

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

MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 2011

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

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dalal at 4:11 p.m. 330 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 9:03 p.m.

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:

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

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 – not 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 – Lee Rittiner asked if the recently pushed-back date for primary elections gives the Commission more time to work on the redistricting plan. He asked for an explanation of the referendum process, as well as an explanation about how districting numbering affects election cycles.

COMMISSION COMMENT

Commissioner Nishioka confirmed for the public and Commissioners that he has reviewed the tapings of the meetings for July 28th, 30th, August 1st, 3rd, and 9th and provided written confirmation to the Chair.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she wished to address rumors circulating that Commissioners were making decisions based on intent to run for office. She informed the public that all Commissioners are prohibited from running for office for at least five years after the plan is adopted.

CITY ATTORNEY AND STAFF ASSIGNED TO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION COMMENT

Ms. Spivak noted that this is the 42nd public hearing of the Commission. She explained that for those in the audience who may have not attended a Commission meeting before, the City Attorney's Office has been providing legal presentations throughout the past year that are posted on the Commission web site. She also noted that she has been providing refreshers at the past few meetings and for the benefit of the public would do so for today's meeting.

Ms. Spivak noted that the Commission adopted the preliminary plan on July 21st and then held five public hearings throughout the community to provide information on the preliminary plan and take public feedback. Today's meeting is the second of three scheduled hearings to discuss any possible changes to the preliminary plan based on that testimony, demographics, and other information the Commission has received throughout the process. The Commission is scheduled to vote on adopting the final plan on August 25.

As stated in previous meetings, the preliminary plan is legally defensible. Ms. Spivak explained that any changes proposed to the preliminary plan need to include supporting information, including public testimony or statistical, demographic, or other information provided by NDC in order to update the legal findings. The City Attorney's Office and outside counsel will complete a new, full legal analysis of the proposed final plan as amended.

Ms. Spivak again provided a refresher of redistricting principles for the benefit of the Commission and the public. She then responded to a request made by Commissioner Quiroz at the August 9 meeting for outside counsel, Ms. Marguerite Leoni, to review the compactness of Districts 6 and 7 in the "tqapi" map on the Esri system. Ms. Spivak noted that so there is no confusion, in "tqapi," Districts 5, 6, and 7 are numbered differently than in the preliminary plan.

The request to review Districts 6 and 7 was completed by Ms. Leoni. Districts 6 and 7 are not subject to analysis under Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 because they were not drawn as majority-minority or minority-influenced districts. Compactness of the minority communities in those districts therefore was also not an issue under Section 2 of the VRA. Thus, compactness in those districts is to be weighed and balanced against other traditional redistricting criteria such as communities of interest, contiguity, and access to population centers. However, the legality of the plan does not hinge

only on compactness of one or two districts, but must be looked at as a whole. The City Charter does not state what test to use to measure compactness; there are several different compactness tests, all essentially mathematical formulas. NDC was asked to run these tests on “tqapi” Districts 6 and 7, as well as on the districts in the preliminary plan. Ms. Spivak asked Mr. Levitt to comment on these tests. Mr. Levitt presented information showing the results of various compactness tests.

Commissioner Nishioka asked Attorney Spivak to remind the Commission of criteria related to deviation and population.

Ms. Spivak noted that each of the nine districts needs to have as close to 144,624 people. Deviation is measured as a percentage spread between the population of the largest district and that of the smallest. Historically, up to 10% difference in population has been defended, but case law has been narrowing such that the goal is to have as close to zero deviation as possible, while acknowledging that exactly zero deviation is mathematically impossible. The preliminary plan has a 3.24% deviation. As stated during the last hearing, deviation could increase slightly.

Commissioner Marquez asked what the largest deviation that the Commission can allow is.

Ms. Spivak stated that there is no magic number. It is important that if changes are made that create a larger deviation there need to be findings to justify it, such as an identifiable community of interest.

ACTION ITEMS:

ITEM 1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JULY 26, JULY 28, JULY 30, AUGUST 1, AND AUGUST 3, 2011, REDISTRICTING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARINGS

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he will only be able to vote on the approval of the July 26th meeting and would like to do that separately.

Motion by Commissioner Nishioka to: Approve the July 26, 2011 Redistricting Commission Public Hearing Minutes. Motion seconded by Commissioner Morrow. Motion passed unanimously 6–0; Commissioner Kosmo was not present.

Commissioner Quiroz would also like to make the same proviso that she has not compared the verbatim translation of the minutes to the video taping of the meetings to ensure that each transcription is completely accurate.

Motion by Commissioner Quiroz to: Approve the July 28, July 30, August 1, and August 3, 2011, Redistricting Commission Public Hearing Minutes, with accompanying proviso. Motion seconded by Commissioner Potter. Motion passed 5–0; Commissioner Nishioka abstained and Commissioner Kosmo was not present.

ITEM 2 – DEVELOPMENT OF FINAL REDISTRICTING PLAN

Mr. Levitt reviewed the two changes directed by the Commission at the last hearing, which were to move the area south of Commercial Street and east of Harbor Boulevard in the East Village Business Improvement District from District 8 to District 3, and to move the area northeast of Genesee Avenue in Linda Vista into District 7. He also stated that at the last hearing NDC had provided maps and demographic information showing options for Shelltown to be placed in Districts 8 and 9, but that the Commission had not directed that it be moved.

Commissioner Marquez asked what the population was in the area moved from District 8 to District 3.

Mr. Levitt stated that the area has two residents.

Comment 1 – Helen Dominguez spoke against placing Park Village into District 6. She stated that their common interests align with Peñasquitos and neighboring PUSD communities. She stated that they risk drastic loss of home values if they are redistricted into District 6. She stated that APAC requested this change without her consent.

Comment 2 – Keith Rhodes showed a map that shows how the Census incorrectly shows the alignment of the 56 freeway. He was informed by NDC that the actual physical freeway route will be used once the plan is adopted and submitted to the Registrar. He asked staff to confirm that. He stated that he has been in the area over 20 years and has watched both Mira Mesa and Peñasquitos grow. The canyon is a natural divide between Mira Mesa and Peñasquitos. He stated that Rancho Peñasquitos should be unified.

Comment 3 – Jim Cantwell spoke in favor of keeping Park Village with Rancho Peñasquitos. He referenced the Peñasquitos preserve being a natural divide.

Comment 4 – Susanne Roland stated that Park Village is a community of interest with the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos. She asked they remain in the same district.

Comment 5 – Frances Waid stated that she took out three loans and bought her home in Park Village with the understanding that it was Rancho Peñasquitos and that the Preserve was a boundary. She asked they remain united with the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos.

Comment 6 – Brandon Wallace stated that he bought a home in Park Village three years ago so that he could raise his daughters in Rancho Peñasquitos and they could attend the Poway Unified School District. He stated that their common interest lies with the rest of Peñasquitos.

Comment 7 – Francis Tepedino stated she was standing in for the president of the Tierrasanta Community Council and read a letter from the Council stating that they support and adopt the preliminary plan. They have already arranged meetings with other leaders of the communities in the new District 7. He also asked that his alma mater USD remain with Linda Vista.

Comment 8 – Neil Thorton thanked the Commission for keeping Tierrasanta as one cohesive unit and expressed support for uniting PQ.

Comment 9 – John Becker, president of the Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board and Park Village resident, advocated for keeping Park Village with the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos in District 5. He referenced the shared community planning area and commonalities between Park Village and the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos, as well as the natural boundary of Peñasquitos Canyon and the Pomerado Health District. He presented options for balancing the populations while leaving Park Village in District 5. He stated that Scripps Ranch, Miramar, and Mira Mesa have been in the same district for 30 years; he also noted shared commercial centers, schools and school district, and a fire station. Park Village shares none of these with Scripps Ranch, Miramar or Mira Mesa, but instead shares these with other communities in the proposed District 5. He highlighted other similarities and shared interests with District 5.

