

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

**THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 2011**

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
CITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING – 12<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR  
202 C STREET, SAN DIEGO, 92101**

**CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dalal at 4:10 p.m. 362 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 10:00 p.m.

**ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING:**

(C) Chair Anisha Dalal  
(VC) Vice Chair Carlos Marquez  
(M) Ani Mdivani-Morrow  
(M) Theresa Quiroz  
(M) Frederick Kosmo  
(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 – 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 – Andy Berg thanked the Commission for their hard work and encouraged them to finish strong.

Comment 2 – Joost Bende encouraged the Commission to strengthen their resolve to core principles and keep communities united, not to rush through the final steps of the process. He asked them to put more importance on communities of interests than to deviation. He thanked the Commission for their dedication.

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

Ms. Spivak reminded the Commission that today’s hearing is scheduled to be the last one before the vote on the final plan. She asked that after public comment and work on the map, the Commission discuss the findings in the preliminary plan and make any suggested changes so that legal review can be completed prior to voting on the final plan. She suggested that depending on the length of testimony and discussion at today’s hearing, the Commission consider adding a meeting for Monday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>. She reiterated for the benefit of audience members that the work of the Commission does not affect the boundaries for the Poway Unified School District, or other boundaries such as those for community plans or neighborhoods; rather, it affects which Councilmember represents your community.

**COMMISSION COMMENT**

None.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**ITEM 1 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 9, 2011, REDISTRICTING COMMISSION MEETING**

Commissioner Potter stated that on Page 12, fifth paragraph down, the words “Rio Road” should be “railroad.”

**Motion by Commissioner Potter to: Approve the minutes from the August 9, 2011, Redistricting Commission meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Morrow.**

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he will be abstaining from the vote since he was not present at the August 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he was not present at the Monday, August 18th meeting but has reviewed the taping.

**The motion to approve the minutes from the August 9, 2011, Redistricting Commission meeting passed 6–0. Commissioners Dalal, Marquez, Kosmo, Morrow, Potter, and Quiroz are in favor. Commissioner Nishioka abstained.**

**ITEM 2 – DEVELOPMENT OF THE FINAL REDISTRICTING PLAN**

Mr. Johnson presented the August 18 Plan, which includes the changes made at the last hearing directed by the Commission: to move the area south of Commercial Street and east of Harbor Boulevard in the East Village Business Improvement District from District 3 to District 8, to move Kensington north of Monroe Avenue from District 9 to District 3, and to move Normal Heights south of Monroe Avenue from District 3 to District 9.

Comment 1 – Joost Bende stated that he and his neighbors are here to present two viable alternatives to splitting Rancho Peñasquitos. They can also defer to Commissioner Nishioka's alternative map.

Comment 2 – Alex Bourd advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5. He referenced their common interests and shared activities. He stated that splitting a tight knit community to satisfy deviation is not justifiable.

Comment 3 – Kathy Terry advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5. She referenced their common interests and shared activities, including schools, sports leagues, and shopping centers.

Comment 4 – Robert Marshall advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5. He referenced their common interests and shared activities, including schools, families, sports leagues and sporting facilities.

Comment 5 – Zhiyong Wang advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5 and asked the Commission not to split his community.

Comment 6 – Julie Ann Sih advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5 on behalf of her family and three neighboring families. She referenced their common interests and shared activities centered north of Highway 56, including places of worship.

Comment 7 – Xing Lu works, lives, and raises her family in Park Village. She advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5, referencing the Peñasquitos Canyon preserve as a natural boundary. She stated that Highway 56 was built for the many commuters in Peñasquitos, not to divide the community. She referenced shared interests, including schools, parks, and retail centers.

Comment 8 – Maria Mata advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5. She referenced the historical unity of Rancho Peñasquitos within one district and stated that splitting PQ goes against redistricting principles.

Comment 9 – Helen Dominguez advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5. She referenced common interests, including school district, churches, shopping centers, library, YMCA, and sports leagues. She stated that APAC misrepresented Asians in PQ and asked the Commission to reconsider their decisions based on that misrepresentation. She asked that deviation be accepted in order to unite PQ.

Comment 10 – James Lin, a Park Village resident, advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5. He stated that his children's friends, his colleagues, and patients at the clinic where he is

employed all live in District 5. He stated that his children all attend schools in District 5. He stated that as an Asian American he feels represented in District 5.

Comment 11 – Dr. Robert Mendoza, a Park Village resident, advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5. He stated that he’s reviewed the agendas and viewed some of the Commission meetings since learning about the proposed plan to split PQ. He sees no advantages to the proposal, stating that the reasoning is strictly based on numbers and population.

Comment 12 – Arlene Chang stated that she is a third-generation Japanese American and her family has lived in Park Village for twenty years. She advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5, stating that Park Village would be the only part of Peñasquitos not in District 5. Her children attend schools, use parks and public facilities in District 5, and they attend community events in District 5.

Comment 13 – Bo Liu advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5, stating that his family lived in Mira Mesa for six months but relocated to Peñasquitos because they did not share similar interests and lifestyle with Mira Mesa residents. He stated that Mira Mesa residents are mostly small business owners, but he and his wife are high-tech professionals. He stated that all his family’s services, facilities, and schools are in District 5.

Comment 14 – Thomas Hebrank thanked the Commission for placing Kensington back into District 3. He outlined Kensington’s plan for reunification and stated that it was not based on income levels or race, but on communities of interest. He asked the Commission to ratify the change in the final vote.

Comment 15 – Robert Gleason echoed Mr. Hebrank’s sentiments and thanked the Commission for unifying the LGBT community largely in District 3. He urged the Commission to approve the Kensington move in their final plan.

Comment 16 – Robert Coffin thanked the Commission for reuniting Kensington with other Adams Avenue communities in District 3. He referenced their historical connections and asked the Commission to adopt the change in the final plan.

Comment 17 – Margaret McCann thanked the Commission for placing Kensington back into District 3. She referenced their communities of interest, including older neighborhoods and the LGBT community.

Comment 18 – Phal Chourp with Victoria House Corporation is a City Heights resident. She considers having three Councilmembers representing City Heights a benefit.

Comment 19 – Hang Xia, a Chinese immigrant and Park Village resident, advocated for uniting Park Village with Peñasquitos in District 5. He stated that all his neighbors, white, black, Asian, all interact with each other at their children’s schools, their churches, sports leagues, and community events. Despite their diverse ethnicities, they share values – that should take precedence over race or population criteria.

Comment 20 – John Pilch with the San Carlos Area Council stated that they are pleased with the map as it is now and ask the Commission to adopt it as the final map. He stated that community leaders from the new District 7 have already begun meeting.

Comment 21 – Jay Wilson, president of the Del Cerro Action Council, stated that Del Cerro residents are pleased with District 7 as drawn in the preliminary plan. Speaking on behalf of the Mission Trails Foundation, he stated that they are also pleased that the Park remains whole within one district, and with Navajo and Tierrasanta.

Comment 22 – Jim Smith advocated for uniting Park Village with PQ in District 5, stating their shared schools and facilities. He stated that his community is diverse and asked if creating a racial divide between districts is really what they should strive for or want.

Comment 23 – Mihai Fratian, an eighth grader at Mesa Verde, stated that he plays sports and is active in Boy Scouts within District 5 and wants to remain in District 5.

Comment 24 – Andrei Fratian, an eighth grader at Mesa Verde Middle School, stated that he doesn't understand why some people want to group Peñasquitos with Mira Mesa, but he does know that he doesn't want to be included in a district where he doesn't know anyone. His school friends and water polo teammates are all in District 5.

Comment 25 – Xuemei Zhang, a Park Village resident since 2005, stated that she feels that if they are put into District 6, even as an Asian she will not feel represented. She wants to have a say in electing a City Councilmember in District 5.

Comment 26 – Wahsun Chin, a 20-year Peñasquitos resident, stated that they are hoping to have a City Councilmember that represents all of Peñasquitos as well as the north side of the Preserve. He asked the Commission to keep Park Village with District 5.

Comment 27 – Neena Rahman stated that when she lived in New York in an apartment she felt she never belonged, but living in Rancho Peñasquitos she is part of a community. She asked the Commission to keep Rancho Peñasquitos together. She stated that redistricting is done for the people and she asked the Commission not to redistrict in a way that makes people unhappy and resentful.

