

AGENDA

2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 2011, AT 4:00 P.M.

SILVER ROOM (2nd Floor)
SAN DIEGO CONCOURSE
202 C STREET, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

Web: <http://www.sandiego.gov/redistricting>

Email: redistricting_2010@sandiego.gov

Phone: (619) 533-3060

NOTE:

Agendas, reports and records are available in alternative formats upon request. To order information or request an agenda in an alternative format, please contact the Commission office at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting to ensure availability. If a Sign Language Interpreter, aids for the visually impaired, or Alternative Listening Devices (ALD's) are required, please also contact the Commission office at least five (5) working days prior to the meeting to ensure availability. The Commission office can be reached by phone (619) 533-3060 (voice) or by email at redistricting_2010@sandiego.gov.

ROLL CALL

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the Redistricting Commission on items of interest within the jurisdiction of the Commission. Time allotted to each speaker is determined by the Chair and, in general, is limited to two (2) minutes. Submit requests to speak to the Commission's 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.

COMMISSION COMMENT

CITY ATTORNEY AND CITY STAFF ASSIGNED TO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION COMMENT

INFORMATION ITEMS

ITEM 1: Redistricting Law Briefing by Deputy City Attorney Sharon Spivak.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 2: Approval of minutes from the July 14, July 16, July 19, and July 21, 2011 Redistricting Commission meetings.

ITEM 3: Development of Final Redistricting Plan.

STAFF REPORTS

ITEM 4: Midori Wong, Chief of Staff:
--Monthly budget report.

ADJOURNMENT

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

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 2011

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

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

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

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

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

ROLL CALL:

Vice Chair Carlos Marquez called the roll:

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

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

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

Comment 1 – Michael Sprague thanked the staff for updating the website. He stated that he has requested to be notified by mail of the meeting schedules a few times. He has not received any notifications by mail.

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

COMMISSION COMMENT:

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

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

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

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

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

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

None.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 1: DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Dalal called a 10 minute recess.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Commissioner Potter agreed with Commissioner Marquez's sentiments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Commissioner Quiroz liked Commissioner Kosmo's suggestions.

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

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

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

Commissioner Potter supports Commissioner Kosmo's proposal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STAFF REPORTS

ITEM 4: MIDORI WONG, CHIEF OF STAFF

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary
2010 Redistricting Commission

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

Comment 1: Judith Pilch

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

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

SATURDAY, JULY 16, 2011

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

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dalal at 10:06 a.m. 43 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 1:53 p.m. to the next scheduled meeting of the Redistricting Commission on Tuesday, July 19th, 2011 at the City Administration Building in the Committee Room.

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

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

ROLL CALL:

Chair Anisha Dalal called the roll:

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

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

Comments are limited to no more than two minutes per speaker. Submit requests to speak to Midori Wong, Redistricting Commission Chief of Staff, before the item is called. Pursuant to the Ralph M.

Brown Act, no discussion or action, other than a referral, shall be taken by the Redistricting Commission on any issue brought forth under Non-Agenda Comment.

There we no non-agenda comments.

COMMISSION COMMENT:

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

CITY ATTORNEY AND CITY STAFF ASSIGNED TO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION COMMENT:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 1: DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Dalal called a 5 minute recess.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

All Commissioners agreed to disregard Plan 6.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Commissioner Potter also favors moving forward with Plan 4b.

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

Commissioner Morrow also favors keeping Golden Hill in District 3.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Dalal asked what the rationale for that would be.

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

Chair Dalal stated she is comfortable with the change.

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

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

Commissioners Kosmo and Morrow are in agreement with changes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Dalal is comfortable with the splitting of Rancho Peñasquitos.

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

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

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

Chair Dalal agreed with Commissioner Marquez's sentiments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Dalal agrees with Commissioner Marquez.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Johnson stated that Tuesday would just tweaking boundaries.

Commissioner Nishioka asked when NDC anticipates having the plans online.

