

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

SATURDAY, JULY 30, 2011

**BALBOA PARK PALISADES BUILDING – RECITAL HALL
2130 PAN AMERICAN ROAD WEST, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101**

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dalal at 10:11 a.m. 47 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 11:45 a.m.

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

(C) Chair Anisha Dalal
(VC) Vice Chair Carlos Marquez
(M) Theresa Quiroz
(M) David Potter
(M) Frederick Kosmo

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Quiroz called the roll:

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

(Transcript Begins)

Comment 1: Daniel Beeman

Thank you. I'm not exactly sure of what your—of what the committee can do, but I think one of the things that I saw here is that we no longer have a citywide representation on the council. The mayor doesn't sit there, so there's no way for us to get anything done for a citywide. And that's why I think that if we could some way recommend that if we ever considered to have any other seat or we considered to maybe to go back and look at the situation, we look at having an ombudsman, a city councilmember that represents the whole city, because we get all split up. But fire, police, parks, streets, sidewalks, lighting – these are all City. These are issues that deal with the whole city and I think that's what we really need. I am really saddened that we end up— that this district ended up to be a splitting up of all the districts to make another in-house fighting situation that we already have on council. I really think that really what we should have looked at and somebody should have counseled us before this was even on the ballot, is that really we need a full representation with the new council the way we have it now. And it would have cost us a lot less money in the long run, but I think we still need that. We're still going to need that down the road because nobody's sitting there and playing for everybody, for every citizen in the city. It's all split up into these little compartmentalization according to whose within your district and it causes a lot of fighting and things like that, and confusion for our citizens, especially when you look at the new map and the maps that we've had before. So, I hope that the Commission can in some way look to see about how we can get representation for the full city and that some way can be considered. I hope we don't have to go to some type of— going back to the ballot to do that, but that might be. Thank you very much.

(Transcript Ends)

CITY ATTORNEY AND STAFF ASIGNED TO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION COMMENT

There was no comment.

PUBLIC HEARING:

ITEM 1 – OVERVIEW OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

Ms. Midori Wong, Chief of Staff, Redistricting Commission, provided an overview of the preliminary redistricting plan and the materials included in the agenda packet, including maps, demographic tables, and filing statement prepared in compliance with the City Charter. She also explained how street level detail of the plan could be accessed online using the free redistricting mapping tool.

ITEM 2 – PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

(Transcript Begins)

Comment 1: Tom Hebrank

Good morning Commissioners and everyone else here in the audience. My name is Tom Hebrank. I'm the immediate past chair of the Kensington Talmadge Planning Group and I'm co-chair of our grassroots

effort, Keep Kensington 3. What defines Kensington? Per www.about.com, if you search San Diego neighborhoods, it describes Kensington as one of the three mid-city urban neighborhoods whose main thoroughfare is Adams Avenue. It is at the eastern end of the strip that begins with University Heights at the western end, with Normal Heights in between. Of the older urban neighborhoods in San Diego, it is one of the most desirable ones to live. Like its fellow hoods it is distinguished by the classic neon Kensington sign that spans Adams Avenue. Our communities of interest lie along Adams Avenue. As mentioned we have University Heights on the west side, Normal Heights in the middle and Kensington on the eastern side. What do we have in common? We have our library, which it's a little small, a little hard to read, but it is the Kensington/Normal Heights Public Library. We share our parks, including Ward Canyon Neighborhood Park. Each of these is just a short walk across the Adams Avenue bridge, spanning the I-15. We also share historic homes and characteristics. We have similar infrastructure issues, needs and challenges. We have a significant LGBT community. As a member of that, I have spoken to many in the community, and I have not talked to one yet that is not in favor of keeping Kensington in District 3. We have a predominance of single-family residences and we have a lack of redevelopment zones. We also share the Adams Avenue Business District. It's a rich collection of mom-and-pop small business which stretch the length of Adams Avenue. It includes the Adams Avenue Business Improvement District and the Adams Avenue Maintenance Assessment District. This is the host of the Adams Avenue Roots Festival, the Taste of Adams, and the Adams Avenue Street Fair each year. We have submitted a map as of yesterday that can be found on the website and I have handed out to the Commissioners the benefits to our map, the map itself, and statistics. To run through the benefits of our proposal– number 1, it returns Kensington to District 3. Our Adams Avenue community is an interest. That is where we lie now and that's where we'd like to stay. It increases the LGBT representation in District 3. It combines Shelltown and Southcrest communities of interest in District 9. I think per your own documents, Shelltown was just moved to balance populations. It increases the Latino representation in District 9, from 50% to 53%. It unites the City Heights and El Cajon Boulevard corridor in District 9. It places western Golden Hills in District 3 which is where it is right now, and it accomplishes all these goals with minimal disruption to the Preliminary Map. We are talking about moving groups of 5,000 people or less, so we're not pulling a thread out of this, we are just making some minor tweaks and adjustments. This is what our proposed Adams Avenue Reunification Map looks like, with the changes I described, primarily moving Kensington into District 3, putting the small El Cajon corridor there between El Cajon Blvd and Monroe into District 9 to keep all of City Heights neighborhoods and City Heights redevelopment together. It moves Shelltown back into District 9 and it does remove the eastern side of Golden Hills and puts it into 8. That was a necessary move to balance populations. Statistics, those are going to be very difficult from this level. The Commissioners have those in front of them, but basically all of the deviations per our plan are very minimal. I think two out of three districts that are affected by our proposal actually have smaller deviations at this point. So, I think it's a very well balanced plan. And with that I will conclude my presentation and I appreciate your consideration of our proposal and now we have other speakers on our behalf.

Comment 2: Darlene Love

Hi, my name is Darlene Love and I was actually born at Mercy Hospital and brought home to Kensington on Adams Avenue, so I've had a long history with Kensington. My dad did write *The History of Kensington* and I own commercial property on the corner of Adams and Marlborough, and one of the places is the Kensington Café. I just love that I go there every morning to have my breakfast and coffee and all the people from the neighborhood come in and we discuss issues. And this is one that is being discussed extensively and I have not met one person that is not really concerned that we would

be pulled away from our friends and our people we've been working with, west down to Park. So, I just so hope that we get to stay with District 3 and I am also a resident; I live at the end of Adams Avenue and I can't think of anything else. I just hope that you really to take this into consideration. We belong with District 3. Thank you so much for your time.

