

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

**TUESDAY, JULY 19, 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 4:11 p.m. 40 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 8:41 p.m. to the next scheduled meeting of the Redistricting Commission on Thursday, July 21st, 2011 at the 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  
(M) Ani Mdivani-Morrow – present  
(M) Theresa Quiroz – present  
(M) Frederick Kosmo – present  
(M) Arthur Nishioka – present  
(VC) Vice Chair Carlos Marquez – present  
(M) David Potter – 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.

Comment 1: Michael Sprague thanked the Commission for adding him to the mailing list. He received last Saturday's agenda today and he has not yet received this day's agenda. He stated the idea is to get agendas three days before a meeting. He asked if fact-checking is being done on speaker comments.

Comment 2: Dr. Allan Chan asked the Chair if comments and questions received via email or U.S. mail are given the same weight as signatures on petitions.

**COMMISSION COMMENT:**

Commissioner Quiroz referred Dr. Allan Chan's question to the City Attorney's office.

Commissioner Nishioka asked if there was any trouble finding the correct location of the meeting, since it was moved last minute.

Chair Dalal stated that she hadn't heard of any problems and mentioned the signage posted to redirect the public.

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

None.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**ITEM 1: DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN**

Mr. Levitt presented the July 19<sup>th</sup> Plan and explained the one change from Plan 4b in the Mountain View area. A section of Mountain View was swapped out between District 4 and 9. That was the only change from Plan 4b.

Commissioner Nishioka asked about the logic for the stair-step like boundary through Mountain View.

Mr. Levitt stated that they followed the boundary proposed by Mr. Pollard and the Community in Unity proposal. He stated that this area can be cleaned up, perhaps by lowering the boundary to Logan or National Ave.

Comment 1 – Gary Smith, President of the Downtown Residents Group, opposes splitting the Downtown Community Planning Area. He referenced their shared community planning area, the singular community planning group that represents all of Downtown elected from all the

neighborhoods, shared project area committee, and shared parking district. He urged the Commission to reunite Little Italy and East Village with the rest of Downtown.

Comment 2 – Anne MacMillan Eichman with the Little Italy Residents Association spoke in favor of keeping all of Downtown in one district. She referenced their shared vision for the area and their fears that splitting Downtown would split their focus.

Comment 3 – Tom Cleary spoke in favor of keeping USD together in one district. He referenced the CUP and Master Plan. He stated that their basketball pavilion is in District 2 and their softball and baseball facilities are in District 7. He'd like the eastern most parcels of the university to be included in one district. He also advocated for Linda Vista to remain in one district and that its community boundaries be respected. He is opposed to being split into three districts.

Comment 4 – Thomas Kaye, President of Linda Vista Town Council, spoke in opposition to splitting Linda Vista into three parts. He stated that Plan 6 showed that it is possible to keep Linda Vista in one district.

Comment 5 – Andy Berg stated that although he'd prefer Rancho Peñasquitos not be split at all, he thinks the current north-south dividing boundary of the 56 is appropriate except for the southwest corner; a street called Via Panacena should be in District 5. His bigger concern is the east-west dividing boundary, Salmon River Road. It is a narrow road and it will cause next door neighbors to be in different districts. He thinks the better east-west boundary would be Black Mountain Road, because it is major thoroughfare and there are no residences on that road south of the 56. It would move 2,182 people to back into District 5, making it 1.5% over the population goal and District 6 1.87% below. Neither is the greatest deviation. He stated that he emailed the Commission with the details and a map.

Comment 6 – David Strickland, representing the Golden Hill Community Planning Group, thanked the Commission for including Golden Hill and South Park into District 3. He stated that they voted on Wednesday night that they remain connected and within the boundaries of 94 on the south, 15 on the east, and 5 on the west. He appreciates that the most recent map does that.

Comment 7 – David Moty stated that he neither hates nor loves this map. He is troubled by the southern appendage and fears that community will be forgotten down there, but stated that it is up to that community to speak out against their placement.

Comment 8 – Laura Riebau, Chair of Eastern Area Planning Committee, spoke about the differing interests of the Eastern Areas and City Heights. She stated that the Eastern communities want balanced housing while City Heights wants low-income housing; Eastern communities want business development, City Heights want to develop social services; they are concerned about parking while City Heights residents are less concerned about parking because they have public transportation. She believes joining the two areas should be avoided because of their differing socio-economic interests.

Comment 9 – Anna Orzel-Arnita with the Redwood Village Community Council advocated to keep all the College areas together in one district. She stated that Redwood Village and Rolando Park need to remain with the College areas. They endorse the Fox Canyon Plan. She stated that they are not aligned with any political party or an ethnic identity. They are just looking out for the best interest of their communities. She presented the Commission with 75 signatures in support.

Comment 10 – Taina Olason is a Redwood Village resident and wants to remain with the College areas in one district. She moved to Redwood Village specifically because her child attends SDSU. She urged the Commission to keep Redwood Village and all the other College communities together.

Comment 11 – Michael Sprague thinks the southern appendage of District 9 is odd and that the connections are not there. He stated that the LGBT community's proposal did not want City Heights for political reasons. He stated that the part of City Heights that wanted to stay in District 3 was not considered and that some of the information presented in the case to remove City Heights from District 3 is flawed.

Comment 12 – Dustin Steiner, Chairman of Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee, thanked the Commission for unifying Scripps Miramar Ranch into one district.

Comment 13 – Janet Kaye representing the Linda Vista Multi-Cultural Fair Organization spoke in opposition of splitting Linda Vista into three districts. She stated that Plan 6 was acceptable for Linda Vista, but Plan 4b is not. She asked that the Commission not resolve the redistricting challenge on the back of Linda Vista. She presented an alternate map.

