

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

MONDAY, AUGUST 22, 2011

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

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dalal at 2:18 p.m. 320 persons were observed to be in attendance. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Dalal at 5:46 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:

Commissioner Quiroz 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
(M) David Potter – present
(VC) Vice Chair Carlos Marquez –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 asked everyone in support of keeping Rancho Peñasquitos whole in District 5 to stand. He referenced all the emails and testimony received from Peñasquitos residents. He stated that all had agreed to help proceedings by limiting testimony and applause.

Comment 2 – Valerie Sanfilippo stated that she'd heard on the news that Republicans had hacked into EMPOWER's and other progressives' emails. It is a federal offense and she asked for an investigation. She stated that she had been unable to email the Commission and wondered if it too had been hacked. She questions the political leanings of the Commission. She asked for additional time to work on the map, referencing the pushed back primary election date and stated that if changes aren't made to the preliminary map to reflect post-map testimony, the public isn't being heard.

Comment 3 – Clive Richard, a resident of the new 9th District, thanked the Commission for their work and reaching compromise. He stated that he is happy with his new district lines.

Comment 4 – Brian Pollard stated not every person will be satisfied with the Commission's decisions, but it is important to remain true to their principles and stay the course. He stated that property values, school districts, crime rates, parks and libraries will not change.

COMMISSION COMMENT

None.

CITY ATTORNEY AND STAFF ASSIGNED TO REDISTRICTING COMMISSION COMMENT

Ms. Spivak asked to spend a few minutes talking about the goal for today's meeting. She stated that assuming the Commission stays on the schedule previously agreed to, at the end of today's meeting, the Commission should have a final map that would be presented for a vote on Thursday, August 25. She asked that the Commission have a discussion on the written findings that must accompany the proposed final map, making any changes from the filing statement for the preliminary plan. She and outside counsel will then review the legality of the map as it stands. During the Thursday meeting, she will also ask NDC to present any information that affects the numbering overlay as it relates to the numbering of districts. Finally, she reminded the Commission to keep focused on traditional redistricting principles, public testimony, the VRA, equal protection clause, and population deviation standards that have been discussed over the entirety of the process.

ACTION ITEMS:

ITEM 1 – DEVELOPMENT OF THE FINAL REDISTRICTING PLAN

Comment 1 – Maggie McCann, a Kensington resident, summarized the points in a letter submitted by the Keep Kensington 3 committee. She stated that the letter describes how the area south of Monroe Avenue is in City Heights and where the exact boundaries of Kensington are. She referenced other times that neighbors and CPAs are split in the preliminary plan, as well as instances where a district spans across a freeway. She stated that communities of interests are more important than CPAs because CPAs

are for providing input to developers and are not related to Council District boundaries. She asked that Kensington remain with its other communities of interests to the west.

Comment 2 – Jim Varnadore, a City Heights resident, stated that the preliminary map does not provide a unified City Heights because a piece of City Heights is still in District 4. He asked that it be united including Ridgeview on both sides of Fairmount Ave.

Comment 3 – Micki Johnson with Linda Vista CDC stated that they prefer USD remain with Linda Vista in the same district.

Comment 4 – Janet Kaye with the Linda Vista Town Council asked the Commission to return the jewel of Linda Vista, USD, to District 7. She clarified that in the 8/9 minutes, on page 10, Tom Cleary did not say that USD blends into the Morena district and that pieces of Morena need to be kept with it to protect USD; he did not say that to Commissioner Kosmo. Also, she clarified two statements on page 11, saying that there is no piece of Linda Vista east of 805; and that Linda Vista does not share in the Bay culture with Morena area.

Comment 5 – Dorothy Perez with the Linda Vista Planning Group stated that Linda Vista is multi-cultural and many residents are not involved in politics. She asked for the reunification of Linda Vista on the west side of 163 and east of 5. She stated that no one has advocated for the Morena area to be in District 2.

Comment 6 – Jan Kane, a Rancho Encantada resident, stated that Scripps Ranch Planning Groups and the Scripps Ranch Civic Association have been active in the development of their community since the beginning. They are also linked geographically. They shop together, go to school together, and worship together. She asked that Rancho Encantada be in the same district as Scripps Ranch.