Comment 3: Joel Young

Thank you, Madam Chairman and members of the Commission. I am Joel Young. I am a resident of Liberty Station. I am here representing a community organization in Point Loma and Liberty Station known as Point Loma People for Progress, or P3 for short. We have been in existence for about six years and I have about several hundred members. We have a seven member board of directors. We have been very concerned about the redistricting. We've had a very good relationship with the existing District 2 office, which has been very helpful to us in dealing with issues and making improvements to the quality of life in Point Loma and Liberty Station. Our primary concerns have been keeping the Point Loma community together and incorporating the airport into District 2. So we're here speaking in support of the plan as proposed with regard to District 2. Our board of directors had a meeting last month at which we specifically reviewed several plans, some of which broke up the Peninsula community, and we were very strongly opposed to those. So, we are very much in support of the plan as it is presented today, with regard to District 2 and I think we also support the inclusion of the other beach communities to support the Mission Bay area. So, I'm joined here by the secretary of our board of directors, Jean Neemer, who will not be speaking, but has also submitted written comment to this affect. Thank you for your consideration.

Comment 4: Doug Case

Good morning, I am Doug Case. I am the president of the College Area Community Council and at our July meeting we discussed redistricting in depth and we discovered that our top priorities are to keep College East and West together, because they really are one community, to be united with El Cerrito – on all your maps you show El Cerrito as existing only south of El Cajon Blvd but it is actually a community that spans both north and south of the boulevard and we feel it is very important that the College area and El Cerrito be in the same district. And finally, that Rolando be united with the College area in the same district because of our shared concerns regarding the issues related to the university. We also rank ordered by priority the other communities with which we share common interest, and those were Talmadge, Del Cerro, Redwood Village, and Kensington. We did not envision being placed in District 9, but looking at the map that you drew it meets most of our major needs, our top priorities: College area united, El Cerrito, Rolando are all in the same district, and half of our priorities are in that District. On the other hand we realize that that the College area seems to be a piece of the puzzle that is in play and there is discussion among some people of moving us into District 7, which should be District that goes north of interstate 8. We don't have any objections to that as long as you meet our top priorities, College area together with El Cerrito and Rolando. That also would put Del Cerro in the same district with us. We feel we actually share probably more in common with some of the communities along the I-8 corridor like Grantville, Allied Gardens, Mission Valley, than we do some of the communities that are south of Route 94. So as long as you keep our key communities together we will be comfortable in 7 or 9, and in some respects maybe more comfortable in 7 because we share more with that northern I-8 communities than we do the southern communities. Thank you.

Comment 5: Louise Guarnotta

Hi, my name is Louise Guarnotta. I have lived in Kensington for 39 years; my husband has lived there for 65 years. I know you've heard it all, but I'm here today just to ask you to use common sense and keep Kensington in Council District 3 and I'll tell you why. Kensington is relatively small with only 2,000 residences, including apartments. By putting us into a huge district that has nothing in common with us and is so far removed from our geographic location, you would be marginalizing us, including our substantial number of gay and lesbian residents. With a business district only three blocks long, our life is basically in Normal Heights. Because the Adams Avenue Business Improvement Association includes the Kensington area, there would be some funds that—to preserve streetscapes and other programs along Adams Avenue—that would not be able to be used across council boundaries, effectively cutting off our small community. We share not only the Normal Heights and Kensington Library, but also parks, Vons, and Rite Aid are in Normal Heights. In fact, it seems that Kensington is more like a sister of Normal Heights and for that reason should be kept in the same Council District. When you have two neighborhoods as closely joined as Kensington and Normal Heights are, it would be impossible to have continuity in managing them if they were to exist in different Council Districts. So please, do not put our small neighborhood in jeopardy. Keep us in Council District 3. Thank you.

Comment 6: Jay Wilson

Good morning, Commissioners. I'm Jay Wilson. I'm a 43-year resident of the Navajo community and I am president of the Del Cerro Action Council. At our Thursday meeting of the Del Cerro Action Council, I took a straw poll of the board members and of those residents attending the meeting and all unanimously support the district lines as currently drawn. I know there is an effort to redraw District 7 to include south of 8. As Mr. Case mentioned, the College areas first three preferences for communities to be included in their area are all south of 8. There was reference a week ago that the fact a tunnel was to be built between San Diego State and the Navajo community and that was to connect San Diego State to the property that San Diego State owns. That was rejected because of engineering challenges and the cost was absolutely prohibitive. On behalf of the Del Cerro Action Council, I urge you to keep the boundaries of District 7 as they are currently in place. Thank you.

Comment 7: John Pilch

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is John Pilch. I am president of the San Carlos Area Council, past chair of Navajo Community Planners, and a resident of San Carlos for 33 years. I'm here to thank to you for service and to tell you that we're pleased with the preliminary map as you've drawn District 7. Thank you for your work. Also, thank you for putting up with the negative comments about this Commission and some of you personally. That has no place in this process. Our agenda is to have the Navajo area kept in the same district and we've achieved that. We've also achieved having our neighbors to the north in Tierrasanta working with us on Mission Trails Park. The findings of the Commission on page 15 are in sync with our comments and how we envision a new District 7 to look for the next ten years. We welcome the opportunity to work with the communities to the west on problems that are similar to both areas. We ask that you keep the College area, which is not a community of interest with the Navajo area, south of 8. I-8 is a natural boundary and recognized as such in your findings. Jay mentioned a tunnel, I don't know how that came up, but there was no proposed tunnel from Grantville to the College area. In fact, I proposed the tunnel when San Diego State said they were going to invade the Adobe Falls area residences for their professors. I suggested the tunnel and

they pretty dismissed it with the back of their hands, saying there wasn't any money about – \$4 million– and the State would never fund it. So, that is a red herring. People are going to disagree with you but that's a democracy. Thank you again. Your work is appreciated.