Comment 14 – Michael Johnson read a letter from the Linda Vista Community Development Corporation into the record. It stated that the LV CDC is disappointed that Linda Vista is split into three districts and the overall process, especially the presentation of various maps with no documentation.

Comment 15 – Lee Rittner spoke about his involvement and accomplishments within the community of Rolando Park. He is opposed to placing Redwood Village and Rolando Park into District 4. He'd prefer they stay in a district with the College areas. He referenced many of the joint political struggles in the areas of College, as well as the similar housing and shared schools. He believes District 9 is gerrymandering.

Comment 16 – Cindy Chan, a resident of Rancho Peñasquitos, thanked Commissioner Quiroz for her voiced support of APAC. She advocated for the APAC proposal, referencing the petitions, letters, and emails. She stated that the LGBT community's requests have been adhered to, as well as other minority communities' requests, except for the Asian community. She urged that the Commission grant the will of the AP community and its supporters, by placing Mira Mesa, North University City, and Rancho Peñasquitos be placed in one district.

Comment 17 – Corinne Wilson, a resident of Tierrasanta, asked that Tierrasanta be placed in District 6 with the communities to the west because it is in line with the Tierrasanta Town Council

wishes. She stated Tierrasanta is aligned with the communities to the west. She referenced the military families and the geographical connectivity.

Comment 18 – Mitz Lee spoke regarding the numbering of the preliminary districts. She stated that numbering the new districts ties the districts to an incumbent who may or may not effectively represent the new constituents. She asked that the public be informed of the laws governing the numbering and evidence for numbering districts as they are, especially the new District 6, and that their input be considered.

Comment 19 – Marco LiMandri, representing the Little Italy Association, lives, works, and was born in Little Italy. He stated that Little Italy has deep and historic bonds with both the Bay and Downtown. He stated that there are 7 neighborhoods in Downtown and separating Little Italy from those is going against 20 years of work and growth. He asked that the southern border of the district follow the Downtown Community Plan and the Barrio Logan Community Plan. He asked that if the northern boundary be at Laurel Street. He gave some background on the geographic, structural, and economic history of Little Italy.

Comment 20 – Brian Pollard addressed Commissioner Nishioka's question from the last meeting about the stair-case like boundary in Mountain View. He stated that the boundary had been created as such after discussion with residents and was based on things like churches, businesses, theater facilities, and parks, as well as population percentages. He stated that District 4 as drawn increased the African American population in the district. He voiced support for the new multi-cultural District 9. He stated that some Mt. Hope and Mountain View residents don't like the change but they understand the need to be placed in a new multi-cultural district.

Comment 21 – Jose Lopez spoke against splitting Rolando Park and Redwood Village from the College areas. He asked they be included in District 9 and that Mountain View and Mt. Hope return to District 4. He referenced the recent influx of emails from residents of the College areas asking for the same.

Comment 22 – Barrett Tetlow, representing the Republican Party of San Diego County, spoke regarding the numbering of the districts. He stated that incumbents have term limits within districts. If a district number changes, the incumbent could possibly restart his or her term limit. He stated the City Attorney should look into this. He also discussed deferrals and accelerations. He stated that some plans had as much as 20% of the population being deferred or accelerated and he'd referred that to Ms. Leoni. He stated that is not the case with the current plan, but to watch out for those issues when making the final numbering decision.

Chair Dalal called for Commissioner comment and discussion.

Commissioner Potter outlined some changes that could be made to the Linda Vista area, so that it would only be split between Districts 2 and 7. It would make for changes in deviation. He asked the other Commissioners for comment.

Commissioner Nishioka was under the impression that the area of Linda Vista in District 7 would be put into District 6.

Mr. Levitt stated that the area of Linda Vista in District 7 has 20,000 people. If it is added to District 6, they'd have to remove 20,000 from elsewhere in the district.

Commissioner Morrow stated that public testimony today showed that there are major flaws in the preliminary redistricting plan. She asked the Commission to reconsider the decision to include Redwood Village and Rolando Park in District 4. She feels the testimony of the residents of this area is being ignored.

Commissioner Quiroz asked that the small Census tract at the edge of Rolando Park be reunited with Rolando Park. She asked that the Linda Vista lines be matched better in the area where it attaches to Bay Park.

Mr. Levitt stated that there is no population in that area; Commissioner Potter stated that it is part of Tecolote Canyon.

Commissioner Quiroz asked Mr. Levitt to further explain the issues regarding East Village.

Mr. Levitt stated that the boundary was drawn at the border of the neighborhood of East Village. An area extends south of that into District 8 that is part of the Downtown Planning Area, but it's part of the Barrio Logan neighborhood according to the City's website.

Commissioner Quiroz asked if we could check with the Barrio Logan groups to see if that area is of importance to them. She'd like to check before moving into the Downtown district. She also stated that if more people were added from Mountain View into District 4, it would better balance the population. She asked for Mr. Pollard's input. She stated that District 3 has too few people; she'd like Little Italy added into District 3 to better balance the population. She thinks it's an important part of Downtown.

Mr. Levitt stated it would affect the population deviations of both districts but it neither would have the lowest or highest deviations in the plan.

Commissioner Marquez is concerned about placing Little Italy in District 2. He asked Commissioner Kosmo if the same airport issues that affect Little Italy also affect Old Town, and if so, would that be the appropriate trade off.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that as he's said before Little Italy could definitely go with Downtown. He had only configured it this way because Old Town aligns better with Mission Hills and the I-5 was a good natural boundary. He is flexible for switching it with Little Italy.

Commissioner Marquez addressed the Eastern Area, Rolando Park, and Redwood Village residents, as well as the Kensington residents. He stated that their comments are heard loud and clear and taken into consideration. He stated that the regions that they are describing are organized and

involved. He respectfully noted that there are people in the proposed district who don't have the same level of organization and who feel powerless. His hope is to empower those people with the way this district is configured.