Comment 7 – Joost Bende, former chair of the Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Group, presented two versions of a new map and asked the Commission to vote on it. He discussed the important role of planning groups in districts and in distributing funds. He stated that Rancho Peñasquitos has one planning group, while Scripps Ranch has three. He stated that PUSD is a recognized community of interest by the Commission and asked that all PUSD be kept together. He asked the Commission to unite PQ in District 5.

Comment 8 – Mateo Camarillo with the Latino Redistricting Committee thanked the Commission for the creation of the second Latino district and for reuniting all parts of Barrio Logan in District 8 and reminded the Commission of the two points in the Voting Rights Act including the requirement not to dilute the vote of protected classes and to avoid packing, which he believes is being done with Shelltown at the southern border of District 9.

Comment 9 – Erik Marquis, a member of the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council, stated that in response to the no votes by Commissioners Potter and Kosmo on Commissioner Nishoka's map because of concerns of that Scripps Ranch was not given enough notice, he emailed Scripps Ranch community leaders. He listed everyone he emailed. He stated that he invited the leaders to meeting with them to reach a compromise; they declined. He stated that ScrippsRanch.org posted a notice to residents, letting them know there was still a possibility that Scripps Ranch would be split into two districts. He

concluded that Scripps Ranch has been duly notified of the proceedings and he hopes today the Commission will decide the matter based solely on its merits.

Comment 10 – Jin Liu, a resident of the area of Rancho Peñasquitos in the proposed District 6, stated that although he lives on Adolphia Street, which is not officially a part of Park Village, he shares the same concerns about being split from Rancho Peñasquitos. He asked the Commission to keep Rancho Peñasquitos whole.

Comment 11 – Harvey Payne presented a refined version of Commissioner Nishioka’s map, titled “Keep PQ in D5 Version 2.” He stated that this map has a lower deviation than the August 18 map at 3.58% and asked the Commission to adopt it.

Comment 12 – Valerie Sanfilippo stated that she prefers to retain most of the original District 6, but that since her district is being sacrificed to create an Asian district; her second choice would be Commissioner Quiroz’s API map. She suggested flipping Clairemont and Kearny Mesa.

Comment 13 – Dixie Blake stated that Kensington is not part of District 9 and that their natural boundary is Fairmount. She also stated that it is a disservice to the other communities in District 9 because they do not share the same concerns and would not be mutually supportive.

Comment 14 – Paul Hoover spoke about the formation and work of the Rancho Peñasquitos Fire Safe Council. He stated that research shows that in case of fire, Rancho Peñasquitos would evacuate to the north and stated that Black Mountain Road is closed during wild fires. He stated that Scripps Ranch is evacuated to Mira Mesa High School during wild fires because they are in the same district and share three safe travel routes during wild fires. He stated that Peñasquitos, Black Mountain Ranch, and Torrey Highlands need a single representative to effectively help the community prepare for predicted fires.

Comment 15 – Darshana Patel spoke about the shared facilities and similar concerns between Park Village and the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos, which are not dependent on race or ethnicity. She spoke about the diversity with the API community, and stated that while the API community does not speak with one Pan-American voice, Peñasquitos does speak with one community voice. She presented a petition from the API community members in Rancho Peñasquitos asking that the Commission not split their community to create an API district.

Comment 16 – John Keating stated that he spoke to the Registrar of Voters and they told him that their deadline is a soft one and they can afford the Commission an additional two weeks if necessary. He went over reasons for placing a portion of Scripps Ranch, as opposed to Park Village, into District 6 including accessibility, traffic, schools, places of worship, shopping and dining, employment centers, recreation facilities, and land use. He stated that Scripps Miramar Ranch is a full-service community while Park Village is a neighborhood.

Comment 17 – Bradlee Chang, a 20-year Park Village resident, presented a petition with 5,719 signatures from Rancho Peñasquitos residents asking for a united Peñasquitos in District 5. He showed pictures of the community’s efforts to obtain signatures, and stated that their hub of operation was the Peñasquitos Community Center, located in the proposed District 5.