Comment 10 – John Keating requested that all of PQ remain in one district. He thanked his neighbors for attending and showing support. He stated that they are not a political group nor a special interest. He referenced their shared school district, shopping centers, and places of worship. He stated that their fear is lack of representation and that Park Village will be the only part of PUSD that is not in District 5. He is afraid that two Councilmembers will cause confusion and lead to inaction. He asked the Commission to consider a larger legal deviation.

Comment 11 – Jeanette Poole, a 17-year resident of Park Village, advocated for a united Peñasquitos. She stated that based on her experience in planning, she feels that Mira Mesa and Scripps Ranch are much more similar than Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa. They share schools, fire stations, community events, and thoroughfares. She stated that 25 days ago, splitting Rancho Peñasquitos was not on the table; this is recent news to her community, despite the process being near its end. She gave background on Park Village, stating that it was built with the intention to be an integral part of Peñasquitos. She also mentioned that the Peñasquitos community park is in Park Village; a part important to all of Rancho Peñasquitos would be in another district.

Comment 12 – Jagadish Nayak advocated for keeping Park Village with the rest of Peñasquitos in District 5. He stated this area is people, not just numbers, and asked the Commission to please acknowledge their voice.

Comment 13 – Karen Lim, a Park Village resident, stated that although the Asian community is considered the silent minority, her Asian neighbors are united in supporting a unified Peñasquitos. She stated that she believes Allen Chan, owner of Jasmine Restaurant, initiated this initiative, but that if he plans to win office, splitting Peñasquitos will not accomplish it. She stated that she does believe Asians need a voice in City government, but this is not the way to do it. She supports a complete Peñasquitos, unified in District 5.

Comment 14 – Andy Berg thanked the community for coming out. He stated that the last time his community united against something, Sempra Energy changed the Sunrise Powerlink route. He stated that if Sempra can change a Powerlink route, the Commission can make changes to the map.

Comment 15 – Lifun Leung said that she moved to Peñasquitos after ten years in Mira Mesa because she didn't have anything in common with Mira Mesa residents. She stated that she is Asian and feels represented in Peñasquitos; she does not feel the need to be reclassified into Mira Mesa to be

represented. She is respectful of the Commission's work but asks that the Commission be respectful of what Rancho Peñasquitos wants. She asked that PQ remain whole within one district.

Comment 16 – Vicki Pineda thanked the Commission for hearing their voice and stated that she is in favor of one PQ.

Comment 17 – Bill Griffin, a Peñasquitos resident, stated that one of the things making this community great is unified representation. He feels Peñasquitos needs to retain its unified representation.

Comment 18 – Thomas Monroe stated that the biggest issue for them is representation. The hub of their community is north of the 56 and they will no longer have a say about what goes on in their community if they are split away from it.

Comment 19 – Gloria Kuramoto stated that she moved into Park Village from another area because they wanted to stay within Peñasquitos. She urged the Commission to keep them united.

Comment 20 – Dawei Huang stated that when he moved into Rancho Peñasquitos in 2001, there were only two Chinese families in the area. He stated that his family created great friendships with their American neighbors, and his children have made many friends as well. He feels that another group is trying to now represent his community without the consensus of his community. His children play in the Peñasquitos Soccer League and Little League. He asked the Commission to leave Rancho Peñasquitos united.

Comment 21 – Kathie Wagner, a 20-year Park Village resident, stated that the Commission has allowed deviation in other areas, including District 1, in order to keep together communities of interest. She asked that the same be done for Rancho Peñasquitos.

Comment 22 – Eva Barasch stated that Peñasquitos is a multi-ethnic community. She is against redistricting based on one ethnicity. She stated that Peñasquitos has been united for over 25 years and she asked that the commission leave it united.

Comment 23 – Siu Chu Chiu stated that his family has been in Rancho Peñasquitos for over 30 years and in Park Village since 1991. He addressed the part of the filing statement that says an Asian population is requesting representation on the council because of cultural ties and shared activities. He stated that they are all for Asian representation; however, he prefers a City Councilmember who cares for the welfare of their district over one of a certain ethnicity.

Comment 24 – Barrett Tetlow with the San Diego Republican Party made a presentation comparing the preliminary plan's District 6 with Commissioner Quiroz's District 5. He stated the preliminary map's D6 is more compact. He presented figures as an analysis of both districts' possible support for Asian candidates using recent election comparisons.

Comment 25 – John Pilch asked that District 7 as in the preliminary plan remain as is.

Comment 26 – Song Wang expressed support for one PQ and stated he spoke for his family and for a neighbor/coworker who had to work late. He referenced commonalities amongst Park Village and Rancho Peñasquitos and stated they are not aligned with Mira Mesa.

Comment 27 – Ramuka Ferreira stated that she purchased her home in Park Village because of the cohesive nature of Peñasquitos and because of PUSD. She feels another group lobbying for PQ to be in there district is akin to the tail wagging the dog. She asked the Commission to keep Peñasquitos whole and in one district.

Comment 28 – Frank Jackson stated he deduced from the filing statement that the only reason for splitting Peñasquitos was population numbers. He referenced the differences in community and commercial activities, school districts, and crime rates as reasons to keep Mira Mesa and Rancho Peñasquitos separate. He stated that the PQ residents in attendance today are a fraction of those who wanted to be here.

Comment 29 – Judy McCarty read a letter from former Mayor and Navajo area resident Dick Murphy in support of the District 7 as drawn in the preliminary map. The letter commended the Commission for uniting the communities along the San Diego River. She went on to say that if Mission Trails were to be removed from District 7, the communities surrounding it will be disenfranchised because they are the volunteers and the residents who built the Visitor's Center.

Comment 30 – Dorothy Leonard supports the preliminary map which keeps the core of Mission Trails Regional Park in District 7. She's been involved in the formation of the park since 1971 and has always worked with the Councilmember from District 7 and their staff. She stated that is crucial that the park remain within one district with its surrounding communities, especially with the master plan update in progress.

Comment 31 – Joe Morse supports the preliminary map which keeps the core of Mission Trails Regional Park in District 7. He also supports keeping USD in District 7 as it is an important part of Linda Vista.

Comment 32 – Ricardo Delgado spoke against merging the area of District 8 between Newton and Harbor Drive into District 3. He stated Barrio Logan has struggled to create an identity and is currently in the process of conducting studies. He opposes ceding part of Barrio Logan to District 3 because he fears the will use that area to create a stadium or other large scale developments that will disrupt and alter Barrio Logan's character.

Comment 33 – Mark Sabat, a Park Village resident, called attention to Commission's principles stating it would help preserve identifiable communities of interest and stated Peñasquitos is one such community. He and his neighbors are against placing Park Village in a different district than the rest of PQ.

Comment 34 – Zachariah Cheruvallath, a 15-year Park Village resident, stated that he found out about the preliminary redistricting plan this morning and took time off work to be here today. He thanked his neighbors for also taking time off work to attend. He urged the Commission to keep Peñasquitos united.

Comment 35 – Yifeng Cui, a Park Village resident since 2009, stated that he had not heard about redistricting until yesterday. He asked the Commission to keep Rancho Peñasquitos united.

Comment 36 – Yun Du stated that he and his neighbors were not made aware of the issue until recently. He stated that he and his neighbors are not numbers to be shuffled around, they are people. He stated that other organizations cannot represent them.

Comment 37 – Alex Bourd asked that his name be added to the record amongst those who are against splitting Rancho Peñasquitos.