Comment 8: Michael Sprague

I do appreciate the work but it is a thankless job; however, if you were to divide District 3 along Fairmount Ave, which is where the neighborhoods of City Heights have asked, you would include the LGBT community back into the LGBT community and you would include Kensington, both of whom have asked relentlessly to stay in 3rd. And to remind you that– once again – that the information you received from the LGBT packet said City Heights did not vote for gay marriage, that is absolutely untrue. The 7th district of City Heights did not vote for it, however the 3rd District portion did. We are a community of 16 neighborhoods, we are not the Mid-City community plan. You are dividing the Mid-City community plan. There is no such thing as the City Heights plan. That document does not exist. Reasons to stay in the LGBT community: there have been 18 votes that have been taken place since the division putting Council District 3 with part of City Heights. In the 18 elections that have taken place, 18 times the 3rd District portion of City Heights has voted with the LGBT community – 18 out of 18. And to falsify those records regarding gay marriage to include part of City Heights that are in the 3rd District was ludicrous, improper, and I don't why the Commission feels it needs to come up with a new definition of whose gay and whose not, because that's exactly what you're doing. You are defining the status of who is gay and you're doing it based on economics and skin color and I don't its appropriate and I don't think it's the way to divide a community.

Comment 9: Linda Pennington

Linda Pennington – I have lived in the Azalea Park neighborhood in the City Heights community for over 31 years. I was very stunned when I learned that the LGBT Redistricting Committee wanted to cut City Heights out of District 3. The people that I know and the new letters that come through me to the Commission overwhelmingly want our part of City Heights to stay in District 3. We have worked so hard to keep this part of the city, the heart of San Diego, from turning into a hopeless slum. We have spent–my neighbors in Azalea Park have gone to the Gay and Lesbian Pride Parade for over 17 years, inviting the gay community in. We've had an award winning entry in the parade; we've been in the festival inviting the gay community in and other parts of City Heights have said, please send some over to our neighborhood too. Our neighbors, many are what I call hardcore volunteers. We are in the canyons doing restoration work; we're working with the police; we work with Code Enforcement. The rest of the city should be thanking us for all the work we have done in City Heights and we would like very much to stay in District 3. As Michael mentioned, you could go from Fairmount to the west and keep this part of City Heights in District 3 without too much gerrymandering. And we just feel like we have been cast adrift, if we're just going to be thrown into this new district with no one that we know for representation; we have to start from scratch. I have 30 years of organizing, 25 years as a fulltime volunteer, and the last few years organizing Project Clean for Community Housing Works, which Project Clean I started 30 years ago, and organizing Face Lift, where we have done over 500 homes in City Heights. Thank you.

Comment 10: Joe Naskar

Good morning, my name is Joe Naskar. I live in Mission Hills. When I saw the proposed map, I was very happy that Mission Hills was included in District 3, as we are not a beach community and have more in common with the uptown communities. When looking at the map I noticed that you used Interstate 5 as a division line. What happens, unfortunately, is the area on the other side of Interstate 5, which is the Pacific Highway corridor, is isolated in District 2, separated by SPAWAR, MCRD, and the airport. It is going to be an orphaned area. It is warehouses and we have been working as a community to try improve that area. There is no resident population there; there are several condominiums that are— one is built and one is under construction. They will not be represented as they are not a beach community in District 2. If you look at page 2 of that map, if it's included in District 3, we can continue to have a voice with the Council member from District 3. If we have to ask District 2, we will not be able to really have any voice with them to try to keep moving that area uphill. So, that's something I hope you'll consider. Thank you for your time.

Comment 11: David Schutz

Good morning. My name is David Schutz and I'm a resident of the Greater Old Town area and an active member of the Western Slope Association of Mission Hills. I would like to build upon the comments of the previous speaker, referencing the same map. As proposed, the Pacific Highway corridor, representing the area between the airport and the I-5 is being assigned essentially as a geographic and population isolated zone, from District 3. In point of fact, while I-5 might appear to be a natural barrier, the Census tract and the practical exchange of common issues exist across it. Without a direct examination it may not be apparent to the members of the Commission, but there are in fact four underpasses or overpasses that afford pedestrian as well as surface street access to the zone whereas only Pacific Highway, relatively high-speed thoroughfare with no pedestrian access is available into this hangnail portion. We have common issues that transcend each side of I-5. A single council person in the past has been very effective in bringing the resources of the City forward. I ask in view of the fact that this impacts minimal population, that you consider inclusion of it— bring it into conformity with the natural barrier and the census tract barrier, by making it part of neighboring District 3.

Comment 12: Daniel Beeman

Hello, my name is Daniel Beeman. I reside in District 6 now and District 6 needs our neighbors. We need Linda Vista, we need USD, and Bay Park/Mission Bay. Those are people that we frequent with, that we know and that we understand and those have many assets of the city that we need to use. I will miss my Mission Valley Association, but this is where I believe a new district should be drawn because a new district there will be able to incorporate a lot of different new neighborhoods and developments that are new to this city that will need representation. But this is way out of what your map already says. Right now, District 6 has very little in common with Rancho Bernardo [sic], Mira Mesa, and Miramar. I don't want to disenfranchise them; I'm just trying to tell the truth. Also I believe there is a little bit of a power play being played here. Like I said before, there's common interest situations here and Downtown is a powerbase. It's a huge powerbase. When we give Downtown to one district, that powerbase is not equally represented to the neighborhoods and to the districts. And I think we really need to go back and look at that. I think like people have been asked, that District 3 move back into Kensington area. If you move it back over there to the 43rd Street and move it that way, then you are going to have to take some people off. The map is going to have to move over from Downtown. I think

this will be a good chance to get District 8 and District 2 a little better representation of Downtown, the powerbase of our City and the political wherewithal. You know, we need to have the political wherewithal to be able to get stuff going on. That is what this Commission is about. So I ask that you look at that and that you look for more representation for all the people.

