b, because they unite the Navajo areas.

Comment 16 – Jose Lopez presented a hand out and letters to the commission. He advocated for the Fox Canyon plan and stated that Plan 4b is ideal for his area.

Comment 17 – John Pilch, President of the San Carlos Area Council, thanked the Commission for uniting the Navajo communities in 4b and 5b, and suggested one of those be adopted. He stated that Plan 6 is not supported by Navajo. They do not share commonalities with Kensington and Talmadge, nor with San Diego State. He referenced SDSU's exclusion of impacts on Navajo from their Environmental Impact Report on their redevelopment.

Comment 18 – Kathryn Willetts, a Golden Hill resident, advocated keeping Golden Hill with South Park and North Park. She referenced shared resources and facilities.

Comment 19 – Norm Dahlgren is in support of Plan 4b because he finds it logical to keep South Park and Golden Hill with Balboa Park and the surrounding communities. He stated that South Park and Golden Hill are directly impacted by the surrounding areas.

Comment 20 – Staajabu Heshimu stated that Plan 6 is unacceptable with respect to District 4. She stated that in Plans 4b and 5b, Redwood Village and Rolando Park have nothing in common with communities to the south of them. They should be with the College area district.

Comment 21 – Andy Berg with the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council is in favor of Plan 6 only as it relates to District A, because it keeps Rancho Peñasquitos whole. He talked about the shared health district, shared youth sports, and commonalities amongst residents.

Comment 22 – Elizabeth M. Cuen, a Tijuana River Valley resident, stated that she feels that in the past San Ysidro and Tijuana River Valley have been marginalized. She stated that with the new

District 8 representative things have begun improving. She thanked the Commission for their outreach and the opportunity for the public to be involved.

Comment 23 – Rick Accurso, a Golden Hill resident, is in favor of Plan 4b and opposed to Plan 5b. He stated that he attends community meetings in Balboa Park and areas he can walk and bike to. He stated that Golden Hill, South Park and North Park form one village.

Comment 24 – Lei-Chala Wilson, president of NAACP in San Diego and member of NCNW and BAPAC, spoke in favor of keeping Oak Park and Webster within District 4. She referenced shared resources, shopping centers, and public services. She advocated for the Community in Unity map and the creation of a second Latino district. She supports Plan 3 or Plan 5b.

Comment 25 – Matthew Kostrinsky, a resident of Del Cerro, stated that their community of interest is that of the College area. He stated that they share issues regarding to mini-dorms, and college facility development. He stated that he and his family attend community events in the College area, not in Tierrasanta. He stated that both communities of Tierrasanta and Del Cerro were against building a road that would unite the two communities. The only thing connecting them is a trail. He referenced Tierrasanta Town Council's 14-1 vote not to be united with Del Cerro. College is a community of interest with Del Cerro.

Comment 26 – Perla Rodriguez representing the Stockton Community Council expressed their support for the Community in Unity plan and the establishment of a second Latino and immigrant empowerment council. She thanked their District 8 Councilmember for the improvements in their district.

Comment 27 – Remigia Bermudez stated that Plan 4b and 5b are acceptable for Districts 8 and 9, but the inclusion of Redwood Village and Rolando Park into District 4 is a disservice to the district. It dilutes the minority vote. She asked that information be available earlier. She had earlier submitted an email expressing support for Plan 5, but upon arriving realized that there are now new maps. She retracts her previous endorsement and is now in support of Plan 5b, but with reservations because she hasn't had a chance to thoroughly review it, since it was only made available today. She stated that the meetings are too rushed and close together and she would prefer more outreach and meeting information.

Comment 28 – Michael Sprague thanked the Commission for updating the mailing list to include him. He stated the websites are not up to date. He stated that City Heights residents have helped elect LGBT candidates in the past. He stated that the new District 3 removes all Catholics, Muslims, Buddhists, evangelicals and only some types of Jews, as well as Latinos, Asians, or poor. He stated there is no Latino district because there is only 24% voting age Latino population in District 9.

Comment 29 – Ben Rivera, from the District 8 communities, once again advocated for keeping the Historic Barrio neighborhoods together. He asked for some changes in the areas between the 805 and 15. He stated that Golden Hill residents are mostly working class people and the Golden Hill Park also services District 8 areas. He stated that he thinks Golden Hills would fit well into another Hispanic majority district.

Comment 30 – Leon Wu, a resident of Rancho Peñasquitos, is in favor of uniting Mira Mesa and Rancho Peñasquitos as a whole into one district. He petitioned for APAC and found proof in the signatures and conversations with residents that Rancho Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa form a community of interest and residents of both communities do want to be united.