He also addressed APAC members, stating that he hopes they don't leave with the idea that they were ignored or not considered in the deliberations. He stated that CVAP numbers show they did try to unify the API community and their numbers in District 6 are similar to the Hispanic and African American numbers in Districts 9 and 4, respectively. He stated that he wanted to speak to these items because he doesn't want anyone to feel that they've been unheard. He thanked the public for their continued participation.

Commissioner Nishioka echoed Commissioner Marquez's sentiments, stating that none of the testimony was lost on him. He took all comments into consideration when deliberating how the districts are formed. He also asked Mr. Levitt to confirm that what is seen before them in Maptitude, will be exactly what is uploaded onto Esri.

Mr. Levitt stated that yes, it will be the same.

Commissioner Nishioka also echoed Commissioner Morrow's sentiments regarding Rolando Park and Redwood Village. He pointed out that a vote was taken at the last meeting on this issue and he yields to the Chair on how these fine tunings are settled. He also commented that the south Peñasquitos border seems like a smooth boundary to him and he has no problem with it.

Chair Dalal asked that the Commission discuss the Little Italy, Linda Vista, Redwood Village/Rolando Park, and Rancho Peñasquitos areas. She asked to start with Little Italy. She began the discussion by stating she is in favor of adding Little Italy to District 3 and removing Old Town.

Mr. Johnson clarified that the Commission can move Little Italy into District 3 without moving Old Town, because the deviation would be 1.5%.

Commissioner Potter stated that is his preference.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that as long as it doesn't affect the overall deviation, he is comfortable with Little Italy moving into District 3 if that is the residents' choice. He would rather not separate Mission Hills and Old Town; if they could remain united in District 3 as well without severely affecting deviation that is his preference as well.

Commissioner Quiroz agrees with the other Commissioners that Little Italy should be moved into District 3, Old Town and Mission Hills should remain.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he has no problem with the switch of Little Italy into District 3.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he'd like to keep Pacific Highway together and in the same district as the airport as much as possible, as the Commission had previously discussed. Chair Dalal agreed with Commissioner Marquez. She asked to move on to the Linda Vista area.

Commissioner Potter suggested going over Mesa College Drive and carrying it over 805 and combining all that into District 7

Mr. Levitt stated that would put District 6 under by over 2%.

Commissioner Potter stated that he's attempts to do this in Esri came back with a lesser deviation.

Commissioner Marquez asked that when tests are done live, that NDC provide ethnic population data as well, because he recalls configuring this area like this in order to unite the API community.

Commissioner Nishioka also recalls that being a factor in configuring the area this way.

Mr. Levitt stating that moving that area into District 6 would increase the Asian population in District 6.

Chair Dalal stated that deviation would be unacceptable.

Mr. Johnson stated that at the beginning of the process they try to get as close to 0% population deviation as possible. At this later stage of fine tuning, he is more comfortable with larger deviations. He stated that 2.4 and 2.5% makes him slightly nervous, but the reasoning could back that.

Commissioner Quiroz asked for clarification. She asked if the area currently highlighted is added to District 6, does the Asian population increase.

Mr. Levitt confirmed that it does.

Commissioner Quiroz stated the 2.5% deviation is high for her, but she'd like to try to reunify Linda Vista.

Commissioner Marquez wants to explore the northern boundary for District 6 proposed by Mr. Berg.

Mr. Levitt stated that what changes are made in the south will affect what can be done in the north.

Commissioner Nishioka would like to reunite the USD campus.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that District 6 is down to 146,000. She asked if the boundary change Mr. Berg suggested would increase the population in District 6.

Mr. Levitt stated that the boundary Mr. Berg was talking about would increase the population in District 5, further decreasing the District 6 number. He stated that the issue with USD is that the campus falls in two Census blocks, both of which are rather large.

Commissioner Kosmo asked for the population of the Census block that includes part of USD within District 6.

Mr. Levitt stated the population in that Census block is 986.

Commissioner Kosmo asked if, that since population was taken from District 2, could that block be added to District 2 to reunify USD.

Commissioner Potter stated that the shape of the block could make it problematic. He'd like to put the sports field back in, but without going all the way up to Ulric Street.

Commissioner Kosmo asked if only the sports field could be added to District 2.

Mr. Johnson stated that there would have to be enough supporting criteria to override the criteria to keep Census blocks whole.

City Attorney Spivak stated that the Commission would have to identify the finding that justifies splitting the Census block (i.e., compactness, a community of interest, contiguity, etc.).

Commissioner Marquez stated that it the Commission treated UCSD as a community of interest because of the redevelopment. He thinks the same case could be made for USD. He is not comfortable with treating UCSD and USD differently.

Commissioner Nishioka asked if there are residents in the separated area.

Mr. Johnson stated that according to the parcel map provided by USD, there is some population living in those two parcels east of District 2. If they split the block, they have no way of knowing how much population is on either side of the split.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that USD should know where their boundaries are and how many people are within their boundaries. She agrees with Commissioner Marquez that large universities are communities of interest and wants to treat all of them fairly. She'd like to see exactly what part of the university is being removed.

Commissioner Potter asked for the topography base map to be added. He asked that they consider changing it the other way, moving the line west instead of east.

Mr. Johnson stated that most of the dorms are to the west.

Chair Dalal asked for a ten minute recess.

Upon reconvening, Mr. Johnson presented the two options for reunifying USD. One would be to move the USD parcels in District 7 to District 2, or do the opposite. If you move District 2 Census blocks into District 7, those are whole blocks—so you wouldn't have to split blocks, but it would be a few thousand people. Combined with the removal of Little Italy, it creates a deviation in District 2

of 2.8%. NDC could pull together the population numbers for the dorms in this area, for an idea of the amount of people that would be removed from District 7; the only problem is that there wouldn't be any ethnic data.

