<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time Submitted:</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Meeting Date:</th>
<th>Comment Type:</th>
<th>Agenda Item:</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2021 15:54</td>
<td>Dyno</td>
<td>9/1/2021</td>
<td>Agenda Item Comment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>My name is Dyno and I am an Asian American. I am a resident of National City, but I work in District 1 and South County. I am a Teaching Artist and have taught all throughout San Diego and specifically in South County - I work with a lot of youth from elementary, middle and high schools and I meet families who live in this area - from South Bay, National City, and Barrio Logan. Many of the children and families come from working class backgrounds. The community is very connected and often gather in parks, community centers and school assemblies - prior to the pandemic. There is a strong presence among generations of families and community gatherings. Many of the parents support their children and show up for celebrations after their work. Many families have multiple jobs and have older children who caretake for their younger siblings. There is also a strong presence of culture and cultural traditions in the communities. Many rely on community care and mutual aid in addition to government assistance. We are advocating to keep Point Loma and Coronado separated as the interests and needs of the community greatly contrast the needs of impacted communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2021 15:50</td>
<td>Kristina Mananquil</td>
<td>9/1/2021</td>
<td>Agenda Item Comment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>My name is Kristina Mananquil and I am an Asian American. I am a resident in South County as well as a teaching artist, primarily in Barrio Logan. I have worked with children ages 2 to teens and young adults since 2016. Many children and families in this area share many interests, needs, issue areas. Many families and youth face struggles and challenges such as lack of housing, access to health/mental health and safety (especially in this pandemic), transportation to school and childcare services, incarceration of youth and family members, presence of pollution, gentrified neighborhoods and heavy police presence and criminalization. This community also shares many cultural traditions and celebrations. Many gather in at Chicano park as a home and community. There is also a strong presence of community gatherings and support for local businesses and artists. It is a community of culture and resistance and brilliance. I am advocating for this community to stay separated from areas such as Point Loma and Coronado who cannot relate to the needs and shared community interests and culture. Keep the Barrio together with communities that can amplify shared needs and issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I live in La Jolla just south of UCSD. I favor maintaining CD1 boundaries as they are. From the south to the north, CD1 is dominated and united by important natural preserves: San Clemente Canyon, La Jolla Marine Reserve, Torrey Pines State Park, and Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve. Residents support each other in supporting them.

UCSD has been connected with University City from their joint beginnings around 60 years ago. La Jolla is also contiguous with UCSD. The whole area shares many cultural, research, and educational and commercial entities which are interdependent.

The entirety of CD1 is served by a growing transportation corridor including Rail Lines highways and other intercommunity resources. Such an area is best serve by having one Councilmember who is attentive to all these important issues.
Dear San Diego Redistricting Commission members,

I am a part of the District 1 Coalition of Concerned Citizens which includes environmental, community, and neighborhood groups as well as representatives from Community Planning Groups.

As a resident of the Bird Rock neighborhood within and at the south end of the La Jolla Community, my husband and I are committed to the preservation of Council District 1 (CD1) in its current configuration and inclusion of the entire, cohesive La Jolla Community within the CD1 boundaries, including the addition of a 2 property parcel of the Bird Rock neighborhood that is in La Jolla but is currently part of Council District 2.

Historically, the CD1 communities have worked well together and share common interests including environmental protection, coastal access, managed growth, enhancement of outdoor recreational opportunities, climate action plans, education, and infrastructure connectivity and concerns. These communities have strong community planning groups which communicate well with each other.

All efforts should be made to keep neighborhoods and communities together in one District and to observe natural boundaries which can physically separate districts. It is possible for commissioners and citizens to join together to make re-districting work for everyone.