Comment 28 – Jack Yang, a Park Village resident since 1997, stated that what makes you a community is not your race or background, but what you have in common like where you shop, where you work, where you dine, and how your kids interact. These factors bond a community and friendships. He asked the Commission to keep Rancho Peñasquitos united.

Comment 29 – Louise Guarnotta stated that Kensington is 50% canyons. It is very small, at about 1500 single residences. The Adams Avenue corridor is three miles long and Kensington at the very east end, with 3 blocks in the Adams Avenue Business District that would be cut off from funding if not included in District 3.

Comment 30 – Susana Kemmerrer stated that she has lived in Park Village since 1990 before the 56 was built and when Black Mountain Road was small. She stated that her community is united and should not be divided. She stated that five out of the ten redistricting principles outlined in the plan are not met if Park Village is divided from Rancho Peñasquitos. She stated they share nothing in common with Mira Mesa and Kearny Mesa and she feels they won't be represented in District 6.

Comment 31 – Kathie Wagner stated that she is a 20+-year resident of Peñasquitos. She asked the Commission to in good conscience do what is right and keep Park Village with the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos in District 5 and accept the deviation.

Comment 32 – Yunqin Shi, a Park Village resident of 8 years, stated that she recently talked with Dr. Allen Chan several times within the last few days. She concluded that Dr. Chan and APAC do not understand the current lifestyles of the Chinese in Park Village and PQ; APAC assumes that their lifestyles are the same as they were 20 years ago. She stated that her family shops, dines, and interacts more to the north of the 56 freeway than to the south.

Comment 33 – Lichung Chu, a 10-year Rancho Peñasquitos resident, stated that although school districts are not equal to City Council districts, school life overlaps with community interests. He stated that his children's lives are consumed with school and school friends; parents interact with other parents via PTA and volunteering at their children schools. They shop and dine in District 5.

Comment 34 – Brandon Huang stated that he attended a presentation by APAC and concluded that their rationale for grouping PQ with Mira Mesa is because of the large API population in both areas. He stated that he does not want to be grouped by race or ethnicity but by common interests. He asked the Commission to leave Park Village in District 5.

Comment 35 – Emily Serafy Cox with EMPOWER San Diego stated that members of the Communities in Unity Coalition are surprised about the change in District 9, because it splits two neighborhoods and although she does not believe the Commission is motivated by politics or racism, the configuration of the map with the District 9 changes makes it appear so. She stated that the less-white parts of Normal Heights and Kensington have been removed and included in District 9.

Comment 36 – Dr. Jim Paterniti reminded the Commission that the Scripps Ranch community wants to be united, including Rancho Encantada, Scripps Miramar, and Miramar Ranch North, bringing the entire 92131 zip code together. They'd also like to remain with the adjacent fire-risk communities in District 5.

Comment 37 – Gloria Kuramoto, a 9-year resident of Park Village, supports Commissioner Nishioka's map that reunites Park Village with the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos. She referenced common shopping centers and community interests. She stated that APAC does not represent her and she felt insulted by certain comments made to her at a recent APAC meeting. She stated that her community is a melting pot.

Comment 38 – Bradlee Chang stated that he believes keeping Rancho Peñasquitos with Park Village in District 5 helps the Commission meet its goal. He stated that PUSD does in fact constitute a community of interest because he and his neighbors moved to Peñasquitos for the school district. He stated that keeping Park Village in District 5 keeps their community of interest together. He stated that principles such as uniting wildfire areas, using natural boundaries, intra-district access, compactness, uniting planning areas, and uniting communities are all better met by keeping Park Village in District 5. He also stated that APAC does not represent Park Village Asians who identify themselves with District 5.

Comment 39 – Tom Cleary, chair of the Linda Vista Planning Group, thanked the Commission for adding the northern area of Linda Vista into District 7. He asked the Commission to try to include the

remaining part of Linda Vista in District 2 into District 7. He stated that they have consulted with the ACLU, who opined that a deviation up to 10% is Constitutional as long as it is not for a partisan majority or to protect an incumbent.

Comment 40 – Janet Kaye, representing the Linda Vista Town Council and Linda Vista CDC, stated that all of Linda Vista looks forward to joining District 7. She stated that they have already been collaborating with leaders in the Navajo, Del Cerro, Tierrasanta and Allied Gardens, Grantville. She asked the Commission to include western Linda Vista in District 7.

Comment 41 – Dorothy Perez informed the Commission that the funeral procession of Officer Jeremy Henwood traveled on Friar’s Road past the Linda Vista Police Station. She stated that fifty Linda Vista residents stood at attention in front of the Police Station. She asked the Commission to keep Linda Vista united.

Comment 42 –Tom Monroe stated that Peñasquitos preserve separates Park Village and Mira Mesa and was there long before the 56. He also stated that District 6 has more commercial interests; District 5 and Park Village are more residential. He is concerned that Park Village will not be adequately represented in District 6.

Comment 43 – Mary Fox, a 14-year resident of Park Village, asked the Commission to keep Park Village in District 5 because of common interests, land use, and natural boundaries. She’d like to be able to vote and fight for issues important to their community and neighbors.

Comment 44 – Ramesses Surban, a member of the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council and the Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board stated that PQ should remain whole and undivided. He referenced PUSD and stated that historically PQ has always been united.

Comment 45 – Qinlei Wang, a Park Village resident, stated that he believes race has been the predominant motive for splitting Park Village away from Peñasquitos and that is contrary to the law. He stated that APAC does not represent Asian Peñasquitos residents and that their motive for including PV in District 6 was solely to increase the Asian percentage. He sees no other plausible reason for the change. He stated that PV residents’ votes would be diluted in District 6 and that they feel represented in District 5.

Comment 46 – David Yang, a 6-year resident of Park Village, compared the union of Park Village with District 6 to forced marriage in that two entities with no common interests are forced together against their will.

Comment 47 – Joe LaCava stated that Park Village residents do not want to be included in District 1 and University City does not want to be split. He thanked the Commission for coming up with alternatives and discussing ideas.

Comment 48 – Jack Fu advocated for keeping Park Village with Rancho Peñasquitos in District 5. He referenced their unified lifestyles and common interests.

Comment 49 – Sanhoug Liu stated that she and all her neighbors understand that the Council district lines are different than school district lines. She is a Chinese American and has lived in Park Village for three years. She stated that she and her Asian neighbors feel properly represented in District 5 with Rancho Peñasquitos. She stated that she chose to live in Rancho Peñasquitos because of common interests and lifestyles, and that she does not share these with Mira Mesa or Kearny Mesa residents.

Comment 50 – Evan McLaughlin with the San Diego Labor Council thanked the Commission for putting the parcels south of Commercial Street back into District 8. He stated that Commercial Street is also the boundary for the Downtown San Diego Partnership Business Improvement District; all the streets north of Commercial Street are on a north-south/east-west grid and a letter-number grid. South of Commercial, the streets are diagonal and lose their number/letter designations. These make Commercial an appropriate boundary.

Comment 51 – Deborah Ditter, a Torrey Highlands resident, stated that although Torrey Highlands is not in danger of being redistricted into District 6, she is still strongly opposed to the carving out of Park Village from their district. She stated that it negatively affects Park Village and it will negatively impact the surrounding communities as well, including Torrey Highlands. She stated that Park Village doesn't want to lose their voice in District 5, and the rest of District 5 doesn't want to lose the Park Village voice and vote.

Comment 52 – Julie Adams stated that although she doesn't live in Park Village, she is a resident of Rancho Peñasquitos and of PUSD. She asked the Commission to keep her community united and to include Park Village in District 5.

Comment 53 – Dr. Richard Nguyen, a Park Village resident, stated that Park Village is completely a part of Rancho Peñasquitos – to change it would impact residents' daily lives. He also stated that their core values coincide with their neighbors in District 5.

Comment 54 – Jill Pearlman thanked the Commission for putting Kensington in District 3. She stated that she lives in District 3 and works in District 9 and can assert that the areas are different and need different representatives.

Comment 55 – Sebastian Capella, a Park Village resident, advocated for keeping Park Village with Rancho Peñasquitos in District 5. He stated that their community has already organized; next will be the mobilization of all of Peñasquitos; and lastly, the communities to the north will get involved.

Comment 56 – Steve Maher talked about the geography of Rancho Peñasquitos in contrast to the geography of District 6. He stated that District 6 is all flat areas, with grid streets. District 5 is rolling hills with canyons and homes in the canyons. He stated that the Councilmember representing District 6 as proposed would have trouble allocating services like fire and police.

