

Date and Time Submitted:					
	Name:	Meeting Date:	Comment Type:	Agenda Item:	Comments:
12/16/2021 15:31	Patricia Fillet	12/16/2021	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>We are more then outraged by your negligent civic/public service in deciding for Old Town to be displaced into District 2 from District 3! In fact, the Commissioners acknowledge the mean deviation DOES not impact to keep a population of 1200 in D3. Further, your actions tell and confirm your political agendas in placing Old Town - a community of interest - outside of it's historic and geographic growth. Shame on you in diluting a supportive commissioner to keep Old Town in D3, or the significant fact the mean deviation remains unaffected! You have already heard from the many voices alarmed for their neighborhoods. Where is the equity for the neighborhoods affected by your influence to redraw these district lines? As you now go home and enjoy your holidays, ask yourselves silently, or even out loud, you missed the opportunity to do even more. Yes, this is a difficult process, and you were willing to accept this public service challenge, but your decision will now impact our neighborhoods over the next decade!</p>
12/16/2021 14:54	Betty Rodriguez	12/16/2021	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>Thank you for all your hard work. Thank you for reuniting linda vista into one district. I think the makeup of our city council and other elected officials indicates that citizens most often vote their conscience and not someone who looks or sounds like them. San diego is diversified and doesnt need empowerment districts to keep it diversified . It needs more of an effort to get out everyone eligible to vote to actually vote. Rather than criticize, let's be happy that people are willing to volunteer so much of their time to do what at times must have seen a thankless task. Thank you commissioners.</p>
12/15/2021 18:45	Shital Parkikh	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I agree that some of the eastern tips of DMM preserve that were pointed out by Jeanette Waltz and Helen Boyden with populations like Torrey Highlands, Merge 56, The notch (which is marked as the preserve in the attached map), have been in D5 . They do not need to be in D1 this time around as DMM community planning board was only talking about the Eastern DMM Preserve without any population and keeping it that way. This map is fine as it conforms with the Del Mar Mesa Community Plan.</p> <p>Thanks so much for your hard work. Happy Holidays Shital Parikh, VC DMM Community Planning board</p>

					<p>I agree that some of the eastern tips of DMM preserve that were pointed out by Jeanette Waltz and Helen Boyden with populations like Torrey Highlands, Merge 56, The notch (which is marked as the preserve in the attached map), have been in D5 . They do not need to be in D1 this time around as DMM community planning board was only talking about the Eastern DMM Preserve without any population and keeping it that way. This map is fine as it conforms with the Del Mar Mesa Community Plan.</p> <p>Thanks so much for your hard work.</p>
12/15/2021 18:43	Shital Parikh	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Shital Parikh, VC DMM Community Planning board
12/15/2021 17:43	Kathleen S Glenn	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I cede my time to Jeanette Walt for non-agenda comment

12/14/2021 17:27	Linda Acuna	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>To: Redistricting Commission City of San Diego,</p> <p>I am the Chair of the Old Town Community Planning Group, but submit the following comments for your attention as an individual concerned private citizen. I am taking this action as a private citizen because proper notice (as per the Brown Act) was not given by the City to allow us to come together as a group to review what is being proposed and prepare a response.</p> <p>I was distressed to learn that you are considering moving Old Town San Diego from District 3 to District 2 and parts of Mission Hills (west of interstate 5), as well.</p> <p>It seems that there are a lot more positives in keeping these neighborhoods in the same district than tearing them apart.</p> <p>If it is not obvious, major roads and highways separate Districts 3 & 2.</p> <p>I ask you to delay your decision until the communities affected have had a reasonable time to review what is being proposed. I am certain the affected communities would welcome a representative from the Redistricting Commission to come and give a presentation.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Linda Acuña, Chair Old Town Community Planning Group (comments submitted as an Individual Concerned Citizen)</p>
12/14/2021 16:18	Oliver Nunez	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>What the (deleted expletive) is wrong with you? What is the purpose of removing Old Town from District #3? This seems underhanded and shady and is probably related to a development deal. Stop messing up our city and try not to screw it up more than you already do considering our local government is so inept and corrupt.</p>

12/14/2021 16:13	Austin Farres Oriol	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Old Town in District #3! We ask you to keep Old Town San Diego in District 3 to maintain its integrity, character, neighborhood connections, and historical significance. Old Town is more aligned (organically and by the geographic landscape) with other communities in District 3: Banker's Hill, Balboa Park, Gaslamp (Horton's subdivision of New Town), Presidio Park, and the San Diego River
12/13/2021 19:44	Donia Albishry	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	NO to redistricting!!! We want to be in control of our own development and are a special area and should stay in district 3. We have NOTHING in common with district 2 I will legally fight this if need be Very sneaky u tried to get this thru with no notice to us Shame on you all. I certainly will vote all of u out of office and make a huge effort to get all neighbors to do likewise
12/13/2021 19:40	Ross Fatemi	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	DO NOT redistrict. I own a rental property in old town and am vehemently against redistricting us We are u inquest and historical and no other district should have a say over development in OldTown except us who live and own property therein.
12/13/2021 19:36	Behzad Fatemi	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I do not want to be redistributed. We are an historic area and nothing in common with district 2 Why would you even want to do that. Sick! We demand a say over our historic community and it needs to stay in district 2 where it belongs. Your very sneaky and I will support all legal means against you that our community wishes to start NO to redistributing us.
12/13/2021 17:13	Phyllis Daniel	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Regarding Old Town: it is historic and should be kept part of the Mission Hills area and District 3. Look at the history, the boundary roads and the types of occupants. District 3 has the historic areas including Presidio Park, Mission Hills, Hillcrest and Balboa Park. Old Town belongs in District 3.
12/13/2021 1:27	Tracy B Baker	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep the Old Town Community in District 3 with Mission Hills. You are carving out Old Town and placing it with the Midway district. Old Town does not belong with the Midway business and beach districts. It is aligned with Mission Hills and its historic community. The beach area of District 2 has its unique issues and nuances that are completely different than the Old Town / Mission Hills Communities. Keep Old Town with Mission Hills in District 3.

12/12/2021 20:46	Cindy Yurkovich	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Dear Redistricting Commission for the City of San Diego,</p> <p>Keep the Old Town Community in District 3 with Mission Hills. Old Town and Mission Hills have a historical history and they are natural neighbors.</p> <p>Keep Old Town in District 3. Don't break it up.</p>
12/12/2021 20:03	Kay Dean	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please do not take Old Town San Diego and move it to District 2. Old Town is part of the historic Mission Hills area. It really has no connection to the District 2 Costal Area. Also, to break up Districts by streets and disconnect communities is totally illogical and impacts defined communities. I can not understand how this is managing with efficiency. This would make it much more difficult for our Council representative. Please keep Old Town San Diego in District 3.</p>
12/12/2021 16:28	Jean M Rockwell	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Keep the Old Town Community in District 3 with Mission Hills. In looking at the redistricting map, you have split up streets where blocks are separated into two different districts. Old Town and Mission Hills are and have always been natural neighbors due to their adjacent locations and historical history. Please leave the boundaries bordered by highways; not separating people from within their community. The beach area of District 2 has its unique issues and nuances that are completely different than the Old Town Mission Hills Communities. Do not fracture our family tree of neighborhoods; Keep Old Town with Mission Hills in District 3.</p>
12/12/2021 16:27	Virginia S Oliver	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I have lived in Missin Hills for 36 years. I feel very close to the Old Town area. Why on earth would you carve out a portion of it (including random portions of streets) across the natural boundary of I-5 and reassign it from District 3 to District 2? The interests of Old Town and Missions Hills are very much aligned and closely intertwined. The reassignment makes no sense and I oppose it.</p>
12/12/2021 16:02	Barbara Aries	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As an 18-year resident of Mission Hills (District 3), I believe there is a definite benefit to continue keeping all of Mission Hills and Old Town together within District 3. We have issues that are very specific to our neighborhoods (as do most areas of this city have specific issues for their neighborhoods).</p>