Chair Dalal called a 5 minute recess.

Mr. Levitt asked the Commission to consider District 4. He went over the options in Plan 4b and 5b, which includes Oak Park, Webster, and Rolando Park and Redwood Village. He showed a different option which removes Redwood village and Rolando Park and kept some residents from Mt. Hope and Mountain View.

Chair Dalal asked if there was a way to use the 94 or other more natural boundaries as dividers.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she sees more of a connection between City Heights and the areas of Mt. Hope and Mountain View, than with Redwood Village and Rolando Park. She prefers keeping more of Mt. Hope and Mountain View with District 9. She asked if it was possible to change out the part of Mountain View for the area shown in Mr. Pollard's map.

Mr. Levitt stated that is the same, but that it was drawn this way in accordance with Commissioner Quiroz's plan.

Commissioner Quiroz thanked NDC for taking her map into consideration but stated that Mr. Pollard has met with Mountain View community members and they've decided what they'd like. She'd like to see their version.

Commissioner Marquez asked what including the entirety of Mt. Hope as well as Redwood Village and Rolando Park would do to the population deviation.

Mr. Levitt said it is about 2,000 people; it would make the area connecting District 9 to its southern portion narrower.

Commissioner Potter asked to see Mr. Pollard's map to better understand the boundaries he was speaking to.

Mr. Levitt stated that Plan 3 has the boundary in Mt. Hope that Mr. Pollard is referring to.

Commissioner Potter stated that he recalls Mr. Pollard's map had District 9 crossing over the freeway.

Mr. Levitt said that's true; he also took a portion of Chollas View and put it into District 9.

Commissioner Potter asked what doing that would do to the population. He stated that the Mt. Hope area has five elementary schools, two on the east side of the freeway with some of their students

living on the west side of the freeway. It might make sense to combine those two areas in one district.

Mr. Levitt stated that the area east of the freeway in Chollas View has 3,300 residents.

Commissioner Potter asked if adding Chollas View and removing some of Mountain View would balance the population.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the gentleman who worked with Mr. Pollard indicated that there was no intention to split Chollas View.

Mr. Levitt stated that putting the rest of Chollas View back into District 4 along with the rest of Webster, it would balance the population in the district.

Commissioner Marquez asked for the minority breakdown differences between Plan 4b, and the scenario including parts of Rolando Park, Redwood Village, Mt. Hope and Mountain View.

Mr. Levitt stated that in Plan 4b District 9 is 50% Latino, 43.6% Latino by voting age population.

Commissioner Quiroz asked the Commission to consider that Redwood Village and Rolando Park are more like Oak Park in that they are single family homes and have higher household incomes, and Mt. Hope and Mt. View are more apartments with lower incomes.

Commissioner Marquez asked what would happen to that break down if Redwood and Rolando are added to District 9.

Mr. Levitt stated that in that case, District 9 would be 48.9% Latino by total population, 41.5% by voting population, and 25% by citizen voting age population.

Mr. Johnson suggested taking Plan 6 off the table, since they seem to be fine tuning Plans 4b and 5b.

All Commissioners agreed to disregard Plan 6.

Mr. Levitt asked for direction regarding Redwood Village and Rolando Park for the preliminary map.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that deciding between Map 4b and 5b should come first, so that tweaking boundaries could be done to one map.

Commissioner Marquez stated that at the last meeting he raised several concerns with Plan 4, regarding Kensington and Talmadge, Golden Hills and South Park. He stated that the testimony and concerns regarding the connectivity of Golden Hill with District 9 was compelling and he is comfortable with including them in District 3 and moving forward with Plan 4b.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she too reviewed the connectivity issues after the last meeting and also found that in order to adhere to traditional redistricting requirements she cannot keep Golden Hills with District 9.

Commissioner Kosmo stated he too is comfortable moving forward with 4b. He asked if everyone else concurs.

Chair Dalal stated that in her experience working in City Heights, Talmadge is connected to that community. She stated that contiguity is also an important deciding factor in keeping Golden Hill and South Park with District 3.

Commissioner Potter also favors moving forward with Plan 4b.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that it's a hard decision but keeping Golden Hill in District 3 is appropriate.