Comment 18 – Bob Ilko with Scripps Ranch Civic Association stated that they have been involved in the process for many months, presenting their request for a united 92131 zip code. He stated that the City Attorney's office and mapping consultant have confirmed that the preliminary map is legally defensible; making the proposed 11th hour changes could render it indefensible because the changes being are arbitrary and capricious. He stated that it splits a planning area, a development area, their community of interest, and the Scripps Maintenance Assessment District, making it the only MAD in the City which is split amongst two districts. He mentioned the fire councils and recovery programs pioneered in Scripps Ranch, their elder care programs, and their neighborhood watch program - the largest in San Diego.

Comment 19 – Bob Dingeman asked the Commission to endorse the August 18th plan and keep Scripps Ranch united.

Comment 20 – Elissa Barber, VP with the Scripps Ranch Civic Association, asked the Commission to keep Scripps Ranch united, stating that they are a cohesive community across planning groups.

Comment 21 – Rochelle Braunstien, a Scripps Ranch resident, advocated for a united Scripps Ranch citing their cohesiveness across diverse ages, ethnicities, genders and sexual orientations. She asked Commission not to divide the community to appease noisy activists.

Comment 22 – Dustin Steiner with the Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee spoke about facilities and resources shared throughout Scripps Ranch, which includes Miramar Ranch North, Scripps Miramar Ranch, and Rancho Encantada. He stated they are one cohesive community.

Comment 23 – Jay Wilson with the Del Cerro Action Council and Mission Trails Foundation stated that they support the August 18th plan and thanked the Commission for keeping Navajo area whole.

Comment 24 – John Pilch, President of the San Carlos Area Council, asked the Commission to support and finalize the July 21 map.

Comment 25 – Todd Phillips, Chair of the Scripps Ranch Planning Group, stated that splitting Scripps Ranch violates the redistricting principles of contiguity and compactness. He asked the Commission to adopt the July 21st map.

Comment 26 – Bari Vaz with the Mira Mesa Town Council and Planning Group stated that Mira Mesa's prime objective was to keep Mira Mesa whole in one district and thanked the Commission for making that happen. They support all communities' efforts to remain united.

Comment 27 – Rosella Reese spoke on behalf of her parents, Beniga and Vesitacion Bergardo, Peñasquitos residents since 1979. She stated that they've help build Peñasquitos, and now as Park Village residents, they will be split from their community. It is emotional for them.

Comment 28 – David Berry with the Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee stated that residents in Miramar Ranch North or Scripps Miramar consider themselves residents of Scripps Ranch. It is one cohesive community and he asked the Commission to remain true to their core principles and keep them united.

Comment 29 – Jose Lopez thanked the Commissioner for advocating for Latinos and LGBT communities. He asked the Commission to return Kensington to District 3.

Comment 30 – Walt Merrill, an 18-year resident of Park Village, is appalled that he only found out about the redistricting process the previous Saturday. He feels the Commission and the City did not do a good job of disseminating information. If they had more time and more information they would have had more people show up in support of keeping Rancho Peñasquitos whole.

Comment 31 – Mary Ye recently moved into Park Village and immediately felt welcomed. She stated that she and her neighbors share similar values. Her husband attended the APAC meetings and they concluded that although they admire APAC's goal and Dr. Chan's intentions, they feel it is a bad idea to split a community of interest on racial lines.

Comment 32 – Doug Beckham, a lifelong resident of Linda Vista, asked the Commission to reunite USD with Linda Vista.

Comment 33 – Deven Patel, president of APAC, stated that most of the City's growth has been in the northern part of the City. He stated that 51% of the growth has been in the Asian population. He stated that currently, 16% of San Diego's population is API with no City Council representation. He asked the Commission not to divide Peñasquitos or any other high API populated neighborhoods; respect communities of interest; and give fair and equal representation to the API community in San Diego. He cited the organizations that support APAC and their proposed map.

Comment 34 – Michael Sprague gave the Commissioners a map of early Kensington. He stated that when Kensington created their planning group, because it was too small they were forced to move their boundary out to El Cajon Boulevard and group with Talmadge. He stated that 54th Street was the boundary between east and west.