12/12/2021 15:00	Erin Smith	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please do not move Old Town into the 2nd district! This area is somewhere I have spent a lot of my life, being a local I love visiting and working in Old Town. The streets here are filled with history, there literal burial sites in the streets! Moving the birth place of California would make no sense at all and would make me super disappointed in my city.</p> <p>Would you guys also be moving the historic buildings and such?? There is no reason to do this unless you want the city to lose it's charm and history</p>
12/12/2021 14:50	EJ Sobo	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>It's come to my attention that there is a plan afoot to reassign the neighborhood in which I live (Presidio Hills / Old town) from District #3 to District #2. This makes no sense to me, given the social, geographic, political, and historical alignment of my neighborhood with Mission Hills and other communities in District 3: Banker's Hill, Balboa Park, Gaslamp (Horton's subdivision of New Town), etc. My neighborhood has no connection whatsoever (business-wise or residentially) with the Midway area and the Coastal Communities of District 2. Indeed, major roads and highways separate these districts from my neighborhood. Please keep AT LEAST the Presidio Hills residences along the Jackson-Cosoy-Presidio loop in District 3, where we belong. Thank you for your attention to our community.</p>

12/12/2021 9:15	Patty Ducey-Brooks	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a board member of the Old Town Chamber of Commerce, I am alarmed to learn that you are considering moving Old Town San Diego from District 3 to District 2 and parts of Mission Hills (west of interstate 5).</p> <p>We find no significant reason for the move from District 3 to District 2. In fact, all neighborhoods within District 3 flow through Old Town – at Presidio Drive., San Diego Avenue, or Washington St., connecting major highways (interstates 5 and 8) are byways of Mission Hills and Old Town. Adversely, by removing a population of 1300 in Old Town to include Mission Valley (nearly two miles east), instead, clearly impacts defined communities of interest.</p> <p>There is a strong alliance between Old Town’s sister community (Mission Hills), which is obvious by the working relationships, the connected neighborhoods, and their shared history.</p> <p>How do you make sense of disconnecting communities (street by street) by establishing different districts? It does not seem logical or rational. Nor should it make sense to our Council representatives who will be responsible for managing these dislocated neighborhoods and communities.</p>
12/10/2021 8:05	Debbie Scharoun	12/15/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>We ask you to keep Old Town San Diego in District 3.</p> <p>For years now residents of the Park Village have been lumped in with Mira Mesa for representation. Unfortunately our issues are not in line with those in Mira Mesa and so essentially have no representation. Please readjust district lines so that we can be placed in same district as those PQ residents north of 56 as previously districted.</p>
12/9/2021 18:15	Ravi Gopinathan	12/9/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Ravi Gpinathan and I'd like to advocate for the comission to adopt the SDCC map. I am a voter from Carmel Valley and I would like to be a part of district 5. Residents of Carmel Valley share more in common with those of Rancho Penasquitos than those of la Jolla. Others have mentioned that not many people from Carmel Valley support the SDCCD map but I'd like to state that I am one of them. This map is better than the current map that has two coastal districts, which empower wealthier residents who are more likely to support candidates who block the construction of affordable housing. Also, I would like to thank you for keeping Mount View and Stockton in district 9, instead of taking them out and lowering the Latino CVAP of d9.</p>

12/9/2021 16:58	John Stump -City Stump	12/9/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>December 9, 2021 TESTIMONY FOR MEETING OF DECEMBER 9, 2021 sent by Email</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DO NO HARM • REQUEST CONSULTANT TO PROVIDE MAP THAT KEEPS HISTORIC LEVELS <p>2011 COUNCIL DISTRICTS HISTORIC STATUS QUO ANTE DISTRICT 3, 4, 8, and 9 https://districtr.org/plan/91979</p> <p>SEE SUBMITTED EMAIL FOR COMPLETE COMMENT ALSO SUBMITTED MAPS</p>
12/9/2021 16:24	Pam Blackwill	12/9/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a landowner/developer in PQ TH area of SD. In support of keeping these communities whole in District 5.</p>
12/9/2021 15:29	Jean Potter	12/9/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I request that you keep the Scripps Ranch community in one district, District 5, as it is now. Making Scripps Ranch Blvd from Pomerado Road to Affinity Court as the western boundary makes no sense. Please move the western boundary to I-15. The freeway is a logical divide. We are one community and should stay as one community in one City Council district.</p>
12/8/2021 11:49	Gus Hernandez	12/9/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Gus (He/Him/His), I live in Hillcrest, and I ask the Commission to maintain District 3 as currently show in the Preliminary Map with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure D6 has an AAPI CVAP of at least 40% - Ensure D9 has a Latinx CVAP of at least 32% - Move the Qualcomm neighborhood to D7 <p>These changes will ensure that our communities are adequately represented in the redistricting process. Thank you.</p>
12/8/2021 11:42	Joseph Severino	12/9/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Joseph Severino, PhD, my pronouns are he,him,his, and I live in the Mission Valley neighborhood. I am writing to ask that the Commission maintain District 3 as currently shown in the Preliminary Map and make the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensure D6 has an AAPI DVAP of at least 40% -Ensure D9 has a Lantinx CVAP of at least 32% -Please move the Qualcomm neighborhood into D7 <p>Thank you very much!</p>

12/8/2021 11:38	Laura Horst	12/9/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Laura Horst (they/she) and I live in the North Park neighborhood. I am writing to ask that the Commission maintain District 3 as currently shown in the Preliminary Map and make the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensure D6 has an AAPI CVAP of at least 40% -Ensure D9 has a Latin@ CVAP of at least 32% -Move the Qualcomm neighborhood into D7
12/7/2021 21:44	John Stump	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please start from the South and move North at the next meeting
12/7/2021 18:56	Mae Case	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Mae Case and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. I have concerns about the implications of the commissioners priorities in this redistricting process. Census numbers tell us that the city is composed of 53% BIPOC, yet the proposed draft map shows white CVAP numbers increasing across several council districts. Additionally, the Latinx CVAP in D9 went down from 35% in 2011 to 29% in the current proposed map, while the White CVAP in D9 went up from 36% in 2011 to 42% in the current proposed map. BIPOC residents have never been prioritized in San Diego and that is on track to be true in this 2021 redistricting process. To remedy this, commissioners must increase the Latinx CVAP in D9 to create a second Latinx Empowerment District with at least 32% Latinx CVAP, create an AAPI Empowerment district that is at least 40% AAPI by total population or 35% AAPI CVAP in D6, and maximize the Black CVAP in District 4. Please make the motion to direct HaystaqDNA to create maps for discussion that would increase the AAPI total population of D6 to 40% or AAPI CVAP up to 35%.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

12/7/2021 18:34	Shital Parik	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello Commissioners,</p> <p>It was such a relief to hear Mr. Brad Wiende (unsure of last name), explain that Del Mar Mesa Preserve will be kept together with DMM residential community in District 1. Also that the Los Penasquitos Canyon eastern strip adjacent to DMM will stay in District1. Both these areas have no population but, they are both MSCP lands and form an important wild life corridor.</p> <p>Property owners in DMM ceded up to 75% of their property to create the DMM Preserve. I thank you on behalf of all of them and the Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board for keeping our community and open space together so it is possible for us to oversee the Preserve and work with only one city council office of District 1, that is aware of the issues related to the DMM Preserve for about three decades. Your decision to keep DMM Preserve with the residential area will help governance and is logical. Thank you for your hard work and listening to our community needs.</p>
12/7/2021 18:30	Chad Adapon	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>BIPOC representation in San Diego has gone down, despite BIPOC going up recently. This is discriminatory and racist as district lines continue to make BIPOC communities weaker.</p> <p>To remedy this, commissioners must increase the Latinx CVAP in D9 to create a second Latinx Empowerment District with at least 32% Latinx CVAP, create an AAPI Empowerment district that is at least 40% AAPI by total population or 35% AAPI CVAP in D6, and maximize the Black CVAP in District 4.</p> <p>Please make the motion to move Qualcomm stadium back to D7 where it belongs, and then bring either Mountain View or Stockton into D9 to increase the Latinx vote in D9. Please make the motion to direct HaystaqDNA to create maps for discussion that would increase the AAPI total population of D6 to 40% or AAPI CVAP up to 35%.</p>