Comment 38 – Paul Hoover, a 13-year resident of Park Village, business owner, and community volunteer, stated that his neighborhood is a melting pot of many ethnicities and what binds them is Rancho Peñasquitos. They and their children shop, play sports, go to school, and use facilities in Rancho Peñasquitos. He stated that when he reviewed the minutes, despite what other organizations have said, no Park Village resident of any ethnicity has said they want to be a part of the communities to the south. He stated that of the thousands of emails, most are from their Asian neighbors. He stated that the 56 is not a boundary in their neighborhood and that it is crossed many times daily. He stated Peñasquitos Canyon is a natural boundary between Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa and has been so for 30 years. He stated that the Commission's principle to keep neighborhoods united is not adhered to in splitting PQ. He also stated that APAC does not represent Park Village residents and their motivation is strictly racial. He outlined Scripps Miramar Ranch and Mira Mesa's longtime alignment.

Comment 39 – Lian He, an 8-year resident of Park Village, stated that she first heard about this issue on Saturday night. She stated that her family worked hard to afford the premium price of their home to be in this neighborhood and she fears her house will lose value. She stated that APAC does not represent her and her neighbors.

Comment 40 – Harry Chen, a Park Village resident, stated that his 6-year-old son has lived his whole life in Park Village and the first letters he could recognize were P and Q. He stated that both of his sons share interests with other kids in Peñasquitos, including sports leagues and schools. He asked the Commission to consider one PQ.

Comment 41 – Douglas Sapp wanted to go on record as opposing the split of Rancho Peñasquitos.

Comment 42 – Jeffery Zhang stated that although APAC's goals are noble, splitting communities of interest is the wrong way to achieve the goal. He implored the Commission to keep Park Village with Rancho Peñasquitos.

Comment 43 – Sathish Gurram, a Park Village resident, asked the Commission to keep Peñasquitos united.

Comment 44 – Mary Fox, a Park Village resident, stated that they are not only a community; they are a family and she urged the Commission not to split it up.

Comment 45 – Jeff Storey stated the map is an aberration and it needs to be changed. He asked for one PQ.

Comment 46 – Gerald Sims, a resident of Park Village since 1990, stated that although Black Mountain Road connects them with Mira Mesa, he and his family shop, attend school, and receive public services from Rancho Peñasquitos. He stated they are one community and stated it would be a travesty to separate them.

Comment 47 – Prashant Khanwali compared putting Park Village in District 6 to designating Catalina Island as part of Oregon to satisfy population requirements. He stated that Peñasquitos Canyon is a natural boundary, and although there is nothing wrong with Mira Mesa, they are separate from PQ.

Comment 48 – Jack Fu, a PQ resident for 25 years and of Park Village for 20, stated that although redistricting doesn't affect school districts, an elected official cannot take care of all of Peñasquitos because Park Village has been split away from their districts. He asked if he were elected, how would he take care of his neighbors who are in another district? He stated Peñasquitos is a family that shares commonalities with Rancho Bernardo.

Comment 49 – Eva Lieu stated that she is neither Republican nor Democrat. She is an American citizen, emigrated from China in 1988. She said she settled originally in Mira Mesa but because her kids were unhappy she moved into Rancho Peñasquitos for the school district. She stated that she is also a real estate agent and that outside of PUSD house values go down. She stated that if Park Village is not kept with Rancho Peñasquitos property values will drop.

Comment 50 – Li Liu, a Park Village resident, stated that he lives next to the canyon. He stated that his children go to PQ soccer and PQ swim team. His family's interests lie in Peñasquitos, not Mira Mesa.

Comment 51 – Cheong Kun, a Park Village resident, is opposed to separating Park Village from the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos into District 6. He stated that he'd like to be in a district that is defined by similar interests, family structure, and educational levels, not one defined by race. He stated that placing Park Village into District 6 is like a forced marriage and will lead to a lose-lose situation for residents and future councilmembers.

Comment 52 – Tom Hebrank asked that Kensington remain with its community of interest along the Adams Avenue corridor. He responded to criticism that Kensington residents were "late to the game" and gave conflicting testimony. He stated that the Commission held five post-map hearings and all were attended by Kensington residents. He apologized for not coming to previous hearings, but all prior seriously considered maps had included Kensington in District 3. He stated there has been no conflicting testimony; the only speakers prior to the preliminary map were two Talmadge residents. He addressed the proposal to carve out the area south of Monroe in Normal Heights. He passed out a map showing redevelopment areas in City Heights.

Comment 53 – Qinlei Wang, a Park Village resident and Chinese immigrant, stated that the Peñasquitos community is defined by economics and family interests, not by race. He stated that a lot of his Asian neighbors were not aware of APAC's intentions to split Rancho Peñasquitos. He stated that all of Rancho Peñasquitos, as well as other areas of District 5 have high Asian populations, but are also united because of other commonalities. The desire to form an Asian district should not take precedence over keeping Rancho Peñasquitos united.

Comment 54 – Dr. Daniel Sinder stated that his community has been asked to respect the proceedings here today as well as the Commission’s work to date. He asked that the Commission respect their own principles by keeping the Rancho Peñasquitos community intact.

Comment 35 – Cindy Moore with the Serra Mesa Community Council stated that, like their neighbors from San Carlos and Tierrasanta, they also support the current preliminary District 7. Although it doesn’t include all the communities they had originally requested, it does include all their borders.

Comment 56 – Mark Bergersen stated that he’s lived in Park Village for 20 years and raised his children there. He is Caucasian, his wife is Asian, and his children are Rancho Peñasquitos. He asked the Commission to keep Rancho Peñasquitos united.

Comment 57 – Cindy Baker stated that the Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve is a natural boundary that impedes them from using any resources in Mira Mesa. She also stated that she’d be unrepresented in District 6.

Comment 58 – Kimberly Hoshino wanted to go on record as opposing to split Park Village from Rancho Peñasquitos

Comment 59 – Helen Xing asked that there be no mix up of politics with their children’s education. She stated that if APAC promoted this proposal, it does not represent the Asian community in Peñasquitos in the Park Village area. She stated the proposal would have a negative impact on her community, home values, and the Park Village elementary school.

Comment 60 – Erik Marquis hopes the Commission can reaffirm their faith in the democratic process by reuniting Park Village with Peñasquitos in District 5.

Comment 61 – Gordon Caudle opposed splitting Park Village from Peñasquitos.

Comment 62 – Randy Johns that he chose living in Park Village over Mira Mesa because of the schools and the community has become family to them. He stated that Park Village is Rancho Peñasquitos.

Comment 63 – Sridhar Prasad stated that all the invalid reasons for splitting Rancho Peñasquitos should be overridden by the voice of the people.

Comment 64 – Cary Likes has been a Rancho Peñasquitos resident since the 80s, and in Park Village in the 90s. He feels no connection to the communities to the south, but instead to the areas to the north and east. He stated that the Canyon is a natural boundary.

Comment 65 – Julie Adams noted that she is the Rancho Peñasquitos Volunteer of the Year, and although not a Park Village resident she is committed to their unified community. She asked the Commission to take consider all the people in attendance as evidence of a community of interest. She asked that Park Village remain in District 5 with the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos.

Comment 66 – Rajesh Bagge, a Park Village resident since 2001, stated that he chose to purchase a home in Park Village because of the community and the school district. He stated his community is a family and that the Peñasquitos Preserve is a natural boundary.

Comment 67 – Evan McLaughlin with the San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council stated that the Labor Council is concerned about the Commission’s plan to place several blocks within the Barrio Logan Planning Area into District 3. He stated that the triangular area has only two residents and is exclusively industrial under the 1991 Barrio Logan Plan. It serves as a significant buffer between the Downtown and the working waterfront. Residents voted overwhelmingly to keep it.