Comment 57 – Harry Chen advocated for keeping Park Village with Rancho Peñasquitos in District 5. He compared splitting Park Village from Peñasquitos to sending children from the same family to live with and be represented by another.

Comment 58 – Sunny Roland stated that she is well aware that this is about City Council representation. She wants a Councilmember who represents her neighborhood of Park Village and she wants her voice to matter. She does not feel it will if Park Village is in District 6. She asked the Commission to stick to their principles and keep Park Village in District 5.

Comment 59 – Darshana Patel stated that her concern is how Park Village will be represented if they are incorporated into District 6. She referenced the shared family values, the parks, and libraries as things that are important to District 5 residents and Park Village. She stated that their communities are residential and family oriented, while District 6 is mostly commercial.

Comment 60 – Tariq Rahman asked the Commission to hear the plea of Park Village residents and unite them with the rest of Peñasquitos in District 5. He stated that Park Village is well-represented in their current district. He stated that APAC does not represent them. He stated that his community is a community of nationalists wanting to integrate and assimilate within their neighborhoods, not segregate for the purpose of championing special interests.

Comment 61 – Albert Chiu, a homeowner in Peñasquitos since 1974, stated that his children were raised in Park Village and live there now. He asked that Park Village not be split from Rancho Peñasquitos.

Comment 62 – Sridhar Prasad stated that splitting Peñasquitos was done to provide a voice for a certain ethnic cultural group. However, he stated that it is clear that APAC does not represent the Asians in Peñasquitos. He asked the Commission to reconsider and keep Park Village in District 5.

Comment 63 – Kenn Laundroche, a Peñasquitos resident, stated that he is in support of his Park Village neighbors' request to remain in District 5. He stated that since the construction of 56 he has witnessed the efforts of the people south of the 56 to remain an active part of Rancho Peñasquitos community. He urged the Commission to keep PQ united in D5.

Comment 64 – Kuang Fan representing Park Village residents expressed his opposition to redistricting Park Village into District 6. He referenced the natural boundary of the Peñasquitos Preserve that separates Park Village from the rest of District 6. He stated that their community of interest lies to the north.

Comment 65 – Jim Wilk, a 18-year Peñasquitos resident, asked the Commission to keep Peñasquitos united in District 5 so that Canyonside Park is represented in the Council district with the residents who use it most. He also referenced the new development at Camino Del Sur and 56, stating that it needs a united Rancho Peñasquitos to be successful.

Comment 66 – Anne Shillam with APAC stated that the August 18 map in no way represents the work of APAC. They did not advocate for the placement of Linda Vista, Kearny Mesa, and Clairemont Mesa as this map does. She stated that although some people only want to assimilate into society, APAC is about political empowerment, and that San Diego is the only city in Southern California that does not have Asian American elected officials.

Comment 67 – Emma Huang read a statement for her husband, her family and her neighbors. She stated that they are strongly opposed to the splitting of Rancho Peñasquitos. She stated that Asians are properly

represented in District 5. She referenced the shared schools and sports leagues, as well as community events, family values, and common income levels.

Comment 68 – John Shepherd stated that he is Filipino American, his wife is Filipino Japanese, and they do not vote based on race or ethnicity. He is concerned about representation. He stated that their issues are better served by a Councilmember representing areas adjacent to Park Village.

Comment 69 – Janay Kruger with the University Community Planning Group stated that they continue to fully and unanimously support the Coast and Canyons plan. She stated that they need to remain united because of the scientific community of interests that helps propel jobs and the economy.

Comment 70 – Priscilla Ann Berge, a Kensington resident, stated that when David Moty spoke before the Commission he fairly represented the position authorized by the Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group board members – to keep Kensington and Talmadge together with communities south of 8 and to the west, not the east. When the Commission put Kensington and Talmadge into District 9, opinions and options changed. Since Kensington and Talmadge couldn't both be moved into District 3, they shifted their priorities to at least keep Kensington in District 3.

Comment 71 – Cindy Moore, a 33-year resident of Serra Mesa, stated that the neighborhoods that Serra Mesa advocated to be united with were not all included, but that the southern part of Aero Drive was. Aero Drive is important and impacts Serra Mesa. Proposals for this area are presented to the Serra Mesa Planning Board. She asks that whatever changes are made tonight, that Serra Mesa and the area south of Aero Drive remain together.

Comment 72 – Janeen Ameral with the Serra Mesa Community Council asked the Commission to remember that Serra Mesa does have crazy borders and not much in common with communities to the north, but instead shares interests with communities to the east and west. She asked the Commission to keep District 7 as it is in the current plan.

Comment 73 – Linda Perine with the LGBT Redistricting Task Force stated that there are strong arguments for keeping Kensington in District 3 and also strong arguments for keeping it in District 9. In this case, she suggested following the rules and principles for redistricting, including keeping neighborhoods together, keeping community planning areas together, and using freeways as natural boundaries, in the absence of compelling reasons to do otherwise.

Comment 74 – Matt Corrales thanked the Commission for reuniting the areas south of Commercial into District 8. He is opposed to the splitting of Kensington and Normal Heights, in order to place a portion of Kensington into District 3. He asked the Commission to reverse the decision.

Comment 75 – Sean Sala with the LGBT Redistricting Force stated that Kensington's proposal for keeping them in District 3 favors the rich and the white. It splits Normal Heights, splits Kensington, and splits the Ken-Tal Planning Group; it makes no sense. He stated that he feels the Commission has done an incredible job with District 3 and asked them not to feel obligated to honor any special interests.

Comment 76 – Mary Johnson, a 16-year resident of Park Village, stated that after moving there by chance, her family became enamored with the community and the people that they have stayed. She asked the Commission not to try to fix what is not broken and leave Peñasquitos united.

Comment 77 – Helen Quintanilla, a 20-year Park Village resident, asked the Commission to keep Peñasquitos whole and united in District 5. She referenced the common school district and places of worship. She asked the Commission not to use the 56 as a divider.

Comment 78 – Cindy Chan thanked John Becker and Jeanette Waltz Pool for reaching out to the Asian Americans because now more Asians are aware of the redistricting process and local politics in San Diego. She stated that the result is evidence for a hypothesis by Dr. Lee which she read at a previous meeting that “there is good evidence that when you try to get Latinos and Asian Americans involved in politics, they will get involved. It’s not that these groups don’t care about politics and don’t have political views. It’s more that a lot of the times the political parties aren’t speaking to the issues that really matter to Latinos and Asian Americans.” She also read an excerpt from the same article stating that we are not living in post-racial society and that ethnic groups are becoming more and more important in the American electorate. She referenced several reasons and facts in support of the APAC proposal and defended APAC’s proposed plan and efforts to unite all of Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa.

Chair Dalal called a recess. Upon reconvening, public comment continued.

Comment 79 – Jon Becker, Chair of the Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board and a 17-year resident of Park Village, asked the Commission to adhere to its principles, including keeping neighborhoods and CPAs intact, and using natural boundaries. He outlined similar land uses and infrastructure that unite Scripps Ranch and Mira Mesa as communities of interest, and differences that separate Park Village and Mira Mesa.

Comment 80 – Jeff Storey stated that he does not want to be pigeonholed by race. He asked that Park Village be kept in District 5.

Comment 81 – Ashwin Vasvani, a Park Village resident, stated that he feels he shares things in common with his peers in District 5, not other young API people in Mira Mesa. He stated that APAC does not represent him. He stated that he and his friends are the new generation and will be affected most by the Commission’s decisions and they do not feel defined by race.

Comment 82 – Wei Paxson, a Chinese immigrant, stated that her family’s common interests lie with other Rancho Peñasquitos residents. She stated that her sons swim and play softball in Peñasquitos and are taught by other Peñasquitos parent volunteers.

Comment 83 – Paul Hoover read a statement from his neighbor, Lily Tran, asking the Commission to keep PQ together in District 5 and cited several common interests, including shared schools, sports leagues, classes, shopping centers, and community activities. She stated that joining Mira Mesa and Rancho Peñasquitos focuses solely on one aspect of herself – her race – but dismisses other aspects that define her, including her friends, family, colleagues, where she shops, and her children’s social and academic activities.