12/7/2021 18:21	Michael McDonald	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Michael and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. I am here to voice concerns about the implications of the commissioners priorities in this redistricting process. Census numbers in San Diego tell us our city is composed of 53% BIPOC, yet the proposed draft map shows white CVAP numbers increasing across several council districts. The Latinx CVAP in D9 went down from 35% in 2011 to 29% in the current proposed map, while the White CVAP in D9 went up from 36% in 2011 to 42% in the current proposed map. It's hard to understand why Latinx representation is going down in the 2nd Latinx empowerment district when the Latinx population has gone up overall in the city. Removing Qualcomm Stadium from D9 won't change that, but it moves D9 in the correct direction. BIPOC residents have never been prioritized in San Diego and that is on track to be true in this 2021 redistricting process. To remedy this, commissioners must increase the Latinx CVAP in D9 to create a second Latinx Empowerment District with at least 32% Latinx CVAP, create an AAPI Empowerment district that is at least 40% AAPI by total population or 35% AAPI CVAP</p>
12/7/2021 18:07	Maya Misra	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Maya Misra and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. I am writing out of concern regarding the commissioners' priorities in this redistricting process. According to census data, our city is composed of 53% BIPOC, yet the proposed draft map shows white CVAP numbers increasing across several council districts. This says a lot about who the commissioners are willing to advocate for and whose public testimony has been granted more weight. But it's not too late to address this concern! The Latinx CVAP in D9 went down from 35% in 2011 to 29% in the current proposed map— even though the Latinx population has increased overall in the city. We need a second Latinx empowerment district to uplift the voices of this community of interest, and we can work towards that goal by moving Qualcomm Stadium out of D9 and into D7. We can then bring either Mountain View or Stockton into D9 to increase the Latinx vote in D9. Please also make the motion to direct HaystaqDNA to create maps for discussion that would increase the AAPI total population of D6 to 40% or AAPI CVAP up to 35%!</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

12/7/2021 18:03	Joshua Arriola	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Josh Arriola and I am with Asian Solidarity Collective (ASC) in San Diego, California. ASC is the regional lead organization for the AAPI & AMESMA Redistricting Collaborative.</p> <p>I would like to thank the commission for keeping our Convoy COI whole which includes Mira Mesa, Clairemont, Kearny Mesa, Linda Vista and keeping it with El Cajon, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley and supporting the new configuration.</p>
12/7/2021 17:52	Matt Panebianco	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please keep the St. Augustine community in Torrey Hills as part of District 1. We live on Vereda Mar Del Sol and are very much part of the Carmel Valley community. It doesn't make sense to me why you would take a neighborhood of homeowners and move them to District 6 but keep the neighboring apartment complex in District 1. Or why a large section of Sorrento Valley Road would be included in District 1 rather than District 6, which it has a lot more in common with. If you are trying to keep the populations even, please consider moving the Sorrento Valley portion to Mira Mesa. If that isn't an option, please consider one of the apartment complexes which has a more transient population. Please don't move the 600 homeowners from our community. Thank you for taking the time to work on this and listen to our concerns.</p>
12/7/2021 17:51	Adina Weinig	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Adina Weinig and I live in Normal Heights in D3 I am here to voice concerns about the implications of the commissioners priorities in this redistricting process. Census numbers in San Diego tell us our city is composed of 53% BIPOC, yet the proposed draft map shows white CVAP numbers increasing across several council districts. The Latinx CVAP in D9 went down from 35% in 2011 to 29% in the current proposed map, while the White CVAP in D9 went up from 36% in 2011 to 42% in the current proposed map. It's hard to understand why Latinx representation is going down in the 2nd Latinx empowerment district when the Latinx population has gone up overall in the city. Removing Qualcomm Stadium from D9 won't change that, but it moves D9 in the correct direction. BIPOC residents have never been prioritized in San Diego and that is on track to be true in this 2021 redistricting process.</p>

12/7/2021 17:31	Khue Tran	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am commenting because I am concerned about the priorities the commissioners have in this redistricting process. The current census data tells us that despite a majority percentage POC in San Diego, the draft maps show proposed districts with increasing percentages of white CVAP in multiple council districts. It's hard to understand why Latinx representation is going down in the 2nd Latinx empowerment district when the Latinx population has gone up overall in the city. While removing Qualcomm Stadium from D9 won't change that, but it will move D9 in the correct direction. BIPOC residents have never been prioritized in San Diego and that is on track to be true in this 2021 redistricting process. To remedy this, commissioners must increase the Latinx CVAP in D9 to create a second Latinx Empowerment District with at least 32% Latinx CVAP, create an AAPI Empowerment district that is at least 40% AAPI by total population or 35% AAPI CVAP in D6, and maximize the Black CVAP in District 4. Move Qualcomm Stadium back to D7, and move Mountain View or Stockton into D9 to increase the Latinx vote in D9.</p> <p>Please direct HaystaqDNA to create maps to increase AAPI population in D6</p>
12/7/2021 17:27	Samantha Mohn	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Samantha Mohn and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. I am here to voice concerns about the implications of the commissioner's priorities in this redistricting process. Census numbers in San Diego tell us our city is composed of 53% BIPOC, yet the proposed draft map shows white CVAP numbers increasing across several council districts. The Latinx CVAP in D9 went down from 35% in 2011 to 29% in the current proposed map, while the White CVAP in D9 went up from 36% in 2011 to 42% in the current proposed map. Please make the motion to move Qualcomm Stadium back to D7 where it belongs, and then bring either Mountain View or Stockton into D9 to increase the Latinx vote in D9.</p>
12/7/2021 17:26	Diana Go	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Diana and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. BIPOC residents have never been prioritized in San Diego and that is on track to be true in this 2021 redistricting process. To remedy this, commissioners must increase the Latinx CVAP in D9 to create a second Latinx Empowerment District with at least 32% Latinx CVAP, create an AAPI Empowerment district that is at least 40% AAPI by total population or 35% AAPI CVAP in D6, and maximize the Black CVAP in District 4.</p>

12/7/2021 17:25	Stacey Uy	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Stacey Uy and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. I have strong concerns about the implications of the commissioners priorities in this redistricting process. Census numbers in San Diego tell us our city is composed of 53% BIPOC, yet the proposed draft map shows white CVAP numbers increasing across several council districts. The Latinx CVAP in D9 went down from 35% in 2011 to 29% in the current proposed map, while the White CVAP in D9 went up from 36% in 2011 to 42% in the current proposed map. It's hard to understand why Latinx representation is going down in the 2nd Latinx empowerment district when the Latinx population has gone up overall in the city. Removing Qualcomm Stadium from D9 won't change that, but it moves D9 in the correct direction. BIPOC residents have never been prioritized in San</p> <p>Diego and that is on track to be true in this 2021 redistricting process.</p>
12/7/2021 17:12	Kathryn Berkman	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>All of Torrey Hills is the same community of interest. Please include all of Torrey Hills in District 1. Thank you.</p>
12/7/2021 17:10	Vlado Vucicevic	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The planned redistricting of one partial neighborhood, to include it within Mira Mesa, and for which the neighbors do not wish to be part of nor appreciate the redistricting without their input leaves us wondering if the community is being heard. Splitting up neighbors who see each other on a daily basis walking on the same streets and defining one as part of Carmel Valley and another as part of Mira Mesa does nothing for community relations. Our neighborhood demographics are very much different than those of Mira Mesa and due to the canyon, rarely do we travel to Mira Mesa. Utilizing the canyon as a natural boundary for identifying the redistricting makes much more sense.</p> <p>How people on one side of the street belong to Mira Mesa and our neighbors on the opposite side of the street are Carmel Valley does not make much sense. How do you split a street into two jurisdictions? The methodology, or lack thereof, for redistricting one side of a street and not another, while at the same time leaving streets to the West and the apartment complex to the East in Carmel Valley, does not appear to be made in a logical manner.</p>