I recommend that commission members read my Op-Ed published in the Times of San Diego that addresses Linda Vista concerns regarding re-districting, and that this comment be entered into the commission’s public comment log. Here is the link to the article: https://timesofsandiego.com/opinion/2021/08/21/opinion-why-must-linda-vista-be-split-into-multiple-political-districts/
Dear Redistricting Commissioners,
Speaking on behalf of the University Community Planning Group as Chair, the following motion was approved at its meeting on August 10, 2021, regarding the Commission’s redrawing of new Council District One boundaries by a vote of 7 Yes, 2 No, and 2 Abstain:
1. Keep the University Community Plan area together
   a. We have been a Community Plan area with the same boundaries for over 30 years.
   b. The areas of the Community Plan area north and south of Rose Canyon are closely integrated. Many people who work at UC San Diego and attend school there live in University City south of Rose Canyon - in fact it is called University City because it was developed starting in the 1960s to build housing for the professors and staff at UC San Diego. Planning for University City and UC San Diego have been integrated for over 50 years.
   c. University City High School and the three elementary schools serve our community plan area. (University City High School; Standley Middle School; Doyle, Curie and Spreckels Elementary).
2. Keep the University Community Plan area in District 1.
   a. We are a contiguous area integrated by major roadways and shared open
      space resources, including residential, employment, commercial, common
      public schools, hospitals, parks and open space, and our relationship to UC
      San Diego.
   b. We are closely aligned with the coast and its institutions, and share them
      with La Jolla, including UC San Diego, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, the
      Salk Institute, and Scripps Research Institute. We also share major
      hospitals at UC San Diego and Scripps, as well as parks and recreation,
      including the Glider Port and Torrey Pines State Reserve.

3. Keep District 1 the same if possible.
   Speaking personally, and as a 50-year resident of University City with two
   degrees from UC San Diego, I can attest to the focus of the community, both
   here in UC and in La Jolla, on UC San Diego, its institutions, and facilities. My
   ties with UC San Diego extend over those 50 years.
   We have been asked to say what we want, not what we don’t want, from
   the redistricting process: UC San Diego belongs with La Jolla and University
   City in the same council district.
   Sincerely, Chris Nielsen
   UCPG Chair
   50 Year University City Resident
Dear Honorable Chairman Hebrank, Honorable Vicechair Malbourgh, and Honorable Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to participate at last night’s Special Meeting. The meeting was well organized and professionally conducted.

I am submitting Non-Agenda Written Testimony for the Regular Meeting of August 19, 2021 concerning Community of Interests - Actual Residential Population v. Special Tourism Business Districts and Areas. These Non-Agenda Comments were prompted by an insightful article in today’s, August 18, 2021, Voice of San Diego, “San Diego’s Vietnamese Community Is Booming and Wants Redistricting to Show it”.

At last evenings Special Meeting, a request was made for the Commission staff to make a special effort to identify Racial and Ethnic Asian communities of interests, within the City. I support this this request.

San Diego has a significant and unique history of contribution from Asian persons. Historic Asian and Pan Asian Communities of interest exist throughout the City. Examples are in the San Ysidro community and Downtown (somewhat as the result of the Chinese immigration wave as Railroad workers); the Pilipino persons in District 4 & 8 areas surrounding our military and naval bases, the Samoan Polynesian peoples from both the Independent State of Samoa and American Samoa in District Four (particularly as members of my District 4 St. Rita’s parish community); the Chamorro people of Micronesia’s Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (somewhat in District 7 by Zion Health); the Korean peoples (somewhat historically engaged in Otay Mesa farming in D8); the Tai ethnic group Lao people or Laotians in D4’s Encanto and east of 54th street; and the Vietnamese of throughout the City - Mira Mesa, Rancho Penasquitos, Allied Gardens, and Talmadge/College areas.
The Supreme Court recognizes keeping communities of interest whole as a key part of the map-drawing process. A jurisdiction’s communities of interest are its overlapping sets of neighborhoods, networks, and groups that share interests, priorities, views, cultures, histories, languages, and values. The following is a non-exhaustive list of elements that help define communities of interest:

- Shared interests in issues such as schools, housing, transit, health, and environmental conditions;
- Common social and civic networks, including churches, temples, mosques, homeowner associations, and community centers, and shared use of community spaces, like parks and shopping centers;
- Racial and ethnic compositions, cultural identities, and language;
- Similar socio-economic factors such as income and education levels;
- Other shared political boundary lines, such as shared school districts;
- Natural and man-made features, including streets, highways, canals, hills, etc.

(The REDISTRICTING FOR COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT: A Legal How-To Guide, ACLU NoCal, ACLU SoCal, CA Common Cause, 2021 page 8).