Comment 84 – John Keating with the PQ Planning Board stated that when the Commission approved the preliminary plan, it was based on the information they had at the time and possibly the desire to appease APAC. He stated that the Commission has more accurate information now to make a better decision. He stated the Commission has two options: to split either PQ or Scripps Ranch, or accept the high deviation. The PQ Planning Board stated that Scripps already is divided by “old Scripps” and “new Scripps.” Peñasquitos has always been one cohesive unit and entirely in PUSD. He stated that Scripps has more in common with Mira Mesa than PQ, including that they are currently in the same district and share a high school. He stated that Scripps Ranch is represented by two planning groups; PQ is represented by one. They support Commissioner Nishioka’s map. He stated that the Commission also has strong enough findings to accept the deviation.

Comment 85 – Jeanette Poole apologized on behalf of her community for booing Dr. Chan’s proposal. She stated that Peñasquitos Asian Americans have come out and stated they do not feel the need to have their district reconfigured to get adequate representation. She stated that the communities within the proposed District 5 and Park Village are cohesive while being diverse, and function well as such. She referenced the joint Planning Group for Peñasquitos, Torrey Highlands and Black Mountain Ranch and that they’ve historically been in the same district. She also mentioned four public funds that are used throughout all of Peñasquitos that would have to be administered through two Council districts. She also mentioned the shared Special Permit Recreation Council for all of Rancho Peñasquitos, Black Mountain, and Torrey Highland. She stated that APAC’s petition did include signatures from Rancho Peñasquitos residents; she stated that if the Commission found it useful, they could gather a petition that shows the number of Asians with a different view than APACs. She stated that she and John Becker put out a brief email and the Asian community rallied each other; they did not lead the effort.

Comment 86 – HaiLong Wang, a Park Village resident, stated that his family moved from Mira Mesa two years ago. He is angry that Park Village is being separated from Peñasquitos. He stated that they live their life and invest their money in Rancho Peñasquitos. Although he has friends and colleagues in Mira Mesa, his family’s interests and life lies in Rancho Peñasquitos. Park Village belongs in District 5.

Comment 87 – Guy Oshiro gave background on his Japanese-American family’s history. He stated that he understands APAC’s goals, but that when Asian Americans want their voices heard, they make their voices heard.

Comment 88 –Laura Riebau with the Eastern Area Planning Committee reminded the Commission that communities surrounding SDSU to the north and south of I-8 are a community of interest, and that Mission Trails Park divides Navajo from Tierrasanta. She stated that Navajo is contiguous with areas to the east. She also stated that Federal law says race shouldn’t override other aspects, like history, demographics, lifestyle and economics. She asked the Commission to keep their community of interest together or at least to include Redwood Village and Rolando Park in District 9.

Comment 89 – Steve Hadley stated that Clairemont and the communities north of Miramar have no common interests and that disconnect will affect representation on the City Council. He stated that the solution is to include all of Peñasquitos in District 5 and put Scripps Ranch in District 6. He suggested putting Tierrasanta and Serra Mesa into District 6 because Serra Mesa belongs with Kearny Mesa for reasons including redevelopment, development on Aero Drive, and Montgomery field. He stated taking North and South Clairemont and united them in District 7 with Linda Vista.

Comment 90 – Greg Bourque asked the Commission to open their heart and not separate the deep bond that is shared throughout his community, which is proven in their demonstrations at the last few meetings.

Comment 91 – Sari Hotchkiss stated that the new District 9 is a farce. She does not see the reasoning in joining a community like Kensington with Southcrest. She stated that many of her neighbors in Rolando Park have neither heard nor been to many of the neighborhoods in District 9. She doesn't feel this map serves any of the communities. She stated that Commissioner Marquez made a comment that Kensington's vote would cancel out Shelltown and Southcrest's, and that is proof that these communities have nothing in common.

Comment 92 – Deborah Knight with Friends of Rose Canyon expressed support for the findings and reasons for adoption for District 1 and stated that the map has unanimous support across the district. She stated that she's seen a few maps circulating lately which once again propose to split University City. She urged the Commission to reject any such maps and keep District 1 as it is in the current plan.

Comment 93 – Erik Marquis stated Park Village and the rest of Peñasquitos are residential neighborhoods with similar interests, while the rest of District 6 is highly commercial. At 6% of the district he doesn't feel that Park Village will be represented in District 6 or empowered.

Comment 94 – Ralph Peters stated it makes no sense to split Park Village from Peñasquitos. It is the largest identifiable part of Rancho Peñasquitos and the rest of the community would be hurt by its exclusion.

Comment 95 – Remigia Bermudez thanked the Commission for reuniting Barrio Logan and asked the Commission to keep it as such in the final plan. She is concerned about the issue of Shelltown.

Comment 96 – Brian Pollard urged the Commission to keep District 4 as it is configured now and not to make any changes last minute.

Comment 97 – Harvey Payne advocated for uniting Park Village with Peñasquitos in District 5. He stated that all the testimony can be converted to concrete findings for doing so.

Comment 98 – Dr. Allen Chan stated that he was happy and proud to see so many Asian Americans here today and asked them that no matter what happens remain active in local political processes.

Comment 99 – Lee Rittiner stated that there are several ways to create a second Latino district without drawing District 9 as it is. He also stated there is a way to create a District 6 that unites the areas of Rancho Peñasquitos, Torrey Highlands, Black Mountain Ranch, and Mira Mesa. He also suggested that the next Commission start the process earlier. He asked the Commission to reconsider the Rolando Park/Redwood Village issue.

Comment 100 – Ben Rivera stated that the redistricting process has not been publicized effectively in the community and that there are no translation services provided at these meetings. He stated that they

want no cutting off of any part of Barrio Logan and their district. They do not want to be a remnant, waiting until everything else is decided to finalize their boundaries and population.

Comment 101 – Andy Berg stated that an ideal District 5 would include all of Rancho Peñasquitos and all of Scripps Ranch; however, one of the communities has to be split because the deviation is too high. He stated that Jon Becker’s plan was well done, but the Commission could choose to reject the 6% deviation. He stated that if it comes down to splitting Scripps Ranch or Peñasquitos, he believes that the Commission originally chose Rancho Peñasquitos to be split because of APAC influence and the belief that the split was what Asian population in Peñasquitos wanted. He stated that the testimony has shown that is not the case. He also stated that Todd Gloria is part Asian and a member of the API community. He gave the following reasons for splitting Scripps Ranch as opposed to Rancho Peñasquitos: Scripps Ranch has historically been split, Peñasquitos has not been; Scripps Ranch has always been in a district with Mira Mesa, Rancho Peñasquitos has not; before Scripps Ranch High School was built, Scripps Ranch students attended Mira Mesa High and still have the choice to attend either; Mira Mesa and Scripps Ranch are sister communities that merge into one another; and lastly, Commission’s finding that families in PUSD constitute a community of interest –the 10,000 residents in Park Village are in PUSD.

Chair Dalal thanked the public for their input and asked for Commission discussion.

Commissioner Marquez also thanked the public and Commissioner Nishioka for providing a map for discussion. He requested scheduling an additional meeting for Monday to allow more time for incorporating changes resulting from public testimony and to finalize the filing statement.

Commissioner Potter stated that if there is another meeting he’d like to have all other issues resolved today and focus the additional meeting on the Rancho Peñasquitos/Scripps Ranch issue.

Ms. Spivak stated that the Commission can decide to discuss whatever they’d like at an additional meeting but they cannot foreclose any public comment unless the agenda states that only a subset of the plan. However, that would foreclose discussion on anything else. She suggested they have more discussion before getting to that point.

Commissioner Quiroz prefers to finish the map and just finalize the findings on Monday.

Ms. Spivak stated that would be preferable from a legal standpoint; the more time to legally review the map, the better.

Commissioner Potter stated that if a map is decided on tonight, he’d like to stay and work on the findings as well.

Commissioner Nishioka thanked the public and stated that being a North County resident and having ties to the community it was very hard for him to decide whether to split Rancho Peñasquitos or Scripps Ranch. He largely considered the Scripps Ranch residents overcoming the fires that burned down many homes and then turning out to help other North County residents when they lost their homes in later fires. It pains him to hear one area pitted against another. He stated that he has, however, put together a

map that tries to take into account the recent testimony. He does want to put this map forward for consideration.

**Motion by Commissioner Nishioka: To discuss for consideration Commissioner Nishioka's map titled Park Village/Scripps. Seconded by Commissioner Marquez.**

Commissioner Kosmo thanked the public for coming out and testifying. He stated that the problem is the equal protection clause, a Constitutional requirement for equal population in each district. So, the decision is in fact to split either Rancho Peñasquitos or Scripps Ranch. He appreciates the new information and feels it should be discussed and considered. He stated that APAC has been present in the proceedings since the beginning and provided a lot of testimony and evidence for a community of interest between Mira Mesa and Rancho Peñasquitos. As a Commission, they have to consider the entire record, not only the latest testimony.