12/7/2021 17:05	Anne Rios	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Anne Rios and live, work, and grew up in Encanto in District 4.</p> <p>I am here to voice concerns about the implications of the commissioners priorities in this redistricting process. Census numbers in San Diego tell us our city is composed of 53% people of color, yet the proposed draft map shows white CVAP numbers increasing across several council districts. The Latinx CVAP in D9 went down from 35% in 2011 to 29% in the current proposed map, while the White CVAP in D9 went up from 36% in 2011 to 42% in the current proposed map. It's hard to understand why Latinx representation is going down in the 2nd Latinx empowerment district when the Latinx population has gone up overall in the city. The only answer must be that we are witnessing real-time redlining and racism. By separating the voice of a community you are stifling the democratic process and ensuring that injustices and the true minorities contain all the power.</p>
12/7/2021 16:59	Darshana Patel	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I would like to cede my time to Jeanette Waltz for the group presentation in support of keeping Torrey Highlands with Rancho Peñasquitos in D5.</p>
12/7/2021 16:58	Joanne Worrall	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Regarding Item 1 - Discuss and vote on Proposed Changes to the UPDATED Preliminary Redistricting Map, I cede my time to Stephen Erbert.</p>
12/7/2021 16:57	Myleen Abuan	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Myleen Abuan and live in Chula Vista. I am here to voice concerns about the implications of the commissioners priorities in this redistricting process. Census numbers in San Diego tell us our city is composed of 53% BIPOC, yet the proposed draft map shows white CVAP numbers increasing across several council districts. The Latinx CVAP in D9 went down from 35% in 2011 to 29% in the current proposed map, while the White CVAP in D9 went up from 36% in 2011 to 42% in the current proposed map. It's hard to understand why Latinx representation is going down in the 2nd Latinx empowerment district when the Latinx population has gone up overall in the city. Removing Qualcomm Stadium from D9 won't change that, but it moves D9 in the correct direction. BIPOC residents have never been prioritized in San Diego and that is on track to be true in this 2021 redistricting process. To remedy this, commissioners must increase the Latinx CVAP in D9 to create a second Latinx Empowerment District with at least 32% Latinx CVAP, create an AAPI Empowerment district that is at least 40% AAPI by total population or 35% AAPI.</p>

12/7/2021 16:48	Christine Lopez	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Christine and I live in D6. I am here to voice concerns about the implications of the commissioners priorities in this redistricting process. Census numbers in San Diego tell us our city is composed of 53% BIPOC, yet the proposed draft map shows white CVAP numbers increasing across several council districts. The Latinx CVAP in D9 went down from 35% in 2011 to 29% in the current proposed map, while the White CVAP in D9 went up from 36% in 2011 to 42% in the current proposed map. It's hard to understand why Latinx representation is going down in the 2nd Latinx empowerment district when the Latinx population has gone up overall in the city. To remedy this, commissioners must increase the Latinx CVAP in D9 to create a second Latinx Empowerment District with at least 32% Latinx CVAP, create an AAPI Empowerment district that is at least 40% AAPI by total population or 35% AAPI CVAP in D6, and maximize the Black CVAP in District 4. Please make the motion to move Qualcomm Stadium back to D7 where it belongs, and bring either Mountain View or Stockton into D9 to increase the Latinx vote in D9.</p>
12/7/2021 16:35	Carol Zimmerman	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I live in St. Augustine neighborhood and can not believe that my street in this complex will be redistricted to district 1 when part of the same development will remain within the same district 6. This make no sense and I oppose this change. Thank you very much for hearing my voice.</p>
12/7/2021 16:28	Victoria P Lanning LaBruzzo	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I would like to also submit the following map: https://districtr.org/plan/90975 Changes made on this map from current Commission map reflects Districts 2, 5 & 6 in an effort to give Scripps Ranch a chance. The last map I submitted had a potential issue with contiguous boundaries (even though an exception should be made if trying to keep communities together). Thank you.</p>

12/7/2021 15:20	John William Stump	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Comments on Preliminary Map/Plan</p> <p>The proposed Preliminary Plan/Map continues a deliberate and unjustified scheme to dilute the historic minority vote in District Nine. The proposal adds a very large number of White voters by crossing into entirely new geographical and infrastructure areas. It enters into a completely new San Diego River Valley watershed and crosses at least three major infrastructures roads Between Friars Road and Camino Del Rio South, including the entire 8 lanes of the Interstate 8 Kumeyaay Freeway.</p> <p>No rationale or need to enter into this entirely new area has been given that justifies and overcomes the dilution of the minority populations in the historic District Nine. There are easy alternatives to meeting the changes in City wide populations. First the 2011 District Nine population is sufficient to be reasonably within the range of proper size and could be maintained as status quo ante. The White populations that are being scooped onto the minority brown pie slice should remain in their historic location as part of District seven.</p> <p>The Redistricting Commission must not dilute the minority voting population in D9. Analyze the 2011 D9 boundaries and population and only add population areas which do not dilute voting rights!</p>
12/7/2021 15:15	Teagan Ampe	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I just heard that you're splitting my community, Scripps Ranch, into pieces. That makes no sense. My friends from school, my teammates from sports, my fellow Girl Scouts, etc. have lived all over Scripps Ranch, so why would you split us into different City Council districts? Why are all the elementary schools in District 5, but the only middle school--Marshall Middle--in District 6? And now you have three other versions that take weird pieces out of the neighborhood. Versions 1, 2, and 3 "Lowering the Deviation of District 5" maps all put our high school, Scripps Ranch High, into a different district, too. We aren't numbers on a plot to "balance," we're people who want to be able to work together for the community. Please keep Scripps Ranch together.</p>
12/7/2021 14:44	Victoria P Lanning LaBruzzo	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>From my previous comment: Keep Scripps Ranch Whole - I am updating the map I would like to submit to: https://districtr.org/plan/90947 I changed the boundary lines but the populations did not change.</p>

12/7/2021 14:25	Victoria P Lanning LaBruzzo	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please consider the following map: https://districtr.org/plan/90934</p> <p>This map unites Scripps Ranch's geographically connected communities & neighborhoods - South of Pomerado, Rancho Encantada and also the neighborhood of Scripps Legacy that has HOA residents living on Cypress Canyon Park Drive split into two different districts. The new map would send the Sabre Springs Community on the whole, 10,772 residents from District 5 into District 6. Geographically touching corners at the I-15. Even though the map connects only in the corner, the Sabre Springs Community is bordered by clear geographical mountain, freeway, and main thoroughfare separations. Sabre Springs borders Poway to the east, I-15 to the west, Scripps Ranch to the South and Ted Williams Parkway to the North. These borders are far more representative of a community boundaries than what is being done with the current map in Scripps Ranch. It also decreases district 5 by 2,622. This new map helps to accomplish keeping communities and residential neighborhoods together especially when Scripps Ranch continues to be splintered in every direction with the commissions current considerations.</p> <p>Thank you so much for your hard work & consideration.</p>
12/7/2021 14:16	Howard Wayne	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am the Interim Chair of the Linda Vista Planning Group. Since July I have spoken to the Redistricting Commission in support of reuniting Linda Vista into a single council district. Our Planning Group reaffirmed that this is its top priority. Linda Vista is made up of seven census tracts. That includes the Morena Area, which must be included in any council district that contains the entirety of Linda Vista. We do not want our community to be used as spare parts to fill out the population needs of another district.</p> <p>One of the priorities of the Commission is to reunite communities that were divided in the 2011 plan. Splitting off the Morena Area would retain this unfair treatment of Linda Vista. Prior proposed maps have united Linda Vista into a single council district. This proposed map is an outlier that should be discarded.</p>

