

2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

11 JUL 22 AM 10:27

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

DATE: July 21, 2011
TO: City Clerk
FROM: 2010 Redistricting Commission
SUBJECT: Filing of Preliminary Redistricting Plan for the City of San Diego

INTRODUCTION

The City of San Diego 2010 Redistricting Commission (“the Redistricting Commission”) is vested with sole and exclusive authority to adopt plans that specify the boundaries of districts for the San Diego City Council. San Diego City Charter sections 5 and 5.1 were enacted by the voters in 1992 to create an independent Redistricting Commission to draw City Council districts in compliance with the law.

The seven-member Redistricting Commission voted 5-2 to adopt a Preliminary Redistricting Plan (“the Plan”) on July 21, 2011. The Plan complies with the redistricting criteria and legal requirements of San Diego City Charter sections 5 and 5.1; the U.S. Constitution; the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965; and related cases and statutes. The Redistricting Commission considered and relied upon traditional redistricting criteria in drawing and adopting new City Council district boundaries. The Redistricting Commission also added a ninth Council district, as directed by the voters of the City of San Diego in a Charter amendment enacted in 2010.

In preparing the Plan, the Redistricting Commission followed these principles:

- Equalize the population by forming City Council districts designated by numbers 1 to 9, inclusive, which contain, as nearly as practicable, one-ninth of the total population of the City of San Diego as shown by the federal Census numbers of 2010;
- Avoid diluting the voting strength of protected classes as set forth in the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965;
- Provide fair and effective representation for all citizens of the City, including racial, ethnic, and language minorities, and be in conformance with the requirements of the United States Constitution and Federal statutes;
- Use contiguous territory to form districts, with reasonable access between population centers in the district;
- Use whole Census tracts or blocks to the extent it is practical to do so;
- Preserve identifiable communities of interest;
- Observe natural boundaries as district dividing lines;

- Draw districts as geographically compact as possible and practical to do so;
- Not draw districts for the purpose of advantaging or protecting incumbents;
- Recognize that the City has a well-organized group of communities and neighborhoods, which has created strong communities of interest; and thus, ensure that each community planning area and neighborhood is intact in a single district to the extent possible, while adhering to the law and applying and balancing traditional redistricting principles.

Meetings and testimony: The Redistricting Commission convened 33 public meetings between October 21, 2010 and July 21, 2011, each noticed in accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act. These meetings included two Introductory Hearings in the community, and nine widely publicized Pre-Map Public Hearings, one in each City Council district and one held in Balboa Park, exceeding the requirement of the San Diego City Charter to hold at least four public hearings in various geographic areas of the City before the preparation of a Preliminary Redistricting Plan. Approximately 850 people attended these hearings.

During those hearings, the Redistricting Commission heard from more than 380 public speakers and received approximately 61 written comments. During its regular meetings held since November 4, 2011, the Commission also heard from approximately 300 speakers and received 38 written comments. To date, the Commission has received approximately 950 letters or emails, 195 telephone comments, and 2,000 signatures on petitions. The Commission also received 23 proposed maps from individuals and organizations. Maps submitted to the Commission were posted on its website and its online redistricting mapping program. The testimony, written submissions, telephone comments and maps were considered by the Commission before adopting the Plan.

Public outreach: Public outreach efforts included providing simultaneous interpretation in Spanish at the April 20, 2011 and April 30, 2011 Pre-Map Public Hearings, and language assistance in Spanish at the May 2, 2011 Pre-Map Public Hearing. Agendas, presentation materials, request to speak forms, written comment forms, and instructions on how to provide comment were provided in Spanish at the April 20, April 30, and May 2, 2011 Pre-Map Public Hearings. These materials also were provided in Vietnamese, Tagalog and Spanish at the May 9, 2011 Pre-Map Public Hearing. The dedicated telephone comment line at the Commission office included English and Spanish options. A Commission staff member bilingual in Spanish provided language assistance to telephone callers, and translated public testimony at various Commission meetings. Since February, the Commission's chief of staff has made more than 40 presentations to town councils, community groups and stakeholder organizations in the City.

The Commission has been committed to transparency in its proceedings. To maximize public access to its proceedings, the Commission procured online redistricting mapping software so the public could draw, share, propose and submit maps to the Commission. Public training for the software was held on June 23, 2011. All maps submitted to the Commission and developed by the Commission for consideration are available online. In addition, many Commission meetings were televised and videotapes of Commission meetings are posted to its website.

THE PRELIMINARY PLAN

A map of the Plan (adopted July 21, 2011) is attached. The Plan divides the City's population of 1,301,617 into nine City Council districts of approximately equal population. The Commission's goal was to draw districts with as close to a population of 144,624 as possible, while ensuring districts were drawn in compliance with redistricting law and the principles set forth above. The Plan has a total population deviation of 3.24%. The largest City Council district has a population of 147,375 (+1.91% in population); the smallest district has a population of 142,711 (-1.33% in population). Demographics for the districts, including Citizen Voting Age Population and population by racial groups per district, are detailed in attachments to this statement.

The Commission numbered the nine districts at its meeting on July 19, 2011 after analyzing population statistics and geography of the existing eight Council districts, determining the overlap between existing districts and the proposed new districts, and using that analysis to determine there is a rational basis to assign each of the numbers to a given district. Seven of the nine proposed districts (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8) will include more than 50% of the population from the district that previously had that number. (The Census statistics used for this analysis can be found in an attached matrix.)

This Plan is described below in detail. The Charter directs that the Redistricting Commission consider U.S. Census data. Thus, all definitions of neighborhoods that follow have been matched to the nearest and most logically corresponding Census Block border, but may differ from City maps in which City definitions do not follow Census geography. Detailed demographics for each City Council district in the Plan appear at the end of this filing statement. The Districts may be summarized as follows:

DISTRICT 1

- Community Planning Areas
 - Carmel Valley
 - Del Mar Mesa
 - Fairbanks Ranch Country Club
 - La Jolla
 - Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—western part)
 - NCFUA Subarea II
 - Pacific Highlands Ranch
 - Torrey Hills
 - Torrey Pines
 - University
 - Via de la Valle

- Neighborhoods
 - Carmel Valley
 - Del Mar Heights
 - La Jolla (partial—area in La Jolla Community Planning Area)

- La Jolla Village
 - North City
 - Pacific Beach (partial—area in La Jolla Community Planning Area)
 - Sorrento Valley (partial—area in University Community Planning Area)
 - Torrey Pines
 - Torrey Preserve
 - University City
- Demographics
 - Total population: 147,375
 - Deviation: +1.91% (+2,751 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 96% of the population to be included in the new District 1 is presently included in City Council District 1.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Carmel Valley and La Jolla are connected by Interstate 5. Del Mar Heights Road and State Route 56 also connect communities. La Jolla and University City are connected by La Jolla Village Drive and Nobel Drive.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - The Commission intended to keep coast and canyon communities together because they share common interests and concerns.
 - The Commission agreed that the University of California - San Diego (UCSD) is a community of interest that is connected to the communities of University City and La Jolla, and all three must be kept together in one district.
 - The Commission did not wish to split North and South University City, in keeping with the principle that neighborhoods and community planning areas should be kept intact.
 - The Commission agreed that the high-tech business community in this area should be kept in one district.
 - Natural boundaries used include Interstate 805 and State Route 52. A portion of land east of Interstate 805 with a population of two people was included to keep the University Community Planning Area intact.
 - The Commission wished to keep the La Jolla Community Planning Area intact in one district.
 - The Commission determined that Carmel Valley is connected to and shares similarities with the western portions of District 1 and other coastal and coastal-influenced communities.
 - The Commission determined that Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Hills, Via de la Valle and Fairbanks Ranch Country Club planning areas needed to be kept together in one Council district.
 - Larger deviation was acceptable for this district in order to make the district cohesive and keep communities together.

- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing other criteria and community of interest boundaries.

DISTRICT 2

- Community Plan Areas
 - Clairemont Mesa (partial—area west of Tecolote Canyon)
 - Linda Vista (partial—the Morena neighborhood and University of San Diego (USD))
 - Midway-Pacific Highway
 - Mission Bay Park
 - Mission Beach
 - Ocean Beach
 - Pacific Beach
 - Peninsula
- Neighborhoods
 - Bay Ho
 - Bay Park
 - La Jolla (partial—area in Pacific Beach Community Planning Area)
 - La Playa
 - Loma Portal
 - Midway
 - Mission Beach
 - Morena (including all of USD)
 - Ocean Beach
 - Pacific Beach (partial—area in Pacific Beach Community Planning Area)
 - Point Loma Heights
 - Roseville/Fleet Ridge
 - Sunset Cliffs
 - Wooded Area
- Demographics
 - Total population: 142,711
 - Deviation: -1.33% (-1,913 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 77.6% of the population to be included in the new District 2 is presently included in City Council District 2.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Pacific Beach, Mission Beach, Ocean Beach, Point Loma and San Diego International Airport are accessible by Interstate 5. Midway Drive, Ingraham Street and Nimitz Boulevard are major connecting streets. Mission Bay Drive and Mission Bay Boulevard connect Mission Beach to Pacific Beach. The Pacific Beach area is connected to Interstate 5 by Grand Avenue and Garnet Avenue. Garnet Avenue and Balboa Avenue connect Pacific Beach to Bay Ho and Bay Park.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - This district reflects an intent by the Commission to bring together the beach communities of Ocean Beach, Mission Beach and Pacific Beach, as well as the peninsula of Point Loma, into one district.
 - The Commission determined that these areas share common issues including concern for their beaches and bays, tourism in the area, and environmental issues, including issues of traffic, noise and pollution impacts from Lindbergh Field, which is also included in the district.
 - The Commission determined that downtown should be removed from this district, as it does not share common interests with these coastal areas, and was not well-represented in a district that included downtown.
 - Although they are part of the Clairemont and Linda Vista community planning areas, the Commission determined that Bay Ho, Bay Park, and Morena should be included in the district, in recognition of the importance of Mission Bay to neighborhood residents and their proximity, recreational opportunities, and views related to the bay.
 - The Commission determined that Loma Portal and Point Loma should be kept together.
 - The Commission determined that USD is a community of interest that needs to be kept as intact as possible. One Census block within it was determined to be too large and thus was split in order to unite the USD campus.
 - The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

DISTRICT 3

- Community Plan Areas
 - Balboa Park
 - Centre City
 - Greater Golden Hill
 - Greater North Park
 - Normal Heights
 - Old Town San Diego
 - Uptown
- Neighborhoods
 - Adams North
 - Balboa Park
 - Bankers Hill
 - Burlingame
 - Core-Columbia
 - Cortez Hill
 - East Village
 - Gaslamp Quarter

- Golden Hill
 - Harbor View
 - Hillcrest
 - Horton Plaza
 - Little Italy
 - Marina
 - Midtown
 - Mission Hills
 - Normal Heights
 - North Park
 - Old Town
 - Park West
 - South Park
 - University Heights
- Demographics
 - Total population: 147,117
 - Deviation: +1.73% (+2,493 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 57.5% of the population to be included in the new District 3 is presently included in City Council District 3.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Old Town, Mission Hills, Park West, Bankers Hill, Balboa Park, and Golden Hill are accessible by Interstate 5. University Heights, Hillcrest, Balboa Park and Downtown are accessible by State Route 163 (Cabrillo Freeway). Hillcrest is connected to University Heights by University Avenue. University Heights and Normal Heights are connected by Adams Avenue and Interstate 805. The North Park and Normal Heights areas are connected to the South Park and Golden Hill areas by Interstate 805 and Interstate 15. Broadway and B Street connect the Downtown area to San Diego City College and Golden Hill.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - The Commission determined that Balboa Park is a major common interest of many of the neighborhoods in this district.
 - The Commission wished to unite the older, urban communities of character surrounding Balboa Park, including Hillcrest, Downtown, North Park, South Park, and Golden Hill.
 - The Commission wished to move the district to the west, to fully include Mission Hills and Old Town, which share common interests with the other neighborhoods included. Moving the district to the west resulted in excluding the Kensington/Talmadge area, but also prevented fragmentation of the City's Latino and new-immigrant population located in the City Heights area (see discussion of new District 9 below.)

- The Commission removed portions of City Heights from District 3 as City Heights does not generally share demographic and socioeconomic interests similar to the other neighborhoods in this district, and to allow City Heights to be united into a single new district, District 9.
- The Commission found the LGBT (Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender) Community to be a community of interest with a large population residing south of Interstate 8 in communities with similar housing of a certain age, which should be included in a single district within the boundaries of this Council district. The Commission considered that the LGBT community of interest has historically been represented by Council District 3 and wished to draw a district that respects this history and provides fair representation for the community.
- Testimony from the LGBT community supported including Downtown within this district, in contrast to residents of District 2's coastal areas who asked that Downtown be removed from their Council district.
- The Commission found that Mission Hills, Bankers Hill, Old Town, and Little Italy share common interests with other neighborhoods in the proposed district, after hearing public testimony indicating their common interests.
- The Commission wished to unite Mission Hills and Hillcrest in a single district.
- Golden Hill was united with District 3 based upon its proximity and connection to Balboa Park and to balance population deviation.
- Downtown neighborhoods were found to share a community of interest, which was a compelling reason to unite them all. The addition of Little Italy added a slightly higher deviation for the district, but its inclusion with the rest of downtown was a compelling reason to include it with District 3 (as opposed to District 2).
- Natural boundaries for this district include Interstate 805, Interstate 8 and State Route 94 (Martin Luther King, Jr. Freeway)
- Although located primarily in the Mission Valley Community Planning Area, a block located west of Interstate 15 was added to District 3 in order to include residential units at the end of Cromwell Court.
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