Commissioner Marquez stated that he has also struggled with the issue. He stated that there is a very extensive record to base the preliminary map on, and though he respects the integrity of the record, recent testimony conflicts with previous testimony. He stated that he cannot ignore the fact that people whom APAC claimed to represent have said they are in fact not represented by APAC.

Commissioner Nishioka thanked Ms. Wong and Ms. Spivak for working hard to support the Commission. He stated that the statistics should be interpreted properly. In his mind there are over 244,000 Asians in San Diego, some of mixed heritage. He stated that as generations integrate into society, remembering their ancestral backgrounds is important to all ethnicities. He asked the public to try to understand the complex process of redistricting and all the components that went into each decision to arrive at this map.

Mr. Johnson showed a table of Asian population in each proposed map that unites Peñasquitos. Commissioner Nishioka's map has an Asian population of 30.9% and 23.5% CVAP, about 2 points lower than the August 18<sup>th</sup> plan. The overall deviation would be 3.54%, which is less than the current map of 4.59%. District 6 remains the smallest, but the smallest by less.

Ms. Wong pointed out for the record that there are 40 people showing as unassigned to any district.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that the map was done at 1:16 a.m. that morning and he was unable to find exactly where the 40 unassigned people were. He stated that NDC would need to smooth out and refine the northern border. He suggested that if they move forward with the map, that Scripps Ranch be given a chance to comment on the changes. He also stated that many of the arguments for uniting Peñasquitos could be made for Scripps Ranch.

Mr. Johnson stated that they could find smoother lines, similar to those in Plan 6. He also reminded the Commission and public that in the online software they are unable to split USD, but that change is in this plan and will be shown on the final plan. He went over some of the possible dividing streets.

Commissioner Nishioka pointed out that Rancho Encantada is part of the Poway Unified School District. He asked Commissioners with more knowledge of the area what would be a good border.

Commissioner Potter stated that he originally drawn three alternatives splitting Scripps Ranch in earlier stages of the process. One alternative was at Pomerado Road, one being farther north. He'd need to go back and look at what he'd done before. He stated that some of the areas to the south aren't really part of Scripps Ranch and could be removed.

Mr. Johnson stated that one map used Scripps Lake Drive as a border and went down that until it got to Timberlake Drive, and followed that across back to Scripps Trail and Semilian Boulevard, over to Pomerado Road.

Commissioner Potter asked if NDC had any of his previous alternatives on Esri that they could look at; one was a map called DP3. Commissioner Potter stated that he could look into that if the Commission desires.

Commissioner Marquez asked the Chair if the Commission could make a decision on this area but give NDC some discretion along the border and smoothing the lines out.

Mr. Johnson stated that it might be worth to find out if the Commissioners even want to make this swap.

Commissioner Quiroz thanked the public for coming out and stated that they Commission does have to take into consideration the entire record, including the many Asians who did want Mira Mesa and Rancho Peñasquitos joined, not only the many Asians who've come out today and at recent meetings in opposition. She stated that APAC and the residents here tonight both want Rancho Peñasquitos united and she agrees that it should be, but she is not willing to split Scripps Ranch because they need representation for their fire-prone areas. She asked Mr. Johnson to show her API map, and stated that in this map, Rancho Peñasquitos is kept whole with Black Mountain Ranch and Torrey Highlands, but PQ residents don't support that option either. She stated that University City is another area she would not consider splitting.

Chair Dalal stated that she is impacted and moved by diverse turn out from Rancho Peñasquitos area. She is open to the map from Commissioner Nishioka. She stated that it is a very hard decision to split either Scripps Ranch or Rancho Peñasquitos, but she is open.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he is open to the change but is not comfortable reducing the Asian population in District 6. He asked Ms. Spivak if there is enough record to substantiate such a change. He feels it is important to make sure that the Asian population is properly represented.

Ms. Spivak stated that they would have to review the map as it stands at the end of the night. She stated that the percentage never reaches near 50% and that is the number that creates a minority-majority district. These configurations are for an influence district, which requires a different kind of analysis.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that based on Ms. Spivak's comments he remains open to the idea of potentially splitting Scripps Ranch instead of Rancho Peñasquitos.

Commissioner Potter is open to the idea but is hesitant to do so while the Scripps Ranch participantes aren't here to rebut the arguments. He'd liked to discuss it as the sole item at the next meeting.

Ms. Spivak stated that it could be noticed as a sole item or as a sub-item as long as the maps available to the public. She stated that the ROV deadline is September 15<sup>th</sup> and that the Commission might want to consider additional meetings.

Mr. Johnson reminded the Commission that if they choose to meet on Monday, they'd be informing the public on Friday of a meeting on the following Monday and therefore there might not be a great turnout.

Ms. Spivak stated that it would be in compliance with the Brown Act, which requires 72 hours notice.

Chair Dalal stated that the Commission would do proper outreach if they decide to have a Monday meeting.

Commissioner Morrow thanked Commissioner Nishioka for his attempt to create a map, but she feels that the Commission has known since the beginning that they would either have split Peñasquitos or Scripps and they have already made the decision.

Commissioner Marquez stated that besides the passionate testimony about common interests within Peñasquitos, there was evidence that there are more connections between Mira Mesa and Scripps, including access between population centers. He stated that reviewing the last few days' testimony might help the Commission feel more comfortable making the change. He stated that the Commission chose to divide Rancho Peñasquitos in part to provide fair representation for the API community in this area. Recent conflicting testimony makes it hard to argue that this move empowers API residents of Park Village. He proposed asking the consultant to bring two versions of the map at the next meeting showing two alternatives for the northern area.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she wants to finish the map tonight. She is concerned that changing it now would not give time to Scripps residents to argue the change. She feels there were many reasons for choosing to split Rancho Peñasquitos over Scripps Ranch, not just API population. She also stated that APAC did not claim to represent Asians in Rancho Peñasquitos but 216,000 plus Asians in San Diego. She stated that the Commission needs to look at the map from a citywide perspective and provide the best map for everyone.

Commissioner Marquez stated that the Commission learned that it is not enough to try to empower a protected class, but you have to prove through a legal VRA analysis that these people are able, or would be able to elect a candidate of their choice. He stated that high percentage does not guarantee that a population can elect the candidate of their choice, but instead organization and cohesiveness. He stated that the API community is very diverse in race, culture, socio-economic status, and values.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that the public testimony on this issue has been so compelling that he'd like to take the time to get it right. He is also concerned about giving the Scripps Ranch people time to react. He suggested moving the final vote to September 1<sup>st</sup>.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that based on DOJ methods, the Asian community in San Diego could be undercounted. In attempt to move forward, he would like NDC provide some ideas on the dividing line within Scripps Ranch and present it at the next meeting, having given enough notice for the Scripps Ranch residents to mobilize.

Chair Dalal suggested a Monday meeting starting at 2:00 pm. She asked NDC to look at Commissioner Nishioka's map and present something then.

Mr. Johnson stated that NDC could create a map very similar to Commissioner Nishioka's for review on Monday, but stated that pushing the decision out and missing the ROV deadline would have serious ramifications.

Chair Dalal confirmed that there would be a Monday, August 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he could work his schedule out to attend a 2:00 p.m. meeting, but that it could be difficult for residents.

Commissioner Morrow stated that the Commission has been at this meeting for four hours without reaching a consensus and at the next meeting it could be same. She feels the Commission should decide today and vote to change it or leave it as is.

Commissioner Quiroz agrees with Commission Morrow that a vote should be done today. She feels that all information is available now.

**Motion by Commissioner Nishioka to: Direct NDC to use Commissioner Nishioka's "Park View Scripps" map and to return with a map with refined borders between Districts 5, 6, and 7. Motion seconded by Commissioner Marquez.**

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he will vote no because he doesn't feel there has been fair notice and opportunity for the Scripps Ranch residents to provide input.

Commissioner Potter will also vote against the motion because of the reason stated by Commission Kosmo.

Commissioner Marquez reminded the panel that they can also abstain. He asked if the motion is to create an alternative version for discussion, or to actually incorporate the changes into the final plan.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that his motion was to incorporate the changes into the final plan.