12/7/2021 14:05	Jeffrey L Stevens	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I chair the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group. The Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve is very important to Mira Mesa and to all other surrounding communities. It is outside of Community Planning Areas and contains no population. Currently the boundary between D6 and D1 is Peñasquitos Creek, which forms a natural boundary running west-east in the center of the Preserve. The current boundary turns north to include Park Village in D6. Draft maps have moved the northern boundary of D6 both north and south. I recommend that the Commission retain Peñasquitos Creek as the northern boundary of D6, shifting the eastern boundary to follow the Creek south of Park Village.
12/7/2021 12:45	Brenna Vucicevic	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Hello, My name is Brenna Vucicevic and have lived in the Torrey Hills community with my family for 15 years raising our two kids. We feel we have contributed to this community, and that we ARE part of the Carmel Valley community. I live on Vereda Mar Del Sol. Currently the map has our street excluded from District 1, but the houses across the street are not? It simply does not make sense. Please revise the current updated preliminary map and include the streets that are part of the St. Augustine home developement which complete Torrey Hills. It seems very devisive to cut right through a neighborhood that considers themselves all part of the same community of Carmel Valley. Thank You for your time- Brenna
12/7/2021 11:52	Paula Cullivan	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Do not read Redistrict Carmel Valley. It makes no sense
12/7/2021 11:32	Joyce Glady	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Thank you for voting to keep Torrey Hills in District 1. Our family has lived in the Carmel Valley/Torrey Hills area for close to 30 years. We have many friends and neighbors who we share roads, schools, businesses and community interests with. It has come to our attention that, due to a consultant's error, 606 of our neighbors were moved to District 6. On behalf of our neighbors and community, I respectfully ask that our neighbors also remain with us in District 1. Thank you for correcting this error and keeping our community whole.

12/7/2021 10:44	Bari Vaz, President, Mira Mesa Town Council	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The Mira Mesa Town Council, on behalf of the Mira Mesa community, would like to state that we do not approve of moving the southern boundary of D1 to cover all of the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve on the western end, as presented in Map 89274 to be voted on as Item 1, Subitem B.</p> <p>The Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve is very important to all surrounding communities. It is outside of all Community Planning Areas and contains no population. Extending the boundary of D1 to the southern border of the canyon will not change the population in D1.</p> <p>All communities that form the borders around the Preserve must have City Council representation that can speak to decisions affecting the Preserve and by extension, the quality of life in surrounding communities.</p> <p>The boundary between D6 and the communities to the north should follow Peñasquitos Creek, a natural boundary that is the current boundary between D6 and D1. We ask that the Commission retain Peñasquitos Creek as the boundary between D1 and D6.</p>
12/7/2021 9:46	Helen Boyden	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please approve the addition of Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve and the eastern portion of Del Mar Mesa Preserve (incorrectly specified as Torrey Pines in the agenda) to District One. This will preserve all of this valuable and precious coastal canyon and important and vulnerable watershed area in one district--District One. This appears as Subitem B.</p>
12/7/2021 9:31	Diane Petersen	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The boundary map 89040 shows 606 residents of Torrey Hills being split away from others in the Torrey Hills community moving us out of District 1 into District 6. I respectfully request ALL residents of Torrey Hills remain together and intact in District 1 as we have shared interests not only with our fellow Torrey Hills residents, but also with the other communities in District 1 that include Carmel Valley and Torrey Pines. In addition, we are separated from most if not all of the other District 6 communities by Los Penasquitos Canyon which should serve as a natural boundary between District 1 and District 6. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

12/7/2021 7:25	Kristen Panebianco	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please keep the St. Augustine community in Torrey Hills as part of District 1. We live on Vereda Mar Del Sol and are very much part of the Carmel Valley community. It doesn't make sense to me why you would take a neighborhood of homeowners and move them to District 6, but keep the neighboring apartment complex in District 1. Or why a large section of Sorrento Valley road would be included in District 1 rather than District 6, which it has a lot more in common with. If you are trying to keep the populations even please consider moving the Sorrento Valley portion to Mira Mesa. If that isn't an option, please consider one of the apartment complexes which has a more transient population. Please don't move the 600 homeowners from our community. Thank you for taking the time to work on this and listen to our concerns.
12/7/2021 7:06	Gary Wonacott	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am sickened this morning to learn that Councilmember Campbell, through Seamus Kennedy's actions was responsible for the map that your group has adopted with modifications. It seems that so many of the decisions related to Mission Beach come back to short term rentals. While there is a relatively small minority of STR owners in Mission Beach (the majority are investors who live else where), they have the backing of large platforms, AirBnB and Expedia, and they will stop at nothing to get what they want (\$\$\$). I am past president of the town council and have tried to be a vocal opponent of this industry, which has resulted in 3 attempts to purge me from the town council, including the most recent attempt, a physical attack. Is this what it comes down to? We have many great neighbors still here. Help us sustain ourselves by moving us away from D2 to D1, where we have a chance.
12/6/2021 21:38	Tim Ampe	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	It doesn't make sense to chop up the community of Scripps Ranch. The community has strong natural and man-made boundaries: Marine Corps Air Station Miramar to the south, Mission Trails regional park to the east, Poway to the north-east, and 10 lanes of I-15 on the West. It doesn't make sense to cross these large boundaries to remove portions of the community just to play a demographic numbers game. Scripps Ranch is a close community that deserves to be kept together in a single city council district. Thank you.

12/6/2021 21:32	Gary Wonacott	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	It is difficult for me to see how Pacific Beach and Mission Beach (Bay) could end up in different Districts. Again, our two communities share a common border, beaches, streets (Mission Blvd), and important issues. Mission Beach has a very limited commercial district. As a result, we rely on the commercial district in Pacific Beach for virtually all of our shopping and services. Please consider moving Mission Beach to D1.
12/6/2021 20:07	Lisa Chou	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The new approved map 89040 does not meet the intent of the re-districting vision as stated on the secretary of state website where we are trying to (1) geographically keep contiguous districts, (2) keep and respect the geographic integrity of local neighborhoods or communities in a manner that minimizes its division, (3) respect the geographic integrity of a city to minimize its division, (4) easily identifiable boundaries that follow natural or artificial barriers, which is the penasquitos canyon separating us from sorrento valley and mira mesa, and (5) lines shall be drawn to encourage geographic compactness. With this new map, residents of Torrey Hills have been cut from their immediate neighborhood. It does not make sense that our immediate neighbors who share the same streets, shopping, and geographical neighborhood should be separated into separate districts.
12/6/2021 19:31	Jason Miller	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Dear Planning Team,</p> <p>We submit this form today to go on record to oppose the current revised redistricting map related with Carmel Valley Torrey Hills region. The currently revised and proposed boundary is unnatural, since it splits up well-defined and clear-cut neighborhoods into different districts.</p> <p>Please have a detailed look at the map including street map and see that this is a cut through a long-standing neighborhood community that should not happen. While there is a canyon perimeter that is shared with the new proposed district, it is highly irregular as there are no shared neighbor boundaries, no shared local roads, and no recent history of being in the same district. Many thanks for your consideration.</p> <p>Best regards, Jason</p>

12/6/2021 19:27	Michele Addington	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please approve Subitem E: Evaluate moving part of Mountain View to District 9 and offset it with moving Mission Valley east of I-15 and north of I-8 to District 7, and analyze moving Stockton to District 9 and offset it with moving Mission Valley east of I-15 and north of I-8 to District 7.</p> <p>I am a Mission Valley East of I-15 Homeowner and currently I am in District 7 and would like to remain in same.</p> <p>Regards, Michele Addington</p>
12/6/2021 19:24	Michele Addington	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please approve Subitem C: Review moving Mission Valley East (east of 163 and north of I-8) from District 9 to District 7, adding Stockton to District 9, and moving Morena to District 2.</p> <p>Currently Mission Valley is in District 7, thus Mission Valley would remain in same.</p> <p>Regards, Michele Addington</p>
12/6/2021 19:24	Jason Miller	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Dear Planning Team,</p> <p>We submit this form today to go on record to oppose the current revised redistricting map. The boundary is unnatural, since it splits up well-defined and clear-cut neighborhoods into different districts.</p> <p>Please have a detailed look at the map including street map and see that this is a cut through a long-standing neighborhood community that should not happen. While there is a canyon perimeter that is shared with the new proposed district, it is highly irregular as there are no shared neighbor boundaries, no shared local roads, and no recent history of being in the same district. Many thanks for your consideration.</p> <p>Best regards, Jason</p>