Comment 35 – Anne Shillam stated that Linda Vista is the home of USD and USD has never shared a bond with the Morena area; she is an alumnus and resident of Linda Vista for 40 years and can attest to that. She stated that creating a District 9 south of 8 freeway was solely to create a Latino-majority district.

Comment 36 – Dionne Carlsan, a North Park resident, supports keeping Kensington into District 3 because of their shared interest in historic preservation. She stated that the other communities in District 3 work closely with Kensington.

Comment 37 – Yunqing Shi was active in collecting the signatures for the petitions submitted by Mr. Bradlee Chang and Ms. Darshana Patel. She stated that all 5,719 signatures on Mr. Chan's petition were from residents of the proposed District 5; 94% were from Peñasquitos; 68% were from Park Village. Of the 1,651 signatures collected on Ms. Patel's petition, 89% were from the Peñasquitos area.

Comment 38 – Remigia Bermudez asked the Commission to adopt the July 21st map. In absence of that option, she stated that adding Shelltown into District 9 would allow for Normal Heights to remain whole, add a Latino voting block to District 9, and keep Southcrest and Shelltown united. However, it

creates a large deviation in District 8, she asks the Commission to keep D8 and D9 as in the July 21st map.

Comment 39 – Lee Rittiner presented a new plan titled “8_18 improved plan” in Esri; he outlined the districts as drawn in his map.

Comment 40 – Linda Perine, Chair of the LGBT Redistricting Task Force, asked the Commission to hold fast to the principles they’ve adhered to in creating the preliminary map. She stated that the July 21st map is the outcome of months of work and collaboration. She stated that the splits currently in the map were done where there were clear and compelling reasons, as the Commission is tasked with. She feels that there are no clear and compelling reasons for splitting Kensington.

Comment 41 – Dr. James Paterniti brought a newsletter to illustrate the cohesiveness of Scripps Ranch across neighborhoods and planning groups. He also brought a map and talked about a parcel they donated to the YMCA to benefit not just Scripps Ranch, but the City of San Diego as well. He spoke about their fire safety programs pioneered in Scripps Ranch. He stated that his community uses their resources responsibly and for these reasons, he asks the Commission to leave District 5 as it is in the July 21st map. He also stated that Rancho Peñasquitos is in District 1 currently and they’ve never been in a district with Rancho Bernardo.

Comment 42 – Jeanette Poole stated that the difficult decision to split either Rancho Peñasquitos or Scripps Ranch should be decided based on which community split makes more sense. She asked the Commission if it makes more sense to split a small residential neighborhood with no other support services, or an independent, full-service community that can stand on its own, which is historically affiliated with communities to the west. She asked the Commission to at least consider and review the plan presented by Peñasquitos residents.

Comment 43 – Andy Berg stated that although the Commission has heard vast amounts of testimony in the last few meetings, the choice is still to split either Rancho Peñasquitos or Scripps Ranch. He stated that both communities have similar, strong reasons for remaining united; however, it makes more sense to split Scripps Ranch because they have three distinct communities with two community planning groups, and have historically been in two council districts. Rancho Peñasquitos is in one community planning group and has never been split across Council Districts. He stated that the August 18th plan splits two neighborhoods – Park Village and Torrey Highlands, neither of which have ever been split. He also stated that the Keep PQ in D5 map lowers the deviation in the city-wide map by 1%. He stated that the Commission’s findings state that PUSD is a community of interest; Park Village is the only part of PUSD that isn’t in District 5.

Comment 44 – Tom Hebrank from Kensington stated that the area dispute in the Keep Kensington 3 map is historically City Heights. He stated that this is not about race of class, but about staying with the community of interest along Adams Avenue and the LGBT community.

Chair Dalal called a ten minute recess.

Upon reconvening, Commissioner Potter presented a refined version of Commissioner Nishioka’s boundary in his Park View Scripps plan, similar to the boundary presented in a map by Mr. Shoecraft.

He stated that the map was for Commissioner discussion and not a proposal to revise the preliminary plan.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he is still split on the decision and thanked Commissioner Potter for refining the boundary.