Commissioner Potter prefers taking the portion of the north towards the west. He does believe USD is a community of interest.

Commissioner Nishioka wondered if this would affect the data available to Registrar of Voters. Mr. Johnson stated that it would not affect the Registrar's data, since they work with parcels as opposed to census blocks.

Chair Dalal agreed with Commissioner Potter and favors the second option. She also deems USD a community of interest.

Commissioner Nishioka wants NDC to verify that what is before them now will be the same in Esri and won't need any reconciliation when presenting the data to the Registrar.

Mr. Johnson stated that Esri can't show split blocks, but it will show within the data presented to the Registrar.

Commissioner Kosmo also agreed that USD is a community of interest and is in favor of splitting the census block.

Commissioner Quiroz also agrees that USD is a community of interest and is in favor of splitting the census block; at this time it is the best solution.

Commissioner Marquez supports the change as well.

Commissioner Potter would like to go all the way to lines shown between District 2 and 6.

Mr. Johnson stated that they are going to take the zero population block.

Commissioner Morrow asked for clarification and asked to see what it would look like. She also asked that darker colors be used.

Mr. Johnson clarified and Mr. Levitt hand-drew the area for clarification.

Commissioner Morrow is also in support of the change.

Regarding the northern border of Linda Vista, if the boundary is moved up to include the north part of Linda Vista in District 7, it would leave District 6 under populated by 2.4%.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that there was a lot of testimony today to reunite Linda Vista, but there was also previous testimony for splitting Linda Vista. She'd like to discuss the merit in either option.

Commissioner Marquez stated the public will have a chance to voice their opposition to any changes made during the public hearings. He also stated that he'd like to review the southern boundary again when the Commission is ready to return to that conversation.

Chair Dalal asked for the current border streets.

Mr. Levitt stated the southern border is at Genesee and the 163 freeway. The change would take it to Mesa College Drive.

Commissioner Nishioka asked Commissioner Potter about a previous comment about this area of Linda Vista being part of the Clairemont planning area.

Commissioner Potter stated that was many years ago. He stated that Kearny High and the park are the areas important to Linda Vista that he's concerned about. He doesn't recall testimony to split Linda Vista.

Commissioner Quiroz asked if the part along the freeway is Linda Vista.

Mr. Levitt stated that it is part of the planning area.

Commissioner Nishioka prefers keeping it as it is.

Chair Dalal stated that since they are not reaching agreement, they should move on to the Rancho Peñasquitos area for the time being.

Commissioner Nishioka thinks the division as is seems smooth and likes it as it is.

Commissioners Kosmo and Potter agree.

Commissioner Quiroz also agrees because the deviation is ideal as is.

Commissioner Marquez is also comfortable with the boundary as is. He'd like to discuss some possible changes to the boundaries of District 8, 9, 3, and 4.

He asked what the population deviations and CVAP numbers would be if Shelltown, Rolando Park and Redwood Village were moved into District 9; Golden Hill into District 8.

Removing Golden Hill would leave District 3 would leave it under populated by over 5%. If Shelltown was taken out of District 8, it would leave it over at 4.18%. If Redwood Village and Redwood Park into District 9, would be over by 8,000, and District 4 would be under by 9%.

Commissioner Morrow presented some revisions she made independently. She took Mountain View and Southcrest, and put all of Mt. Hope in District 9.

Mr. Levitt stated that in this version District 4 is under populated by 768 residents, and District 9 is under populated by 437. Redwood and Rolando Park, as well as part of Shelltown, Southcrest, and partial Mount Hope and Mountain View have been added to District 9, but part of Ridgeview has been added to District 4.

Commissioner Marquez stated that this district was configured to create a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic empowerment district. He'd like to see the CVAP and ethnic numbers for this proposal. He also reminded people that Latinos make up a third of the population, and within this district there have already been concessions; the Latino population is already down 25% from what was proposed originally. The boundaries are not arbitrary.

Commissioner Kosmo believes Shelltown should remain in District 8.

Commissioner Marquez is interested in seeing the number.

Commissioner Quiroz is concerned about the plan presented by Commissioner Morrow because this plan splits Shelltown, Ridgeview, Mt. Hope, and Mountain View in order to get Rolando Park and Redwood into District 9. She appreciates the attempt, but splitting so many neighborhoods is unacceptable to her.

Commissioner Morrow stated that Shelltown is not split in her proposal and that Mountain View is split now in the current proposed plan.

Mr. Levitt stated that in the July 19 Plan, District 9 is 48.65% Latino.

Mr. Levitt stated that yes, what is before them now is a previous map developed by NDC when asked to look into Redwood Village and Rolando Park. Their proposal swaps out Redwood and Rolando for more of Mountain View.

Commissioner Marquez asked what the difference between the two versions is in terms of ethnic populations.

Mr. Levitt stated that the current District 9 is 26.3% by the ACS special tabulation; at this configuration it is 25.46%, so it lessens the Latino populations.

Commissioner Marquez asked that if going into Shelltown, would it make up the 2% Latino population that is lost in this version.

Mr. Levitt stated that including all of Shelltown into District 9 would raise the Latino CVAP to 26.5%. It creates a 4.4% deviation in District 9, and a 2.7% deviation in District 8.

Commissioner Marquez asked about splitting Shelltown.

Mr. Levitt split Shelltown down 40<sup>th</sup> Street and stated that this creates deviations of 3.08% in District 9 and -1.45% in District 8.

Commissioner Quiroz would like to look at the Mountain View area. She wants to see the deviations and the Latino and African American numbers if Redwood and Rolando Park are placed in District 9 and more of Mountain View is taken back into District 4.