DISTRICT 4

- Community Plan Areas
 - Eastern Area (partial—neighborhoods of Oak Park, Redwood Village, Rolando Park, and Webster)
 - Encanto Neighborhoods
 - Skyline-Paradise Hills
 - Southeastern San Diego (partial—area east of Boundary Road between Imperial Avenue and Logan Avenue)

- Neighborhoods
 - Alta Vista
 - Bay Terraces
 - Broadway Heights
 - Chollas View
 - Emerald Hills
 - Encanto
 - Jamacha
 - Lincoln Park
 - Lomita
 - Mountain View (partial—area east of Boundary Road between Imperial Avenue and Logan Avenue)
 - Oak Park
 - Paradise Hills
 - Redwood Village
 - Rolando Park
 - Skyline
 - Valencia Park
 - Webster

- Demographics
 - Total population: 142,727
 - Deviation: -1.32% (-1,897 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 94% of the population to be included in the new District 4 is presently included in City Council District 4.

- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Rolando Park, Redwood Village, Broadway Heights, Emerald Hills, and Webster are connected by State Route 94 (Martin Luther King, Jr. Freeway). North Encanto and Emerald Hills are connected by Akins Avenue. State Route 54 (South Bay Freeway) connects Bay Terraces South and Paradise Hills in the southern portion of District 4.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - The Commission largely respected the current boundaries of District 4, consistent with public testimony that the district be kept as close as possible to its present boundaries, while recognizing that it needed to lose population consistent with creating a new 9th District.
 - The Commission recognized that District 4 has a large, geographically compact African-American population and that it has historically been an African-American influence district. The Commission wished to draw a district that respected that history. The district also has a well-established community of interest surrounding its churches, schools, and neighborhoods. District 4's population will be 19.8% African-American, 41.5% Hispanic, and 23.9% Asian.

- The Commission determined that the Webster and Oak Park communities should be included in District 4, consistent with public testimony on the interests of those communities.
- To reduce the deviation and balance population numbers for the district, a portion of Mountain View was removed from District 4, also consistent with public testimony.
- Natural boundaries for the district include the City's boundaries, Interstate 805, and State Route 94 (Martin Luther King, Jr. Freeway).
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria. (Note: There is a small portion of land adjacent to the district that is not part of the City of San Diego, but that is the site of a cemetery.)

DISTRICT 5

- Community Plan Areas
 - Black Mountain Ranch
 - Carmel Mountain Ranch
 - Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—western area)
 - Miramar Ranch North
 - Rancho Bernardo
 - Rancho Encantada
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area north of State Route 56 or east of Salmon River Road)
 - Sabre Springs
 - San Pasqual
 - Scripps Miramar Ranch
 - Torrey Highlands

- Neighborhoods
 - Black Mountain Ranch
 - Carmel Mountain Ranch
 - Miramar Ranch North
 - Rancho Bernardo
 - Rancho Encantada
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area north of State Route 56 or east of Salmon River Road)
 - Sabre Springs
 - San Pasqual
 - Scripps Miramar Ranch
 - Torrey Highlands

- Demographics
 - Total population: 143,961
 - Deviation: -0.46% (-663 people)

- Historical: Approximately 65.3% of the population to be included in the new District 5 is presently included in City Council District 5.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Rancho Peñasquitos, Sabre Springs, and Scripps Ranch are connected north and south by Interstate 15. The Ted Williams Freeway (State Route 56) connects Torrey Highlands, Rancho Peñasquitos, Sabre Springs, and Carmel Mountain Ranch east and west.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - The Commission determined that the neighborhoods in this district share similar socioeconomic factors.
 - In accordance with public testimony, a group of neighborhoods was kept together based upon the community of interest formed by their inclusion in the Poway Unified School District, with the exception of Rancho Peñasquitos, which was split to balance population. Therefore, a portion of this North City community was included in a district to its south. A natural dividing line for the split is State Route 56 and Salmon River Road.
 - The western boundary of District 5 was drawn in part to respect the desire of those who testified from District 1 that they wanted to keep coastal communities together. This decision kept Torrey Highlands in District 5, in part to balance population deviation.
 - The Commission determined that a number of the neighborhoods included in District 5 are affected by the threat of wildfires and share a common interest in that regard. Not all such neighborhoods could be included in District 5, however, because fire is an issue to more communities than can be included in one district, making it difficult to create a “fire district” that is sufficiently compact.
 - The Commission determined that Rancho Encantada should be united with Scripps Miramar Ranch and Miramar Ranch North into one Council district. Rancho Encantada (now Stonebridge Estates) previously had been included in District 7, but was isolated from the rest of the population in that district and had a large geographic separation from it. The closest population center to Rancho Encantada in District 7 is south of Miramar in Tierrasanta. At the time of the last redistricting, Rancho Encantada had not yet been developed. Members of the public testified that the Scripps Miramar Ranch and Miramar Ranch North planning groups took responsibility for its planning, and that the Scripps Miramar Ranch planning group received facilities benefits assessment money from its development. Members of the public requested that the three areas be kept together because of their connection, as described above, and their contiguity.
 - Natural boundaries include the City’s North and East limits, the Interstate 15 corridor and the 56 freeway. Interstate 15 is a significant central travel corridor that defines the district.
 - Although the Commission did not wish to split communities, a portion of Rancho Peñasquitos was removed from this district to achieve more equalized population.

This was unavoidable after the Commission's decision to unite Rancho Encantada, Scripps Miramar Ranch and Miramar Ranch North.

- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible, recognizing that the City's North and East boundaries have jagged lines and while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

DISTRICT 6

- Community Plan Areas
 - Clairemont Mesa (partial—area east of Tecolote Canyon)
 - Kearny Mesa (partial—area north of Aero Drive)
 - Linda Vista (partial—area northeast of Genesee Avenue)
 - Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—eastern part)
 - MCAS Miramar (partial—area west of Interstate 15)
 - Mira Mesa
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area south of State Route 56 and west of Salmon River Road)
- Neighborhoods
 - Clairemont Mesa East
 - Clairemont Mesa West
 - Kearny Mesa
 - Linda Vista (partial—area northeast of Genesee Avenue)
 - MCAS Miramar (partial—area west of Interstate 15)
 - Mira Mesa
 - North Clairemont
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area south of State Route 56 and west of Salmon River Road)
 - Sorrento Valley (partial—area in Mira Mesa Community Planning Area)
- Demographics
 - Total population: 144,099
 - Deviation: -0.37% (-525 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 38.6% of the population to be included in the new District 6 is presently included in City Council District 6. Approximately 50.5% of the population to be included in the new District 6 comes from the current District 5. (However, 65.3% of the population included in the new District 5 also comes from District 5.) Approximately 7.4% of the population to be included in the new District 6 comes from the current District 1.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Mira Mesa, Miramar, and Kearny Mesa are connected north and south by Interstate 15 to the east. Mira Mesa, Miramar, North