Commissioner Quiroz stated that she has heard it commented that Rancho Peñasquitos was split to give the API community an empowerment district. She stated that Commission based all its decision on the Charter, the VRA, and public testimony. She stated that she recently went back and watched all the mapping meetings where the PQ split was discussed. She summarized how the Commission reached the decision to split Peñasquitos, based on the taped meetings. She stated that the Commission decided to split Peñasquitos based on the totality of the circumstances. She is in favor of keeping the map as it is now; however, she still feels her TQ API map is the answer to this situation.

Commissioner Kosmo discussed the importance of deviation and how because of it either Scripps Rancho or Peñasquitos has to be split. He appreciates the testimony in the last few weeks, but he has to consider the totality of evidence, including conflicting testimony about links between Rancho Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa. He is not comfortable splitting Scripps Ranch at this late hour. He feels the Preserve is more of a shared interest than a natural boundary, and that I-15 is a stronger boundary. For these reasons, he is in favor of leaving D5 as it is in the preliminary plan.

Commissioner Potter stated that he remembers struggling with these splits in the earlier stages of the process and in his original maps. He feels the 56, Salmon River Road and the San Diego Aqueduct are more appropriate boundaries than the proposed boundaries splitting Scripps Ranch. For these reasons, he is also in favor of leaving D5 as is.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that his motion to move the boundary from Salmon River Road to Black Mountain failed at the last meeting, because most Commissioners were not comfortable with the high deviation.

Chair Dalal stated that after exploring this issue extensively, she hears a consensus from the Commissioners that they will not be making any changes to the proposed District 5.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he would have like to see Rolando Park and Redwood Village in the same district with the College area, but for several reasons this move was not made by the Commission. He sees inconsistencies between the arguments used for keeping these neighborhoods in District 4 and the arguments for moving Kensington back into District 3; he wants to treat all neighborhoods fairly and consistently. For these reasons, he wishes to reverse the move of Kensington into District 3.

Motion by Commissioner Nishioka: To move the area of Kensington north of Monroe Avenue from District 3 back into District 9, and the area of Normal Heights south of Monroe Avenue from District 9 back into District 3. Motion seconded by Commissioner Morrow.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that he would support this motion, because the Commission has tried to keep neighborhoods and community planning groups united wherever possible. He also feels I-15 is a more appropriate boundary than Monroe Avenue.

Commissioner Potter will be voting against the motion. He commended the Kensington residents for their research into the matter; it clearly explains why there is a difference in character south of Monroe Avenue. He stated that the Commission has split several Community Planning Areas and neighborhoods, and therefore he feels comfortable making these splits.

Commissioner Marquez will also be voting against the motion. He also commended Kensington residents for their research. He understands that at times residents define their neighborhoods differently than what is on the City's maps and respects Kensington's concerns with preserving their historicity and their strong LGBT community. He also feels that if Kensington is left in District 9, it would consume the Councilmember's attention and cause problems in District 9.

Motion to move the area of Kensington north of Monroe Avenue from District 3 back into District 9, and the area of Normal Heights south of Monroe Avenue from District 9 back into District 3 passed 5–2. Commissioners Morrow, Quiroz, Kosmo, Nishioka, and Dalal are in favor, and Commissioners Potter and Marquez are opposed.

Chair Dalal stated that there were no more changes to the map and they would move on to the findings.

Ms. Spivak asked for confirmation that the final map is essentially the preliminary map with a change to the Linda Vista area. She asked NDC to state into the record what that change was.

Mr. Douglas confirmed that the only change made to the preliminary plan was a shift in Linda Vista. That shift consisted of moving the area north of Genesee from District 6 into District 7, according to the Linda Vista neighborhood and Community Planning Area border.

Ms. Spivak stated that the City Attorney's office will be working on updating all the data and statistics in the opening paragraphs. She asked the Commission to focus on the findings, stating that since some boundaries did not change, the findings probably won't either; however, if the Commission would like to tweak anything in lieu of recent testimony, they can work on that as well. She reminded the Commission that outside counsel would be working on refining the language, so they just need the Commission's direction.

Commissioner Quiroz agreed with Commissioner Potter's suggestion that they include how the Commission identified CPA boundaries.