Commissioner Morrow also favors keeping Golden Hill in District 3.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he'd like to finish working on District 4 before moving up to the north. He stated that based on public testimony Oak Park and Webster should remain in District 4. He also stated that he has heard the testimony regarding Redwood Village and Rolando Park, but keeping a strong Hispanic population in District 9 is important to him. He is in favor of keeping District 4 as it is now, but is open to differing opinions. He'd like the part of Mountain View that Mr. Pollard showed on his revised map to be a starting point for expansions of District 4.

Commissioner Marquez stated he is also most comfortable with this version of District 4. If tweaks are made to the Rolando Park and Redwood Village borders, he'd like to see the boundary in Mountain View start at 41st or 39th Street; however, he prefers this version.

Commissioner Quiroz stated she is in agreement with Commissioner Kosmo. She is uncomfortable taking out Redwood Village and Rolando Park because she believes those communities would be better represented in District 4 than Mountain View or Mt. Hope would be.

Mr. Johnson asked if there was consensus on District 4.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he feels they are close enough to make a decision regarding District 4. He stated that he is sensitive to the College area communities, but feels there is a compelling argument to not dilute minority voting strength for District 9. He is in favor of keeping Redwood Village and Rolando Park in District 4.

Commissioner Kosmo asked for the population percentages in both scenarios again.

Mr. Johnson stated that Plan 4b as it is now is 50% Latino. Mr. Levitt stated that with just Mountain View, it would be 48.6% Latino.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that the percentage would go down and it would have to further in to balance population.

Commissioner Marquez stated that percentage is negligible but the District would be less compact if it stays as is. He is comfortable moving forward with Plan 4b but with Redwood Village and Rolando Park in District 4.

Commissioner Quiroz would be comfortable moving forward with the small change Mr. Pollard drew in.

Mr. Levitt stated that the change Mr. Pollard made is negligible when it comes to population; the African American population is slightly higher in District 4.

Commissioner Kosmo stated he is also comfortable keeping Redwood Village and Rolando Park in; he is comfortable with Mr. Pollard's change as well.

Commissioner Quiroz would like a vote regarding keeping Redwood village and Rolando Park in District 4.

Commissioner Potter is comfortable with keeping Redwood Village and Rolando Park in District 4.

Chair Dalal and Commissioner Kosmo are also comfortable with District 4 as drawn.

Commissioner Morrow is opposed to including Redwood Village and Rolando Park in District 4; she believes they should be in District 9.

Commissioner Nishioka is also opposed to keeping them with District 4; he stated they should be with the College areas.

Mr. Johnson stated that the vote is 5-2 to keep Rolando Park and Redwood Village in District 4. He asked Chair Dalal if they should proceed.

Chair Dalal asked to proceed with the 5-2 vote and move on to the next area.

Mr. Levitt asked if there was consensus about changing the part of Mountain View that is in District 4.

Chair Dalal asked what the rationale for that would be.

Mr. Levitt stated that testimony has asked for specific parts of Mountain View to remain in District 4. Mr. Johnson stated that it is the swap Mr. Pollard requested during public comment.

Chair Dalal stated she is comfortable with the change.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the way it is currently is based on her map and she mapped it that way because of population. Now that the community has come and asked for a more specific boundary, she is comfortable with changing it.

Chair Dalal asked the other commissioners if they agree with the proposed change.

Commissioners Kosmo and Morrow are in agreement with changes.

Commissioner Potter wanted clarification on where exactly the street boundaries are.

Mr. Johnson stated that on Tuesday, since there will be one plan they will have it live and doing changes in real time. He stated the goal of Tuesday is to do the fine tuning, including that for Mountain View.

Commissioner Potter stated that he is comfortable with the change presented here, with the idea that they can fine tune on Tuesday.

Commissioner Marquez is comfortable with the change in Mountain View. He stated that he'd like to discuss whether 41st is the appropriate boundary on Tuesday.

Mr. Johnson stated that yes, the software will be set up to make changes live on Tuesday and these areas will be fine tuned.

Chair Dalal stated that she'd like to fine tune all areas in the map, in regards to shopping areas, public facilities, schools and the like.

Commissioner Morrow asked for clarification as to where Webster and Ridgeview were in this version. She also asked about population changes should Redwood Village and Rolando Park be included in District 9, and Ridgeview moved to District 4.

Mr. Levitt stated that the remaining portion of Ridgewood has 2,000 residents; they'd need to find 5,000 from other areas.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that Commissioner Quiroz lives in that area and there has been other testimony to the natural divide, Chollas Creek, between the two communities. He would be uncomfortable moving Ridgeview into District 4.