Commissioner Marquez asked if the motion were amended to have NDC provide two maps for discussion and vote on Monday, would that change Commissioner Kosmo and Potter's vote on the motion.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that there needs to be adequate notice to Scripps Ranch. He'd like to discuss on merit, but because the needed information is not in front of him, he will vote no. If there is a way to properly present this plan, he is willing to meet further to decide.

**Motion by Commissioner Nishioka, seconded by Commissioner Marquez, fails 3-4. Commissioners Nishioka, Dalal, and Marquez are in favor; Commissioner Morrow, Quiroz, Kosmo, and Potter are opposed.**

Commissioner Marquez proposed an alternative motion that asks NDC to create an alternative map incorporating Commissioner Nishioka's "Park View Scripps" map of Districts 5, 6, and 7, so the Commission can then decide between that map and the August 18<sup>th</sup> map on Monday. He also suggested a meeting on Friday to provide enough time for noticing and to discuss the changes.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she feels they've already voted on that.

Ms. Spivak clarified that Commissioner Marquez is making a new motion; the question is how different is it from the first motion.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that Commissioner Marquez's motion is to have the alternative map brought back next time and for the Commission to take the same vote.

Commissioner Marquez clarified that two no votes were premised on the fact that there is not sufficient time for Scripps Ranch to respond. This motion allows that time.

Chair Dalal stated that there doesn't need to be another motion; providing direction to NDC might be enough. She asked for the opinion of the Commissioners on whether to provide such direction.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that they will need five votes to make the change and he is open minded. If he had more information he might be a yes vote, therefore he is in favor of having a meeting on Monday.

Commissioner Marquez stated that since they have not discussed the filing statement, they need to have a meeting on Monday. If they want to consider a potential change they'll also have to decide to have another meeting on top of that. He asked Ms. Spivak if that assumption is wrong.

Ms. Spivak stated that once the Commission is close to a final map, she'll need time during a meeting to go through the filing statement to make any necessary changes to ensure that the filing statement adequately and legally reflects what's been done, any changes made, and what was considered. She thought the Commission would have a plan today, giving the City Attorney's office and outside counsel a week to legally review the map and prepare a rough draft of the revised filing statement; it doesn't look like that will be the case. If the Commission is considering additional meetings, they might need to push out the date for the final vote past the 25<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Marquez asked if it would suffice to have a meeting on Monday and the following Friday.

Ms. Spivak stated that she is not aware of where the Commission stands on its votes, nor does she want to know, but it depends on the changes the Commission makes.

Commissioner Marquez stated that if they spend Monday taking public testimony and decide on either the August 18<sup>th</sup> or Commissioner Nishioka's alternative map on that day, Thursday can be spent reviewing the filing statement, with a final vote on Friday.

Chair Dalal favors doing both deciding on a map and reviewing the filing statement on Monday and keeping the August 25<sup>th</sup> agenda.

Ms. Spivak reminded the Commission that legal needs time to do a legal analysis before the final vote.

Chair Dalal stated that she agrees that they should move forward. The motion failed and she thinks the Commission should move forward. She prefers a Monday meeting to go over the findings.

Commissioner Marquez rescinded his motion to prepare two maps.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she has no problem with moving Kensington into District 3, but the way it was done is not right because it splits a community planning area and it splits two neighborhoods across class lines. She stated that the southern, less-white, and less-affluent parts of Kensington and Normal Heights are disenfranchised. The public testimony was that all of Kensington should be in District 3.

**Motion by Commissioner Quiroz to: Move Kensington north of Monroe Avenue and Normal Heights south of Monroe Avenue from District 3 back into District 9. Motion seconded by Commissioner Morrow.**

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he strongly disagrees with the move made at the last meeting when he was not in attendance. He appreciates the efforts of everyone on Commission to make fair decisions but he stated that he will vote against the final plan if this change is not rescinded. He stated that the change goes against the Commission's principle to keep communities together. He stated that the Kensington move troubles him because it is a community and neighborhood attempting to divide itself and another neighborhood, Normal Heights. He also objects to the fact that the portion of Normal Heights affected by this change has received no notice of what is being proposed; it is an underrepresented area he feels is being taken advantage of. He also feels it goes against the principle to keep Community Planning Groups together. The Adams North/Normal Heights Planning Group is split and the Kensington Talmadge Planning Group is also split.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that the reasons for keeping Redwood Village and Rolando Park in District 4 as opposed to District 9 with the rest of the College communities are the same reasons for keeping Kensington in District 9. He feels there should be consistency in dealing neighborhoods. He stated that natural boundaries are an important part of the redistricting criteria. Many Kensington residents have argued that I-15 is not a natural boundary but that Monroe Avenue is. He stated that he can roll a ball across Monroe Avenue, but could not throw a ball across the I-15 freeway overpass between Kensington and Normal Heights. He feels that I-15 is a clear, natural boundary and Monroe is not. He also feels that this is a socio-economic based decision. He believes that the more affluent residents in north Kensington are trying to stay with District 3 and leave behind the poorer people of color that live in multi-family apartments. He feels protecting people in underserved communities is an important task of the Redistricting Commission. Separating those residents in the less affluent areas of Normal Heights and Kensington from the rest of their neighborhood would leave them in the same planning groups without representation.

Commissioner Potter read an excerpt from an email from Gerry Webber with the El Cajon Boulevard Business Improvement Association stating that he has no objections to the preliminary plan since the Business Improvement District has always been split amongst two districts, District 3 and 7. The letter does however object to the splitting of Normal Heights, which has always been in one district. Commissioner Potter is in favor of the motion.

Commissioner Morrow stated that she agrees that reversing the change keeps two planning groups together, two neighborhoods intact, and that I-15 is a natural boundary. She added that District 3 already has significant political and economic power with Downtown, Hillcrest, Mission Hills, and Banker's Hills. She believes the newly created District 9 has no political or economic power without Kensington. She also stated that it is ironic that some Commissioners state that they care about the underrepresented, yet are in favor of removing the only hope for that district, powerful and influential Kensington.

Commissioner Marquez stated he was in favor from the beginning to include Kensington in District 3. He believes that including Kensington in District 9 will consolidate the political power in that district and consume the attention of the Councilmember for at least four years, and that the southern areas will not receive the attention they need. He finds it interesting that the Commissioners who are now saying they are protecting the underserved in these communities, when they drafted their own maps did not include a District 9 in the southern regions. He will be voting against the motion.

Chair Dalal stated that she voted for keeping Kensington in District 3 because of testimony about the Adams Avenue Business District, the shared facilities with Normal Heights, and the natural boundary between Kensington and Talmadge. She will be voting against the motion.

Commissioner Quiroz responded to Chair Dalal's comments by saying that Kensington was not put into District 3. It was separated along class lines and the more affluent part was put into District 9 in exchange for the least affluent part of Normal Heights.

Chair Dalal responded to Commissioner Quiroz by stating that her interpretation differs.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he agrees with Chair Dalal and interprets the testimony similarly. He supports the change made last meeting.

Commissioner Potter stated that he disagrees so strongly with Commissioner Quiroz's interpretation of how the Commission arrived at this decision that he reverses his position and will not support the motion.

**Motion to move Kensington north of Monroe Avenue and Normal Heights south of Monroe Avenue from District 3 back into District 9 does not pass 3–4. Commissioners Morrow, Quiroz, and Kosmo in favor and Commissioners Nishioka, Potter, Marquez, and Dalal opposed.**

Commissioner Quiroz pointed out that without the reversal there will only be four yes votes on the final plan.

Commissioner Marquez addressed Commissioner Quiroz by first stating that he respects her years of service and feels they have similar value systems. He then stated that she should consider another argument other than casting the Commissioners who voted for this change as racist.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she did not say that; she stated that in reviewing the tapes you would find that she said she is sure that was not anyone's intention, but it did come out that way. As a person who deals with these types of issues daily, she attests that it can be construed that way. She stated that all the Commission's rules and principles were violated in this configuration and she believes that if the Commission is intent on placing Kensington into District 3, they can find a better way.

Commissioner Kosmo would like to get away from that part of the discussion. He would consider another idea to include Kensington in District 3 if it arose, but he does feel this configuration violates many of their principles, including keeping neighborhoods and CPAs together.

Commissioner Potter prefers a 2:00 p.m. meeting on Monday because of the length of meetings and time constraints.

Chair Dalal also prefers a 2:00 p.m. She asked Ms. Wong to confirm that there will be an additional meeting on Monday, August 22 at 2:00 p.m.

Ms. Wong stated that in anticipation of additional meetings, she had already reserved Council Chambers for Monday.