She also stated that testimony caused her to have concern with the wording "preserve identifiable communities of interest" found at the bottom of the first page that reads. She'd like that to be more clear by adding "for the purpose of representation" after that sentence, because of recent confusion on that issue.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that the additional language suggested by Commissioner Quiroz is not found in the City Charter and adding it may cause some inconsistencies.

Ms. Spivak suggested adding explanatory language somewhere else in the document, but stated that the list on the front page is language taken from the City Charter.

Commissioner Kosmo prefers keeping the City Charter language. Chair Dalal and Commissioner Nishioka agree.

Ms. Spivak asked the Commission to proceed by District and discuss if there will be any changes to those findings.

Commissioner Nishioka asked that the volume of comments and emails be updated.

District 1

Commissioner Potter would like to have a stronger record and read a prepared list of additional findings for District 1.

Commissioner Nishioka asked that the word “must” be changed to “should” in the second bullet item, and he’d like the fourth bullet item to be revised to read that “many of the high-tech business community should be kept together in this area,” because of the high-tech businesses in District 6.

Commissioner Potter suggested some further findings that recognize the relationship between UCSD and the surrounding communities, including goals of its planning group.

Commissioner Quiroz is concerned about the suggest language because it wasn’t stated as such in the testimony.

Commissioner Potter stated that their decisions are not based solely on testimony but on other research as well.

Chair Dalal stated that she wants the language in there, without specifically quoting the planning group goals.

Commissioner Nishioka is supportive of Commissioner Potter’s suggestions, but would like to remain consistent, especially when they get to the discussion of Downtown and South Bay.

Commissioner Potter is also supportive of the additions.

Ms. Spivak will work on summarizing the language in bullet format.

District 2

Commissioner Potter stated that he also has distributed in writing additional findings as to why the Commission kept the Pacific Highway corridor in District 2, since there was testimony to move it into District 3.

Ms. Spivak stated that they will work on summarizing the language to strengthen the findings for inclusion of the Pacific Highway corridor in District 2.

District 3

Commissioner Nishioka thinks it's important to add that keeping Downtown intact is vital to the tourist and convention business.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that they might want to add language about including the small part of East Village in District 8.

District 4

Commissioner Kosmo stated that since members of the public have said that Redwood Village and Rolando Park were included in District 4 to balance population, he'd like to add language stating that this was done to ensure equal protection and for deviation reasons.

All Commissioners are comfortable with this addition.

District 5

Commissioner Potter asked that they clarify the boundaries of Rancho Peñasquitos, specifically on page 10, under Planning Areas and Neighborhoods. He'd like to replace "Salmon River Road" to "San Diego Aqueduct."

Commissioner Kosmo asked to add language regarding the equal protection requirements, and the Charter requirement for equal population, because that was a factor in splitting a community in Rancho Peñasquitos. He'd also like to add that Peñasquitos Canyon is a common interest in Mira Mesa and Rancho Peñasquitos in the District 6 portion.

Chair Dalal stated that there is a bullet that parallels Commissioner Kosmo's comments.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that he'd like to add that portions of District 5 are within the San Diego School District.

Chair Dalal asked Commissioner Kosmo if he meant to add fire-hazard language about the Scripps Ranch and Rancho Bernardo collaboration during recent fires.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that his fire-hazard comments had to do with District 6 and the Peñasquitos Canyon being a shared fire concern.

District 6

Commissioner Potter wants to revise the text on page 12; he'd like to replace "Salmon River Road" to "San Diego Aqueduct." He also wished to add language regarding the boundary between Districts 6 and 7, due to the large amount of public testimony from Linda Vista asking that their community be reunited. They were fearful that their voice would be diminished by being split across three districts. He referred Ms. Spivak to his handout for specific language.

The Commission agreed to include the language as written by Commissioner Potter.

Ms. Spivak asked if the Commission would like to add language about the conflicting testimony regarding communities of interest.

Commissioner Quiroz suggested that after the second bullet about the APAC testimony, they insert a bullet item explaining the testimony from the Park Village residents.

Commissioner Kosmo generally supports that comment; he'd like to include that they heard conflicting testimony about two communities of interest. The Commission attempted to balance the conflicting testimony and produce a map that was fair.