The Commission must be careful not to fall into the Mayor Wilson Era solution to Racial and Ethnic diversity. In that era the solution was to appoint one complimentary representative from the then simplistic color choices of Brown, Black, and Yellow, to add to a mostly White Council. Today, we recognize that within very generalized racial groups there are a wide variety of ethnic groups, each with distinct identities and cultural groupings. No one would lightly classify together the Irish, Scotts, Welch and English, as simply common “Pan Isles White People.”

The Commission will also be challenged by other factors, in addition to continuity, to define a residential community of interest, based on the above elements. San Diego has established several historic and economic districts themed for the promotion of business/tourism. These varied districts may have had, at one time, large and specific racial and ethnic groups; but today the founding resident population has moved to or been forced out of those areas.
Old Town, The Presidio, & Mission San Diego de Alcalá are places of significant common social, civic and historic identity with the Kumeyaay and Mexican peoples. The areas have churches, clubs, restaurants, and themed shops based on these peoples' historic presence; but today the residential population has changed. Often native peoples return for festivals and church services but they live and vote in other places.

Similarly, Little Italy; Downtown’s Chinese District; Little Saigon; Roseville, La Jolla’s Duval enclaves, the College Area Jewish community, and others have features and business owners that reflect a largely absent population. The names on buildings and streets remain but the people have largely left. For example, a significant indicator of a peoples’ social and religious presence can be an Eruv. Three existing San Diego eruvim are in La Jolla, University City, and the San Diego State University area. Planning is process for a fourth San Carlos eruvim. But the mere presence of an eruvim does not indicate the residential population necessary for voter districting. Residents of an eruvim area should not be split. Similarly, residents in one parish area should not be placed in a voting District away from their church.

I would be pleased to assist the Commission’s Redistricting efforts with additional background on most of these special historic economic / tourism districts as I have in the past served as their Counsel or as elected representative for their redevelopment. Themed cultural areas can have a great economic boost but must be linked with actual racial and ethnic populations to form a true community of interest to promote voters rights and participation.

I look forward to presenting oral testimony on the matters presented in letters, at the Commission’s regular meeting, of August 19, 2021. Please include this letter and my two previous letters in the record.

All the best,

/s/

John Stump, resident, property owner, and taxpayer in current Districts Four and Nine
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/18/2021 10:58</td>
<td>Allison Goldhammer</td>
<td>Agenda Item Comment</td>
<td>I am a young working professional in the University City/UTC area and I would like to urge the redistricting commission to group University City/UTC with the communities to the east and north, i.e; Miramar, Mira Mesa, Convoy, and Carmel Valley. As a active member in my community I feel I speak for many of us when I say it is unrealistic too live where I work on an average hourly wage and the public transportation, while improving, is still mostly inaccessible. I feel as though those priorities better align with our neighbors to the east and north as they are more likely to be dependent on those resources. Unlike our neighbors to the west in La Jolla who are, for the most part, not dependent on those resources and therefore are not made a priority. By regrouping I feel our community will prioritize those needs and as a result, strengthening as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/17/2021 16:49</td>
<td>Lynn Haims</td>
<td>Non-Agenda Comment</td>
<td>Bay Park and Bay Ho should remain in District 2 with the other beach communities. We have similar issues and concerns. Over the past several years, our communities (PB, OB, MB, Pt. Loma) have been working together on such issues as density/height limits, scooters, homelessness, vacation rentals, beach and canyon cleanups, Mission Bay/DeAnza Cove/Campland, Rose Canyon and other issues that are mutually important. Bordering Mission Bay, we are beach communities and want to continue being part of that group of communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/17/2021 15:43</td>
<td>Carrie Munson</td>
<td>Non-Agenda Comment</td>
<td>Hello Honorable Commissioners, I am writing of my own opinions and not of the organizations I am a part of. I live in Bay Ho. Please consider keeping Bay Ho and Bay Park aligned with the other beach communities in District 2. We are beach communities and share a common Mission Bay. Our community issues align closely with those of Pacific Beach, Mission Bay and Ocean Beach. Many residents in my community feel the same way. Thank you for your consideration. Take care. President, Clairemont Town Council Foundation Vice Present, Clairemont Town Council Director at large, Harborheights of Bay Ho Architectural Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Honorable Chairman Hebrank, Honorable Vicechair Malbourgh, and Honorable Commissioners,