**ITEM 3 – APPROVAL OF REQUEST FROM CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF FEES AND COSTS IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$50,000 FOR THE SERVICES OF SPECIAL VOTING RIGHTS ACT COUNSEL, MARGUERITE LEONI OF NIELSEN MERKSAMER PARRINELLO GROSS AND LEONI LLP**

Ms. Spivak stated that early on the City Attorney's office was aware that they were going to need outside counsel. They retained Ms. Marguerite Leoni, who has been working diligently behind the scenes providing counsel and also helping draft the preliminary filing statement. The City Attorney made an agreement to take care of all the costs incurred by Ms. Leoni for her services to the Commission up to \$50,000. At this point she has incurred about \$25,000 in expenses. The City Attorney's office would like to be reimbursed by the Commission from its budget once all their expenses are paid.

**Motion by Commissioner Nishioka to: Approve request from City Attorney's office for reimbursement of fees and costs in an amount not to exceed \$50,000 for the services of special Voting Rights Act counsel, Marguerite Leoni. Motion seconded by Commissioner Potter.**

Commissioner Quiroz asked that the bills be reviewed and approved by the Chair.

**Motion passed 6–0, with Commissioners Quiroz, Kosmo, Potter, Marquez, Dalal, and Nishioka in favor. Commissioner Morrow was not present at the time of the vote.**

**STAFF REPORTS**

**ITEM 4 – STAFF REPORT BY CHIEF OF STAFF MIDORI WONG**

Ms. Wong stated that the Committee Room would not be available on Monday for overflow. She can look into holding the meeting in the Silver Room instead, but that would incur an additional cost for video coverage.

Commissioner Potter asked what the capacity is in the Silver Room compared to the Chambers.

Ms. Wong stated that she is not sure but the issue in Chambers is the fire-hazard risk. Once the floor reaches capacity, people must wait in the lobby and be shuttled up as room is made available. She would also have to find out if video coverage is available for Monday in the Silver Room. Video coverage would cost about \$400; they have not had to pay for overtime for audio.

Chair Dalal stated she prefers to leave it to Ms. Wong's discretion as to where best hold the meeting.

Ms. Wong asked if the agenda should have specific sub-items.

Mr. Johnson rescinded his suggestion to use sub-items.

Commissioner Nishioka asked NDC to prepare a version of his map with refined borders for Districts 5, 6, and 7.

Commissioner Morrow stated that it is a waste of time to meet and work on the findings if the plan will not be approved with 4 yes votes if the Kensington issue is not resolved.

Chair Dalal asked NDC to bring to Monday's meeting data around Kensington.

Commissioner Marquez asked for clarification for the Commissioners and the public from Rancho Peñasquitos. He asked the Chair to acknowledge whether the Rancho Peñasquitos split is off the table or not.

Chair Dalal stated that there are still decisions to be made. NDC will provide data for both the Kensington issue and the Peñasquitos issue. The agenda for Monday's meeting will be posted tomorrow and it will provide more information on what will be discussed.

Ms. Wong stated that since no changes were made today, the Commission will be considering changes to the August 18<sup>th</sup> map.

Commissioner Marquez stated that it seems to him that the Rancho Peñasquitos issue is off the table unless there are three Commissioners who will vote no on the final map with Peñasquitos split as it is as was done with Kensington.

Ms. Wong asked the Commission to provide direction on whether additional data regarding Commissioner Nishioka's map is needed for Monday.

Mr. Johnson stated that what he understands is that the August 18<sup>th</sup> map remains the Commission's current version of the plan. He has direction to provide staff reports on what Commissioner Nishioka's map would look like if the edges were smoothed and the 40 unassigned people accounted for; and also to provide more data around the Kensington and Normal Heights area.

Chair Dalal stated that there is not enough support to further explore the Rancho Peñasquitos split and directed NDC to provide data only on the Kensington/Normal Heights issue.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Dalal adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

---

Julie Corrales, Executive Secretary  
2010 Redistricting Commission

Written Comments Received August 18, 2011  
Redistricting Commission Meeting

**Comment 1: Blue Jasmine Ramos**

Please continue to keep all of Barrio Logan intact. I wish for it to remain in District 8. Thank you.

**Comment 2: Beth Hurley**

Why did the Commission Allow Ms. Quiroz to railroad it? The woman is clearly on a crusade to attain her own goals rather than those of the citizens of the communities. She has no right. It's not the job description. Scripps "deserves" it more than PQ? Nonsense. Scripps has been split in the past and has two planning commissions. The fires were 8 years ago. They are rebuilt! She is being negligent in her position and I am appalled. Scripps and Mira Mesa share a high school. The arguments she made for keeping Kensington together apply exactly to PQ. It's hypocritical.

**Comment 3: Srinivasan Balasubramanian**

Housing communities are very different between Park Village and Mira Mesa; Park Village has no trailer park. Crime rate in Mira Mesa is much higher, practically none in Park Village. Mira Mesa has transient population with more rueters [sic].

**Comment 4: Sanjay Kamath**

Please adhere to your own guideline and keep Park Village part of PQ and District 5.

**Comment 5: Anne Schoeller**

Keep all College South communities together. I can't believe you are moving Kensington out which will further dilute our vote. This is a slap in the face that you are so reluctant to do anything for our communities of interest. Everyone else got what they want.

**Comment 6: Jocelyn Tsai**

As an alumni of the Poway School District schools of Park Village, Mesa Verde, and Westview High, I find what is going on now as a catastrophe. I don't know each politician's, Commissioner's agenda or goal in this split of a harmonious community, but in actuality if this "redistricting" passes I believe you will not see a positive outcome, but a flee of suburbia in Park Village. Communities, friendships, and lives will be broken over your decisions. So I ask you, I plead to you to unite PQ under District 5.

**Comment 7: John Higgins**

Please unite the Park Village community in District 5. I feel I and my family have common interests with the rest of the PQ community in District 5.

**Comment 8: Brett Amon**

I've lived in Rancho Peñasquitos for years. I moved to PQ from Mira Mesa to get away from the traffic and lifestyle. Park Village has a thriving community, large diversity, excellent schools system, the PQ preserve, beautiful location and "quiet" neighborhood. I can only imagine what would happen to this wonderful community. This plan would separate our families, friends and schools. And there is no benefit for this ruling.

**Comment 9: Sonny & Lily Amon**

I'm outraged with this split proposal of Park Village from PQ. We are residents since 1987. We value our district and are totally not in favor of this plan. I believe this is not going to benefit all of us Park Village residents. Please do go through with this plan. Thank you. We want to remain in District 5.

**Comment 10: John Hileman**

Thank you for keeping Kensington in District 3. Please keep us there.

**Comment 11: Julie Hileman**

Thank you for keeping Kensington 3.

**Comment 12: Mario Ingrassi**

Since Kensington has been removed from District 9, it is now very simple to reunite Rolando Park and Redwood Village back to the Eastern Area by tweaking the southern area of District 9 into District 4 and if necessary a portion of Golden Hill could be shifted into District 8, if they would not mind. Thank you for all the time and effort you have given to all of us and for listening to everyone.

**Comment 13: Yanying Auyeung**

As Exec VP of our PTA, I understand unity, I understand having a voice. However, I resent political organizer manipulating and claiming to be our voices when it is most certainly NOT! Look at the real residents representing ourselves here today! We speak our own voices!!! The message is clear – we want to stay as 1 PQ in D5!!! Please listen to the real people, Asians and non-Asians alike, who have lived in harmony and want to remain in D5 as a whole community! The redistricting concept was supposed to be for the people. When this many families who up on a busy weekday to oppose a redistricting plan, you have to wonder/question why anyone would even consider redistributing in such a way that hurts any community?

**Comment 14: Jean Roberts**

I am a mother of 2 children (7 and 10 yrs) who attend Park Village Elementary. In 1999, we moved from Carmel Mtn Ranch to PV because we liked the neighborhood that we felt was an extension or sister community of where we were already living. We specifically moved to remain within the multicultural community we had come to love. My kids have friends at school – NOT Asian-friends, Indian-friends, Samoan-friends. In the same way, my husband and I have neighbors without ethnic or ancestrally hyphenated friends. We share the same concerns with those along the brush filled canyons north of the 56 and east of the 15 as brush fire season begins. The parents I volunteer with at my children's school are concerned with the same issues of raising our children, sharing places to get the best cakes for birthdays, events at the YMCA (in PA), the fun of the PQ street fair – things of no consequence or interest to the residents of Mira Mesa, Kearny Mesa, or Linda Vista. Please move Park Village back to our neighborhood – Peñasquitos in District 5. Thank you for your time.