Mr. Levitt asked the Commission to consider District 5. In Plans 4b and 5b, a portion of Rancho Peñasquitos is included in District 6. Another option is to split Scripps Ranch. He asked for direction on this area.

Commissioner Marquez would like to see Rancho Peñasquitos united at least in part with Mira Mesa. He stated the south part of Scripps Ranch is not heavily populated, another reason to leave it with the rest of Scripps Ranch.

Mr. Levitt stated that if the problem is the boundary dividing Rancho Peñasquitos, it could be moved from the smaller Salmon River Road to Black Mountain Road, but they'd have to go north of the 56.

Mr. Johnson stated they could come back and fine tune later; he'd like to know if any commissioners prefer the split of Scripps Ranch as opposed to splitting Rancho Peñasquitos.

Commissioner Quiroz asked what the population would be if Rancho Peñasquitos is split further up. She'd like to see the topography base map added to this area.

Mr. Levitt stated that area has about 5,000 people and that base map could be added.

Mr. Johnson stated that they can address the exact boundary in Rancho Peñasquitos on Tuesday. He'd like to know if the Commission is at a consensus regarding splitting Rancho Peñasquitos and keeping Scripps Ranch whole.

Chair Dalal is comfortable with the splitting of Rancho Peñasquitos.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that the decision is a difficult one for him and the Commissioners. He stated that the PUSD was not the ruling factor for him in deciding how District 5 would form. He took into consideration the Coast and District 1. His preference to keep Scripps Ranch whole is in recognition of that community's joint losses in the fires and their efforts to help each other recover emotionally, administratively, and financially. He stated that it's a painful decision, but portions of Rancho Peñasquitos will have to be ceded for population reasons.

Commissioner Kosmo is in support of Plan 4b. He stated that he doesn't like to split communities and this was a hard decision, but keeping part of Rancho Peñasquitos in District 6 makes for a good percentage of API population, which was important to him.

Commissioner Marquez stated that including all of Rancho Peñasquitos in District 6 would cause connectivity issues in the north, and the other viable alternative would create an extremely long north eastern district (more than 20 miles) which seems unacceptable to him. He'd like to be able to keep Rancho Peñasquitos whole, but there are many reasons why it cannot be done. He's comfortable moving forward with this map.

Chair Dalal agreed with Commissioner Marquez's sentiments.

Commissioner Morrow stated that she is in favor of keeping Scripps Ranch whole, but doesn't like splitting Rancho Peñasquitos either. She asked if Rancho Peñasquitos could be kept whole and more of Linda Vista added to District 6.

Mr. Johnson stated that the problem is not the population of District 6, it's the over population of District 5 if both Scripps Ranch and Rancho Peñasquitos are kept whole and in District 5.

Commissioner Quiroz asked if the division of Rancho Peñasquitos could be taken further up to the 56 and more of Linda Vista included in District 6. She also stated that District 7 is not longer than District 5 would have been had all the north eastern fire-risk communities been combined into a district.

Mr. Levitt stated that District 5 would have to come down into either Tierrasanta or East Elliot.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that to her that would be a good thing; she'd like to see District 7 be not so long from one end to the other. She asked why Linda Vista was split where it was; she's not sure if that is in accordance with the public testimony about the two areas of Linda Vista.

Mr. Levitt stated that the split keeps the Morena area in District 2. He said that could be moved back in to District 6 but you'd have to take some of Tierrasanta.

Commissioner Quiroz stated she wouldn't mind seeing Tierrasanta split so that District 7 could be more compact.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he is opposed to splitting Tierrasanta because he did not hear any testimony advocating for a split. He thinks there is consensus that Scripps Ranch be kept whole. He asked if they could move on to another district.

Chair Dalal agrees with Commissioner Marquez.

Commissioner Potter also agrees but pointed out that he tried splitting Rancho Peñasquitos in different ways in his map, but the freeway is the most definitive way. He is in favor of keeping District 7 as it is because of the public testimony regarding the expansion of Mission Trails Regional Park. He stated that the small pocket of Linda Vista that is split away is an area very much in itself and he is comfortable with that area as it is.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that since there is little to no population in Miramar East, she would like to see it joined with District 5 because of the fire risk areas and to help with the compactness of District 7.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that the area of Miramar East is open space and could go either way, but he prefers it as is in Plan 4b. He stated there are fire concerns in Tierrasanta as well as in the north. He prefers this configuration because of the development of Mission Trails Park.