Congratulations on your appointment to this most important Commission. Thank you for your service to our City. I have some initial principals and comments concerning the processes for accomplishing your important work. They follow:

A. "So the last shall be first, and the first last." MATTHEW 20:16. Please consider a district number neutral process. I suggest that your processes, to determine the nine Council Districts, be neutral as to the District number until you have followed the law and guidelines to form appropriate Districts. Only after that outcome neutral process; then assign District numbers randomly or by draw. Past practices have numbered the richest District NUMBER ONE and the poorest Districts Last, as Numbers 8 and 9. Please use different processes to assign District numbers and discontinue the top-down approach. Our City started along the San Diego River in Old Town and only later did it develop by the Bay in New Town. Coastal development was much latter. I suggest, because our Council elections are based on even and odd numbering that a random draw assignment be made for even and odd districts.
The numbering of Districts has some real practicable priority effects, for example District One is called on first to speak at Council and to Vote. Like the discredited law of primogeniture, the First Council District gets to announce its Budget priorities or express its opinions first. For initial Commission development and discussion purposes I suggest that draft districts be alphabetically designated until a random draw is held.

B. Natural geographical features like water sheds should be used as initial jumping off definitional boundaries for Council Districts. Use of watersheds do not follow any artificial political or incumbents’ donor or constituency interests. From time out of mind, the indigenous Kumeyaay peoples lived and organized along our City’s nine (9) natural watersheds - Tijuana, Chollas, SD Bay Florida/Swetzter, San Diego River, Famosa Slough, Los Peñasquitos, Mission Bay, La Jolla, and San Dieguito. The Bay and Coastal water quality is largely determined by the quality of water that flows into them from the water shed above them. Improving watershed conditions uphill determines the Bay and Beach qualities.

I believe that clean up and renovation of the City’s water sheds would be advanced if each Council District had, at its core, a significant watershed to steward. The Coast, Beaches, and Bays are resources we all share in common; so organization based solely on a Beach or Bay approach favors some and excludes others.

Thank you for considering these initial principles and comments concerning the City-Wide processes. I look forward to discussing the development of a Chollas Creek focused district at your next scheduled meeting.

All the best,

/s/

John Stump, resident, property owner, and taxpayer in current Districts Four and Nine
Hi, I’m Bradley and I’m a current student at UCSD and I’ve never really been huge into getting my voice out but recently I have seen a lot of issues for students at UCSD and I am going to be spending the next few years here in San Diego as well.

The biggest issue I’ve seen recently is definitely housing. I don’t know all that many people yet but just off the top of my head, I can think of 4 of my friends that have struggled with housing. I’m really hoping to see more housing matters decided with student interests in mind which would come as a result of increased representation from better-drawn district lines.

I’m confident that the youth of San Diego, particularly students at UCSD, will provide a relevant and valuable voice for the community and I truly hope to see a deeper representation of these students in our new districts.

As a San Diego local and UCSD student, I care deeply about ongoing issues students face that go unaddressed simply because their voices are too often left unheard. At the moment, thousands of UCSD students are having difficulties finding affordable housing in the vicinity of the university in which they study and work. Housing for students is a critical issue in which student opinion should not be overlooked, because rising costs for available units harm some of the most vulnerable members of our community. As the demand for housing continues to grow, students are met with limited financial options to be able to afford both housing and the high costs of education. Students deserve to be heard and considered in local policy, especially when their struggles are frequently overlooked by a combination of school and local administrators. How can a district flourish when its vital communities are suffering?

I am a former student of UCSD, class of 2021. I believe the entire UCSD campus should be united with its neighbors to the north and east; UTC, Carmel Valley, Mira Mesa, etc. UCSD deserves to be in a district with aligning views on land use, housing, and other pertaining planning issues.
My name is Samir and I am a student at UCSD and have been living on-campus at UCSD for most of my academic time (barring the pandemic). In regards to the matter of separating UCSD and nearby student population areas from District 1 and adding it to District 6, it is my firm belief that the students will be better represented in District 6 rather than District 1, and the people in District 1 will benefit from allowing this change to happen. The main reason is that the needs of the average student and the average unit homeowner are very different. The student population has more in common with District 6, so by having the students be a part of District 6, student needs will be better met. Similarly, without the student population, District 1 can better serve the homeowners of La Jolla and not need to accommodate student desires. This will ultimately benefit these two groups of individuals. Thank you.
The University Community Planning Group at its meeting on August 10, 2021, approved the following motion regarding the Commission’s redrawing of new Council District One boundaries:

1. Keep the University Community Plan area together
   a. We have been a Community Plan area with the same boundaries for over 30 years.
   b. The areas of the Community Plan area north and south of Rose Canyon are closely integrated. Many people who work at UC San Diego and attend school there live in University City south of Rose Canyon - in fact it is called University City because it was developed starting in the 1960s to build housing for the professors and staff at UC San Diego. Planning for University City and UC San Diego have been integrated for over 50 years.
   c. University City High School and the three elementary schools serve our community plan area. (University City High School; Standley Middle School; Doyle, Curie and Spreckels Elementary).

2. Keep the University Community Plan area in District 1.
   a. We are a contiguous area integrated by major roadways and shared open space resources, including residential, employment, commercial, common public schools, hospitals, parks and open space, and our relationship to UC San Diego.
   b. We are closely aligned with the coast and its institutions, and share them with La Jolla, including UC San Diego, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, the Salk Institute, and Scripps Research Institute. We also share major hospitals at UC San Diego and Scripps, as well as parks and recreation, including the Glider Port and Torrey Pines State Reserve.

3. Keep District 1 the same if possible.

Sincerely,

Chris Nielsen
UCPG Chair

I am a former UCSD student who believes that our community alines more with communities to the north and east of us; MiraMesa, Carmel Valley, Miramar, etc. As a student, we shop and hang out to the east because that's where our friends live and that's where we can afford to be. We can't afford to be in La Jolla. Dropping down into La Jolla west of campus is like going into another city completely. UCSD and University City should be in a city council district with the north and east neighborhoods and not with La Jolla.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/9/2021</td>
<td>Ahmed Akhtar</td>
<td>Non-Agenda Comment</td>
<td>My name is Ahmed and I'm a graduate student at UCSD. I am interested in redistricting because I want to see the entire UCSD campus united with the neighborhoods where UCSD community members live. UCSD includes employees, faculty, students, and more. Most people affiliated with UCSD don't live in La Jolla, we live in the neighborhoods to the north and east. Issues like housing and transportation are different for UCSD affiliates than La Jolla community members, and we deserve a councilmember who will acknowledge UCSD's housing and transportation problems. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>Joe Long</td>
<td>Non-Agenda Comment</td>
<td>Dear San Diego City Redistricting Commissioners,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you very much for your consideration and commitment for this vital task. According to San Diego Registrar Office from 2011 to 2021 in San Diego county, The Vietnamese population has increased significantly: * 2011 total Vietnamese American voter registration roll is 13,701 * 2021 total Vietnamese American voter registration roll is 30,124 More than double within the past 10 year. One particular area I would like to ask for your attention is the Linda Vista area, where a large Vietnamese population is residing. Currently, this area is part of District # 7. Community of Interest ties would be much stronger in terms of Vietnamese churches &amp; temples, and grocery outlets with nearby communities northerly, such as Clairemont, Clairemont Mesa, Clairemont Mesa East, and Clairemont Mesa West etc...This area has fewer common ties with other areas of District 7 which is predominantly located on the East side of Hwy 15. I would urge this Commission to unify this Linda Vista area with adjacent areas with similar high concentration of Vietnamese population. Such merging should greatly improve common community of interests Thank you, Joe Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>Joe Long</td>
<td>Non-Agenda Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To Whom It Concern,

By way of introduction, my name is Ralph Peters. I am the subcommittee Chair of the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council redistricting subcommittee.

The purpose of the Rancho de los Peñasquitos Town Council is to serve, represent, and promote the activities and interests of all Rancho de Los Peñasquitos residents. The contents of this submission are not intended to personally represent the Rancho Penasquitos Town Council Board members, but are the results of a community survey conducted by the Rancho Penasquitos Redistricting subcommittee. Our subcommittee has prepared an online survey regarding public opinion on the possibility of reuniting all contiguous neighborhoods in Rancho Penasquitos, Zip Code 92129.