Comment 68 – Jose Lopez stated that Mid-City communities including City Heights, Kensington, and Talmadge, along with the College area are together a community of interest. He’d like District 9 to remain as is in the preliminary plan.

Comment 69 – Darryl Lin, a Park Village resident, wanted to add one point to the others already mentioned by his neighbors. He stated that it is his opinion that grouping Asians in one district does not mean better representation for the Asian community, because there are 48 countries in Asian with different cultures and customs. He asked that Park Village remain with the rest of Peñasquitos.

Comment 70 – Lee Rittiner stated that the Commission did not join Redwood Village and Rolando Park with District 9 to preserve a Latino majority. He presented a map that he stated met these objectives for the Commission. He stated that his wife is a real estate agent and that the home values in Rolando Park are around \$270K, while in District 4 they are about \$200K; the home values are not similar. He mentioned that he and Mr. Pollard will be working together to discuss these areas. He stated that the state has moved the primary elections back from February to June, giving the Commission time to redo the maps. He stated that District 8 can be construed as “packed” because it is 75% Hispanic. He stated that Paradise Hills is closer to the southern communities than Barrio Logan. He stated that the Commission’s findings mention Highway 94; however, three communities south of the 94 have been pulled from it, and two more communities to the north of 94 have been added. It is not being treated as a boundary. Yet, he stated, that in District 7, which had acceptable deviations as it is now, the I-8 was used as a concrete boundary. District 7 now goes west and crosses three freeways. He asked the Commission to go back through its findings and principles and look at these inconsistencies.

Comment 71 – Nan Jiung, a resident of Park Village, stated that she loves Rancho Peñasquitos and wants it to remain whole and in District 5.

Comment 72 – Laura Riebau asked the Commission to review its key requirements and redistricting criteria, especially those on slides 17, 18, and 19 regarding communities being compact and preserving communities of interest to retain social and lifestyle patterns desired by its residents. She stated that is the kind of testimony the Commission has been hearing from the College area and from PQ. She stated that she feels the Commission is only considering testimony given early in the process and not all of the testimony. She stated that their findings and principles are inconsistent between communities. She stated that District 9 is going to be a problem for its Councilmember because it has too many problems. She stated many communities have come forward to ask not to be in District 9. She stated that no one likes District 9 and asked the Commission to consider those requests.

Comment 73 – Scott Goss, a Park Village resident asked the Commission to consider that the Peñasquitos Preserve is a natural boundary, while the 56 freeway was man-made after Park Village was already established. He also reminded the Commission that Councilmembers don't represent math or numbers, but people, and that the people of Park Village have spoken.

Comment 74 – Maria Martinez, a Barrio Logan resident, asked the Commission to include the area south of Commercial currently a part of District 2 in District 8, and not in the new District 3. She stated that Barrio Logan residents are the ones that deal with the consequences of Downtown redevelopment. Placing this area into District 8 ensures that decisions regarding future developments in this area will not be made by District 3 residents who live far away, but by the Barrio Logan residents who are most affected.

Comment 75 – Georgette Gomez with the Environmental Health Coalition asked the Commission to include the area south of Commercial in District 8. She stated that downtown interests are requesting that this area be in District 3. She provided a map that shows Barrio Logan homes and facilities that surround the area, including a multi-family apartment complex and an elementary school. She stated that the Barrio Logan community has worked diligently for the last three years to update their community plan, the oldest community plan in San Diego. During the process, stakeholders have fought to keep density and building heights low. Keeping the area in District 8 would allow Barrio Logan to participate and to make sure future development does not negatively impact the neighborhood environmentally or economically. She also asked that Shelltown be included with Southcrest in the District 9, as long as the Commission can accept the deviation in District 8.

Comment 76 – Andrea Carter is opposed to ceding a part of Barrio Logan to District 3 because of racial and ethnic minorities, natural boundaries, and the community of interest. She stated that throughout the entire process, they've been urging the Commission to keep the Historic Barrio neighborhoods whole.

Comment 77 – Xing Lu stated that she emigrated from China 15 years ago because she believes that in American there is democracy and freedom and that people are heard here over special interests. She stated that APAC does not represent her or other Asians in Park Village. She stated that she has lived in Park Village for ten years and has been represented well there.

Comment 78 – Dr. Allen Chan stated that he received an email from the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council that asked Park Village residents and friends to attend this meeting and that it erroneously said that redistricting affects home values and school districts. He stated that redistricting affects neither. He stated that APAC has always advocated for a united Peñasquitos and that the Town Council had asked the Commission to split Rancho Peñasquitos at Black Mountain Road. He asked the audience to go onto the Commission's website and review the tapes and documents.

Comment 79 – Geoffrey Chan, a 24-year Peñasquitos resident, stated to the Rancho Peñasquitos residents in the audience that they have been betrayed by the Town Council and the Planning Board because at the two of five Public Hearings that they attended, the Council and the Planning Board only asked for the boundary of District 5 to be moved from Salmon River Road to Black Mountain Road; they did not ask for remapping of Park Village. He stated that neither housing values nor school districts are affected by redistricting.

Comment 80 – Carlos Martell stated that Barrio Logan should be kept intact because they meet all the criteria and because it is logical and reasonable. He stated that the special Downtown interests want to impose their commercial interests and values on the small strip of land south of Commercial Avenue that is part of Barrio Logan neighborhood.

Comment 81 – Steve Hadley stated that in his ten years as a staff member in District 6 he cannot recall any issues, concerns, or interests that were shared between Mira Mesa and Clairemont. He stated that to Clairemont, MCAS Miramar is a boundary between the two. He proposes that the Commission revert to Plan 3, District C and put Miramar and Peñasquitos together as whole communities. He asked that the northern communities and Clairemont be kept whole.

Comment 82 – Ben Rivera with Logan Heights Neighbors Group and a member of the Southeastern Planning Group and the Ad Hoc Committee on Planning for the Greater Logan Heights area stated that District 8 is very diverse ethnically and racially, but are united in support of keeping District 8 together. He stated that they are not asking for “packing,” but that July 21st map be adopted for District 8. He stated that discussion regarding valuable property in Barrio Logan is not a reason to move the district boundaries.

Comment 83 – Neena Rahman stated that she cancelled her son’s orthodontist appointment and skipped his soccer game at another Rancho Peñasquitos school to be here today to ask the Commission to keep Park Village with Peñasquitos in one district.

Comment 84 – Remigia Bermudez is opposed to “chunking” off a part of Barrio Logan. She asked how swapping neighborhood land for economic land advantage meets redistricting criteria. She stated that Barrio Logan has been part of the process since April and that it is disgraceful and unfair for the Commission to change the boundaries because people representing Little Italy or Centre City want a part of Barrio Logan that has minimal population but is valuable in commercial land. She stated that splitting a community for a private interest group is unacceptable. She stated that District 8 has already lost Golden Hill, Southcrest, and Shelltown – they do not want to lose this area to District 3. She stated that District 8 will agree to cede Shelltown if their population is replaced by Golden Hill, not East Village or Downtown.

Comment 85 – Dustin Steiner, Chair of Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee, stated that they endorsed the preliminary plan and any plan that keeps Miramar Ranch North, Scripps Miramar Ranch, and Rancho Encantada in one district.

Comment 86 – Tariq Rahman, a Park Village resident, asked the Commission to reconsider the division of Peñasquitos. He stated that his community heard about this very recently and asked the Commission not to consider them late-comers.

Comment 87 – Chau Shi, a 15-year Park Village resident, stated that he loves his diverse community. He stated that the community volunteers at the schools. He stated that he is an engineer and he deals with data, but that data should be used to deal with machines, not humans. He asked the Commission to consider the people’s wishes.