Clairemont, Clairemont Mesa East, and Kearny Mesa are connected by Interstate 805 in the west. Black Mountain Road and Kearny Villa Road connect Mira Mesa, Miramar West and Kearny Mesa to the north and south. State Route 52 connects Kearny Mesa and North Clairemont east and west.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

- The Commission determined that Mira Mesa and Sorrento Mesa should be kept together in one district, that Mira Mesa should not be divided, and that Mira Mesa is connected to Kearny Mesa and together they are a community of interest.
- The Commission determined that there is a community of interest among the Asian population in this proposed district that shares business interests, cultural activities, and social ties and concerns. That population is sufficiently geographically compact to comprise 33.2% of the district's population (the largest in the City), thus combining neighborhoods to provide fair and effective representation to the community, insofar as practicable while balancing the Commission's other redistricting goals, and adhering to redistricting law and principles.
- The Commission heard public testimony asking that Mira Mesa, Rancho Peñasquitos, Miramar, Kearny Mesa, North University City, Torrey Highlands and Sorrento Valley be combined into one district. The proposed district combines Mira Mesa and Kearny Mesa with portions of Rancho Peñasquitos, Miramar, Sorrento Valley, and other communities. It was not possible to keep the whole of Rancho Peñasquitos in this district and also address other competing redistricting interests and goals as described above. There was testimony seeking to add North University City to this district; however, there was also testimony that University City should be kept whole and forms a community of interest with the University of California – San Diego (UCSD) and La Jolla. The Commission determined that University City should not be split and that it wished to keep UCSD, University City and La Jolla united in a community of interest related to the university. Torrey Highlands and a portion of Sorrento Valley were not included in the district to address other competing redistricting interests and goals, including compactness, contiguity and population deviation. A portion of Sorrento Valley was not included because it is in the Torrey Pines Community Planning Area, which was kept intact in District 1.
- To minimize population deviation, a portion of Linda Vista north of Genesee and west of State Route 163 was added to this district.
- A common area of interest to many of the communities in this district is MCAS Miramar. These communities include enlisted personnel and their families as well as social, business and commercial interests surrounding MCAS.
- The Commission determined that the North Clairemont area and Hickman Field should be included in one district.
- Natural boundaries for the district include Interstate 15, Interstate 805 and Aero Drive.
- Although they are part of the Clairemont and Linda Vista Community Planning Areas, the neighborhoods of Bay Ho, Bay Park, and Morena were removed from

District 6 and included in District 2 in recognition of the importance of Mission Bay to those neighborhoods due to proximity, recreational opportunities, and views.

- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

DISTRICT 7

- Community Plan Areas

- East Elliott
- Kearny Mesa (partial—area south of Aero Drive)
- Linda Vista (partial—neighborhood of Linda Vista except area northeast of Genesee Ave)
- MCAS Miramar (partial—area east of Interstate 15)
- Mission Valley
- Navajo
- Serra Mesa
- Tierrasanta

- Neighborhoods

- Allied Gardens
- Birdland
- Del Cerro
- Grantville
- Lake Murray (East San Carlos)
- Linda Vista (partial—area southeast of Genesee Avenue)
- MCAS Miramar (partial—area east of Interstate 15)
- Mission Valley East
- Mission Valley West
- San Carlos
- Serra Mesa
- Tierrasanta

- Demographics

- Total population: 143,752
- Deviation: -0.61% (-872 people)
- Historical: Approximately 54.7% of the population to be included in the new District 7 is presently included in City Council District 7.

- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Miramar East, Tierrasanta, Grantville, Serra Mesa, and Mission Valley East are connected north and south by Interstate 15. Mission Valley West, Mission Valley East, Grantville, and Del Cerro are connected east and

west by Interstate 8. Miramar East, Tierrasanta, and Mission Trails Regional Park are connected east and west by State Route 52. Many of the neighborhoods border Interstate 8 and the San Diego River.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

- The Commission determined that Mission Trails Regional Park and the communities that surround it, including Tierrasanta, Navajo and San Carlos, form a community of interest based on their close connection to the park and should be kept together.
- The Commission determined that another community of interest in the area is the northern part of MCAS Miramar.
- The San Diego River Basin runs along the Interstate 8 corridor, and the communities bordering it are united in this district for the first time. These neighborhoods share common issues including concerns about traffic, noise, and flooding from the river. These neighborhoods include Mission Valley and the communities to its north, including Serra Mesa and Linda Vista, which also share common issues related to the traffic.
- Tierrasanta and Navajo residents testified that they are also a community of interest, along with Allied Gardens, Del Cerro, San Carlos, and Grantville.
- Many consider the part of Kearny Mesa south of Aero Drive to be part of Serra Mesa and it is included in this district.
- Mission Valley was included because of topography, connectivity, and schools. Topographically, the south slopes of the valley are steep and serve as a natural barrier between the communities located on the mesa to the south. The north slopes, however, are more gradual and there is not as clear demarcation from the communities to the north. The more gradual slopes also allow greater connectivity to the north; connecting streets include Napa Street, Colusa Street, Goshen Street, Via Las Cumbres, Ulric Street, Mission Center Road, and Mission Village Drive. With the exception of one residential project (the Mission Village Condominiums), located on the south side of Hotel Circle South between Taylor Street and Bachman Place, all other residential areas are north of Interstate 8; elementary school students from these residential areas attend elementary school in Linda Vista (Carson) and Serra Mesa (Jones and Juarez).
- The inclusion of Kearny Mesa south of Aero Drive was intended for the following reasons: (1) to recognize the interface between commercial and industrial development along Aero Drive and adjacent residences of Serra Mesa; and (2) because the Stonecrest residential development west of Interstate 15 relates more to Serra Mesa than to the industrial/commercial areas of Kearny Mesa to the north, and whose elementary students attend Cubberley Elementary School in Serra Mesa. This area also includes the Serra Mesa-Kearny Mesa Library that primarily serves the Serra Mesa community.
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

DISTRICT 8

- Community Plan Areas
 - Barrio Logan
 - Otay Mesa
 - Otay Mesa-Nestor
 - San Ysidro
 - Southeastern San Diego (partial—neighborhoods of Grant Hill, Logan Heights, Memorial, Shelltown, Sherman Heights, and Stockton)
 - Tijuana River Valley

- Neighborhoods
 - Barrio Logan
 - Border
 - Egger Highlands
 - Grant Hill
 - Logan Heights
 - Memorial
 - Nestor
 - Ocean Crest
 - Otay Mesa
 - Otay Mesa West
 - Palm City
 - San Ysidro
 - Shelltown
 - Sherman Heights
 - Stockton
 - Tijuana River Valley

- Demographics
 - Total population: 144,830
 - Deviation: +0.14% (+206 people)
 - Historical: 100% of the population to be included in the new District 8 is presently included in City Council District 8.

- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous to the extent possible because of the need to equalize the population and to connect population in the South Bay to population in the north. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Grant Hill, Logan Heights, Barrio Logan, Shelltown, Otay Mesa-Nestor and the Tijuana River Valley are connected north and south by Interstate 5. Otay Mesa-Nestor and Otay Mesa are connected north and south by Interstate 805 and east and west by State Route 905.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - The Commission recognized that this district has very unique geography, which drives the district boundaries. The configuration requires that the South Bay be connected to communities to the north through a bay corridor under San Diego Bay, as historically has been the case. The district is geographically compact to the extent possible. It must bypass population of other cities to reach from the southern portion to the northern portion of the district.
 - The Commission left the South Bay portion of the existing district intact. The Commission did not wish to fragment or dilute the Latino population and voting population, and recognized and wished to respect the fact that this is a geographically compact population that is sufficiently large to form a majority-minority Latino Council District, as it has for many years. The new District 8 will include a population that is 75% Latino, 10.2% White, 4.6% African-American and 8.9% Asian. The voting age population of the district is 64% Hispanic.
 - The Commission also determined that the South Bay communities should remain together in one district because of common socioeconomic data and communities of interest.
 - In order to balance the population, the Commission joined the South Bay with a portion of the City to the north and included Shelltown.
 - The Commission wished to keep the Historic Barrio District together, including Barrio Logan, Sherman Heights, Logan Heights, Grant Hill, Stockton, and Memorial. The proposed District 8 also reflects an intention not to connect these communities with the Downtown business and commercial interests, because their interests are not the same as those of the Historic Barrio District.
 - Natural boundaries include State Route 94 and the City limits.
 - The San Diego Bay corridor between Imperial Beach and Chula Vista connects the southern and northern part of the district.

DISTRICT 9

- Community Plan Areas
 - City Heights
 - College Area
 - Eastern Area (partial— neighborhoods of Rolando and El Cerrito)
 - Kensington-Talmadge
 - Southeastern San Diego (partial—area east of Interstate 15 except Shelltown and the area east of Boundary Road)
- Neighborhoods
 - Azalea Park
 - Bay Ridge
 - Castle
 - Cherokee Point
 - Chollas Creek
 - Colina del Sol
 - College East

- College West
 - Corridor
 - El Cerrito
 - Fairmont Park
 - Fairmont Village
 - Fox Canyon
 - Hollywood Park
 - Islenair
 - Kensington
 - Mt Hope
 - Mountain View (partial—area west of Boundary Road)
 - Ridgeview
 - Rolando
 - Southcrest
 - Swan Canyon
 - Talmadge
 - Teralta East
 - Teralta West
- Demographics
 - Total population: 145,045
 - Deviation: +0.29% (+421)
 - Historical: This is a new Council District, reflecting a vote of the people in 2010 to add a ninth Council District. The new district combines part of four districts:
 - 46.6% of the people in the new District 9 were previously in District 3;
 - 34.8% of the people in the new District 9 were previously in District 7;
 - 14.3% of the people in the new District 9 were previously in District 4;
 - 4.3% of the people in the new District 9 were previously in District 8.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Kensington, Corridor, Teralta East, Cherokee Point Castle, Mount Hope, Mountain View, and Southcrest are connected north and south by Interstate 15. Corridor, Kensington, Talmadge, College Area West, Teralta East, El Cerrito, and Rolando are connected east and west by University Heights and University Avenue. Ridgeview, Mount Hope, and Mountain View are connected north and south by Interstate 805.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - The Commission expressed an intention to unite City Heights in one new Council District, including Cherokee Point, Corridor, Castle, Teralta East, Teralta West, and Ridgeview. City Heights had previously been in three Council districts.
 - The Commission included the areas immediately to the north of City Heights, including Kensington, Talmadge and College, which permitted District 3 to be shifted west and allowed the Commission to form a district around the unique interests and needs of City Heights.

- The district has the largest population of immigrants in the City, which has unique needs in the community. The district also has a large number of low-income residents, kept together with the new immigrants because of their shared economic interests, including affordable housing, jobs, economic development, access to facilities like parks and libraries, and transit.
- The Commission considered the shared impacts of San Diego State University on surrounding areas to the south, including the university's impacts on traffic and housing, and included those communities.
- Natural boundaries include Interstate 8, Interstate 15 and Interstate 805.
- A portion of Mountain View was included in the district, consistent with testimony specifying where the area should be split, and to balance population deviation.
- The district includes a majority-minority population of Latinos. The Commission did not wish to dilute the voting strength of this significant Latino community and drew boundaries that it believed provided fair representation. The new district will be diverse in ethnicity, with a large Latino population as well as significant African-American and Asian populations. The district's population is 50.3% Hispanic; 23.2% White; 11.2% African-American; and 13.4% Asian.
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. A decision was made to lessen its compactness in order to ensure that the voting strength of the Hispanic community was not diluted and it was provided fair representation. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY PLAN AND UPCOMING HEARINGS

The vote of the Commissioners on the Preliminary Plan on July 21, 2011 was as follows:

- Voting "yes" for the Preliminary Plan as submitted: Commissioners Dr. Anisha Dalal, Frederick W. Kosmo, Jr., Carlos Marquez, Arthur Nishioka, and David Potter.
- Voting "no" for the Preliminary Plan as submitted: Commissioners Ani Mdivani-Morrow and Theresa Quiroz.

In accordance with the requirements of the San Diego City Charter, the Redistricting Commission will now convene five public hearings (more than the three required by the Charter) in various geographic areas of the City in the next 30 days and before a Final Redistricting Plan is adopted by the Commission. The Redistricting Commission may make changes to this Preliminary Plan and filing statement or may adopt it as is. The Final Redistricting Plan shall be effective 30 days after adoption and shall be subject to the right of referendum in the same manner as are ordinances of the City Council. If rejected by referendum, the same Redistricting Commission shall create a new plan pursuant to the criteria set forth in Sections 5 and 5.1 of the San Diego City Charter.

The members of the City of San Diego 2010 Redistricting Commission thank the public for its participation and appreciate the public comment from the many residents of the City of San Diego who participated in the redistricting process during its nine months of hearings since October 2010.