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

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

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

STAFF REPORTS

ITEM 4: MIDORI WONG, CHIEF OF STAFF

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

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary
2010 Redistricting Commission

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

Comment 1: Anne Schoeller

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

**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 21th, 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 19th 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 40th 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 90th 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-weighing 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 Vendaheuvell, 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.

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

THURSDAY, JULY 21, 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 4:05 p.m. 35 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 6:01 p.m. to the next scheduled Public Hearing on Tuesday, July 26th, 2011 at the Logan Heights Branch Library.

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 stated that he received notification of today's meeting two hours prior. He received the back-up materials for this meeting today. He received the agenda for July 19, along with this meeting's agenda via mail today. He stated that he's chaired Brown Act committees before and the Commission is not meeting Brown Act requirements.

COMMISSION COMMENT:

Chair Dalal reflected on the Commission's processes and progress to date. She provided data on the number of speakers heard and correspondence received. She noted the Commission's continued commitment to drawing a fair map, representative of the public. She mentioned the upcoming public hearings and how to obtain dates and location information. She thanked the public for their involvement.

Commissioner Nishioka gave background on current Districts 1 and 5, as well as the Asian communities influence in those areas. He stated that he regrets not being able to satisfy all requests but his decisions were governed by laws and regulations.

CITY ATTORNEY AND CITY STAFF ASSIGNED TO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION COMMENT:

None.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 1: DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

Mr. Johnson reiterated that the split Census block that includes USD cannot be shown on the online Esri system, which only shows whole blocks. The maps in the agenda packets reflect the changes and the demographic spreadsheets comment on how they handled the population numbers. Census Bureau group quarters data to determine how many people are in the dorms that were moved into District 2. It's only total population, however, with no ethnic data. The total population does reflect the shift, but the ethnic data does not. The total moved is 249 people, and therefore will not significantly affect ethnic percentages. He reiterated that the changes are reflected in the maps, data and Filing Statement.

Mr. Levitt showed the split Census block on the screen. He also detailed the minor edits done, including making sure the district lines that follow freeways are smooth; it did not affect population. He also noted that Little Italy has been moved back to District 3.

Chair Dalal introduced Ms. Spivak to present the Filing Statement.

Ms. Spivak stated the Redistricting Plan is not only a map, but also includes the Filing Statement. It was completed this afternoon and made available to public at this meeting. She explained the significance of the Filing Statement and the processes in creating, finalizing, and filing it. She walked through each section of the Filing Statement. She stated that the plan has a total population

deviation of 3.24%. The largest district has a population of 147,375 which is 1.19% over the goal. The smallest district has 142,711 which is 1.33% less than the goal. She stated the ethnic and CVAP numbers are included with the Filing Statement in an attachment prepared by NDC. She further outlined what information is included in the Statement, including data and findings.

Ms. Spivak stated that she can take and incorporate any edits and revisions the Commission finds today; however, if the Commission approves the plan today, staff is prepared to file the statement tomorrow, so they are looking for corrections only.

She noted some errors she'd identified, including:

- On page 5, under Continuity, the street *Balboa* needs to be *Balboa Avenue*
- On pages 11 and 12, under 5th and 7th bullet points under Findings and Reasons for Adoption, there are four instances of *Scripps Ranch* that should be *Miramar Ranch North*.
- The word *unit* needs to change to *unite*.
- Under District 9, the community of Bay Ridge needs to be added to the neighborhood list on page 17.

She asked that any other changes or corrections be submitted to her after public comment.

Comment 1: Rick Bussell, a 20-year resident of Linda Vista, spoke in opposition of splitting Linda Vista into three districts as drawn in the preliminary map. He referenced the progress by Linda Vista to rid itself of gangs and crime and to become an involved community. He asked the Commission to reunite Linda Vista.

Comment 2: Jorge Riquelme with the Bayside Community Center spoke against the division of Linda Vista amongst three districts. He stated that they are a community of interest and quoted Ms. Spivak and the City Charter's definition of a community of interest and the requirement to preserve them. He stated that splitting Linda Vista into three districts makes them politically irrelevant and disenfranchises them. He stated that no population deviation can justify splitting up a true community.