Mr. Levitt stated that is what's being presented on the screen now. Currently D4 is at 19.8% African American; this change would up it to 20% by total population. Currently D9 is 50.3% and it would lessen to 48.65% with the change.

Commissioner Quiroz is not in support of the change because she doesn't want to dilute the Latino vote.

Commissioner Morrow asked the Chair to draw another vote.

Chari Dalal stated that they would do so after full discussion.

Commissioner Marquez stated that Ms. Leoni and Ms. Spivak defined a minority-majority district as 50% plus one, and they are there now with District 9 and he'd like to preserve that.

Chair Dalal asked for a vote indicating whether they'd like to keep it configured as is, or make the change to add Redwood and Rolando Park.

Commissioner Marquez stated that taking it to another vote should not be up for discussion. He stated that they are trying to balance everybody's interests. He feels there has been abundant discussion and they have taken more consideration in drawing these two districts than most, and he is not comfortable in taking it up for a vote because it is a huge change.

Commissioner Potter stated that at this point they are just stating their consensus, not taking a vote. He's in favor of leaving the boundaries as they are.

Chair Dalal also favors leaving boundaries as they are.

Commissioner Nishioka would like to see the alternate adopted.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he'd heard conflicting testimony regarding Redwood Village and Rolando Park. The leaders of District 4 have included these areas in their map all along and community members have also come out. It's been a hard decision, but he is in favor of keeping the plan as it is.

Commissioner Quiroz is in favor of keeping the map as it is.

Commissioner Morrow is opposed.

Chair Dalal stated that the plan will stay as is in a 5-2 vote.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that as far as the API district, she feels the Commission did not draw the district correctly. She addressed APAC in saying that she would not feel comfortable splitting University City, but she would have liked to draw the map in a way that better represents them. She stated that it is saddening to her that the API community waited ten years to get a equitable representation and now they'll have to wait another ten.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he agrees with Commissioner Quiroz, except that he believes the Commission has created a district for the API community that is workable.

Mr. Johnson asked for clarification on two items. One was the northeast corner of District 4.

Commissioner Quiroz asked if that was part of Rolando Park, because in Esri it was included.

Mr. Levitt stated that it had been an oversight and it is now united with Rolando Park.

The second item needing clarification was the East Village southern border. A small part of East Village, according to the Community Planning Area, is in District 8. According to the neighborhood lines, it is part of the Barrio Logan neighborhood.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he is sure that the area in question is an industrial area and part of Downtown.

Commissioner Potter asked to see the current boundaries between District 8 and Downtown.

Mr. Levitt brought up the current boundary, which is north of the boundary being drawn. He stated that there is no overlap between the two community planning areas.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she recalls Barrio Logan being in the process of creating a community plan; that might not have happened yet. She is unsure how to handle this area. She suggests leaving as it is but also leaving it open to comment on Thursday.

Commissioner Marquez feels strongly about keeping the lines as they are. He stated that it is an industrial area, but what happens there affects the Barrio Logan residents and he'd like them to have some voice on what happens in the area.

Commissioner Nishioka prefers leaving the boundary as is, stating that there are not many residents in that area; it is commercial/industrial.

Commissioner Quiroz thanked Commissioner Marquez for pointing out that the people in Barrio Logan are the ones affected by what happens in this industrial area. She is also in favor of leaving the border as it is.

Chair Dalal asked Ms. Spivak to address issue of the numbering the districts.

Ms. Spivak responded to questions and comments regarding the numbering of Council districts and noted she had discussed this at Saturday's meeting. She said numbering of the Council districts needs to have a rational basis. She said the Commission must harmonize the Charter's redistricting sections 5 and 5.1 with Charter sections 10 and 12, which require that certain districts be up for election on certain cycles, including the new District 9.

Numbering needs to consider the following: the existing territory and the current Council districts, and what within that territory will be moved to new Council districts, as well as, significantly, the population in existing districts that is going to be transferred into a new district. She said she has worked with NDC so the Commission will have information it needs to look at the population in existing City Council districts, compared to the population that will be moved into the proposed new council districts, to determine the critical mass of population being assigned to each new district. She said part of the importance in assigning the numbers, as speakers had stated, is that the districts are on different election cycles. But, those election cycles are dictated by the City Charter, and redistricting is not supposed to occur in a way in which chaos would be thrown into the existing election system. She said the Commission will need to look at the underlying demographics from the eight Council districts and how those affect the proposed nine.

She said the Commission is not to take into account who is holding a specific District seat. However, she said, the Commission should be mindful of Charter section 12, subsection g, which states in part: "At the next municipal primary and general elections following a redistricting, Council members shall be elected from those districts not represented" —so in this case it would be District 9— "and from those districts represented by incumbent Council members whose terms expire as of the general election in said year." The incumbent Council members whose terms expire in the general election next year are from the odd-numbered districts.

Mr. Levitt presented two tables showing where population was and has gone between districts.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that Districts' 1, 2, 4, and 8 populations have remained largely in the same district. She'd like to exclude those from the discussion, since it's obvious they should stay numbered as they are, and move on to the others.

Chair Dalal is comfortable with that method.

Ms. Spivak asked that a record be made for each one of those, i.e., "District 1 will remain District 1 because 96% of the population remains."

Commissioner Nishioka stated he'd like them to be off the table, but not permanently.

All Commissioners agreed to proceed that way.

Chair Dalal stated that she would summarize statements and asked that Commissioners voice their opposition as they are eliminating districts from the numbering process.

Chair Dalal asked that District 1 as shown on the plan remain District 1.

Mr. Johnson stated for the record that District 1 retains 96% of its original population and therefore will remain District 1.