12/6/2021 17:44	Lavanya Mahalingam	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>This comment is with regard to the following issue: "At the December 1 meeting, the Redistricting Commission moved most of Torrey Hills back into District 1. Because of an error by the Commission's consultant, 606 residents were excluded and remain in District 6"</p> <p>As a resident of Torrey Hills, this error must be corrected ASAP. We are part of Torrey Hills and should remain part of district 1. We request you to correct this error.</p>
12/6/2021 16:26	Tina Wang	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My house is affected by the boundaries proposed by map 89040. I do not believe we share interests with district 6 since our community resides with district 1. We should be represented by the same individuals that represent district 1. For example, our school district is with district 1, not 6. Please do not approve this map and put torrey hills south with district 1.</p>
12/6/2021 15:53	Wanping Mai	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a longtime resident of Carmel Valley, San Diego. I recently became aware of 606 homes in Torrey Hills being remained in District 6 in the updated map of #89404 (https://districtr.org/plan/89040?portal) while most of Torrey Hills homes have been returned to District 1, Carmel Valley. I hope the assignment of the 606 homes off East Ocean Drive to District 6 is just a technical error as these homes have been part of Torrey Hills Master Association since they were built around year 2000 and the residents living there have close ties to Carmel Valley just as most of Torrey Hills community that has been returned to CV District 1. Therefore I respectfully ask that this error to be corrected before the next public hearing on Dec 7, 2021 so that the entire Torrey Hills community be returned to District 1 and the original boundary between District 1 and 6 remains unchanged with the Los Penasquitos Canyon as the natural boundary.</p>
12/6/2021 15:20	Diane Ahern	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am happy that It looks as though the University City, 92122, community will be kept whole. However my preference is that the community remain in District one.</p>
12/6/2021 14:51	Betty Rodriguez	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Subitem C. From the beginning with the Chair's map we were told how Linda Vista must be kept together. The LV planning group requested that. The clairemont map which was chosen by you had Linda Vista in one district and all Linda Vista rejoiced. Now at this late date someone suggests we go back to where we were - half D7 and half D2. We want to be in D7 entirely and would like you to keep your word. Thank you for your work. Morena is Linda Vista. USD is Linda Vista.</p>

12/6/2021 13:30	Jan Coppola	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The proposed redistricting maps that split Scripps Ranch into two different districts are not clear on the reasoning nor the benefit to the families in Scripps Ranch. The proposal has been done without the input of the community which leads individuals to believe the change would not provide the residents with the best outcome. I do not support the redistricting maps that break this small community into two different districts, especially during an election year for this district. Seems that the change being made would only support the individual who is up for re-election in this district not the population for which that individual was elected to support. If you want to make a change, do it with plenty of time for individuals to weigh in and with as much transparency as possible- if this happens once every ten years learning about it within a month of the election seems nefarious. I appreciate the opportunity for my opinion to be included in this VERY important decision.</p>
12/6/2021 13:03	Yuki Nagano	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Haystaq's #87525 - error ?</p> <p>Just look at Torrey Ridge Apartment. The new map divides this apartment residents into two districts. It makes no sense.</p> <p>Please bring back 600+ Torrey Hills residents and Los Penasquitos Canyon o District 1 and keep Torrey Hills as a whole. Those residents are our neighbors and our kids go to the same school. We share the common interests and should be represented by the same(District 1) council member.</p>
12/6/2021 11:39	Rina Podolsky	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Regarding the approved Map 89040, I would like to voice my concern over the approval of a map that contains glaring mistakes and creates a situation where a small portion of Torrey Hills neighbors would be excluded from their rightful neighborhood. I would like a clear explanation on how this decision has been made and if there is no explanation other than a map being mistakenly drawn, I request that this get corrected immediately. This mistake will have a potential economic and emotional impact in the residents who have been inexplicably excluded. Their home value will potentially be seriously impacted and they will lose their voices as their concerns will become diluted in the district of Mira Mesa with whom they share very little services and items on the agenda. This homeowners have everything in common with their Torrey Hills neighbors and little to no issues in common with Mira Mesa.</p>

12/6/2021 11:13	Archana Gangavati	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Archana Gangavati, a 10-year resident of Torrey Hills, on Corte Luz Del Sol (one of the impacted streets, residences that were left behind in district 6, despite the approval of moving all Torrey Hills back into district 1).</p> <p>I am writing you on behalf of ALL my neighbors because the Map 87040 that Haystaq developed and was approved during your previous meeting moving Torrey Hills has incorrect boundaries for 606 Torrey Hills residents that live on the top of hill by East Ocean Air drive, near the canyon, part of the same housing complex, community, neighborhood and HOA, etc. Map 870404 as approved today carves out and excludes via a strange two-horseshoe like pattern right in the middle of the neighborhood moving houses out of district 1 and leaving others more inside the cul-de-sacs of the same housing complex in district 1.</p> <p>I have to believe that the emission is only an oversight, and that this is rectified in the upcoming meeting.</p> <p>Thanks Archana</p>
12/6/2021 10:53	Anitha Chidambaram	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>hi Mam/Sir,</p> <p>I am writing to you in regards to exclusion of 606 of Torrey hills neighbors who have been left behind in being included into the Carmel Valley Boundary Map. Pls. do not discriminate against these neighbors and include them into the boundary. look forward to a supportive decision favorable to torrey hills neighbors, thank you and best regards, anitha chidambaram</p>
12/6/2021 10:47	Ju Eun Choe	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I want to stay District 1. I can't understand why my home and my neighbors to be redistricted to District 6. All schools and near community are in District 1. I can't even drive to District 6 directly cause there is a deep Valley!!</p>

12/6/2021 10:46	Cori Taylor	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>While most of the Torrey Hills community was returned back to District 1 at the 12/1/2021 hearing, the errors on map #89040 still left 606 Torrey Hills residents behind in District 6. They are our neighbors and friends just across the small community street on Torrey Cir and Vereda Luz Del Sol. Same as us, they are a part of Torrey Hills community and SHOULD remain a part of Torrey Hills community. So please correct the error and return the WHOLE Torrey Hills community back to District 1, including the 606 residents, the Torrey Hills Dog Park and other residential areas along the canyon. Excluding the 606 residents and the Torrey Hills Dog Park is absolutely absurd and appalling! Since the whole Torrey Hills community is to be restored back to District 1, there is NO reason the original boundary between District 1 and District 6 is not restored to include the 606 residents you have excluded. Please make the correction and restore the original boundary to be the Los Penasquitos Canyon and keep Torrey Hills ONE community. Thank you, Concerned Resident</p>
12/6/2021 9:44	David Critchlow	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a resident of Scripps Ranch. My wife and I have lived on both North and South sides of Pomerado in our 35 years and raised or kids here through Scripps Ranch schools. Moving from North to South was no big deal, since Scripps is a united community, and I think the council must vote to keep it that way.</p> <p>Scripps is a unique community, and the possibility that a demographer will split this community in two is unfathomable. Why would the council decide to break up one of the best communities we have in San Diego? We contribute more than our fair share in property and school taxes, and supplement our schools with PTA/FFO funding so that SDUSD funds can be directed to schools that are less fortunate.</p> <p>Please don't mess up something that has worked for 40+ years - keep our community together. If it ain't broke, don't fix it!</p> <p>Thank you, D. Critchlow</p>

12/6/2021 8:30	Tina Call	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am writing against the redistributing of Scripps Ranch, zip code 92131. The proposal to split Scripps, essentially along Pomerado Road is ridiculous. Pomerado is a two lane road and a vital artery through our community, not a dividing line. It makes zero sense to cut off part of this community and give representation for it to a geographically detached district that has no vested interest in anything that happens in that portion of the proposed district. Both sides of the road have always worked together to determine the best interest of our community and it would be wrong to tell small sections of our community that they will no longer be represented in the same United manner that the bulk of the community is would be insane. I urge you to think about the community you are potentially ripping apart, not political numbers. These are peoples lives and the potential quality of life for their future. Please vote NO in the split of Scripps Ranch!
12/5/2021 20:30	Xuepan Guan	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Return Torrey Hilss and Canyon back to D1 and Carmel valley .
12/5/2021 20:10	Jian Yuan	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Dear Commissioners:</p> <p>We have been residents of Torrey Hills for almost 20 years. We request to restore the original boundary between districts 1 and 6 based on the fact that Las Penasquitos Canyon represents a nature boundary with trails from both sides separated by a creek running in the middle. We have enjoyed hiking and biking on the trails for family activities. They are part of Carmel Valley nature habitats.</p> <p>More importantly, there are 606 Torrey Hills residents living in this area, they have always been with the Torrey Hill master association and share common interests with the rest of the Carmel Valley community. They should stay in district 1 with Torrey Hills.</p> <p>Therefore, restoring the original boundary and uniting Torrey Hills is the right thing to do. Thank you very much for your consideration!</p>