Comment 13: Valerie Sanfilippo

Good morning, I'm Valerie Sanfilippo. I've been a resident of Clairemont and Linda Vista since 1977. I'm a voter activist since 2003. I'm sorry that you not split Linda Vista in three; you split District 6, Donna Frye's district in three. I'm not sure that any other district has been so affected. Please reunite the three sections of Linda Vista. USD and Morena is not a separate neighborhood, it has no town council. North Linda Vista/Kearny High area is also part of Linda Vista. It has a low-cost clinic there. Linda Vista is a multicultural community with a multicultural fair. Linda Vista is too vulnerable community to be marginalized. It's more important to keep neighborhood town councils united with one City Council representative than to follow population counts. That's what's meant by practical, I think. Please reunite Clairemont Linda Vista. I agree with the maps and letters, the boundaries of 52, 5, 15, and 8, with the exception of Mission Valley, which are agree to by both Clairemont and Linda Vista Town Councils. They both want Linda Vista and Clairemont to be together with Bay Park and Birdlands Serra Mesa. The 44 bus runs up Linda Vista Road to Convey and Clairemont Mesa Blvd. The 105 runs up Morena Blvd., Bay Park, to Clairemont Drive and Clairemont Mesa Blvd. The 120 bus runs through Linda Vista through Clairemont to Kearny Mesa and Clairemont Mesa Blvd. We are the communities surrounding Tecolote Canyon Park. Linda Vista doesn't belong with the eastern communities. We have a Mission Bay view; that's our vista. Tierrasanta wants its western boundary to be 15. Linda Vista is even west of 163. Clairemont doesn't belong with Mira Mesa/Miramar. There is no shopping road connector there. Clairemont doesn't belong in the Asian district; we are not majority district. The Asian community wants to be Mira Mesa, to be reunited with Rancho Peñasquitos. Perhaps you could move Scripps Ranch to the eastern district. And I also wanted to mention that Kearny Mesa—if you take it to the Asian district it starts north of Aero Drive, not at Mesa College Drive. Thank you.

Comment 14: Ross Lopez

My name is Ross Lopez and I live on Madison Avenue in University Heights and I've been there for 23 years. I find it very odd that the Downtown interests are somehow associated with us. I don't see how the fact that 144,000 people in each district is important. It may be the law but if Downtown is included in our neighborhood, there may be 144,000 people in our neighborhood who would vote. But the interests of downtown are totally the opposite of anything we are interested in and they will over power us. All you have to do is walk around Downtown and walk around University Heights or North Park, or Hillcrest, or any of the other neighborhoods along Adams Avenue—we've nothing in common with Downtown. Their voice will overpower us, their money, their influence—the last year we had a powerful interest in our neighborhood and we had to hire a lobbyist to fight in Downtown. It took over \$60,000 of our money to do that and we do not have that kind of money to constantly fight big interests. I do not believe that this is a fair assessment of extending University Heights, mixed with Downtown, although I'm sure any other area would not want the Downtown interest in their district. Maybe you should make it their own district. They have totally different interest, totally different outlooks, and I would appreciate it if you would reconsider putting Kensington and some of the other areas that people have mentioned back into District 3 and make Downtown its own interest. Thank you.

Comment 15: Ernestine Bonn

Ernestine Bonn, I've lived in University Heights the past 37 years. I've also been active in the North Park community planning, and I'm currently sitting on the Uptown Planning Board, but I don't represent either of those groups. My concern is that one of the things that you stipulate is avoiding diluting the voting strength of protected classes and we are being diluted of our progressive interests. We've worked with Kensington, Mission Hills, Hillcrest on protecting our historical resources. Downtown is strictly for permits, we're for planning for the future. We don't want our boundaries blurred. Downtown wants to come up into uptown; it wants to extend so it can develop high-rises. This is not what we want for our future; we want to protect our history, and it's diametrically opposed. If you've seen what's happened to Downtown. They have demolished most of their history. We don't want that. So, please bring Kensington and Talmadge into our area and for heaven's sake, quarantine Downtown.

Comment 16: Laura Riebau

I'm Laura Riebau. I am chair of the Eastern Area Planning committee. I live in El Cerrito, which is one of the San Diego State University college areas. I'm here again to ask you to reconsider our neighborhoods as a community of interest, because that has not been done by your board before. Our community of interest is made up with our lifestyles and our values, the holidays we celebrate, the flags we wave, the sports that we play, when we say football, we mean the NFL and the AFL and the Chargers, we don't mean soccer – what we refer to as soccer. You're putting our neighborhoods–first, you're splitting our neighborhoods just to make numbers work for other communities of interest and I understand how important it is to give representation to historically underrepresented communities, but we are a community of interest too. And you're not supposed to tear up our voice and our community of the next ten years in order to give the other groups their representation. You're supposed to consider all of us at least at a minimal level, and you have considered many of the neighborhoods at a very over minimum level and not considered my level in the least. In fact, when it came time to put down considerations that had been taken by this board for our board, the sentences just wandered off into nothing. You couldn't come up with anything you had considered for our neighborhood. It was followed by awkward silence and you need to relook at our neighborhoods. And our neighborhoods, with our community values and our lifestyles and the people that live there belong with the communities of Del Cerro, Allied Gardens, Grantville. You are not paying attention to freeways in very many of these communities. You have crossed over freeway boundaries whenever it was needed to keep a community of interest together. And in our case, it is needed to keep our community of interest together. And Navajo–San Carlos can say they have nothing in common with our community but I'll guarantee that Allied Gardens, Del Cerro, and San Carlos have lots of apartments and lots of houses that house San Diego State students. Pull out any newspapers and you'll see that the ads say “close to San Diego State.” The buses that leave from the San Diego State trolley go through San Carlos, all the way to Jackson Drive. We have nothing in common with the Latino community that you are trying to work out. We need to have our neighborhood considered– first just given consideration– and consider us for what we are. We are the San Diego State University communities and that includes Redwood Village, that includes Rolando Park, that includes El Cerrito, Redwood, – sorry, Rolando Village, College West and College East, with Del Cerro, Allied Gardens, Grantville. Montezuma runs right into Fairmount Ave, which runs right into Grantville. We shop at the Home Depot in Grantville; we do lots of things in Grantville. That is one of our shopping centers. Petco, all sorts of stores in that area are the communities that we shop at. We also need to have included the College Grove Shopping Center; that is our

neighborhood shopping center as well. I'm going to continue to see you at all these meetings and continue to ask you to consider our neighborhoods. Thank you.