Commissioner Nishioka suggested they start with the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile districts.

Mr. Levitt stated that 100% of the population of the new District 8 was in the previous District 8.

Chair Dalal stated District 8 as shown on the plan will remain District 8.

Mr. Levitt stated that 96% of the population of the new District 4 was in the previous District 4.

Chair Dalal stated District 4 as shown on the plan will remain District 4.

Mr. Levitt stated that 75.8% of the population of the new District 2 was in the previous District 2.

There was Commission consensus that District 2 as shown on the plan should remain District 2.

Mr. Levitt stated that 65.3% of the population of the new District 5 was in the previous District 5.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that since the next largest population in this new district is from District 1, and it has already been assigned, he is comfortable with leaving this District 5.

Commissioner Quiroz concurs.

Commissioner Nishioka asked what the other Commissioners thought about switching the numbering between Districts 5 and 6.

Ms. Spivak stated that there are also legal implications to the geography that is swapped. There needs to be an overlay of the current geography with the new districts. She'd like to see that today.

Chair Dalal called a five-minute recess so that NDC could show the overlay.

Upon reconvening, Mr. Levitt presented the overlay of the proposed plan on the current districts.

Commissioner Kosmo noted that the majority of the old District 5 remained in District 5, except for a southern portion that is now in District 6. He stated that it doesn't seem like a large enough overlap to make the change. He's in favor of keeping it District 5.

There was Commission consensus that District 5 as shown on the plan should remain District 5.

Mr. Levitt stated that 59% of the population of the new District 3 was in the previous District 3.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that 59% is a logical, rationale basis, especially given that the next largest percent of population is from District 2, which has already been assigned. He is in favor of District 3, remaining District 3.

There was Commission consensus that District 3 as shown on the plan should remain District 3.

Mr. Levitt stated that 54.6% of the population of the new District 7 was in the previous District 7. He presented the overlay of this area.

Commissioner Nishioka asked if there was merit in switching the numbering of Districts 6 and 7.

Mr. Levitt stated that both districts contained portions of the other, but District 7 contains more of both than District 6 does of either.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that District 7 at 56.4% should stay District 7, but looking just at District 7 he can see the argument for making that District 6. But District 6 has only 3% of the previous District 7 and therefore, he prefers to keep District 7 as District 7.

Commissioner Morrow would like them switched because District 7 has been altered the most.

Commissioner Potter stated that based on the 56.4% population and the overlay that District 7 should remain District 7.

Commissioner Quiroz applauded Commissioner Nishioka's efforts to explore the option of switching the numbering, but because of the reasons previously stated she concurs that District 7 remain District 7.

Chair Dalal stated that from a mathematical perspective it makes same to keep the numbering, but knowing the areas in question, the current District 6 is not representative of the proposed District 6. However, mathematically she cannot see a way to change it.

There was Commission consensus that District 7 as shown on the plan should remain District 7.

Mr. Levitt stated that of the two remaining districts, District 6 has approximately 40% of its population from the current District 6, while District 9 has no population from District 6.

There was Commission consensus that District 6 as shown on the plan should remain District 6, and District 9 as shown on the plan should remain District 9.

Commissioner Dalal thanked Mr. Johnson and Mr. Levitt for the facilitation of the processes. She asked Ms. Spivak to lead the discussion on the filing statement.

Ms. Spivak said a key part of the preliminary redistricting plan is the legal document that accompanies it, the Filing Statement. She said it is a City Charter requirement that "the Commission shall file a preliminary plan with the City Clerk, along with a written statement of findings and

reasons for adoption which includes notation of all criteria employed in the process and a full analysis and explanation of decisions made by the Commission.” She then asked the Commission to assist in providing direction so she could prepare the Filing Statement. She said the statement would include a series of findings about the reasoning and rationale for decisions that were made. She asked the Commission how it would like to proceed.

Commissioner Nishioka asked if the statements would be representative of individual Commissioners or the Commission; Ms. Spivak said it was a document from the Commission. She explained what the Filing Statement includes and discussed the preliminary draft she had prepared. She explained that on Thursday the Commission would vote on a package that includes the map, demographics and statistical back-up information, and the filing statement. The packet would be filed with the City Clerk.

Commissioner Nishioka suggested spending five minutes on each district now, as opposed to submitting individual findings and discussing contradiction on Thursday. He also asked when the latest version of the map will be available.

Mr. Levitt stated the changes have been made live during the meeting and that the Proposed Preliminary Plan could be made available online as early as tonight, or tomorrow by noon at the latest.

Commissioner Potter asked if that would include the USD changes.

Mr. Levitt said the changes would be reflected on the printouts and in the data presented submitted on Thursday. However, Esri cannot handle split census blocks, so it will not be visible on Esri.

Commissioner Nishioka asked the map be titled Proposed Preliminary Map without USD changes, or the like.

Commissioner Quiroz would like to add something about the importance of uniting Community Planning Areas and neighborhoods to the criteria in the Filing Statement, because it was an important consideration in their decision making.

Ms. Spivak stated that language regarding this criterion is included in Commissioner Quiroz’s bullet points and will be incorporated into the Filing Statement.

Chair Dalal is in support of Commissioner Nishioka’s suggestion to spend five minutes on each district, to make sure it is a unified voice and effort.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he has his points in front of him and they are according to district. He’d be happy to start the conversation.

Commissioner Marquez would prefer to have the discussion on Thursday stating that not all Commissioners have prepared materials.

Ms. Spivak stated that they can have discussion on Thursday, but she'd like to at least get some direction to start a draft, because the document needs to be voted on this Thursday and filed on Friday. She stated that any documents in addition to today's conversation can be emailed to her and Ms. Wong preferably by tomorrow morning.

Chair started the conversation with District 1. Ms. Wong will keep time for five minutes per district.