12/5/2021 20:05	Maolin Cao	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The new map after the meeting is https://districtr.org/plan/89040?portal. It still split Torry Hills and left 606 residents in district 6 even though most of Torry Hills was returned to its original District 1. It is splitting the community again. I urge you to return Torry Hills back to District 1 as a whole.</p> <p>The boundary between D1 & D5 should also be reverted back to its original, which is the center of Los Penasquitos Canyon. It does not make sense to redistrict the current D1 non-population area to D5.</p>
12/5/2021 19:55	Cathy Wang	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hi Redistricting Commissioners:</p> <p>Thank you for your decision to return Torrey Hills back to Dist.1 on the 12/1/2021 meeting! While most of the Torrey Hills community was returned back, the map #89040 actually had an error that still left 606 Torrey Hills residents behind in District 6. They are our neighbor and friends just across the small community street Torrey Cir and Vereda Luz Del Sol.</p> <p>Same as us, they are part of the Torrey Hills community, paid the same 20 years high tax and Mello Roos building the Del Mar school district, parks, and community structures, developed family and friends from the same community, and spent most of the past two decades in the same area. They are part of US. So please correct the error and return the WHOLE Torrey Hills community back to District 1, including the 606 residents, the Torrey Hills Dog Park, and other residential areas along the canyon.</p> <p>Since the whole Torrey Hills is to be restored back to original dist.1, there's no reason the original boundary between dist.1 and dist.6 is not restored. Please make the correction too and restore the original natural boundary in the Los Penasquitos Canyon.</p>

12/5/2021 19:55	Quinn Leung	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>While most of the Torrey Hills community was returned back to District 1 at the 12/1/2021 hearing, the errors on map #89040 still left 606 Torrey Hills residents behind in District 6. They are our neighbor and friends just across the small community street Torrey Cir and Vereda Luz Del Sol.</p> <p>Same as us, they are part of the Torrey Hills community, paid the same 20 years high tax and Mello Roos building the Del Mar school district, parks, and community structures, developed family and friends from the same community, and spent most of the past two decades in the same area. They are part of US. So please correct the error and return the WHOLE Torrey Hills community back to District 1, including the 606 residents, the Torrey Hills Dog Park, and other residential areas along the canyon.</p> <p>Since the whole Torrey Hills is to be restored back to original dist.1, there's no reason the original boundary between dist.1 and dist.6 is not restored. Please make the correction too and restore the original natural boundary in the Los Penasquitos Canyon.</p>
12/5/2021 19:50	Peijuan Shen	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>There were substantial errors in Haystaq's map #87525. Please return the 606 Torrey Hills residents that were omitted from this map to the Torrey Hills community. In addition to the Torrey Hills Dog Park, the following streets must be included: Torrey Circle, Vereda Mar del Sol, Vereda Luz del Sol, Corte Luz del Sol, Vereda Sol del Dios, Terraza Mar Marvelosa and Corte Mar Asombrosa.</p> <p>We ask that the boundary at Torrey Hills between District 1 and District 6 be the same boundary that exists now. Areas with no population that are currently in District 1 should remain in District 1. That would include the current boundary of Los Penasquitos Canyon.</p>

12/5/2021 19:41	Jianguen Gong	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>There were substantial errors in Haystaq's map #87525. Please return the 606 Torrey Hills residents that were omitted from this map to the Torrey Hills community. In addition to the Torrey Hills Dog Park, the following streets must be included: Torrey Circle, Vereda Mar del Sol, Vereda Luz del Sol, Corte Luz del Sol, Vereda Sol del Dios, Terraza Mar Marvelosa and Corte Mar Asombrosa.</p> <p>We ask that the boundary at Torrey Hills between District 1 and District 6 be the same boundary that exists now. Areas with no population that are currently in District 1 should remain in District 1. That would include the current boundary of Los Penasquitos Canyon.</p>
12/5/2021 19:38	Shangxiu Tian	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a resident of Torrey Hills. The commission returned Torrey Hills back to District 1 at the meeting on December 1st. I am grateful for that. However, there are still 606 residents of Torrey Hills still have not been returned to District 1. This is a mistake that should not have occurred. They are all residents of Torrey Hills community. Please correct this error. We are a whole community. Please return them back to District 1. At the same time, the new plan also divides our community's Dog park and adjacent Penasquitos Canyon into District 6. Please return the Dog park to District 1 .Please remain the current canyon boundary between District 1 and District 6 from the middle of the Penasquitos Canyon.</p>

					<p>As a 27-year resident of Scripps Ranch, I've very disappointed at how Scripps Ranch has become the sacrificial lamb to balance the population now in District 5 due to redistricting changes to make other areas more whole. First, it was the households south of Pomerado Road. Now, the proposal is for "more." The fact that the commissioners are leaving it to the Haystaq demographer to arbitrarily determine what additional areas of the community to carve out just to balance the District 5 numbers demonstrates a callous disregard for our community. It's not OK.</p> <p>Scripps Ranch is one community, represented by one civic association (the SRCA). The SRCA sponsors community-wide events, like our July 4th parade. There are youth community-wide civic organizations (like scouting) and sports (like soccer). The community rallied together to support one-another when more than 300 homes--almost exclusively south of Pomerado Road--were destroyed by the Cedar Fire. The idea that some parts of Scripps Ranch are "affiliated with Mira Mesa" is a false narrative. (They are our neighboring community, with whom we are friendly.) Scripps Ranch is one community that deserves to be kept together. Please do not break Scripps Ranch into pieces.</p>
12/5/2021 17:13	Tamara Hurley	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Thank you.
12/5/2021 15:23	Marcela Szipina	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am one of the residents of Torrey Hills that we were omitted in map 89040. Please revise this map in your December 7 meeting. All Torrey Hills needs to be in District 1 based on Los Penasquitos Canyon boundaries. I'm sure this was a mistake but I would like to be fixed and clarify.</p> <p>Thanks</p>

12/5/2021 14:06	Max Katz	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Max Katz. I am a resident of Torrey Hills St Augustine Community Thank you for your time and for listening to our community concerns during the last meeting and recognizing the need to move All Torrey Hills into District 1</p> <p>After reviewing the Map 89040 I was frankly shocked to see that a portion of Torrey hills was excluded from District 1 and is shown as being part of District 6 of which we have no common geographical boundaries, streets and are separated by a 7.5 miles of Penasquitos Canyon</p> <p>More importantly this redistricting does not meet the vision as stated on the California secretary of state's website where it calls for respecting the geographical integrity of a city to minimize its division, among others.</p> <p>Please revise Map 89040 in our Dec 7 Meeting to move ALL Torrey hills within District 1 based on Penasquitos Canyon boundaries and keep Carmel Valley as one community</p> <p>Respectfully, Max Katz</p>
-----------------	----------	-----------	---------------------	---	--