Comment 3: Dr. Allen Chan stated that in Chair Dalal's earlier comments, she mentioned correspondence and speakers, but didn't mention the petitions with over 2,000 signatures submitted by APAC. He read a statement from APAC addressed to the Commission. APAC is disappointed with the district lines as drawn. They ask that Mira Mesa, Rancho Peñasquitos, and North University City be united in a district. He asked that the water tower area be placed with Mira Mesa and Miramar on the west side of 805, instead of District 1.

Comment 4: Aurora Cudal stated that she is disappointed with the district lines as drawn. She feels the Commission did not hear the API community after all their efforts. She asked that the Commission recognize that the Asian American community exists in San Diego and they need representation.

Comment 5: Jay Wilson with the Del Cerro Action Council stated that he supports the Preliminary Plan as it relates to keeping the Navajo communities together. He also stated that a straw poll of the Board of Directors of Mission Trails Regional Park Foundation found them to also be in support. The Navajo Community Planners Board is also in support of the District 7 drawn by the Commission. He thanked the Commission.

Comment 6: Laura Riebau with the Eastern Area Planning Committee stated that the Committee submitted a map to keep their neighborhoods together. Oak Park and Webster stated they wanted to remain in District 4 as they are now, but the other communities want to remain together in District 7, including the College Grove shopping center. She says the Commission has disregarded their communities. She stated that UCSD and USD were treated as communities of interest, but SDSU and its surrounding communities were not.

Comment 7: Judy McCarty thanked the Commission for keeping the Navajo communities together. She feels the Commission has listened and incorporated public input.

Comment 8: April Boring believes that volunteers in San Diego are not given enough credit and are criticized too much. She is a member of the Navajo community and feels the map is reasonable. She is a lifelong resident of the Navajo area and testifies that it is all one community brought together by Mission Trails Regional Park. She thanked the Commission for recognizing the wholeness of their community.

Comment 8: John Pilch, president of the San Carlos Area Council, thanked the Commission for their work and for keeping the Navajo areas together. He's reviewed the findings in the Filing Statement and it seems to be in line with their testimony. He asked the Commission that they adopt District 7 as shown. He clarified that Lake Murray is a lake, not a community. He stated that area is San Carlos East.

Comment 9: Jolaine Harris stated that her community is not underprivileged as a previous speaker stated. She said her community chose to stay with District 4 because they do good things there. She stated that she was on the planning group ten years prior to the other speaker and was involved in bringing about the creation of the Kroc Center. She stated they have a 25% Asian population that is affluent. She thanked the Commission for keeping her community in District 4 and asks that the College Grove shopping center be included in District 4.

Comment 10: Joost Bende with the Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board stated that they are mostly happy with the map, except that the area south of 56 needs to be reunited with Rancho Peñasquitos. He stated that the Peñasquitos Preserve is a natural boundary dividing Rancho Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa, making the district not contiguous. He stated that the Pomerado Health District and PUSD has been split. He asked that Rancho Peñasquitos be united and Linda Vista be added to District 6 to make up for population, that Scripps Ranch be split along Pomerado Road and Rancho Encantada be put into District 7. He stated that District 7 does not meet the definition of compact.

Comment 11: Larry Baza asked the Commission to put Shelltown in the new District 9. He cited contiguity and connections to Southcrest, which is currently in District 9.

Comment 12: Carolina Ramos asked the Commission to keep Shelltown with Southcrest in the same district. She stated that as a child she didn't know the two were separate. She talked about the shared schools and parks.

Comment 13: Charles Latimer, an Allied Gardens resident, stated that he doesn't believe Allied Gardens is part of the Navajo Planning Group. He stated that they are close but they gave them the Grantville redevelopment area through their Business Association, which he is against. He stated that many people in Allied Gardens are unhappy with what Navajo Planning Group has been doing. He stated that Matt Adams who has spoken before the Commission as a member of the Navajo Planning Group is also a lobbyist for Building Industry Association and a vice-chair for the Republican Party. He also stated that Judy McCarty is a former Republican City Council member. Jay Wilson with the Mission Trails Regional Park was a political aide for Judy McCarty and Republican Jim Madaffer. He said these groups are trying to control their neighborhoods, but Allied Gardens does not want to be with Tierrasanta or the northern part of Navajo. They'd like to be with the College area and Grantville.