Commissioner Marquez agrees that Mission Trails Park redevelopment is a priority in keeping District 7 as it is. Out of curiosity, he asked for the population difference in adding Miramar East to District 5.

Mr. Levitt stated that there are six residents in Miramar East.

Mr. Johnson stated that adding Miramar East to District 5 would lengthen it considerably, but not significantly lessen the length of District 7. He stated that length is usually a problem when it

affects a councilmember's ability to community effectively throughout the entire length of a district. However, because there is nearly no population in Miramar East, that wouldn't be a problem in this scenario.

Commissioner Nishioka supports Plan 4b as it is currently configured.

Mr. Levitt concluded the outstanding areas on which NDC needed direction.

Commissioner Kosmo redirected the conversation to District 1. He stated that this district has the highest deviation. He stated that at the bottom corner of Pacific Beach there is a community planning area boundary that is in District 1

Mr. Levitt stated that they followed the Community Plan boundary. The second line is the neighborhood boundary from the City website.

Chair Dalal asked to see the streets in those two areas.

Commissioner Kosmo would like to see that boundary moved so that those people are in District 1 to better balance the deviation.

Commissioner Potter likes the boundary the way it is, but would like to see the numbers.

Commissioner Quiroz agrees with Commissioner Potter; she likes it the way it is. She stated that District 3 hadn't been reviewed and decided on.

Chair Dalal asked Mr. Levitt to go over the District 3 options.

Plan 4b has Kensington and Talmadge in District 9, and Golden Hill in District 3. Plan 5b has Golden Hill and the southern end of Normal Heights in District 9, with Kensington and Talmadge in District 3.

Commissioner Marquez asked Commissioner Kosmo about the decision to include Little Italy in District 2.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that in the previous version Old Town was in District 2 and Little Italy was in District 3. He said they could go either way, but he drew it this way because Old Town seems to go well with Mission Hills. He stated that Little Italy gets a lot of airport traffic and noise; therefore, he included it with the Bay and the airport. He also referenced the I-5 natural boundary.

Commissioner Marquez thanked Commissioner Kosmo for the rationale and stated he's comfortable with it.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she'd like the District 3 boundary to go up to I-8 because of bike trails and such. She stated that area is mostly businesses, so it shouldn't change the population by

much. She also stated that Mission Hills and Park West are split between District 3 and District 2. She'd like to see them whole.

Mr. Levitt stated that the Community Plan lines stop at the I-5, but the neighborhood lines extend to Pacific Highway.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she believes the public are more familiar with their neighborhoods than with their Community Plans. She'd rather neighborhoods be kept whole.

Commissioner Potter stated that these neighborhood lines weren't decided by residents but were more likely drawn per service areas. He stated there are no residents but mostly businesses on the south-western side of the I-5. For this reason, he supports keeping those areas in District 2. He stated that he'd like to see Mission Valley kept whole.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that here I-5 is a clear natural boundary. This configuration keeps all the airport parking and traffic within the airport district. He stated that he supports the District 3 northern boundary as is because topographically there are steep cliffs heading into the valley from the south and Mission Valley residents are the ones most impacted by the businesses running along the south side of the 8 freeway.

Chair Dalal stated she supports keeping the District 3 boundary as is in order to keep the Valley together in one district.

Commissioner Potter had one exception to that would be two residences in the Mission Valley census block that are actually in the Normal Heights area. He'd like to add those to District 3 to keep them with their neighbors.

Mr. Johnson stated that Tuesday would just tweaking boundaries.

Commissioner Nishioka asked when NDC anticipates having the plans online.

Mr. Levitt said tomorrow at the latest. He would have test results and data available by next meeting.

Commissioner Nishioka asked how the today's Plan will be named on Esri.

NDC stated it will be called "July 19th Plan."

STAFF REPORTS

ITEM 4: MIDORI WONG, CHIEF OF STAFF

Ms. Wong reminded the Commission and the public that the next meeting's start time has been moved up to 4:00 pm. The most recent version of the meeting schedule with updated start times will be online on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairperson Dalal adjourned the meeting at 1:53 p.m.

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary
2010 Redistricting Commission

**Written Comments Received
July 16, 2011 Redistricting Commission Meeting**

Comment 1: Anne Schoeller

You constantly avoided to discussing the Eastern College area. You heard speakers ask to keep Redwood Village and Rolando Park together in the College area/Eastern and you constantly are so concerned with keeping Mid-city No, 9 Western Beach neighborhoods and you avoided talking about what you are doing to District 7, tearing it apart. This is gerrymandering and prejudice on your part.