Comment 17: Anne Schoeller

Good morning to all, I'm Anne Schoeller. This is my eight meeting that I've attended and I'm from District 7, the College neighborhoods – north and south and San Diego State. I feel very strongly that this map does not represent us. We're being into districts for our population alone, which is against the Voter's Right Act of 1965. I lived in the South and I saw this going on, on a much larger scale, where communities were put in, – the votes were adjusted. Well, I feel this is on a much smaller scale, but I do not feel that we're– I think it's diluting our votes. The key principles were to avoid this and just find good faith in deviations having equal population. Well, in the north– and if you'd just looked at our community, all of 7, you would've seen that our population was 147,348. You're supposed to be 144,624, so there would have been very little need to even change us in the first place. We could've easily– the Hispanic communities that are over 54, which is one of our natural areas that ... They were in 7, they could've been put in the new district. There is no reason to cut us up like this. I think that you haven't really looked at– you didn't really look at 7 enough to see that we fit within all the parameters that you were looking for, all the criteria that you were looking for. You can get on one end of College at 94 and go straight across the 8, without even getting on anything else, and go through these northern communities. So, this is my belief and I think that you should take a real good look to give everyone an equal opportunity, a stable– we need stable communities. We've tried to build and keep our people from leaving our communities. We need you to look at this map and put us back in 7, all of us. Thank you.

Comment 18: Stephen Whitburn

Commissioners, good morning. I was watching was watching Thursday's hearing on TV last night, as pathetic as that is, and I was troubled by the perception amongst several speakers from the Asian community who expressed that this Commission has given preference to the Latino and the African American and the LGBT communities, over the Asian community. I don't think this Commission has given preference; rather, I think that the way the Commission has approached this looking at neighborhoods first, the neighborhood geography simply matches up better with the ethnic geography south of the 8 than it does north of the 8. That said I do hope that this Commission will take another look at the Asian community. It is true that the Asian percentage in the draft District 6 is already greater than the African American percentage in draft District 4 and certainly the LGBT percentage in draft District 3. But the point is that you've concentrated the African American and the LGBT communities within districts to the degree that you could to empower them and I hope that you will also concentrate the Asian community to the degree that you can within a district to empower that community. I also think that you could still make improvements to your draft map south of the 8, both from an ethnic perspective and from a neighborhood perspective. The Latino concentration is pretty diluted in District 9 by some of its whiter neighborhoods, including those to the east. And certainly we've heard testimony from the east that they see more akin with the neighborhoods to the north like Del Cerro, than to the west like City Heights. And lastly, I'm not sure that we've heard people from Downtown say that they necessarily want to be in one district. Maybe it is time to challenge that assumption. Maybe if there is an area that could be split up into different districts, it is Downtown. And maybe that could make a lot of other things that people really do care a lot about within this map work. Thank you.

Comment 19: Geoffrey Chan

Good morning, Commissioners. First I want to say it again, for what Commissioner Quiroz and Commissioner Morrow did on July 21st and that they were the only no votes for the passing of the preliminary map. Commissioner Quiroz, you stepped up to the plate and you hit a big, big home run. That ball didn't just land on the bleachers; that ball actually landed on more than 200,000 API San Diego residents' hearts. Thank you. The other comments I have to make, on July 21st Commissioner Nishioka commented on the College representative because they did not come here earlier to present their case, but for the API community we started here on the first day but our voices were not heard. Commissioner Marquez you guaranteed the chance of five more hearings for us to voice and that is why I'm here and I hope even though the situation is not to our favor. We are kind of facing Brian Wilson in the 9th inning, we only have one out left. I hope this last out will change the ballgame.

Comment 20: Amy Del Nagro

Good morning, my name is Amy Del Nagro. I live in Kensington. I also own a number of businesses; I'm a real estate professional. I have to agree that dividing Kensington from its geographic, its historic, and its economic basis with the central metro area is detrimental. I also believe El Cerrito has certainly a concern in being divided from its community. When we sell properties, the economics of selling a complete community, a named community is very important, so it would detrimental to values of homes and to even businesses. So, I really think also that the City should consider making the Downtown area its own district also. Thank you.

Comment 21: Bob Coffin

Good morning, it is good to see you again. As you may remember, I am the existing vice chair of the Kensington-Talmadge planning group, Planning Commission. To my right is Tom Hebrank who was the chair until Mr. Moty took over. Mr. Moty lives in Talmadge, as do four other members of our planning group. Ten of us live in Kensington. What we've—since the two planning groups have been joined together what we've tried to do in the interest of fairness is to every two years change the chair. So one year you'd have a resident of Kensington being the chair, and the next year you'd have a resident of Talmadge. So, Mr. Moty replaced Tom, here, as the chair and he's in Talmadge, as I mentioned. But what we tried to do also is look out for one another and to have actions that serve both communities. In this instance, I believe Mr. Moty decided to go for something was in Talmadge a benefit, but not in Kensington's benefit. He was interviewed by the Voice of San Diego as to why he is promoting pulling Talmadge and Kensington into District 9. This is on July 27th. He candidly admitted that it was going to be in Talmadge's best interest because of the development of El Cajon Boulevard, which kind of leaves us in Kensington in the dust. I mean, we've been trying to get Adams Avenue developed and trying to work together with Talmadge, but he struck out on his own and appeared before this board to say that Kensington has agreed to this. It has not. And I will be back at the next meeting with signatures of members of the planning group to indicate that they did not agree to this and they believe it would be very hurtful to Kensington to end up in District 9. So, thank you very much.

Comment 22: Sherry Hopwood

Hi, I'm Sherry Hopwood. I am a standing member of the Kensington Talmadge Planning board. I echo what Bob said. Kensington is not for this even though David Moty did say that we were. I live in District 3, Council District 3 for 33 years. When it was time for me to purchase a house, I bought a house in

District 3 because culturally, politically that's where I belong. Now, to find out that I'm going to be sectioned off in Kensington and put with a long bit of property, really, that has nothing to do with my beliefs, my way of being, is not right. I feel disenfranchised. I do think you will be disenfranchising a huge amount of people, both in the gay community and just in Kensington community by doing this. We do belong historically with the other—North Park and Normal Heights and all of those going down Adams Avenue. We were created as a trolley district for Adams Avenue and that's why Kensington came about. And now you are going to tell us we belong with south San Diego? We don't belong there. We're not going to help the Latino vote one bit. They're not going to help us. I think that if you really want to empower different ethnicities or cultures, then you need to empower them and let's keep who belongs together with each other. Give each community the power they need to get the votes they need to do what they need to do. So, I guess, basically, that is pretty much what I have to say. But please, we'll always shop at each other's— you know, they're just borders when it comes to Council Districts, we'll shop across the street, we'll do everything. But politics, voting is important and we need to have our power.