Respectfully submitted,




Dr. Anisha Dalal
Chair of the City of San Diego 2010 Redistricting Commission

On behalf of the 2010 Redistricting Commission:


Dr. Anisha Dalal
Frederick W. Kosmo, Jr.
Carlos Marquez
Ani Mdivani-Morrow
Arthur Nishioka
David Potter
Theresa Quiroz

PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO




Adopted July 21, 2011

PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO



Adopted July 21, 2011

PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO




Adopted July 21, 2011

PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO




Adopted July 21, 2011

PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO



Adopted July 21, 2011

PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO



Adopted July 21, 2011

**PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN
COMMUNITY PLANNING AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOODS BY DISTRICT**

—DISTRICT 1—

Community Planning Areas

Carmel Valley
Del Mar Mesa
Fairbanks Ranch Country Club
La Jolla
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve
(partial—western part)
NCFUA Subarea II
Pacific Highlands Ranch
Torrey Hills
Torrey Pines
University
Via de la Valle

Neighborhoods

Carmel Valley
Del Mar Heights
La Jolla
(partial—area in La Jolla CPA)
La Jolla Village
North City
Pacific Beach
(partial—area in La Jolla CPA)
Sorrento Valley
(partial—area in University CPA)
Torrey Pines
Torrey Preserve
University City

—DISTRICT 2—

Community Planning Areas

Clairemont Mesa (partial—area west of Tecolote Canyon)
Linda Vista (partial—the Morena neighborhood and USD)
Midway-Pacific Highway
Mission Bay Park
Mission Beach
Ocean Beach
Pacific Beach
Peninsula

Neighborhoods

Bay Ho
Bay Park
La Jolla (partial—area in Pacific Beach CPA)
La Playa
Loma Portal
Midway
Mission Beach
Morena (including all of USD)
Ocean Beach
Pacific Beach (partial—area in Pacific Beach CPA)
Point Loma Heights
Roseville/Fleet Ridge
Sunset Cliffs
Wooded Area

**PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN
COMMUNITY PLANNING AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOODS BY DISTRICT**

—DISTRICT 3—

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

Balboa Park
Centre City
Greater Golden Hill
Greater North Park
Normal Heights
Old Town San Diego
Uptown

Adams North
Balboa Park
Bankers Hill
Burlingame
Core-Columbia
Cortez Hill
East Village
Gaslamp Quarter
Golden Hill
Harborview
Hillcrest

Horton Plaza
Little Italy
Marina
Midtown
Mission Hills
Normal Heights
North Park
Old Town
Park West
South Park
University Heights

—DISTRICT 4—

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

Eastern Area
(partial—neighborhoods of Oak Park,
Redwood Village, Rolando Park, and Webster)
Encanto Neighborhoods
Skyline-Paradise Hills
Southeastern San Diego
(partial—area east of Boundary Rd between
Imperial Ave and Logan Ave)

Alta Vista
Bay Terraces
Broadway Heights
Chollas View
Emerald Hills
Encanto
Jamacha
Lincoln Park
Lomita
Mountain View
(partial—area east of Boundary Rd)
Oak Park
Paradise Hills
Redwood Village
Rolando Park
Skyline
Valencia Park
Webster

**PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN
COMMUNITY PLANNING AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOODS BY DISTRICT**

—DISTRICT 5—

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

Black Mountain Ranch
Carmel Mountain Ranch
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve
 (partial—western area)
Miramar Ranch North
Rancho Bernardo
Rancho Encantada
Rancho Peñasquitos
 (partial—area north of CA-56 or east of
 Salmon River Rd)
Sabre Springs
San Pasqual
Scripps Miramar Ranch
Torrey Highlands

Black Mountain Ranch
Carmel Mountain Ranch
Miramar Ranch North
Rancho Bernardo
Rancho Encantada
Rancho Peñasquitos
 (partial—area north of CA-56 or east of Salmon
 River Rd)
Sabre Springs
San Pasqual
Scripps Miramar Ranch
Torrey Highlands

—DISTRICT 6—

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

Clairemont Mesa
 (partial—area east of Tecolote Canyon)
Kearny Mesa
 (partial—area north of Aero Drive)
Linda Vista
 (partial—area northeast of Genesee Ave)
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve
 (partial—eastern part)
MCAS Miramar
 (partial—area west of I-15)
Mira Mesa
Rancho Peñasquitos
 (partial—area south of CA-56 and west of
 Salmon River Rd)

Clairemont Mesa East
Clairemont Mesa West
Kearny Mesa
Linda Vista
 (partial—area northeast of Genesee Ave)
MCAS Miramar
 (partial—area west of I-15)
Mira Mesa
North Clairemont
Rancho Peñasquitos
 (partial—area south of CA-56 and west of
 Salmon River Rd)
Sorrento Valley
 (partial—area in Mira Mesa CPA)

**PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN
COMMUNITY PLANNING AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOODS BY DISTRICT
—DISTRICT 7—**

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

East Elliott
Kearny Mesa
 (partial—area south of Aero Drive)
Linda Vista
 (partial—neighborhood of Linda Vista except area
 northeast of Genesee Ave)
MCAS Miramar
 (partial—area east of I-15)
Mission Valley
Navajo
Serra Mesa
Tierrasanta

Allied Gardens
Birdland
Del Cerro
Grantville
Lake Murray (East San Carlos)
Linda Vista (partial—neighborhood of Linda Vista
 except area northeast of Genesee Ave)
MCAS Miramar (partial—area east of I-15)
Mission Valley East
Mission Valley West
San Carlos
Serra Mesa
Tierrasanta

—DISTRICT 8—

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

Barrio Logan
Otay Mesa
Otay Mesa-Nestor
San Ysidro
Southeastern San Diego (partial—neighborhoods of
Grant Hill, Logan Heights, Memorial, Shelltown,
Sherman Heights, and Stockton)
Tijuana River Valley

Barrio Logan	Otay Mesa
Border	Otay Mesa West
Egger Highlands	Palm City
Grant Hill	San Ysidro
Logan Heights	Shelltown
Memorial	Sherman Heights
Nestor	Stockton
Ocean Crest	Tijuana River Valley

—DISTRICT 9—

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

City Heights
College Area
Eastern Area
 (partial— neighborhoods of Rolando and El
 Cerrito)
Kensington-Talmadge
Southeastern San Diego
 (partial—area east of I-15 except Shelltown
 and the area east of Boundary Rd)

Azalea Park	Hollywood Park
Bay Ridge	Islenair
Castle	Kensington
Cherokee Point	Mt Hope
Chollas Creek	Mountain View (partial— area west of Boundary Rd)
Colina del Sol	Ridgeview
College East	Rolando
College West	Southcrest
Corridor	Swan Canyon
El Cerrito	Talmadge
Fairmont Park	Teralta East
Fairmont Village	Teralta West
Fox Canyon	