Comment 88 – Jacquelynne Le asked the Commission to leave Barrio Logan intact and referenced their lower socio-economic status and struggles for progress.

Comment 89 – Matt Corrales stated that he supports Commissioner Quiroz’s proposal with the reunification of Barrio Logan. He stated that her proposal addressed the API community’s concerns and gives them an odd numbered district. He stated that the San Diego Republican Party had influence on the District 6.

Comment 90 – Mehbub Shivji stated that Park Village goes with Peñasquitos, and vice versa.

Comment 91 – Rudolph Pimentel, business owner, property owner and resident of Barrio Logan, stated that he is on the committee updating the Barrio Logan Community Plan. He stated that District 3 and District 8 should not share representation. He feels Barrio Logan has equitable representation now; he asks that Barrio Logan remain whole.

Comment 92 – Leon Wu stated that PQ should remain united and that APAC has never advocated for its split. He stated that redistricting does not affect school districts or home values. He asked his PQ neighbors to review the facts, so that they can discuss them.

Chair Dalal called a recess.

Upon reconvening, Ms. Spivak commented that the Commission’s work does not affect school district lines. The lines that involve the Poway Unified School District will not change no matter what City Council District a neighborhood belongs to. She clarified that this process affects boundaries for City Council representatives.

Chair Dalal asked the Commissioners to list the topics for discussion. She cited whether to include Shelltown in District 9 or District 8, and Linda Vista as topics.

Commissioner Quiroz thanked everyone for attending and coming on such short notice. She wanted to clarify that Andy Berg has been attending Commission meetings for ten months, advocating that Rancho Peñasquitos remain whole and within District 5. She stated that she’d like to discuss the East Village issue.

Commissioner Marquez also thanked the audience for attending. He proposed that they discuss the East Village issue first; he’d like to see it back in District 8. He’d like to push for including Shelltown in District 9 to make that district as compact as possible. He’d also like to discuss putting Kensington back in District 3. He addressed the Peñasquitos residents in attendance by saying that he’d like to explore what can be done with Clairemont North to put Rancho Peñasquitos in its entirety into District 5.

Commissioner Nishioka asked for guidance from Ms. Spivak regarding the type and scale of changes that could constitute additional hearings.

Ms. Spivak stated that if changes to the preliminary plan are more significant than minor adjustments, they could possibly need more hearings to ensure that the public is fully informed because there could be people citywide who are relying on the preliminary map. Although the Charter only requires three

hearings between the preliminary and the final map, if there are major changes she recommends that the Commission consider additional hearings.

Chair Dalal asked Mr. Johnson to provide information on the Shelltown alternatives.

Mr. Johnson addressed a question from a commenter about what is being considered for a population trade off should Shelltown be removed from District 8. He stated that the change as it is being proposed is not a trade. The population in Shelltown is small enough that deviation could be accepted.

Mr. Levitt stated that Shelltown has about 3,000 residents. If it is moved to District 9, the deviation would increase to -2.72% in District 8 and 3.15% in District 9. Those would be the smallest and largest districts if you move them.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she feels there is not a good enough reason to allow this large deviation. She prefers to keep Shelltown in District 8.

Chair Dalal agrees with Commissioner Quiroz; she does not see a compelling enough reason to move it.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he believes the decision hinges on Kensington. If Kensington remains in District 9 and nothing is done about Shelltown, he feels the Commission is doing less to maximize the Latino voting strength in District 9. If Kensington remains in District 9, it is his belief that Shelltown should be included to balance political cohesiveness in Kensington and the College area. He fears that the community members in the southern part of the district could be disenfranchised.

Commissioner Nishioka asked if they put Shelltown in District 9 would it make District 8 even smaller, making the deviation much greater if Park Village were put into District 5.

Mr. Levitt stated that yes, if Shelltown were in District 9 and Park Village in District 5, the deviation would be around 12 to 13%.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he is trying to strike a balance and ensure the Latino and minority populations in the southern part of District 9 do not become disenfranchised or their vote diluted. He stated that these communities historically have low voter turnout and he'd like to continue discussing Shelltown.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she feels that City Heights residents are now being given a chance to elect a candidate of their choice and she hopes that they do stand up and vote.

Commissioner Potter understands the reason for placing Shelltown in District 9 because of the I-5 boundary. But he is concerned about the low population in District 8. He wants to wait to see what's happens up north, before deciding on Shelltown.

Chair Dalal asked Mr. Levitt to discuss the East Village area.

Mr. Levitt stated that the area in question is part of the Downtown Community Plan, but has traditionally been in District 8. It is also shown to be part of the Barrio Logan neighborhood.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that originally she thought this configuration is what Barrio Logan residents wanted, because she thought the area in question was East Village. Because redistricting is about citizen representation and not business improvement district representation, and because of the close proximity of this area to Barrio Logan housing and schools, she feels it should be in District 8.

Commissioner Potter stated that he does not agree with the comment made that this decision was solely based on one person's testimony; rather, it started with an email from the head of the East Village Business Improvement District and was requested by several other speakers over various meetings. He presented a graphic showing that the area is part of Centre City Community Plan. He also presented a graphic of the proposed Barrio Logan Community Plan that excludes the area. He stated that to him it makes more sense to have one Councilmember dealing with all the areas within the Downtown Community Plan.

Commissioner Marquez stated that the Commission has for months operated on the agreed-upon assumption that they would keep Barrio Logan together – the question is if Barrio Logan is defined by the planning area or by the residents of Barrio Logan. It is clear to him and Commissioner Quiroz how to define it. He stated that Barrio Logan has grappled with Downtown interests for decades, and with how far those interests could and would creep into and re-gentrify their neighborhood. He is in favor of placing that small area back into District 8 with the rest of Barrio Logan.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that for her Commissioner Potter's arguments made a case to include this area with Barrio Logan, because if only one Councilmember is going to make decisions regarding what happens in this area without any obligation to the neighborhood and residents that it will affect, that is a problem. She compared it to including the airport in the same district with neighborhoods it affects. She is in favor of putting the area back into District 8.

Chair Dalal is in agreement with Commissioner Quiroz and Commissioner Marquez in favor of placing the area back into District 8, stating that the area will remain in the East Village Business Improvement District, but that it is important that there be dialogue with the communities that redevelopment could affect.

Commissioner Nishioka is also in favor of including the area in District 8, stating that it is a "backyard" issue and doing so would give all stakeholders a seat at the table in deciding how this area is developed.

Commissioner Morrow disagrees, stating that most of Barrio Logan was kept intact and that this area should remain with the rest of its planning area.

Chair Dalal stated that the majority feels the area should go back into District 8.

Ms. Spivak reminded the Commission that in order to approve a final map next Thursday, they will need five votes and they are missing a Commissioner today.

Mr. Johnson also stated that since a vote was required to move this last week, another vote should be required to move it back. They do not want to end up in a position where there is a simple majority voting for a decision, but not the five votes needed to adopt the final plan.

Commissioner Potter stated that the majority should rule at this time; at the final vote he would not use his position on this to vote against the final plan.

Motion by Commissioner Marquez to place the area south of Commercial Street and east of Harbor Boulevard in the East Village Business Improvement District back into District 8 from District 3. Seconded by Commissioner Quiroz. The motion passed 4–2. Commissioners Quiroz, Nishioka, Dalal, and Marquez are in favor. Commissioners Potter and Morrow are opposed. Commissioner Kosmo is not present.

Mr. Johnson asked the Commission to consider any additional changes to the Linda Vista area.