Comment 23: Cecilia Conover

Good morning. Thanks for your time, thanks for being here and for all the hard work that is going into this entire program, I would just like to reiterate a couple of outlines that the Chief of Staff mentioned when she introduced each of the draft neighborhoods— or, draft districts... was the key thing that you were intending for District 3 to keep its historic neighborhoods together and respect the geographic differences. So, our community of Kensington just celebrated its 100-year anniversary. We are a very strong, historic community. We have a very strong relationship with University Heights and Normal Heights, and even Mission Hills and North Park. And we have a very strong business community with these areas, as well. It kind of feels like we are getting our pinky lopped off here, because Kensington is very small and it's easy to sort of push that line up along 15 and think, "there is a nice big geographic boundary," but in reality 15 has never posed any problem as a boundary for Kensington residents to access Adams Ave. It is our main street, our mainstay social and business district. Also, geographically we have a very obvious cutoff with Aldine Drive cutting through the canyon that separates us from Talmadge. Even though we've had a history of a shared planning group with Talmadge, we are really more geographically connected to Normal Heights. I'm also in favor of having you seriously hold on to the idea this is a draft, not get too married to it and give a lot of thought to lumping Downtown into these neighborhoods.

Comment 24: David Conover

Thank you, Commissioners. My name is David Conover and I've lived in Kensington with my wife Cecelia for 20 years. And I don't envy your position with this pie and all the different slices that are happening and I think what we are hearing today is, everybody is concerned about what their piece of the pie is going to look like under this draft proposal. So for me to specifically talk about my particular self interest and the historicity of the home and then neighborhood that I live in and the community efforts that my wife has been involved with is merely sort of a self-interest at this point. I think what is more important is the fact that the Commissioners see the representation for Kensington here, which seems to be very strong and recognize the fact that there is a significant amount of historicity within those communities that we just talked about. So, I would rather move away from myself, which is great, and say that I support one of the strongest presentations, which is Tom Hebrank's, and his presentation I

think allows for all the considerations both politically and population and flavor and community interest. So, I am here in support of that. I'd like you to consider that also. Thank you.

Comment 25: Joe Pettigrew

Good morning, commissioners. My name is Joe Pettigrew. I am a resident of University Heights. Previously, I lived in Banker's Hill and I grew up in Point Loma. First thing, I'd like to echo some of the previous speakers who suggested returning the Pacific Highway corridor to District 3. There—in addition to the warehouses and other businesses there, there are actually a couple of apartment buildings on Laurel Street, which right now are completely isolated from any other population in District 2. And just returning them across the street to District 3 would re-enfranchise them. Secondly, I'd like to talk a little bit about District 9 and its contiguity. In addition to—you know, I understand no matter how you slice the pie, you are going to be dividing communities which today seems like natural ways. The only way we can keep all the communities together would be to put District 9 in La Mesa and Lemon Grove. But right now if you look at Mount Hope and Mountain View, it is impossible to get from those communities to the rest of District 9 by foot, by bicycle, by car unless you go on the freeway. There is no surface street connection between those communities. So I would argue that it would be better for those communities to stay with either District 4 or District 8, where they have historically had connections and physical connections. That would be the issue that I bring before you today. Thank you very much.

Comment 26: Alberto M. Ochoa

Buenos dias. I'm Alberto Ochoa. I've been a resident of Linda Vista for over 35 years and I'm a member of Linda Vista Town Council. At your July 21st meeting, you approved the Preliminary Redistricting Plan that would split Linda Vista community into three council districts, Districts 2, 6, and 7. Although the proposed splitting of our community contributes very little to the overall numbers of residents in other districts, it represents a significant decline in the voting power of our community, Linda Vista, and the power of our local elections. The proposed plan moves the core of Linda Vista to a new district, with other communities with whom we share very little in common. Linda Vista is tied very closely to Clairemont District 6. Not only will you move us to a new district, you would also dilute our political power. There is a deep concern that this opens the way for the eventual disempowerment of our community beyond the City Council redistricting process. The preliminary plan completely disregards one of the key tenants of the redistricting process: preserve identifiable communities of interest. Please do not use our ethnically and linguistically diverse Linda Vista community to achieve the Commission's magic number for population equality of the districts. I respectfully request that the Commission not move forward with the Preliminary Plan that will partition Linda Vista into three different Council Districts.

Comment 27: Linda Perine

Good morning, my name is Linda Perine. I am the chair of the LGBT Redistricting Task Force. I'd like to thank you, Commissioners and staff, for your service to our community. I'm beginning to understand personally how difficult your task is. I also know that we are almost at the end of a very long process. I'm going to miss you all. You're probably not going to miss me, but I can live with that. I'd just like to address just a couple of topics real fast. The first one is the Asian Pacific Islander community. You've all done a good job, I think, for whatever my opinions worth. I think that possibly I would like to ask

you to look again to see if we can just do a little better. You've done a very good job south of 8. One of the problems that we are facing now is that we're comparing "goods" and "betters." Everyone that's here is looking at something that's good and going "you can make it better for me." I'm going to ask you to do something that I know you are going to do whether I ask you or not, which is to keep in mind the best think for the city. Every single person in this room has a good argument or they wouldn't be here. But at this point you've looked at most of those arguments already. So, with all due humbleness and humility, the one argument that I hope you will pay special attention to because I just think it's the right thing is, could we just please, and I'll be happy to be as helpful as I can, please look at the API district again. Thank you for all your hard work.