Comment 14: Michael Sprague stated that the Commission has created a new Latino district in District 4, but that District 9 is not a Latino district because the Latino CVAP is 26%. He stated the LGBT neighborhoods in District 9 would like to stay in District 3. He mentioned their voting behaviors and contiguity as reasons to keep them with District 3.

Comment 15: Cindy Chan, a Rancho Peñasquitos resident, advocated for the APAC plan and asked that the Commission recognize the API community as a community of interest. She referenced the Asian population numbers, the signed petition submitted, and the large amount of public testimony and emails. She stated that the three communities with the largest Asian populations are contiguous: Rancho Peñasquitos, Mira Mesa, and University City.

Comment 16: Waskah Whelan, a Point Loma resident, thanked the Commission for listening to their concerns and keeping Point Loma with the airport. She stated that community interests have to do with problem solving; she stated that grouping residents with shared concerns is a good principle.

Comment 17: David Moty, chair of Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group, asked the Commission to list under their findings in the Filing Statement specifically why Redwood Village and Rolando Park are in District 4, especially since there was public testimony in opposition.

Comment 18: Dr. Pat Washington spoke on behalf of the API community, because she feels they need an empowerment district and she defers to them where that district should be. She is distressed that they do not feel the final map reflects the hours and hours of work they have invested. She asked that the Commission ensure that this community is represented in the map.

Comment 19: John Keating with Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Group asked that the entire planning group be kept together. He referenced the last bullet of the ten redistricting principles, which is recognizing well-organized planning groups.

Comment 20: Leon Wu, a Rancho Peñasquitos resident, spoke as a petitioner for the APAC community. He asked the Commission to discuss the merit of uniting the three most Asian populated areas of the city: Mira Mesa, Rancho Peñasquitos, and University City. He asked that the district be numbered 9. He stated that he doesn't hear their testimony or their petition discussed.

Comment 21: Janet Kaye spoke on behalf of Tom Cleary with the USD Planning Group who was en route, and on behalf of her husband Tom Kaye with the Linda Vista Town Council. She asked that USD be kept in Linda Vista, that the border be drawn at Genesee and that the Chesterton Navy housing north of Genesee be ceded to the MCAS Miramar district, where it belongs.

Comment 22: Dennis McNaney thanked the Commission for their hard work and praised them for coming close to the 144,000 population per district goal. He stated that the high percentage of minorities in certain districts can yield the desired results if the people become mobilized. He stated that the map is fair and achieves the one person, one vote concept.

Comment 23: Anne Schoeller, a Rolando Village resident, is not in favor of being moved into City Heights. She is also upset that Rolando Park and Redwood Village are in District 4. She cited the public testimony. She stated that she hasn't heard a serious conversation about moving them into another district together.

Comment 24: Remigia Bermudez stated that her main concern during this process was to see a district created south of the 8 and the 94. However, the Latino Redistricting Commission's proposal has been tweaked so much that it now dilutes communities of interest. She stated that Kensington, Talmadge, El Cerrito, and those communities to the east are not aligned with the communities of interest in the heart of the district. She asks that if Shelltown and Southcrest are added into District 9, that a portion of Golden Hill be returned to District 8. She alternatively suggested bringing back the portion of Mountain View that was put back into District 4 and adding to it. She stated the map does not represent what the people have worked for.

Comment 25: Eric Germain with the Tierrasanta Foundation thanked the Commission for keeping Tierrasanta whole. He apologized to Commissioner Marquez for remarks at a previous meeting and commended Commissioner Potter and the Commission for doing good work.

Comment 26: Bari Vaz thanked the Commission for keeping Mira Mesa whole.

Chair Dalal called for Commissioner comment and discussion.