Mr. Levitt stated that the area north of Genesee was moved back into District 7 from District 6. It increased the deviations in both districts, but neither significantly.

Commissioner Nishioka commented that he is concerned about the deviation in District 6 and how it will affect other areas, such as Peñasquitos.

Mr. Johnson addressed an area on the map in Peñasquitos where it appears that Highway 56 cuts through a development. He stated that the Census placed the freeway incorrectly and showed a graphic that correctly shows where the freeway lies. He stated that when this goes to the Registrar, the Census error will be corrected and the line will follow the freeway.

Commissioner Potter stated that the Commission supports and understands the Census block boundary runs along the freeway and not where the Census places it; the Commissioners approve that boundary.

Chair Dalal asked Mr. Levitt to explain what would result if Park Village were moved into District 5 with the rest of Peñasquitos.

Mr. Levitt stated that there are 10,624 Peñasquitos residents in the area south of the 56. If that area is moved back into District 5 without any other adjustments, the area would have a deviation of 9,961 or 6.89%. This would also give District 6 a deviation of 14,510. To make this shift, you'd need to take population from another area to balance population.

Mr. Johnson mentioned that Mr. Porter's map that puts this area back together but splits Scripps Ranch, similar to other maps previously submitted.

Commissioner Quiroz asked for the total population of Rancho Peñasquitos.

Mr. Levitt stated that is around 47,683, including a portion of Black Mountain Ranch because of a Census block spanning a bit of both communities.

Mr. Johnson stated it is essentially 46,000 to 47,000.

Chair Dalal asked for population data for Linda Vista.

Mr. Levitt stated that the area that was moved has 3,361 people; the Linda Vista neighborhood without the Morena neighborhood has a population of 21,469, not including the 3,361 people in the area that were added. The Morena area that includes all of USD has a population of 6,818.

Mr. Johnston stated that with or without the Linda Vista move, placing all of Rancho Peñasquitos in District 5 creates a huge deviation in both Districts 5 and 6, and it would have to be offset by a shift of population affecting both districts.

Chair Dalal stated that there lies the challenge. She stated that no one wanted to split Rancho Peñasquitos, but it was split because of deviation amongst other factors.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she kept Peñasquitos whole in her map, “tqapi;” however, she feels that was unacceptable to the Park Village residents as well because it placed Peñasquitos in the same district as Mira Mesa. Because of population criteria, there is little else the Commission can do to keep Peñasquitos whole. She is unwilling to split up several other neighborhoods to keep one neighborhood whole.

Commissioner Potter stated that they could unite Park Village in District 6 by taking the border to Rancho Peñasquitos Boulevard. It would not unite all of Rancho Peñasquitos, but it would unite Park Village.

There were comments shouted from the audience that that area is not Park Village.

Commissioner Potter stated that he was basing this suggestion on previous testimony to move the boundary.

Mr. Levitt stated that there was previous testimony from Peñasquitos residents to move the boundary from Salmon River Road to Black Mountain Road. This would increase the deviation in District 6 to -4.2% and leave District 5 at 1.05%.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that Park Village is defined by the corridor called Park Village Drive and goes all the way to the west edge of the proposed District 6. He asked whether the Commission could consider asking both Scripps Ranch and Peñasquitos to “give a little” to reach an acceptable level of deviation.

Mr. Johnson asked if he meant splitting both communities.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that yes, he’d like to hear what the other Commissioners think about that option.

Commissioner Marquez stated that every time APAC has proposed a map it has been met with vehement opposition from the communities it would be affecting. While they have always advocated keeping Rancho Peñasquitos whole, the centerpiece of their proposals has always been to unite Rancho Peñasquitos with Mira Mesa. He stated that the Commission agreed not to split Scripps Miramar because they wanted to at least attempt to create an API empowerment district. However, despite the Commission’s efforts, APAC has since stated that the Commission did not even attempt to create an API

district. He stated that the map before them now is due as much to the Commission's decisions as it is to APAC's lobbying.

Commissioner Potter asked if it would positively affect deviation if the small area in Stonecrest along I-15 were put into District 6.

Chair Dalal stated that she isn't comfortable with how this addition affects contiguity of District 6.

Commissioner Potter stated that the areas would still be contiguous through the Mission Valley area, so the move wouldn't completely destroy contiguity.

Chair Dalal stated that to her it doesn't seem compact or contiguous enough with that change. She also stated that for her the deviation is too large to accept in the northern districts and she cannot see what else can change.

Commissioner Nishioka asked NDC to state for the record the population and deviation numbers if Park Village is included in District 5.

Chair Dalal stated that District 5 increases by 6.89% and District 6 decreases by 10.03%.

Mr. Levitt stated that the area has 10,624 residents and is 40% Asian by total population and 30% by CVAP. He confirmed that the move would give District 5 a 6.9% deviation and leave District 6 at -10%.

Mr. Levitt stated that currently Adams North and Normal Heights which make up the Normal Heights Planning Area are in District 3, and Kensington and Talmadge which are a part of the Mid-City Planning Area are in District 9.

Mr. Levitt stated that Kensington has 5,856 residents; Normal Heights has 10,721; Adams North has 5,036; and Talmadge has 9,182. The trade off would be placing Normal Heights south of Monroe Avenue into District 9 and putting Kensington in District 3. If only Kensington was moved, District 3 would be at 5.77% deviation and District 9 would be -3.76%.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he supports Commissioner Potter's population neutral proposal. He's always seen Kensington as having more in common with District 3 than District 9.

Commissioner Morrow stated that she thought it was decided at the last meeting that Kensington would remain in District 9 and she's not sure why they are revisiting it.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he recalls the Commission being split on the issue, but he can make a motion.

Motion by Commissioner Marquez to: To move the area of Kensington north of Monroe Avenue from District 9 to District 3, and the area of Normal Heights south of Monroe Avenue from District 3 to District 9. Seconded by Commissioner Nishioka.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she agrees with Commission Morrow that it was discussed last week. She stated that she is against voting on the issue without Commissioner Kosmo here because it would change vote from the previous meeting.

Chair Dalal stated that other issues from the last meeting were also brought up and motioned.

Commissioner Morrow suggested discussing the issue at the next meeting.

Mr. Johnson stated that these changes need to be nailed down tonight and suggested moving forward with a motion.

Commissioner Nishioka asked Ms. Spivak if this change would constitute a significant change that could be reason for additional public hearings.

Ms. Spivak asked NDC to provide demographic and population data so she can better answer the question.

Mr. Levitt stated that they would be moving 4,000 residents from District 9 to District 3, and an equal amount from District 3 to District 9, affecting approximately 8,000 residents. The change would increase the Latino population of District 9 to 51.17%. It would also increase the Latino CVAP to 27.1%.

Commissioner Marquez stated that for him the political cohesion issue is what is most important. Since the Commission is not in favor of moving Shelltown into District 9, he feels this move is a good compromise.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that there were votes against moving part of Barrio Logan into District 8 because of the Community Plan. In this instance, the proposal would split the Kensington-Talmadge planning area. She stated that this proposal also splits two neighborhoods, Kensington and Normal Heights. She believes that this proposal violates many principles that the Commission has been basing their decisions on, only to reunite one neighborhood with its preferred district.

Commissioner Potter stated that the Commission violated one of its principles in the decision to keep part of the East Village in District 8, and this is a similar type of decision. He stated that there is a clear distinction between the areas south and north of Monroe Avenue. He also stated that splitting the Kensington-Talmadge area is supported by public testimony.

Chair Dalal stated that the testimony from the Kensington residents asking to be kept with communities to the west resonated with her. She is in favor of the proposal.