Chair Dalal agrees with Commissioner Kosmo.

Mr. Johnson asked if the Commission wants to add any additional language to the Scripps Ranch findings to balance the argument.

Chair Dalal and Commissioner Kosmo stated that the current findings will suffice.

District 7

Ms. Spivak asked if they should include repeat of the language included under District 6, regarding the reunification of Linda Vista. Commissioner Potter said it could be shortened in this section.

District 8

Ms. Spivak stated that although there was much discussion regarding the portion of District 8 south of Commercial, District 8 stayed the same as in the Preliminary Plan. The findings could remain the same unless the Commission wants to add language.

Commissioner Nishioka wants to add language to the bullet regarding the South Bay community of interest about maquiladores and trans-border businesses in the area.

Chair Dalal stated that although it is a valid point, she did not hear much testimony regarding that aspect of their community and for that reason is hesitant to include it.

Commissioner Nishioka stated that although it wasn't discussed, it is evident and part of his considerations in keeping that area united.

Commissioner Potter concurs with the Chair because the Commission never had any intention of dividing the area and the maquiladores were not mentioned in testimony.

Chair Dalal asked that they include something regarding the area south of Commercial Street and their rationale for keeping it in District 8.

Commissioner Marquez stated that they should include that a portion of land belong to the East Village was kept in Barrio Logan in order to keep the neighborhood whole and because the residents are subject to the environmental health impacts in that area.

Commercial Kosmo asked that they strengthen the Shelltown discussion with Charter language about equal protection and deviation requirements, and possibly mention the testimony for keeping Shelltown in District 8.

Commissioner Marquez is uncomfortable including the language on the public testimony, unless mention of the conflicting testimony for placing Shelltown in District 9 with Southcrest is also included.

Commissioner Kosmo is comfortable stating in the findings that the Commission heard mixed testimony regarding Shelltown, but ultimately decided to keep Shelltown in District 8 for equal protection and population reasons. Commissioners Nishioka, Quiroz, and Dalal concur with Commissioner Kosmo.

District 9

Commissioner Kosmo wants to add that there was conflicting testimony whether to move Kensington into District 3 or keep it in District 9, but ultimately to adhere to the principles of keeping community plans and neighborhoods together, Kensington remained in District 9.

Commissioner Potter is uncomfortable with that finding because those principles were not adhered to elsewhere in the plan.

Commissioner Kosmo stated that to him it seemed that the I-15, community planning areas, and neighborhoods were the determining factors in keeping Kensington in District 3, but deferred to Ms. Spivak to come up with appropriate specific language.

Commissioner Nishioka wants to explore the language Commissioner Marquez used and wondered if it could be added to other areas that were difficult decisions for the Commission.

Ms. Spivak stated that the term deliberative process could be legal language; her office would review and fine-tune the language. She outlined what to expect in the coming days in the process and at the August 25th meeting.

STAFF REPORTS

ITEM 2 –STAFF REPORT

Ms. Wong confirmed the 4:00 pm start time of next meeting on August 25th. Commissioner Nishioka asked Ms. Wong to provide a report on the remaining budget reserve.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Dalal adjourned the meeting at 5:46 p.m.

**Written Comments Received August 22, 2011
Redistricting Commission Meeting**

Comment 1: Eva Vargas

Uniting Southcrest and Shelltown in District 8 or 9 not separate communities. Please refer to August 15th Plan for approval, it includes Shelltown & Southcrest. As I told you in my first meeting with you at the Logan Heights Library, we in Shelltown, all of Shelltown have been organizing through SDOP for 30 years, and we have built up that community from the bleakness of Imminent Domain to what we have today an empowered community and we're still building. Not just SDOP, but a number of non-profit organizations that are empowering the people an empowerment through Unity, building on similarities between us not differences. We are not just numbers, demographics, statistics we are people with hopes and dreams just like our wealthier neighborhoods to north and the west of us. We're resilient people who will like opportunity for a challenge and building new relationships. Something we should all welcome.

Comment 2: Tao Xin

Please keep the whole PQ in D5. Please do not divide our community.

Comment 3: Amy Huang

Please don't divide our community. Keep whole PQ in D5.