Dist	Tot. Pop.	Dev.	% Dev.	NH							
				Hisp	Wht	DOJ Blk	DOJ Ind	DOJ Asn	DOJ Hwn	DOJ Oth	DOJ OthMR
1	147,375	2,751	1.91%	12,564	93,271	1,998	482	37,531	284	600	645
2	142,711	-1,913	-1.33%	19,619	108,477	3,847	1,102	7,341	577	753	746
3	147,117	2,493	1.73%	37,059	85,523	11,058	1,249	10,027	571	513	1,117
4	142,727	-1,897	-1.32%	59,188	16,839	28,251	497	34,043	1,620	279	2,010
5	143,961	-663	-0.46%	13,641	87,076	4,134	634	36,536	527	436	977
6	144,099	-525	-0.37%	23,193	63,056	6,225	831	47,818	993	491	1,492
7	143,752	-872	-0.61%	28,049	84,131	9,071	1,132	18,794	968	479	1,377
8	144,830	206	0.14%	108,630	14,776	6,671	402	12,859	482	209	801
9	145,045	421	0.29%	73,025	33,655	16,268	672	19,370	515	382	1,158
Total	1,301,617	4,664	3.24%	374,968	586,804	87,523	7,001	224,319	6,537	4,142	10,323
Ideal	144,624										

Dist	% Hisp.	% NH							
		Wht	DOJ Blk	DOJ Ind	DOJ Asn	DOJ Hwn	DOJ Oth	DOJ OthMR	
1	8.5%	63.3%	1.4%	0.3%	25.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	
2	13.7%	76.0%	2.7%	0.8%	5.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	
3	25.2%	58.1%	7.5%	0.8%	6.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.8%	
4	41.5%	11.8%	19.8%	0.3%	23.9%	1.1%	0.2%	1.4%	
5	9.5%	60.5%	2.9%	0.4%	25.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	
6	16.1%	43.8%	4.3%	0.6%	33.2%	0.7%	0.3%	1.0%	
7	19.5%	58.5%	6.3%	0.8%	13.1%	0.7%	0.3%	1.0%	
8	75.0%	10.2%	4.6%	0.3%	8.9%	0.3%	0.1%	0.6%	
9	50.3%	23.2%	11.2%	0.5%	13.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.8%	
Total	28.8%	45.1%	6.7%	0.5%	17.2%	0.5%	0.3%	0.8%	

Abbreviations:
 Dev. = Deviation
 Hisp = Hispanic
 NH = "Non-Hispanic"
 Wht = White
 Blk = Black / African American
 Ind = Native American
 Asn = Asian American
 Haw or Hwn = Hawaiian and Pacific Islander
 Oth = Other
 OthMR or MR = Multi-Race
 Fil = Filipino
 "DOJ" = Aggregated according to U.S. Department of Justice guidance
 Reg = Voter Registration
 CVAP = Citizen Voting Age Population

Note: Total population figure adjusted to reflect split of Census Block number 060730090002000. The racial and ethnic subtotals and percentages are not adjusted, as group quarters data on racial and ethnic composition are not yet available from the Census Bureau.

Dist	NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+									Asn +					Asn +				
	18+ Pop	H18+ Pop	NH18+ Wht	NH18+ DOJ Blk	DOJ Ind	DOJ Asn	DOJ Hwn	DOJ Oth	DOJ OthMR	Tot. Reg.	Hisp. Reg.	Asn. Reg.	Fil. Reg.	Asn + Fil. Reg.	Tot. Vote	Hisp. Vote	Asn. Vote	Fil. Vote	Asn + Fil. Vote
1	119,971	9,524	76,924	1,587	369	30,477	215	420	455	78,244	4,206	7,369	594	7,963	53,225	2,418	3,584	12	3,596
2	124,166	15,152	97,315	2,935	955	6,196	458	625	530	81,777	5,873	1,478	660	2,138	52,432	3,120	860	12	872
3	130,812	29,174	80,248	9,420	1,139	9,021	492	445	873	82,508	10,540	1,894	823	2,717	51,040	5,481	1,080	20	1,100
4	103,218	38,396	14,782	20,384	402	26,739	1,216	188	1,111	59,934	18,812	2,076	3,869	5,945	30,135	8,486	916	61	977
5	107,410	8,879	68,016	2,788	461	26,075	369	287	535	79,382	6,383	5,824	2,054	7,878	54,650	3,730	3,186	25	3,211
6	114,027	16,037	53,197	4,460	679	37,650	755	348	901	68,540	9,098	6,799	3,323	10,122	43,356	4,998	3,332	41	3,373
7	113,685	18,946	71,025	6,252	868	14,803	734	313	744	75,013	7,883	3,297	985	4,282	49,809	4,239	1,731	25	1,756
8	103,299	72,895	13,285	5,276	342	10,456	402	148	495	46,452	29,751	371	2,109	2,480	22,521	13,439	146	23	169
9	105,661	46,451	30,508	11,608	577	15,144	403	270	700	51,012	12,761	3,649	561	4,210	25,384	5,176	1,667	16	1,683
Total	1,022,249	255,454	505,300	64,710	5,792	176,561	5,044	3,044	6,344	622,862	105,307	32,757	14,978	47,735	382,552	51,087	16,502	235	16,737

Dist	% NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+ NH18+								% Asn +				% Asn +			
	% H18+ Pop	NH18+ Wht	DOJ Blk	DOJ Ind	DOJ Asn	DOJ Hwn	DOJ Oth	DOJ OthMR	% Hisp. Reg.	% Asn. Reg.	% Fil. Reg.	% Asn + Fil. Reg.	% Hisp. Vote	% Asn. Vote	% Fil. Vote	% Asn + Fil. Vote
1	7.9%	64.1%	1.3%	0.3%	25.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	5.4%	9.4%	0.8%	10.2%	4.5%	6.7%	0.0%	6.8%
2	12.2%	78.4%	2.4%	0.8%	5.0%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	7.2%	1.8%	0.8%	2.6%	6.0%	1.6%	0.0%	1.7%
3	22.3%	61.3%	7.2%	0.9%	6.9%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	12.8%	2.3%	1.0%	3.3%	10.7%	2.1%	0.0%	2.2%
4	37.2%	14.3%	19.7%	0.4%	25.9%	1.2%	0.2%	1.1%	31.4%	3.5%	6.5%	9.9%	28.2%	3.0%	0.2%	3.2%
5	8.3%	63.3%	2.6%	0.4%	24.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	8.0%	7.3%	2.6%	9.9%	6.8%	5.8%	0.0%	5.9%
6	14.1%	46.7%	3.9%	0.6%	33.0%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	13.3%	9.9%	4.8%	14.8%	11.5%	7.7%	0.1%	7.8%
7	16.7%	62.5%	5.5%	0.8%	13.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.7%	10.5%	4.4%	1.3%	5.7%	8.5%	3.5%	0.1%	3.5%
8	70.6%	12.9%	5.1%	0.3%	10.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.5%	64.0%	0.8%	4.5%	5.3%	59.7%	0.6%	0.1%	0.8%
9	44.0%	28.9%	11.0%	0.5%	14.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	25.0%	7.2%	1.1%	8.3%	20.4%	6.6%	0.1%	6.6%
Total	25.0%	49.4%	6.3%	0.6%	17.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.6%	16.9%	5.3%	2.4%	7.7%	13.4%	4.3%	0.1%	4.4%

Note: Total population figure adjusted to reflect split of Census Block number 060730090002000. The racial and ethnic subtotals and percentages are not adjusted, as group quarters data on racial and ethnic composition are not yet available from the Census Bureau.