The purpose of the survey was to ascertain Community feelings regarding the desire to be in one district that is comprised of the surrounding communities connected through the Poway Unified School District. This letter summarizes the responses of 233 residents as of June 2, 2021. Of these, just more than half (125) reside in the neighborhood of Park Village in the southern portion of Rancho Penasquitos (RP) and currently part of District 6. Just over a quarter of respondents have lived in RP for 20-30 years, with 17% having resided here for 30-40 years. A majority, 63%, are familiar with the outcome of the 2011 Redistricting effort, which split RP into two City Council districts. 197 participants (83%) are in favor of reuniting RP in the upcoming 2021 redistricting effort. Fully 95% of respondents would like to be part of a City Council district comprised of communities in Poway Unified School District (PUSD), with 90% saying they agree or strongly agree with this concept. 97% of those surveyed (231) are strongly opposed to being part of a District that includes Mira Mesa and Kearny Mesa and just one respondent was in favor (1 did not answer and 5 were undecided).
The survey will be open throughout the summer and updated results will be periodically provided to the San Diego Redistricting Commission.

To summarize, the Community response was overwhelmingly in support of (1) reunifying Rancho Peñasquitos, and (2) Rancho Peñasquitos remaining in a PUSD-centric City Council district, with fellow Poway Unified communities such as Rancho Bernardo, Sabre Springs, and Carmel Mountain Ranch.

The survey questionnaire itself is attached as Exhibit A.

We would be happy to discuss in public session any questions the Commission may have regarding the above.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration, Rancho Peñasquitos Redistricting Subcommittee

Sincerely,
Kate Glenn, President
Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council

- Park Village 53%
- Los Peñasquitos 8%
- Adobe Bluffs 8%
- Canyon View 7%
- Sundance 7%
- Rolling Hills 6%
- Torrey Highlands 5%
- Deer Canyon 3%
- Sunset Hills 3%
- Non-Resident 0%

2. How long have you lived in Rancho Peñasquitos? ANSWERS RESPONSES
- 20-30 years 27%
- 30-40 years 18%
- 5-10 years 15%
- 10-15 years 15%
- 15-20 years 10%
- 40+ years 3%

3. Do you know what city council District you live in? ANSWERS RESPONSES
- Not Sure 36%
- District 6 35%
- District 5 29%
| 4. Are you aware that RP was split into two city council districts in 2011 by the San Diego Redistrict commission? ANSWERS RESPONSES | Yes 64%  
Unaware 21%  
No 15%  
| 5. Would you be in favor of RP being reunified when the next City Council Redistricting map is drawn? ANSWERS RESPONSES | Yes 84%  
Undecided 12%  
No 4%  
| 6. Are you aware that a new Redistricting Commission has been established to address and redraw City Council District boundaries? ANSWERS RESPONSES | Yes 67%  
No 33%  
| 7. What is your opinion of RP being a part of a City Council district comprised of Poway Unified School District ("PUSD") communities, such as Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Sabre Springs and Black Mountain Ranch? ANSWERS RESPONSES | In favor 95%  
Not in favor 5%  
| 8. Based on your selection above how do you rate your decision? | Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree | 6  
3%  
2  
1%  
13  
6%  
45  
19%  
167  
72% |
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Would you want RP to be a part of a comprised Mira Mesa and Kearny Mesa District?</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Would you prefer that the City Council district for RP join RP with other PUSD Communities?</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters</td>
<td>Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Would you prefer that the City Council district for RP be one that is joined with Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch and Sabre Springs?</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Would you prefer RP be a part of a City Council district that includes Miramar Mesa and Kearney Mesa?</td>
<td>ANSWERS RESPONSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Based on your selection above how do you rate your decision Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
52  22%
9   4%
7   3%
31  13%
133 57%

14. Do you consider the RP Community to have more in common with Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch and Sabre Springs?
Yes 97%
Undecided 2%
No 1%

15. Do you believe the RP Community as a whole has more in common with Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch and Sabre Springs than with Kearney Mesa and Mira Mesa?
Yes 96%
Undecided 2%
No 2%

Would you like to help us elevate our 'Reunite RP' Campaign?
Not at this time 49%
Count me in! I'll share this with my neighbors 21%
Yes 19%
No 13%
I'll attend and represent RP at the City Redistricting Commission monthly meeting and leave comments 1%