Comment 28: Margaret Lopez

Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Margaret Lopez and I've been living in Linda Vista for most of my adult life and I'm just here to express my concerns about the redistricting of Linda Vista into two or three different districts. I've seen a few maps and spoken with several others about Linda Vista being divided up and I don't understand that because of the Census we have to cut the fat, we have to do something. But, my comments are—first is that Kearny Mesa High School, I was under the impression that that was going to be cut out of our district and I don't understand that because most of our Linda Vista kids go to Kearny Mesa High. Why would we put a school that serves a major part of Linda Vista into another district and split that up? And then, also USD has been a partner with our elementary schools and is much more a part of Linda Vista than the beach communities. They're always partnering with all the schools, so I don't know why we would redistrict that to be toward the beach communities when they're always with our children. And last but not least, I feel to spilt up the community with the Navy housing also be split up north of Genesee, I think that is a mistake because Linda Vista was founded and built by military—you know, founded—it's historical for military families and we love our military families. And I just to know if you could just please take a look at the divisions considered and draw the redistricting lines in a more positive manner, one that works for our Linda Vista. I think that many of our multicultural residents have no idea what's going on; there're not aware of the redistricting and they don't understand the ramifications. Thank you.

Comment 29: Janet Kaye

Madam Chair and Commissioners, thank you for providing this forum and thank you for your service. I do echo the comments of my compadre Dr. Ochoa. I'm here representing Linda Vista Town Council and the Linda Vista CDC. Our representative from USD is on travel, Mr. Tom Cleary. I would like you to please reconsider the three-way division which dilutes our voter strength for the Linda Vista community. The City Charter, when you go to Section 5.1, I feel is not being honored because this new District 7—and if you could please pull District 7 up on the map to show the entire area, I'd sure appreciate that. This District 7 is not compact. It meanders all over the place and we're just a small little western piece of it. A natural border is actually at 15, Interstate 15. Obviously, we will not have fair and effective political representation. We also ask that you retain USD in District 7 where they belong, and not park them in District 2. I think it appears odd that we're hooked on with this meandering district going far, far to the east. We have Tecolote Canyon; Mission Trails Park is on the other end. Let's divide up these wonderful walking canyon areas. Our natural connector is with Clairemont as many people have said. According to your findings and reasons for adoptions, most of the north slopes, you say, along Linda Vista and part of that is not true. The majority of our northern slope is high above Mission Valley, Fashion Valley. If you drive along and take a look up, these hillsides have long been in hillside review.

These are not natural slopes. It's called Linda Vista Mesa. So, thank you for allowing me to speak and good luck with what you have to do.

Comment 30: Cindy Chan

Good morning, Commissioners and the public, First I want to thank everyone who attended the last hearing and sat in those very uncomfortable chairs for two hours as mentioned by Commissioner Quiroz. Second, I want to clarify who APAC is as there seems to be a lot of confusion out there. APAC is a grassroots organization made up of San Diegans who are part of or support the Asian community. We do not have paid officers, board members, speakers, or memberships, nor do we have corporate sponsors or donors. In contrast to what Mr. Andy Berg does, APAC does not advocate for special interest groups who represent developers or contractors or other big businesses. Don't get me wrong, I respect what he does and what others like him do for a living, but if Mr. Berg truly represented the diverse people of Peñasquitos, which I'm a part of, he would not have rushed to accept the division and segregation of Peñasquitos and other Peñasquitanos would not have stood before you requesting otherwise. As I understand it, redistricting is about one person/one vote, not big businesses and big votes. Who you see at virtually every hearing with APAC, including the dozens who came out last Thursdays, are regular folks with no protesting experience, not even me who attended Berkley in the 90s. We work in education, in technology, are doctors, students, small business owners, engineers, restaurant workers, mothers, grandmothers, even great grandmothers. I've great respect for my fellow supporters who take time off to work to rush to this meeting as soon as possible and for some to speak in front of an audience for the very first time and in a foreign. I mean, how scary is that? They inspire me to continue fighting for my community as someone whose parents have sacrificed so much so that I can become the well-educated and informed person that I hope I am today. I'm sure that some of you on the Commission are products of that sacrifice as well. Yes, APAC is one organization but our community consists of 204,000 plus individuals and is growing the fastest. Let us stand against the continued diminishment of the API community. While other major communities of interest have their own empowered district or districts, we have none. This injustice to our community and to San Diego is one that only you, the Commissioners, can correct. Our messages have been loud and clear and specific. The whole of Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa, among others, belong together as attested to by over 2,300 San Diegans. We support the increased representation of all communities of interest and I thank you for all the support that I've heard. And the Asian empowered district the new number 9 District. We've patiently waited decades and decades for representation, but we are patient no longer. The City cannot afford to have representation of the API community further delayed and deferred. As long as Mira Mesa, which holds the largest and highest concentration of APIs, is put into an even numbered district you will be deferring elections for those 75,000 San Diegans. Commissioners, you have the opportunity to be either the Commissioner who acted in favor of the continue disenfranchisement of the API community, or you can go down in history as the Commissioner who finally did the right thing for the API community and for all of San Diego. The question is, who do you want to be? Thank you.

Comment 31: Deborah Knight

Good morning, Commissioners. Deborah Knight. I wanted to give you a kind of a personal example of what I've been involved in University City in the last month as a way of kind of explaining why our community planning area is important to us as a community, not just all the social, economic and other ties that we have. I live in south University City and I've never been on the planning group, the University City Planning Group, which encompasses all of north and south UC, but I have attended and

been involved for at least ten years. So, I've seen a lot pass through that planning group. Unlike other planning group in the areas, we have an incredibly—our meetings go on for hours. We have a packed agenda because we have a lot of developments occurring. I was interested about Kensington's hundredth anniversary. In 1980, much of north University was an open field still. There were coyotes out there. So, it is really a newer community; we were created as the university community because of the creation of UCSD in 1960. This past month, we had...our planning group is considering the construction—the approval of major new office building north of La Jolla Village Drive, that area that's, you know, that APAC has proposed to cut out of University City, which has a very small population number. It is not a significant population center to be added to that; that would not make a big difference in their map. We also—UCSD has a massive new expansion going on, on their east campus, which again would be in that area that would be, you know, is proposed— that little sort of tag, on the APAC map. I'm very supportive of their considerations, but I think that area of north UC should not be considered as a piece of that. Thank you.