Dist	Special Tabulation								American Community Survey (ACS)								
	NH		NH			NH			Total	Hisp	NH Wht	Blk	NH Asn	NH Ind	NH Hwn	NH MR	NH Oth
	Total CVAP	Hisp CVAP	Wht CVAP	NH Blk CVAP	NH Asn CVAP	NH Ind CVAP	NH Hwn CVAP	NH MR CVAP									
1	100,003	7,008	74,461	1,033	15,823	77	45	1,555	100,196	7,061	74,504	1,027	15,955	97	64	1,943	2,400
2	118,225	11,235	98,566	2,242	3,743	432	435	1,542	118,220	11,227	98,386	2,305	3,823	642	473	2,244	2,352
3	110,864	17,853	76,874	7,682	4,933	620	370	2,445	110,716	17,906	76,295	7,724	5,039	1,305	432	4,017	4,064
4	80,659	21,391	15,191	20,389	20,137	145	1,750	1,631	80,842	21,413	15,240	20,288	20,508	223	1,983	2,443	5,857
5	93,748	7,209	66,443	2,712	15,096	337	211	1,730	93,268	7,160	65,571	2,794	15,463	414	229	2,534	1,809
6	101,888	12,218	57,121	3,202	26,264	353	343	2,292	101,443	12,260	56,823	3,125	25,885	481	381	3,368	4,241
7	106,598	14,003	74,356	5,607	8,884	633	986	2,140	106,846	14,022	74,316	5,741	9,194	854	994	2,900	3,545
8	72,199	41,567	15,840	6,033	7,335	233	133	1,018	72,390	41,568	15,906	6,311	7,579	594	158	2,115	9,207
9	70,998	18,704	31,800	10,246	8,230	380	172	1,454	70,295	18,464	31,236	10,492	8,137	616	192	2,155	5,362
Total	855,183	151,188	510,652	59,145	110,444	3,210	4,444	15,806	854,215	151,080	508,277	59,807	111,583	5,227	4,905	23,720	38,836

Dist	Special Tabulation								American Community Survey (ACS)								
	% NH		% NH			% NH			% Total CVAP	% Hisp CVAP	% NH Wht CVAP	% NH Blk CVAP	% NH Asn CVAP	% NH Ind CVAP	% NH Hwn CVAP	% NH MR CVAP	% NH Oth CVAP
	% Total CVAP	% Hisp CVAP	Wht CVAP	Blk CVAP	Asn CVAP	Ind CVAP	Hwn CVAP	MR CVAP									
1	83.4%	7.0%	74.5%	1.0%	15.8%	0.1%	0.0%	1.6%	83.5%	7.0%	74.4%	1.0%	15.9%	0.1%	0.1%	1.9%	2.4%
2	95.2%	9.5%	83.4%	1.9%	3.2%	0.4%	0.4%	1.3%	95.2%	9.5%	83.2%	1.9%	3.2%	0.5%	0.4%	1.9%	2.0%
3	84.8%	16.1%	69.3%	6.9%	4.4%	0.6%	0.3%	2.2%	84.6%	16.2%	68.9%	7.0%	4.6%	1.2%	0.4%	3.6%	3.7%
4	78.1%	26.5%	18.8%	25.3%	25.0%	0.2%	2.2%	2.0%	78.3%	26.5%	18.9%	25.1%	25.4%	0.3%	2.5%	3.0%	7.2%
5	87.3%	7.7%	70.9%	2.9%	16.1%	0.4%	0.2%	1.8%	86.8%	7.7%	70.3%	3.0%	16.6%	0.4%	0.2%	2.7%	1.9%
6	89.4%	12.0%	56.1%	3.1%	25.8%	0.3%	0.3%	2.2%	89.0%	12.1%	56.0%	3.1%	25.5%	0.5%	0.4%	3.3%	4.2%
7	93.8%	13.1%	69.8%	5.3%	8.3%	0.6%	0.9%	2.0%	94.0%	13.1%	69.6%	5.4%	8.6%	0.8%	0.9%	2.7%	3.3%
8	69.9%	57.6%	21.9%	8.4%	10.2%	0.3%	0.2%	1.4%	70.1%	57.4%	22.0%	8.7%	10.5%	0.8%	0.2%	2.9%	12.7%
9	67.2%	26.3%	44.8%	14.4%	11.6%	0.5%	0.2%	2.0%	66.5%	26.3%	44.4%	14.9%	11.6%	0.9%	0.3%	3.1%	7.6%
Total	83.7%	17.7%	59.7%	6.9%	12.9%	0.4%	0.5%	1.8%	83.6%	17.7%	59.5%	7.0%	13.1%	0.6%	0.6%	2.8%	4.5%

Note: Total population figure adjusted to reflect split of Census Block number 060730090002000. The racial and ethnic subtotals and percentages are not adjusted, as group quarters data on racial and ethnic composition are not yet available from the Census Bureau.

	Current District	Population	Proportion of New District	Proportion of Current District
District 1				
	1	141,421	96.0%	70.9%
	2	5,952	4.0%	3.6%
	5	2	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	147,375		
District 2				
	2	110,803	77.6%	66.9%
	6	35,594	24.9%	22.8%
	Total	142,711		
District 3				
	2	48,838	33.2%	29.5%
	3	84,610	57.5%	55.6%
	6	8	0.0%	0.0%
	8	9,975	6.8%	6.2%
	Total	147,117		
District 4				
	4	134,331	94.1%	86.6%
	7	8,396	5.9%	5.8%
	Total	142,727		
District 5				
	1	47,406	32.9%	23.8%
	5	94,016	65.3%	56.4%
	7	2,539	1.8%	1.8%
	Total	143,961		
District 6				
	1	10,624	7.4%	5.3%
	5	72,760	50.5%	43.6%
	6	55,687	38.6%	35.6%
	7	5,028	3.5%	3.5%
	Total	144,099		
District 7				
	3	39	0.0%	0.0%
	6	65,027	45.2%	41.6%
	7	78,686	54.7%	54.2%
	Total	143,752		
District 8				
	8	144,830	100.0%	89.9%
	Total	144,830		
District 9				
	3	67,559	46.6%	44.4%
	4	20,788	14.3%	13.4%
	7	50,428	34.8%	34.8%
	8	6,270	4.3%	3.9%
	Total	145,045		

PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

ONLINE MAP

- Access sd-redistricting.esri.com (create log-in if first time user)
- “File” --> “Open” --> “Shared Plans” --> “Everyone”
- Select “Adopted Preliminary Plan” or Plan ID 30402

To ensure full functionality of the online tool, enable pop-up windows on the browser and install Adobe Flash Player version 10.2.

Questions?

Contact the Commission office (619) 533-3060 or
redistricting_2010@sandiego.gov