When giving consideration to the upcoming redistricting, should there be any consideration for adjusting District 2 boundaries? I believe the area currently included in district 2 should be made part of the District reflecting the balance of the current Clairemont Boundaries in their District.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7/14/2021 10:11 | Pastor Dale W Huntington | Non-Agenda Comment   | Hello,  
My name is Dale Huntington.  
I live in Mt Hope and Pastor in Southeast San Diego.  
I have always felt that Mt Hope gets the short end of the stick because it doesn't fit in with Kensington or College area.  
We fit so much better with chollas view, encanto, webster etc. Culturally.  
The 805 was a line that broke up our community but we are very much connected to the east. I would recommend having these communities together.  
I realize you use natural boundaries like freeways, but this community was displaced by freeways and only seems more separated by our districting. Thank you. |
| 6/10/2014 7:23   | David Moty              | Non-Agenda Comment   | Commissioners:  
At its May 12, 2021 meeting, the Kensington Talmadge Planning Group approved the following motion on a 13-1 vote: The KTPG desires that Kensington and Talmadge are kept together in the same City Council district and that our communities are kept wholly intact, including all the areas currently included in our community plan boundaries. Furthermore, we prefer to remain combined with the immediately adjacent areas to the east, west, and south of us. The areas to our east, west and south tend to share our same issues with aging and inadequate infrastructure, and have followed many of the same development patterns as our community. As you may note from its omission, we believe the areas to our north do not share these same concerns and history.  
Respectfully yours,  
David K. Moty  
Chair, Kensington Talmadge Planning Group |

Dear Redistricting Commissioners,

In response to the recent March 1, 2021 Rancho Penasquitos Town Council Redistricting Committee letter sent to the City of San Diego Redistricting Commission, the Rancho Penasquitos Planning Board (RPPB) desires to make it clear the RPPB was not informed of, nor given the opportunity to review or comment in advance, the content of the March 1, 2021 letter sent from the RP Town Council Redistricting Committee to the City of San Diego Redistricting Commission.

The Rancho Penasquitos Planning Board is the formal established community planning group recognized by the City of San Diego and as such, a separate and independent redistricting committee had been established under the auspices of the Planning Board. It is our desire that the City Redistricting Commission clearly understand that any and all RPPB Redistricting Subcommittee efforts and communications with the Commission continues to be independent from the Rancho Penasquitos Town Council Redistricting Committee.

Sincerely yours,

Brian Reschke, Chair
Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board

CC: District 6 ChrisCate@sandiego.gov
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2021</td>
<td>19:44</td>
<td>Pat Sexton</td>
<td>Non-Agenda Comment</td>
<td>Good morning, I wanted to commend Roy MacPhail for giving the most comprehensive presentation since, I can't remember when. Most of the time when someone from the City is presenting something we have to read between the lines and wonder what they're leaving out, that will hit us in the face, down the road. I didn't get that feeling with Roy's presentation. For that I thank both of you. I've tried to find the map application that would tell me what the population would be if a section of D3 was moved to D8 for example. Has that capability been provided, or is it in the works? My suggestions on moving the District boundaries around would be: 1) move the NE part of D3 boundary, that currently crosses over to the east side of 805, back to the west side of 805 and let 805 be the natural boundary for D3 and the population east of 805 would be D9. And/or on the south end of D3, move the boundary north to Market or G Street and to the south would be D8. Again, thank you for the presentation and I look forward to a return attendance and update. Pat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2021</td>
<td>15:26</td>
<td>Howard Wayne</td>
<td>Non-Agenda Comment</td>
<td>While I understand your meetings are preliminary to the release of detailed census data, I would like to get the Commission thinking about the integrity of communities. Prior to the current districting the entirety of Linda Vista was in a single council district. For reasons not made clear to Linda Vista, the current districting splits Linda Vista between two council districts. Similarly our neighbor Clairemont was split between two council districts. When the Commission comes to drawing lines, I hope it will respect the integrity of communities and not diminish the clout of Linda Vista that has major socio-economic needs. Howard Wayne Interim Chair of the Linda Vista Planning Group The opinion expressed are my own as our Planning Group has not yet taken a position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear City of San Diego Redistricting Commissions,

Greetings. My name is Kate Glenn, president of the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council, a non-profit organization comprised of 16 elected and appointed representatives from the community of Rancho Peñasquitos (“RP”). This communication herein is submitted on behalf of our RPTC Redistricting Committee Chair, Mr. Ralph Peters.