Comment 32: Matt Corrales

Good afternoon, Commission. Again, I appreciate the work that the Chair and the Commission has done and coming up with these maps. Basically, I'm going to just suggest a few tweaks to this map. I think we have a great start, again, especially in the areas south of 8, although I would, again, also echo the comments that we reconsider the API district and make it much more compact and make it much more strong. Specifically regarding the areas with District 7 and District 9, and the overlap there along the 8—in the 2008 election I worked with a group that is based in SDSU to register voters and really make sure that college students were out there getting voting and making sure that college students were maximizing their potential to influence City Council. And one of the ways, you know— what we saw the College community as is— as a lot of other people have testified— is areas both north and south of the 8. I really think we need to reconsider realigning those areas and tweaking the map accordingly more with the old District 7. The College community is the areas in College West and East there; it is the community of El Cerrito, it is the community of Del Cerro, and yes, it goes into parts of San Carlos, Allied Gardens, and Grantville. That is the SDSU community and I think it's high time that the Commission—or sorry, it would be a great idea for the Commission to reconsider reuniting that area. As far as what that affect is on the Latino community, we have the opportunity by moving those areas north, take a few of the neighborhoods down south, and we can get our Latino community up to 53%, up to as much as 55%. There is a great opportunity here to reunite the College communities and make sure we have a more contiguous Latino community. And finally, I don't understand why the Kensington-Talmadge people are suddenly wanting to split up, when earlier I heard dozens of testimonies to the contrary. It's interesting that that's a more diverse neighborhood now and suddenly they want to split. Thank you.

Comment 33: Marilyn Rogers

Hi, my name is Marilyn Rogers and I have lived in Point Loma since 1962 and my children went to school at Point Loma High School. I've been involved in various community activities, including the closure of NTC when it was converted to Liberty Station. I want to commend the Commission on their drawing of the district map for District 2, in particular. I've think you've done a good job. I know it's been a difficult job. And I just want to be sure that you keep Point Loma as one community and I like the way it's been put with the other beach communities. We have the airport in common and we have

the beach. We have two zip codes but we have more things in common and I'd like you to keep Point Loma as one community. Thank you.

Comment 34: Frank Silanos

Hello, my name is Frank Silanos and I'm a resident of Kensington. I know a lot of people from Kensington have been talking about the various reasons why we should remain part of District 3, including Adams Avenue being the streetcar suburb, you know, the shared facilities such as the parks and the stores that we go to, and the fact that there's a big significant LGBT community in Kensington. But I think one of the things that we really need to focus on is the fact that Kensington is an area of historic homes mainly from the '20s and '30s. If you really look at all of San Diego, how many homes are there from that era? There's really not that many in the grand of scheme of things and it's so important that we preserve those neighborhoods, those older neighborhoods, because that's our heritage. I mean, that's something that years from now, people are going to look back and say, you know, look at this great, wonderful neighborhood. And we need to make sure that Kensington is preserved. And I think the best to do that is to keep it as part of the historic communities, such as Mission Hills, Normal Heights, North Park, University Heights. I mean the last thing we want is 20, 30, 40 years from now, we look back and say, oh, you know, Kensington– yea, they had all these old homes, but when they kind of put together with this bigger group of newer housing, they kind of just lost its way and those homes were replaces, or they weren't kept up. And I think that would be really sad for our community and for our history and for the future. Thank you very much.

Comment 35: Ross Connelly

Good morning, Commissioners and staff. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this. My name is Ross Connelly representing the Fairmount Park Neighborhood Association. That is the area surrounded between the 15, the 805, and the 94 freeways. I'm here to encourage you to relook at this map for our neighborhood. We seem to be a linchpin in the new District 9. I'm not sure how it ended up that way but our neighborhood has a majority of white population. It also has a high LGBT community and it has a mix of other minority compliments as well. And so, we have more in common with the current District 3, because of both the makeup and also the communities of interest in our neighborhood. Also, we are adjacent to Azalea Park, which also has a LGBT community, as well. And so, those areas of the proposed District 9, we would prefer to see them back into the District 3, because we share more in common both from a representation standpoint and also from a population standpoint. Just a little background, we have had excellent representation from the members of District 3 for many, many years and our neighbors feel very comfortable with representation that they have received from those district members in the past. We would hate to see that change in a new District 9 on which the focus has suddenly become towards a minority base and not towards a whole population. And it is our opinion that District 9 has been thrown together in the mid-city area to more take of a population base put together instead of looking at what the neighborhoods have in common from a political and cultural standpoint. Also, we also feel that in the past we've had several representatives in City Heights and that has added to our base of influence. Now, we only have one and so we actually feel that our influence within matters in our area will decrease as a matter of this new map. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak this morning.

(Transcript Ends)

ITEM 3 – COMMISSIONER COMMENT

There were no comments.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Dalal adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary
2010 Redistricting Commission

**Written Comments Received July 30, 2011
Redistricting Commission Public Hearing**

Comment 1: Lorraine M. Silva

I am against splitting Pt. Loma in half. I have lived in Point Loma all my life. My three children have as well. Please don't change a good thing. It works as it is.

Comment 2: Marilyn Rogers

I comment the Redistricting Commission on your Preliminary Plan for the city with regard to District 2. The peninsula of Pt. Loma may have two zip codes but it has one high school with common interests of traffic corridors, airport problems, and the beaches. I urge you to keep Pt. Loma as one community with other beach communities. Don't split Point Loma. Thank you for the job you are doing.

Comment 3: Melinda Appling

Please do not divide LV in 3 parts. Our neighborhood has nothing in common with District 7.

Comment 4: Luis Perez

I do not agree with the proposed redistricting of Linda Vista, my community since 1961 when we purchased our house because we planned to live. Keep Linda Vista as is – do not change our community. Amen!

Comment 5: Dorothy Perez

I oppose the division of Linda Vista into three districts. No changes are needed to divide into three districts.

Comment 6: Amy Del Nagro

Per pg 2 – stop hiding behind “the law”! Many laws are passed to support special interests and are morally objectionable and in many cases, legally wrong as well. Laws can be unmade also.

Comment 7: Jean C. Nemer

We respectfully request the inclusion of the SD Airport in Council Dist. 2 because the airport directly and dramatically impacts the Pt. Loma community. We need a council representative and district that recognizes our rights.

Comment 8: Margaret McCann

Keep Kensington 3.