Commissioner Morrow stated she was not in favor the proposed preliminary plan for many reasons, including the inclusion of Redwood Village and Rolando Park in District 4, the failure of the Commission to recognize the Asian community, and the division of Linda Vista.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that the neighborhood lines for Linda Vista will remain the same; it's their representation that will change. She thanked Ms. Spivak and NDC for their quick work. She stated that the neighborhood list on the Filing Statement is outdated.

Ms. Spivak asked for corrections. Mr. Levitt stated that the updated list was provided with the maps today.

Commissioner Quiroz also asked that Lake Murray be changed to Lake Murray/East San Carlos according to public testimony from its residents. She also stated that the API community is a community of interest, but she considers University City a very important part of the city and would not consider splitting that. She asked the Commission to revisit the northern part of the city and consider what the API community is asking.

Commissioner Marquez thanked the public for attending the meeting. He stated that the Commissioners as individuals all had to make concessions because they are committed to serving San Diego as a whole. He is disheartened by comments that state the Commission is disenfranchising groups which they believed they were enfranchising. He is sensitive to the API community's concerns and that is why he advocated splitting Rancho Peñasquitos and including a portion of it with Mira Mesa, as well as including a portion of Linda Vista. He stated that the CVAP in District 6 is around 25%, similar to the African American and Latino empowerment districts. The LGBT empowerment district does not reach 25%. He would like to look at District 9 again, because there is new testimony about the inclusion of Shelltown. He also sees the merit and connectivity in including Golden Hill with District 8. He is ready to approve the preliminary map today and to make these changes before final adoption.

Commissioner Nishioka thanked Commissioner Marquez and stated that he aligns with much of what he said. He stated that he is ready to approve the preliminary map as proposed, but is aware of its flaws. He mentioned the four universities in San Diego and stated that he considers them all communities of interest. He recognized that SDSU is a vital part of the community. He advocates for the unification of SDSU and its surrounding neighborhoods. He also thanked Ms. Spivak for her excellent work on the Filing Statement.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he agreed with a lot of what Commissioners Marquez and Nishioka. He stated that he knows the map is not perfect, but feels it was drafted fairly and in good faith. He knows the Commission took into consideration the API community, as well as all communities of interest. He understands there is an outstanding issue regarding SDSU and he is willing to look at that during the next step of the process and make any necessary changes before final adoption.

Commissioner Potter addressed Ms. Kaye's questions during public comment by explaining the timeline towards final adoption. He addressed APAC, stating that he understands their position but the map they proposed was problematic; it showed a 13% deviation. He stated that District 4 has an 18% African American population and they have consistently elected African American representatives. He stated that Tom Hom, an Asian councilmember in the 60s, was elected from a citywide vote, once with 86% of the vote.

He suggested some corrections to the Filing Statement, including on page 4, under Reasons for Adoption, the fifth bullet says “zero population.” He believes there to be two people living in that block.

Mr. Levitt stated that there are two people living in that Census block.

He stated that on page 3, the fourth bullet under Reasons for Adoption, it should say “Torrey Pines community.” He also asked that on page 17, that the line connecting the southern and northern parts of District 8 be referred to as a corridor.

Commissioner Nishioka asked Ms. Wong where the draft filing statement could be found online.

Ms. Wong stated that it is posted in the July 21st agenda packet. The complete preliminary plan, including filing statement, will be posted on the home page, once changes are made.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she thinks the Commission did an excellent job adhering to the redistricting principles, laws, and requirements while incorporating public testimony with Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, and 9. However, she cannot in good conscience vote to adopt this plan because she feels the API community’s vote was diluted in favor of uniting Rancho Peñasquitos with other communities in the same school district, which she feels is irrelevant to redistricting.

Chair Dalal thanked Ms. Spivak and NDC for creating the Filing Statement and supporting the Commission. She also thanked Ms. Wong for her excellent work and support in various areas. She stated that all emails, correspondence, as well as the petitions submitted by APAC, were provided to the Commission and the Commissioners have reviewed it and all the maps on Esri. She stated that the Commissioners have all received training on the legal requirements regarding redistricting, including the Voting Rights Act. She feels the preliminary plan is a good draft but it can still be changed after the post-map public hearings. She also acknowledged and thanked the API community for their involvement since the beginning of the process. She noted that on page 16 of the Filing Statement, the Commission does acknowledge the API community as a community of interest.