Mr. Johnson suggested that they start by having either Commissioner Kosmo or Quiroz read their documents, because it would cover about 80% of the findings and then Commissioners and Ms. Spivak can add to that.

Chair Dalal agreed to proceed this way.

### **District 1**

Commissioner Kosmo stated that it was important to the Commission to keep the coastal areas together. They decided on keeping University City together after a long debate because of the high-tech, bio tech, and medical industries there. UCSD is a community of interest that crosses over into La Jolla, so the commission decided to keep La Jolla and University City together. Because the population was a little high, they looked into splitting it at Mount Soledad, but decided instead to adhere to the Community Planning boundary in the south.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the Commission consciously accepted the larger deviation in this district to keep the communities of interest together. She also cited the public testimony from the two areas in the north – Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Hills, and Pacific Highlands Ranch, and Carmel Valley, San Dieguito Valley, Via De La Valle, and Fairbanks Ranch – that they be kept together.

### **District 2**

Commissioner Kosmo stated that the Commission decided to keep together the beach communities, Ocean Beach, Pacific Beach, and Mission Beach, because of their many shared interests including Pacific Ocean, the San Diego Bay, Mission Bay, Lindbergh Field – the traffic, noise and pollution, as well environmental issues. They also looked at the surrounding communities are realized there were shared interests there, including Bay Ho, Bay Park and Morena.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the Commission heard strong public testimony from beach communities stating that they were not represented well when grouped with Downtown, because it overshadowed their needs. The Commission decided to separate Downtown from the beach district. Tourism was another commonality that compelled the Commission to unite the beach communities.

Chair Dalal stated that they also decided to keep Point Loma areas because of the shared airport impact issues.

Commissioner Kosmo mentioned that the deviation was less when Little Italy was included in District 2, but the Commission decided against it because Little Italy more a part of Downtown than Point Loma.

Chair Dalal and Commissioner Potter stated that last comment is better incorporated into the D3 discussion.

### **District 3**

Commissioner Kosmo stated that one of the most important factors in drawing District 3 was Balboa Park and unifying the older communities of character around it. The natural boundaries include the 805, 8, 15, and 94 freeways. The Commission also took into consideration the LGBT community of interest and tried to craft a district that was fair to them.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the Commission found the LGBT community to be a community of interest. Also, they were the only group who stated they wanted to be with Downtown. She stated that by moving the district west, the Commission was also able to stop the fragmentation of the Latino population.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he'd also like to include more about moving the district westward to include Mission Hills, Banker's Hill, Old Town, and Little Italy as a result of significant public testimony.

Ms. Spivak suggested that the Commission might want to include something about the Golden Hill discussion.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that there was a discussion about excluding Golden Hill from District 3 and including it with District 9; however, due to the lack of connectivity to District 9 and because of its proximity to Balboa Park, the Commission decided to keep Golden Hill in District 3.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that the Commission decided that Little Italy was a community of interest with Downtown, based on public testimony. It was more important to unite it with Downtown in District 3, than to lessen deviation.

### **District 4**

Commissioner Kosmo stated that the Commission largely respected the current boundaries of District 4, but it was overpopulated so they had to remove some areas. He stated that the Commission kept the communities of Webster and Oak Park within District 4 because of the large amount of public testimony. The Commission also thought it important to respect the African American contributions in that district over the years and keep a large percentage of African American population within the district.

He stated that the Commission made efforts to keep communities together, but to balance population they had to remove a portion of Mountain View. They did this in accordance with public

testimony about where the split should be done. He touched upon the natural boundaries, including the natural city limits.

### **District 5**

Commissioner Nishioka stated that this district is united by its similar socio-economic factors and that the testimony surrounding neighborhoods in the Poway Unified School District was used as a guideline in its formation. Consideration was given to extend it to the coast, but it was decided against because of the communities of interest along the coast that wished to stay together in District 1. The Commission weighed the fire-risk area issue, but found that this was a countywide issue, not necessarily only one of the northern inland communities.

Commissioner Kosmo added that the Commission thought it was important to reunite the Rancho Encantada neighborhood with Scripps Ranch. He stated that the Commission considered the WUI and fire-hazard designations, the Pomerado Health District, and the Peñasquitos Preserve when forming the district.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he agrees that fire-hazard designations were considered in forming the district, but were not a strong enough factor to unite the entire eastern portion of the city, extending down into Tierrasanta and East Elliot.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she'd like to add the area of Scripps Miramar Ranch, stating the public testimony was to unite Rancho Encantada with Scripps Ranch and Scripps Miramar Ranch.

Chair Dalal stated that they did hear testimony about keeping Rancho Peñasquitos whole, but in order to balance population and because of other out-weighting factors, Rancho Peñasquitos was split. Highway 56 was used in dividing Peñasquitos.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the fire-risk factor seems contradictory. Was the fire-risk hazard area and WUI designations reasons for unifying or not unifying?

Ms. Spivak asked for clarification.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that the Commission considered extending District 5 down into Tierrasanta, justification being that it was the front line of the fire-hazard areas. It was not a strong enough factor to unite those areas. District 5 was formed instead primarily in the north.

Ms. Spivak asked if the finding is that a large part of the WUI zone was kept together, but not all of it because of population deviation.

Commissioner Marquez stated that there was a compelling argument for keeping Tierrasanta separate from this district to unite it with the rest of the Navajo areas, so he doesn't think the fire-hazard area fits in as a deciding factor.

Commissioner Nishioka would like to include that another unifying factor was the I-15, a significant central travel corridor in the area.

Chair Dalal mentioned the natural boundaries to the east and north.