Motion by Commissioner Marquez, seconded by Commissioner Nishioka to move the area of Kensington north of Monroe Avenue from District 9 to District 3, and the area of Normal Heights south of Monroe Avenue from District 3 to District 9 passed 4–2. Commissioners Potter, Marquez, Dalal and Nishioka are in favor. Commissioners Morrow and Quiroz are opposed. Commissioner Kosmo is not present.

Mr. Johnson asked if the Commission had made a decision regarding Shelltown.

Chair Dalal confirmed that the Commission had decided to keep Shelltown in District 8.

Commissioner Nishioka asked if it was possible for NDC to review all the alternatives to the situation with Park Village and District 5.

Mr. Johnson stated that there were six maps that have tried to presents solutions to this issue, including the original Plan 3, Plan 6, Commissioner Quiroz's map, the map introduced today by the Park Village community, as well as others.

Commissioner Quiroz feels that since the Commission is splitting neighborhoods now, there is no need to revisit the issue of splitting Rancho Peñasquitos.

Chair Dalal disagrees with Commissioner Quiroz's sentiments.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that splitting Kensington and Normal Heights is stunning to her, but since that is the Commission's action, she feels all communities should be treated the same.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he does not feel the Commission is renegeing on their principles. There are compelling arguments for both sides of the Kensington issue. He stated that he's learned that depending on the region they are working with some principles will need to be applied over others. He stated that the Kensington move was not done based on race.

Ms. Spivak stated that if the change does go into the final plan, she'll need the Commission to discuss the rationale for making the change so that in can be included in the findings. She also asked that outreach be done to the communities of Kensington and Normal Heights to ensure they are aware of the change.

Commissioner Potter stated that he is not in favor of reviewing previous plans for District 5. He'd like to tweak the preliminary map.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he would like to discuss moving the boundary to Black Mountain Road. As a District 5 resident he is pained to see Rancho Peñasquitos split, but he understands why and how that came to be and why it was necessary. He would at least like to entertain this move.

Mr. Levitt stated that there are 2,182 people between Salmon River Road and Black Mountain Road. Moving them from District 6 into District 5 would decrease District 5 deviation to 1.05% and increase District 6 deviation to -4.2%. This move would increase total deviation from 4.59% to 6.1%.

Mr. Johnson added that if this change is made, reversing the Linda Vista move would balance population.

Motion by Commissioner Nishioka to: Move the boundary of District 5 from Salmon River to Black Mountain Road. Seconded by Commissioner Quiroz.

Commissioner Quiroz asked what the total deviation would be.

Mr. Levitt stated that it would be 6.1%.

Mr. Johnson stated for the Commission's consideration that the move would reduce the 10,000 people of Park Village in District 6 to 8,000, therefore possibly lessening their voice in District 6 further.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he can support the change only with accepting the deviation. He is not willing to reverse the Linda Vista move.

Chair Dalal asked Commissioner Nishioka what the rationale for the change is.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that the change is to respond to the community's testimony that identified their community of interest.

Mr. Johnson stated that there is not much court guidance about deviation, but 6% is a large deviation. He stated that to make this change they'd need a very strong record to support it.

Commissioner Potter stated that he could not support the motion; he'd prefer to see a larger group of Rancho Peñasquitos in District 6.

Chair Dalal stated that she could not support the motion because of the large deviation.

Motion by Commissioner Nishioka, seconded by Commissioner Quiroz to move the boundary of District 5 from Salmon River to Black Mountain Road, placing those areas into District 5 failed 2–4. Commissioners Nishioka and Marquez are in favor. Commissioners Morrow, Quiroz, Dalal, and Potter are opposed. Commissioner Kosmo is not present.

STAFF REPORTS

ITEM 3 – STAFF REPORT

Ms. Wong stated that she would do outreach to stakeholders in Kensington and Normal Heights and inform them of the change.

Commissioner Potter asked that the outreach include the El Cajon Boulevard and Adams Avenue Business Districts.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Dalal adjourned the meeting at 9:03 p.m.

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary
2010 Redistricting Commission

Written Comments Received
August #, 2011 Redistricting Commission Meeting

The following persons did not wish to speak, but wished to express their support for uniting Rancho Peñasquitos in District 5:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. David Kuhlman | 13. Tao Xin |
| 2. Michael Chung | 14. Xinoyi |
| 3. Albert Chiu | 15. Dawn Yang |
| 4. Susan Kemmerrer | 16. Paul Yang |
| 5. Julie | 17. Jeant Yang |
| 6. Deqiang Song | 18. Gillian Rucker |
| 7. Tommy Wright | 19. Stacy Knox |
| 8. Srinu Bala | 20. Richard & Diana |
| 9. Rajesh Kumar | 21. Robert Tehrani |
| 10. Jeff McCoy | 22. Amyi Kamdar |
| 11. Melanie & Dave
Lindsey | 23. Jian Qiu |
| 12. Jiajun Lin | 24. Qiang Shen |
| | 25. Khin Suna |

Comment 1: Ping Ling

I strongly support "One PQ," against separate Park Village away from PQ.

Comment 2: Rudolph Pimentel, Business and Property Owner in Barrio Logan

Is it really that simple? Self serving bestowed a gift to District 3 at the loss of District 8, Barrio Logan. In an ideal world, the "fate" would have recognized that Barrio Logan (Dist. 8) and District 3 are their community of interest that shouldn't have to share representation. Equitable representation is what Barrio Logan has now. All Barrio Logan redevelopment is the hard work of our community working together as District 8. Don't dissolve any part of Barrio Logan to District 3. We all worked hard on every part of Barrio Logan. Everyone loses if that happens. Let's not erect barriers. The political calculus is about self-interest. In the case of redistricting, this involves taking care of incumbent, the majority of whom are Anglo and vote just as you do. I will challenge redrawing of any area of Barrio Logan to Dist. 3. Badly gerrymandered map is not what Barrio Logan needs.

Comment 3: Janet Kaye

Seven (7) copies, one (1) original of letter submitted to Ms. Wong. Active dialogue ongoing w/ Navajo, Del Cerro, et al, leaders to work together, all in agreement for * USD to be included in new District 7! Days are speeding by. Good luck! Thank you. ☺

Comment 4: Doris Donadio

I strongly oppose the redistricting, separating Park Village from Peñasquitos.

Comment 5: Kimberly Latta

I strongly oppose the redistricting of Park Village into District 6. We share common interests with the rest of PQ and not with the communities south of us. I feel our needs will not be adequately addressed and we will not receive proper representation.

Comment 6: Chen Huang and Tian Du

We vote against splitting Rancho Peñasquitos and put Park Village Ave area together with Mira Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Linda Vista. It is not a natural boundary and Park Village has no common interest with Mira Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Linda Vista.

Comment 7: David Yang & Zhao, Su

One PQ. Don't split PQ and put Park Village area residents together with Mira Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Linda Vista. No common interests.

Comment 8: Jenny Chen

We want to stay with One PQ!

Comment 9: Blue Ramos

I oppose of any cutting off of Barrio Logan to be put into the D3 (Downtown District). I wish it to remain as is.

Comment 10: Xing Lu

One PQ. Do not carve us out. APAC does not represent any Asian residents here.

Comment 11: Phal Chourp

Victoria House Corporation is a coalition of APAC as supports APAC voice.

Comment 12: Wayne Lucero

I would like to urge the commission to keep Shelltown and Southcrest together in the same district. I grew up in Shelltown and go to church at St. Judes. I know many residents in Southcrest attend this church as well. It's a tight knit community and should not be separated. I

urge the Commission to keep these communities cohesive – the standard deviation for keeping together in D9 is 5.88%, way below the 10% limit.

Comment 13: Aaron Puttroff

I would like to voice my request that Park Village not be realigned with Mira Mesa.