**Comment 15: Connie Terwilliger**

Keep Kensington in 3. Kensington is part of the Adams Avenue corridor – the lines are bit I-15, the lines are Fairmont and Meade/El Cajon. Keep Kensington in District 3. We share resources. We play, dine, shop and live in District 3. My P.O. Box has been in Normal Heights for the entire 26 years I have lived in Kensington. There is no direct route to the new District 9. We do not drive down El Cajon Blvd. to the east to find services. The line should be Meade Avenue and Fairmount. Not Monroe. Monroe does not connect through the district.

**Comment 16: Voe Surquia**

Keep Park Village in Dist. 5.

**Comment 17: Camila Vargas**

Keep our beloved PV united with the District 5.

**Comment 18: Mirtha Bellido**

Please keep Park Village in District 5. It affects my family.

**Comment 19: Jose E Vargas**

Please keep Park Village in District 5. It affects my family.

**Comment 20: Lu Yu**

I have college degree in urban planning and master's degree in real estate management. I fully respect the Commission's work and understand the statistics behind your proposal. Having said that, we need not only look at the current statistics but also predict the future as well. Park

Village is a diversified community which mingles with PQ very closely and harmoniously. It will be more so with new population joining PV.

Last but not least, if one day someone puts us to be part of Arizona State, what would you feel??? Even though it doesn't affect your school, it puzzles you and hurts your feelings of being part of California. Unite PQ in D5!

**Comment 21: Victoria Surquia**

Park Village to be in District 5

**Comment 22: Traiq Rahman**

1. Park village is a close knit diverse community in Dist. 5. We do not want/need to be represented by racially divided groups.
2. We shop in PQ; our children go to parks in PQ, Hill Top Community Park in PQ.
3. APAC is racially dividing us. They should not be allowed to do that.
4. Our police patrol our streets, they know us, they protect us with respect and kindness.
5. We are divided by natural boundary – the canyon.
6. Commission can combine Scripps with Dist. 6 and dilute the racial division.
7. Please keep PV/PQ.TH/BMR in Dist. 5.
8. Your decision will change our lives forever.
9. We are not numbers. We are a community.

**Comment 23: Beth Jaworski**

I support community request to keep Kensington in CD3. The community has been working together closely for years and have created a very strong community of interest in terms of small businesses, historic preservation, community character, transit issues, etc.

CD3 as currently defined in the newly revised redistricting map constitutes more than just a “community of interest.” Residents and business owners have come together over the years and now function as a family. Please do not separate a well-functioning and largely self-governing family. Let Kensington stay with the rest of their CD3 FAMILY.

**Comment 24: Khim Sung**

Keep on PQ in District 5.

**Comment 25: Peggie Sung**

Keep on PQ in District 5.

**Comment 26: Michelle Sung**

Keep one PQ in District 5.

**Comment 27: Yuxin Zhao**

We strongly oppose the proposal to redistrict the Park Village and Adelpia Street area. Here are a few clear reasons for not redistricting: 1) the people in Park Village and Adelpia Street neighborhood do not share common interests w/ people that live currently in Mira Mesa area; 2) Natural boundary of the Canyon should be the divider not the highway.

**Comment 28: Sherry Hopwood**

Thank you for putting Kensington back into District 3.

**Comment 29: Roz Roberts**

I live in Rancho Peñasquitos – Park Village. Our lives revolve around North County. Our interests lie in the Black Mountain/RP/Torrey Highlands area. We want to remain in District 5 as a united Rancho Peñasquitos. Our doctors/church/friends are all in this common district.

**Comment 30: Brian McCray**

Please keep PQ together.

**Comment 31: Lichung Chu**

School district is not equal to city council district, I understand. However, school life highly overlaps with community interest. Starting from our late 20s all the way to the 50s, we spend most of our family life with our kids. And our kids spend 180 days per year at school. Beyond that, for kids they are busy with play days, sports events, or outings with their best friends in school. For parents, we are busy between PTA meetings, school fund raising events, individual meetings with teachers, and social events with other parents. To me, these activities means are a lot more important than where I shop or go to restaurants.

I share common community interests with the parents who have kids attending the same school as my kids. Unite PQ in District 5!

**Comment 32: Erich Hasselmann**

Request Park Village remain in District 5.

**Comment 33: Jonathon Tibbitts**

Thank you for keeping Kensington in District 3. Please keep us there!!!

**Comment 34: Jeau C. Newer**

Please support the council dist. 2 area as it is drawn including the airport.

**Comment 35: Wendy Brown**

Park Village is a part of Rancho Peñasquitos. Rancho Peñasquitos has common interests with Black Mountain Ranch, Rancho Bernardo, Torrey Highlands. Check out our youth sports league! We are separated from Mira Mesa by a half mile wide CANYON from Mira Mesa. From the

entrance of Park Village, it takes 0.6 miles to reach the first commercial building – the US Post Office. In another half mile, you will reach a police station, a fire station, a public library and grocery shopping. Traveling the other way requires 2.3 miles to even reach the first commercial bldg which is Lucky Seafood – hardly the same thing.

Also, if your redistricting guidelines do not allow you to draw lines to favor an incumbent how can you draw them to favor a potential new candidate? Isn't that wrong?

Stop listening to APAC. They don't care about our community. They only care about numbers. We are not numbers.

**Comment 36: Arlene Chang**

Keep Park Village with Peñasquitos in District 5!!

**Comment 37: Julia Simone**

Keep Park Village in PQ and District 5!

**Comment 38: Vishala Bharathi Paliapoto**

I support keeping all of PQ in Dist. 5. We don't want to see PQ in Dist. 6. We don't share common interests, schools, shopping, sports, etc., with Mira Mesa, Miramar, Kearny Mesa or Linda Vista. Hope our voice is heard. Please keep

**Comment 39: Wei Paxson**

I am Chinese, I live in Park Village. I do not agree that Park Village should be split out to District 6. I have lived in Park Village for four years and have many friends in Park Village. I have not heard one Chinese or anybody with other races agree with this proposal to split PV to District 6.

**Comment 40: Lisa Arnold**

Please keep the entire PQ community together. I have lived in San Diego for more than 20 years and the entire time I have been a PQ resident. I love my community and want to continue to be considered a PQ resident.

**Comment 41: Neena Rahman**

Please let us stay united with district five as we share more common interest with the neighborhoods of district five. Please, please, please hear us. We are after all the people for whom all this redistricting is done isn't it?

Hope our voice will reach you. I have come today with little kids. I came to the Tuesday hearing too. I feel now what people in the tribes feel when they are torn apart.

**Comment 42: Beth Hurley**

I strongly believe Park Village should be united with all of PQ in D5. We share athletic leagues, city services (library, Canyonside Park) with PQ. We need to be united with those with whom we share common interests. It only makes sense.

**Comment 43: Wei Paxson**

Park Village is part of District 5 community. Please do not separate us. My children have friends in District 5, not District 6. We share interests in District 5, not District 6.

**Comment 44: Jeff Storey**

PQ for District 5

**Comment 45: James Lin**

One PQ in District 5

**Comment 46: Alan Reyes**

We have lived in the area for 18 years and active with the school, church, and community services of the community. We are opposed to the redistricting of our area with Dist. 6. We want to stay with Dist. 5. Our 3 grown up kids are opposed to that plan. So please keep Park Village with Dist. 5. Thank you.

**Comment 47: Lorna Reyes**

I opposed PQ District 5 to go to District 6.

**Comment 48: Yolanda Nanghi**

I opposed PQ5 going to PQ6.

Is this just for congressional zoning purposes? OR concern about house values, property tax, being affected? School district?

**Comment 49: Liang Lin Zhang**

Please keep Park Village in PQ in District 5.

**Comment 50: Qin Zhang**

Please keep Park Village in PQ in District 5.

**Comment 51: Marc Roland**

I understand how difficult this must be for you. I simply would like you to leave my community of Park Village with Peñasquitos united in District 5. We do everything for the most part in our community of PQ, Torrey Highlands, RB. I go the YMCA in PQ, the library in PA, the grocery

store in PQ. We are in the PUSD with Torrey Highlands, RB, 4s Ranch. Please, please, please keep PQ and Park Village united in District 5!

**Comment 52: Yongmei Wang**

Keep Park Village in PQ in District 5 please!!!