Comment 4: Pickels, Lorraine & Ralph

Keep PQ and D5. Redistricting based on ethnicity is intrinsically wrong and sets a dangerous precedent. Balancing Districts for voter registration is acceptable, but neighborhoods want to retain their identity.

Comment 5: Joe Nebel

The Park Village community is very active in PQ and also in District 5. We have advocated for better roads, bike lanes, library hours and fire station staffing in PQ and Rancho Bernardo. We want our representative to do the same. Moving Park Village to another district will disenfranchise us since we will not be able to vote according to our interests. Please keep PQ whole in District 5.

Comment 6: Di Wong

Keep PQ whole in D5.

Comment 7: Yuhong Tang

Please Please Please keep united PQ in District 5!

Comment 8: Kathie Wagner

I am opposed to the current proposed redistrict map separating a long-time community of interest, Rancho Penasquitos. The July 16th map, supported by several North County Inland Planning Groups (PQ, RB, Carmel Mountain...), was consistent with your mission to keep and preserve communities of interest. All of PQ has shared daily activities with our neighborhood to the North and East. We shop, attend schools, and activities within these neighborhoods. We have always been associated with the North County Inland Community. I realize that the community of Scripps Ranch shared like catastrophes but this in and among itself does not create a community of interest. We as humans help other communities get through these hardships. This current map has pitted our community against another fellow community which is awful. As your findings state... “ A deviation may be required to keep communities of interest intact”. Please do what is right and keep PQ intact w/in District 5. Thank you for your time.

Comment 9: Lichung Chu

In the past weekend, I volunteered to collect the signatures for the petition to keep PQ in District 5. I, together with hundreds of my neighbors, manned stations at the community park and grocery stores, and we went door-to-door. I heard many many dissatisfaction and frustration that they never know that part or whole of PQ is going to D6 until the very last minute. Many people didn't know at all until they heard from me. In general, people are very concerned that we are merging with a community with little common interest. Majority of local API people have never heard of APAC and don't want APAC to represent them. This is my personal testimonial regarding what I've heard and seen in the past weekend.

Comment 10: Kathy Gima

Requesting Commission to approve the “Keep PQ whole in D5 map”. The Park Village community is part of Rancho Penasquitos; not our neighbors to the South and across the Penasquitos canyon..

Comment 11: Ron Gima

Please support the “Keep PQ whole in D5 map”. Our neighborhood does not share any commonalities with the neighborhoods of the proposed districting and would not be properly represented.

Comment 12: Phal Chourp

I support APAC propose map. Example, Kensington was apart of District 3 which contain City Heights. The property value there remain as high (if not higher than) Del Cerro. The fear that the PQ property will decline when it become part of D6 is false.

Comment 13: Jose E. Vargas

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

Comment 14: Mirtha Bellido

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

Comment 15: Camila Vargas

Please keep PV (belonging to PQ) in District 5. It unnecessarily affects many families in PV.

Comment 16: Dr. G. T. Kaye

Our organization was pleased to submit a potential redistricting map for your perusal. We trust you reviewed it. The submitted map maintains Linda Vista whole. We request, as all civic organizations within Linda Vista do, that USD be included in new District 7. USD does not share in the bay and sea culture. USD does not need to be aligned with the Morena area. Because I had a large stroke on July 1st, I am unable to attend the remaining meetings. At least I gave input early on. This comment is dictated. Thank you.

Comment 17: Robert Senne

Penasquitos is a district and separate neighborhood which enjoys natural boundary lines. Mercy Road, Penasquitos Canyon, to the South and Campo Del Sur Road to the North. We are separate and distinct from Kearny and Mira Mesa. None of the residents I have spoken to want to be included in a Mira Mesa boundary. Further if you do so you are lowering our property values and in so doing reducing the taxable amounts due to the City in the future. This is a poorly conceived and clumsy idea which will only lead to animosity between the 2 communities. None in PQ desires this plan. I repeat None. Politically, culturally and geographically we are a distinct community.

Comment 18: Philip Liburd

Thank you Commissioners for all the community meetings and the research and input from multiple sources. I want to restart my support to the Redistricting map that was voted on July 21, 2011.