Comment 14: Tariq Rahman

We, the residents of Park Village, do not want to be redistricted. We want to remain in PQ. Please do not divide PQ. We purchased our property in PQ and want to remain in PQ.

Comment 15: Lori Pidaparathi

Do not move Park Village away from PQ. We bought our home for being part of Poway School District and PQ. Do not take it away.

Comment 16: Murthy Pidaparathi

We want to remain part of Rancho Peñasquitos. I do not see the reason or necessity for redistricting. We bought the place because it is part of PQ. I want you to keep it that way.

Comment 17: Richard Thomas

I've been a resident of Rancho Peñasquitos for 9 years. When looking for a community to call home we decided that we did NOT want to live in Mira Mesa! Rancho Peñasquitos/Park Village area fit my wife and I perfectly! To move us to Mira Mesa would result, most likely, in a reduction of our property values. We, my wife and I, are a part of the Rancho Peñasquitos community and have based our lives there! The Mira Mesa community has NO connection with Park Village where the Peñasquitos community does! Please leave us with the community of Rancho Peñasquitos. If I had wanted to live in Mira Mesa I would have purchased a house there! I believe it is unfair for one organization to influence the redistricting of our area.

Comment 18: Wendy Brown

I am vehemently against the division of the Park Village area from the rest of PQ. If you look at the entrance to Park Village, the monument says "Peñasquitos Park Village." We share school districts, emergency services, and recreational leagues with Peñasquitos. We ARE Peñasquitos! We are NOT Mira Mesa. Mira Mesa has a different school district, a different community. Do NOT split us from the rest of our community! If you split Park Village from PQ and put it with Mira Mesa, et al., you are essentially silencing our voice as we will be a very minor portion of that district with NOTHING in common! Please DO NOT split PARK VILLAGE from PQ!!

Comment 19: Dr. John Wy

I am Asian and do not support dividing PQ. Our community is united.

Comment 20: Zhen Chen

One PQ. No separation!

Comment 21: Bihua Ye

One PQ

Comment 22: Corey Frank

Do NOT change PQ boundaries! Pls!

Comment 23: Radib Sengupta & Anindita Sengupta

Protest again redistricting of Park Village.

Comment 24: Juliana Guvane

We want PQ not to be combined with Mira Mesa. We want to stay as we are now. We love our own place by itself.

Comment 25: Josh Goldstein

Do not split PQ!

Comment 26: Victoria Sunquia

One PQ/no split

Comment 27: Liang Lin Zhang

I want to stay in PQ.

Comment 28: Szu-Han Lee

Keep One PQ .

Comment 29: Qin Zhang, Xinjian Lin

Do not separate Park Village from PQ.

Comment 30: Qing Li, Xiaojing Lou

Do not separate Park village from PQ

Comment 31: Khin Sung

Keep 1 PQ!! We bought our house to have it be in Rancho Peñasquitos. It does not make any sense to destroy the hard work I have done to buy this house and have it changed to Mira Mesa. They are different.

Comment 32: Qixia Liang

One PQ. No separation!!

Comment 33: Lina Ibrahim

Keep Park Village in PQ. One PQ.

Comment 34: Edmond Chiu

We want to remain a part of the PQ community and not part of Mira Mesa! All PQ residents including Park Village residents use Canyonside Community Park and Peñasquitos Creek Park for soccer/cricket and football. We need to be one PQ to decide how maintenance fees for parks are used not MM. We Park Village residents also pay property tax for use of these parks, not Mira Mesa. All of PQ needs to decide how maintenance fees are used for PQ and not for Miramar, Kearny Mesa, and Mira Mesa.

Comment 35: Cynthia Carpentier

I oppose the splitting of Rancho Peñasquitos community into separate districts. Our community of PQ shares similar values and interests. Keep PQ together.

Comment 36: Deborah Pham

I am adamantly opposed to separating Park Village from the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos. Park Village won't receive adequate representation. It is also a waste of City money to have two council reps at each meeting. It would be inefficient for volunteers, etc. Park Village would be the only portion of the Poway School District not in District 5. We would also only be 5% of the district population. Again, I am adamantly opposed to this separation of Rancho Peñasquitos.

Comment 37: Hoa Duong

Let us decide what district we want to be which is Rancho Peñasquitos since we are the one who are paying taxes for 15 years. I do not want to lose the value of my property.

Comment 38: Helen Quintanilla

Lack of dissemination to residents in Park Village of in PQ. I was not aware until last night when they dropped off the notice of this meeting today. I pay my taxes, my daughter goes to Westview. I am a resident of Park Village since 1991. I want to keep Park Village "as is" as PQ = Poway District. I do not want to lose my property value.

Comment 29: Randall Carpentie

I am against the redistricting of Park Village due to begin part of the Peñasquitos community since moving in 1994. We have and are continuing to raise our family in a very family oriented and backed community. No need to be cast off into other communities which we do not share thoughts and desires with. I do not believe a group that wants a bigger voice in government at me

and my family's expense is fair to me, my family, or my community. We share and represent Rancho Peñasquitos views. Canyonside Park, Poway School District, community involvement, Mello Roos Taxes, have been and are still part of the Park Village-PQ sense of family and community. No redistricting!

Comment 30: Mary S. Rogers

I would like greater Golden Hill to remain as it is in the preliminary map. It belongs with older neighborhoods around Balboa Park. It has similar interests and problems. Thank you!

Comment 31: Hao Dung

I am a resident lives in Park Village community. I think its wrong decision to have park village to be part of new district. We have always been very close to the Peñasquitos community and it is very clear to see there is only one PQ. And we will always be one PQ. Mira Mesa and Scripps Ranch are closer to each other. There is a linked freeway, shopping center, tire station. If there were one area to be combined with Mira Mesa it should be Scripps Miramar. Not Park Village!!

Comment 32: Sharon Sinder

I am vehemently opposed to including the Park Village community in District 6. It should remain in District 5 with other members of the PUSD. Shifting the borders to move Park Village into District would cause members of that community to lose their voice within the district and would rob them of adequate and appropriate representation for the particular needs of the community. Altering the district borders is a purely political move, to provide easier access through the canyon ruining the PV community and the local ecosystem. Keep PQ together!! Do not move our community into a district that is dissimilar from itself. You will be weakening PQ as a whole in doing so.

Comment 33: Feng Yan

I want Park Village to remain in the same city council district as the rest of PQ.

Comment 34: Vivienne Seymore

I moved here to be a part of the PQ community and I utilize the Canyonside Park and Preserve frequently at least twice a week. I do not want another district community to manage this area. I want to keep control of our police response locally. And I adamantly oppose the construction of a Camino Ruiz bridge which will cause a decline in natural resources and animals of the PQ Canyon Preserve and as well create more traffic and pollution. It is totally unnecessary.

Comment 35: Sandra Troya

The vast majority of people in Park Village do NOT want to be split off from Rancho Peñasquitos. Stop gerrymandering our community! We don't like it!

Comment 36: Sherry Smith

We chose to live in Park Village because it is located within the Rancho Peñasquitos community which we love. We do not wish to become a part of Mira Mesa which is located across the natural boundary of Peñasquitos canyon. The communities are considerably different.

Comment 37: George & Aura Fratian

We want to keep PQ united. We share so many common things with our current neighborhoods (Torrey Hills, Rancho Bernardo, etc.) and nothing with Mira Mesa community. WE WANT TO REMAIN ONE PQ. Thank you! Respectfully, Fratian Family (2 adults, 3 kids)

Comment 38: Neena Rahman

We would like to keep Park Village as Rancho Peñasquitos. We do not want to be redistricted as Mira Mesa. Sincerely, The Rahman Family of 4