San Diego Redistricting Commissioners,

Most of RP is presently in District 5, along with Rancho Bernardo, Sabre Springs, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Black Mountain Ranch, Torrey Highlands, and Rancho Encantada (Scripps).

Unfortunately, in 2011, the southern section of RP, comprising the Park Village community and an area south of Adolphia Street (approximately 16% of total RP population), was split off from the rest of RP. As would be expected, having our community broken up this way has caused no end of community dissatisfaction, and we believe it is time to set this injustice right.

And it would be simple to do so. While we do not have the 2020 census data yet (and won’t likely until late May or June), a community grouping of all of Rancho Penasquitos, Rancho Bernardo, Sabre Springs ("SS"), Carmel Mountain Ranch ("CMR"), Black Mountain Ranch ("BMR"), and Torrey Highlands ("TH"), should put us population-wise within a whisker of the projected per-district population goal (161,000). Our reasons are set forth below:

1. ‘RP” is split and should not have been split. The statutory guidance provided the Redistricting Commission is that they are not NOT DIVIDE communities, if at all possible. It is time to cure this glaring defect in the 2011 plan.

2. Most owners in “RP” live here because they want to be part of the Poway Unified School District
3. (“PUSD”) and the diverse ethnic and cultural attractions of the constituent PUSD communities.
4. All of the communities listed above – RB, SS, CMR, Torrey Highlands - are part of PUSD. Importantly, Mira Mesa is part of the San Diego Unified School system, which has its own proud traditions and rivalries.
5. The local rivalries for the children of ‘RP” involve the other communities in the PUSD core. Examples of these include: Football games; Wrestling matches Band competitions Cheerleading Basketball Science Olympiad Academic Bowl competitions Various travel teams in soccer, baseball, Pop Warner, etc.
6. Many ‘RP” Boy and Girl Scout Troops have members from BMR, CMR, SR, TH, and/or RB.
7. Income levels in ‘RP” are within a hairsbreadth of the other PUSD communities.
8. The PUSD communities are all contiguous and have no natural boundary separator. ‘RP” is separated from MM by the in places half mile wide Penasquitos Canyon.
9. Our crime statistics are similar – far less than Mira Mesa.
10. Most ‘RP”-ers do their shopping locally or in CMR, not Mira Mesa.
11. Many of us worship in RB.
12. It is a fact that a large number of ‘RP” residents moved out of MM to be part of the PUSD, to move up to the newer housing in ‘RP”, and be part of the vibrant cultural and ethnic milieu that ‘RP” shares with the PUSD communities. MM has (a) older and smaller (by square footage) housing stock; (b) their housing sells for far less than ‘RP” (on average, 25% less); (c) MM has a far higher percentage of renters; (d) MM has more than 10,500 rental apartments - almost three times that of ‘RP”. It is not only apartments that are being rented – it is important to point out that MM has far less Owner-occupied dwellings than ‘RP”.

Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters

Written materials mailed (Continued)
In addition, MM has (e) a significantly lower per capita household income; (g) is far denser in terms of population, and (f) also has a higher crime rate. Lastly, MM is an older, poorly planned community, with very few parks, horrible traffic flow, older infrastructure, and poor drainage. Aside from their absence from the PUSD school system, their markedly different demographics, housing stock, density, and high percentage of renters dictates that the MM community has other issues, problems, and priorities than the PUSD core communities. It needs a dedicated council representative and staff that can focus on MM’s disparate and unique set of problems.

I thank you for your attention to the above. The RPTC Redistricting Committee will be providing additional correspondence and backup data supporting our community’s position on redistricting.

Yours,

Ralph Peters
Ralph Peters, Chair, RP Town Council Redistrict Committee
Email: rptcredistrict21@gmail.com

Kate Glenn
Kate Glenn, President, RP Town Council
cc: RPTC Redistricting Committee Secretary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/18/2021</td>
<td>Diana Martini</td>
<td>Upper portion of district 6 including park village and homes off salmon river rd should be in district 5, not 6... area referenced in district 6 is part of PUSD... revise now!</td>
<td>3/18/2021</td>
<td>Agenda Item Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>