Ms. Spivak thanked outside counsel, Marguerite Leoni, for her work on the Filing Statement, as well as the Commissioners for their input. She added that the Commission is under a very strict deadline from the Registrar of Voters. She stated that at this time, a final vote may be made on or around August 25th. The final hard deadline from the Registrar to provide the redistricting plan is September 15th.

Motion by Commissioner Potter: To approve the Preliminary Redistricting Plan, including the Filing Statement as modified. Seconded by Commissioner Kosmo.

Commissioner Marquez ensured the public that this is not a final map; this vote is to move the process forward, but changes can still be made to the final redistricting plan. He encouraged the public with outstanding issues with the map to continue providing input and attend the upcoming public hearings.

Commissioner Nishioka asked the Chair to provide details to the public regarding the post-map hearings.

Chair Dalal referred the public to the flyers at the back at the room and the website for dates, times, and locations. She went over what to expect at each meeting and encouraged the public to attend.

Motion to approve the Preliminary Redistricting Plan, including the Filing Statement as modified this day, passed 5–2. Commissioners Dalal, Kosmo, Nishioka, Marquez, and Potter are in favor. Commissioners Morrow and Quiroz are opposed.

ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF MINUTES FORM THE JULY 9TH REDISTRICTING COMMISSION MEETING

Comment 1: Michael Sprague stated that he'd like specific questions made during public comment to be answered in the minutes.

Commissioner Potter noted that in the fifth paragraph on page 16 of the minutes, the first instance of Commissioner Potter should be Commissioner Kosmo.

Commissioner Morrow asked that in the last paragraph on page 2 of the minutes, the words “she felt” be removed.

Motion by Commissioner Nishioka: To approve the Minutes for July 9, 2011, as amended. Second by Commissioner Quiroz. Motion passed unanimously 7-0.

STAFF REPORTS

ITEM 3: MIDORI WONG, CHIEF OF STAFF

Ms. Wong thanked her staff and the City staff that helps run the meetings, including CityTV, Communications Department, IT department, City Clerk's office, Purchasing and Contracting, Parks and Recreation, Libraries, Business Office and Financial Management, as well as the outreach team, Humanibility.

She stated that for the five post-map hearings, with the Commission's approval, she can bring on additional temporary help to transcribe the public comments so that the minutes can be made available before the next set of meetings starting August 9th. The Commission approved Ms. Wong's request for additional temporary help.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he would not be attending the public hearings but will view the taped meetings prior to deliberations.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he will not attend the July 26th hearing but will view the taped meeting.

Commissioner Morrow will not attend the July 30th hearing but will view the taped meeting.

Chair Dalal also thanked all the support staff and Ms. Leoni.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he hasn't viewed a budget review in some time.

Ms. Wong stated that the Commissioners received a fiscal year end projection report at the June 25 meeting, and the actual expenditure report will be provided as soon as it is available. The regular budget report will be provided after the end of the month.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairperson Dalal adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary
2010 Redistricting Commission

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

Comment 1: Paul Webster, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce

The San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce supports the proposed preliminary plan. It is a fair and equitable division of San Diego into council districts. It also keeps business and commerce regions intact within each council district. This is important as it does not split business areas but allows each business area to be represented by their respective councilmembers. Because the city addresses so many matters that affect business and commerce, the Chamber feels that business areas must be kept whole and not split by district boundaries. The SDRCC feels that the proposed plan accomplishes this as well as creating fair, equitable and well divide council districts. The SDRCC supports the proposed plan.

Comment 2: Phillip

I want to express gratitude to all commissioners for the openness and inclusive way you allow all community members to participate. I hope that when the final map is drawn you will come back to various communities and present to as many San Diego city residents as possible. With regards to District 4, the Malcolm X Library is not large enough. I strongly recommend that Lincoln High on Imperial Avenue is the venue that is used for the 4th District. Thank you.