### **District 6**

Commissioner Kosmo stated that it was important that Mira Mesa and Sorrento Mesa be kept together, because of the large amount of public testimony. There was also a lot of testimony about how Mira Mesa was connected to Kearny Mesa in a community of interest. These communities formed the center of the district. He stated that the Miramar Marine Corps Air Station affects those communities, so it was included in the district. In Clairemont, Hickman Field and other community facilities tie the areas together. He stated that the Commission tried to fairly represent the Asian community, and took into consideration the Asian population numbers.

Chair Dalal reiterated that Kearny Mesa and Mira Mesa are a community of interest for the Asian community.

Commissioner Kosmo mentioned the natural boundaries, including the 15 and 805 freeways, as well as Aero Drive.

Commissioner Nishioka stated the inclusion of the small part of Linda Vista was in part to better include and represent the Asian community in that area.

Chair Dalal stated that the Rancho Peñasquitos split had to do with population, but it also considered the Asian communities desire to have Rancho Peñasquitos with Mira Mesa.

Commissioner Quiroz added the following to the District 2 discussion: She stated that USD was considered a community of interest by the Commission and in order to keep it together as much as possible, a census block had to be split to incorporate it into District 2.

Chair Dalal stated that in order to minimize population deviation, a portion of Linda Vista north of Genesee was added into District 6.

Ms. Spivak stated that the discussion about USD and the census block split needs to be in Districts 2 and 7.

### **District 7**

Commissioner Kosmo stated that there were two large communities of interest in this area, including the Mission Trails Regional Park which helped tie in the northern part of the district. The second community of interest was Tierrasanta and the Navajo areas. They were kept together in part because of strong public testimony. He also mentioned the shared interest of the San Diego River Basin and the I-8 corridor, which ties in the western part of the district.

Chair Dalal added that the San Diego River impacts Mission Valley and the areas north of it, tying those areas into the district as well.

Commissioner Potter stated that he has a write-up concerning District 7, Mission Valley and Kearny Mesa. He'll provide that to Ms. Spivak so she can incorporate it into the Filing Statement.

Chair Dalal asked that Grantville be added to the discussion about the community of interest, because of public testimony about keeping Allied Gardens and Grantville together.

Commissioner Quiroz asked about the Kearny Mesa split.

Chair Dalal provided clarification and referred Commissioner Quiroz to the handout. She stated that a lot of people consider that part south of Aero as Serra Mesa.

### **District 8**

Commissioner Kosmo referenced the strong public testimony to keep the entire southern areas together. There was not enough population for it to be its own district, so it was kept together with areas to the north of it. There was strong community input to keep the Historic Barrio neighborhoods together and the Commission agreed. The resulting district is a majority Latino district with very low deviation. He referenced the natural boundaries, including I-15 and the 94.

Commissioner Nishioka added that it is joined by an easement through San Diego Bay.

Commissioner Potter stated it's not an easement but Ms. Spivak will define it properly.

Commissioner Quiroz added that the public testimony was adamant they not be joined to Downtown, and that the Commission made an effort not to fragment the Latino majority. She noted to NDC that Tijuana River Valley was missing from the list of neighborhoods for this district.

Chair Dalal wanted to add something regarding Shelltown, since it was discussed whether to leave it in District 8 or include it in the new District 9.

Commissioner Marquez stated that keeping Shelltown in District 8 was required for population, since Downtown and Golden Hills were removed.

### **District 9**

Commissioner Kosmo noted the large amount of public testimony for uniting the City Heights communities. The Commission also considered that the communities directly to the north and east of it blend into City Heights, including Kensington, Talmadge, and the College areas. He cited the natural boundaries, including the 15, 805, and 8 freeways. He referenced the shared interest of education, as well as the large Hispanic population.

Commissioner Morrow stated that the District is not compact.

Commissioner Quiroz referenced District 9's large immigrant population, its minority-majority status, as well as the low income levels as reasons to unite the district as such. She asked that Mr. Levitt separate Azalea Park and Hollywood Park, and to include Bay Ridge.

Chair Dalal would like to include something about the inclusion of Mountain View and the connectivity to Southcrest.

Commissioner Marquez stated that the reason the district is not as compact as it should be is because the Commission made an effort to not dilute the Latino community's vote.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that Mountain View was split and half was included into District 9 for population, in accordance with public testimony, to best represent those two communities.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he doesn't feel there is consensus about education being a factor in uniting City Heights with the College areas. There are other reasons, but he doesn't consider education a primary driver. He believes it was SDSU's impact on the surrounding areas to the south.

Chair Dalal agreed to remove education as a factor for uniting.

Ms. Spivak thanked the Commissioners for providing these details and encouraged them to email her with any additions.

Commissioner Potter asked if the statement would address the Voting Rights Act compliance.

Ms. Spivak stated that yes it would and asked NDC for deviation and population data as soon as their map is done.

Commissioner Nishioka asked for an overview of what can be excepted on Thursday.

Ms. Spivak stated that the preliminary map will be reviewed, and possibly minimally tweaked. The Commission will spend more time on the Filing Statement.

Commissioner Nishioka asked for clarifications on the timeline and the availability of the latest map and materials. Staff fielded his questions.

## **STAFF REPORTS**

### **ITEM 2: MIDORI WONG, CHIEF OF STAFF**

Ms. Wong reminded the Commission that the next meeting is Thursday, July 21 at 4:00 p.m. in the Silver Room.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chairperson Dalal adjourned the meeting at 8:41 p.m.

---

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary  
2010 Redistricting Commission

**Written Comments Received July 19, 2011  
Redistricting Commission Meeting**

**Comment 1: Kathy Vendaheuvel, Golden Hill CDC**

Wish Golden Hill to remain in DC3 per current plan.

**Comment 2: Laura Garrett**

I wish to see downtown kept intact, given the shared vision of our community plan and the common focus on urban density.