12/4/2021 19:47	Jennifer Hou	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a woman of color, I oppose the proposal to merge Mira Mesa and Torrey Hills. It is unfair to characterize all opposition as disparaging another community.</p> <p>These blanket characterizations fail to uncover any real reasons why my neighbors and I wish to keep Torrey Hills separate.</p> <p>In my opinion, what makes Torrey Hills residents unique is that we are devoted to protecting our canyon. Over the years, my neighbors and I have resisted attempts to overdevelop property on the Penasquitos. Furthermore, my daughters have advocated for wildlife conservation of species native to the canyon since they were children. It is home to so many plant and animal species that can hardly be found outside of San Diego.</p> <p>We have reason to believe that the well-being of the Penasquitos is at risk. If districts merge, policies on what to do with local nature may change. For instance, constructing residences or businesses on top of the Penasquitos may provide short-term economic value at the cost of damaging the environment.</p>
12/4/2021 14:37	Patrick Wu	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>We are concerned Torrey Hills residents and we are glad to see that our Torrey Hills community returned back to District 1 at the 12/1/2021 hearing. But the errors on map #89040 still left 606 Torrey Hills residents including my family behind in District 6, with the proposed district boundary being small community streets Terraza Mar Marvelosa, Torrey Circle and Vereda Luz Del Sol.</p> <p>We are afraid of being wrongly represented, as our very only roads connecting outside and all nearby community parks are located in district 1. Our tax is also used for maintenance of these facilities in Dist.1. We don't find it reasonable being redistricted to dist.6, a district across a natural barrier of Los Penasquitos Canyon Reserve from our home, and barely any connections with. This doesn't seem to follow the "contiguous" rule of redistricting.</p> <p>Could you please correct the potential error and return the WHOLE Torrey Hills community back to District 1, including the 606 residents, the Torrey Hills Dog Park, and other residential areas to the north of the Los Penasquitos canyon.</p>

12/4/2021 12:45	Rajat Prakash	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I live in St Augustine, Torrey Hills, which is a small cluster of single family homes with 606 residents. My immediate North neighbors are part of Carmel valley. My immediate South neighbors are also Carmel Valley. To my West is Torrey Pines and to my East is a huge canyon. Where is the justice in cutting my home from my community and calling it Mira Mesa? I strongly oppose the latest map boundaries and want my community reunited with Torrey Hills, Carmel Valley and District 1.
12/4/2021 11:21	Shahab Ariannejad	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please reconsider revising the current approved map that divides Torrey hills and puts 606 residents in an island up against the canyon. This new map isolates these residents from the rest of Torrey hills. The current map does not make logical sense, as the only section of Torrey hills to be excluded from district one is closer to Carmel valley than the rest of Torrey hills that has been Included. The new map sandwiches the Torrey hills neighborhood between the Penasquitos canyon and the included area of Torrey hills in the new redistricting map. Please reunite the remainder of Torrey hills.
12/4/2021 11:12	Patricia Bostrom	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Redistributing commission mapping hearing # 5 For 8 years we have paid our taxes to District 1 in good faith. We expect our local government to maintain “our” neighborhood with police, fire community schools, roadways and good governance. By looping out the Saint Augustine development from the neighborhood of Torrey Hills and unreasonably grouping us into District 6, our trust is eroding.Our neighborhood is staunchly against this! Please return us to District 1. Our trust in your ability to see sense is at risk. We want our community to be kept in tact with the rest of Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley. Our children need to be kept with their friends. we need to be kept with our neighbors. Slicing our development out and forcing us to accept this plan is unacceptable! Thank you.

12/4/2021 10:46	Jim Reilley	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a resident of St. Augustine development in Torrey Hills. Our community believes there has been a significant error in the latest map (89040) for redistricting as the line runs right through our development vs the natural boundary of the canyon that runs right behind to separate District 6 from Torrey Hills/Carmel Valley in District 1. All of St. Augustine and all of Torrey Hills should be included in District 1.</p> <p>Map 89040 does not meet the intent of the re-districting vision as stated on the Secretary of State website, where we are trying to 1) geographically keep contiguous districts, (2) keep and respect the geographic integrity of local neighborhoods or communities in a manner that minimizes its division, (3) respect the geographic integrity of a city to minimize its division, (4) easily identifiable boundaries that follow natural or artificial barriers (which in this case is the Penasquitos Canyon separating us from Sorrento Valley and Mira Mesa), and (5) lines shall be drawn to encourage geographic compactness.</p> <p>Please revise Map 89040 in your December 7 meeting to move ALL Torrey Hills within District 1 using the Penasquitos Canyon boundary. Thank you.</p>
12/4/2021 10:43	Michelle Resler	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Thank you for voting to re-unite Torrey Hills with District 1. However, my neighbors and I are very disappointed that the approved map excluded our St. Augustine, Torrey Hills neighborhood. This will result in cutting our community in half. I hope you will kindly consider a revision during your next meeting that will bring together all of the constituents and residents of Torrey Hills. Please do not exclude the 606 residents in my Torrey Hills neighborhood from District 1.</p>
12/4/2021 10:42	Rajat Prakash	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Request to correct the error in the map for Torrey Hills, where my street (Vereda Sol Del Dios) has been separated from the rest of Torrey Hills. Separating my street from the rest of the neighborhood will make it difficult for my local issues to be addressed properly.</p>

12/4/2021 10:35	Murali Pinnamaneni	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Residences on Terraza mar maravlosa were part of Carmel Valley forever but the houses on East Oceanair are now proposed to be part of Mira Mesa which is not Acceptable while the rest of Torrey hills is part of Carmel Valley .</p> <p>I request the redistrict commission to reconsider the decision and keep Terraza mar maravlosa and homes on East Oceanair to continue to be part of Carmel Valley.</p>
12/4/2021 10:07	Walter Bostrom	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Looking at the map, it looks like a sharks mouth with jagged teeth. It seems like common sense to have This area of Torrey Hills to be included with the rest of Torrey Hills in District- 1. The Penasquitos preserve is a natural separation in this area.</p>
12/4/2021 9:49	Iavanya Mahalingam	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>"Because of an error by the Commission's consultant, 606 residents were excluded and remain in District 6."</p> <p>We are part of the 606 residents who have excluded. We request you to fix this error and let us be part of district 1, which is the most sensible thing to do. We are one of the earliest neighborhoods to come up in the torrey hills area. It makes no sense to separate us from the rest of the Torrey Hills.</p>
12/4/2021 9:38	Hillary Liber	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>On 11/23, the District 1 map was appropriately redrawn to attach most of Torrey Hills to Carmel Valley. However my small neighborhood, which shares stores, schools, parks, and other facilities with our neighbors and is separated by Penasquitos Canyon from Mira Mesa, was carved out in an unnatural and illogical way from district 1 in which we belong. Please restore us to district 1.</p>
12/3/2021 19:39	Abdul Rashid Khan	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a ling time torrey hills resident over 20 years. My children went to Carmel Valley schools. I would appreciate, please keep Torrey hills in District 1 with carmel valley, thanks</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Abdul & Rabia Khan</p>

12/3/2021 18:51	Jill Leibowitz	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I would like to urge you to revise Map 88040 to move ALL of Torrey Hills within District 1. Imagine if you had an elementary school within walking distance ce from your house, but your children could no longer go to it. That will be the result for San Augustine residents if this redistricting takes place. Imagine if your fire services will be over 8 miles away versus in your immediate neighborhood for the first time. That will be the result for San Augustine residents if this restricting takes place. We have been loyal members and taxpayers within the Torrey Hills community for many years, and this plan is especially egregious given that the large apartment buildings in Torrey Hills have been allowed to remain in District 1 rather than the entire single family residential neighborhood of St. Augustine. Obviously to carve out the apartments that are essentially in our backyard and owned/operated by the Irvine Company is a slap in the face to those of us who own our homes and pay our taxes and community fees versus those who do not invest in the community but simply live where they do for the top tier schools.</p> <p>Jill Leibowitz</p>
12/3/2021 14:41	Miao Li	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>We are living on the street 4685 Vereda Luz Del Sol. Recently this street is said to be redistricted into Mira Mesa from Carmel Valley. We love the Torrey Hill community and don't want to be separated from it. My kid grows up here and went to Ocean Air Elementary school, and then now CVMS. Our friends are all here in Torrey Hill and Carmel Valley. We don't want to be treated like this. We wish to keep our community whole.</p>
12/3/2021 14:28	James Cronin	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am appalled an irate over the discriminatory decision to carve out one neighborhood in all of Torrey Hills and exclude that neighborhood (St. Augustine) from remaining in District 1 along with Carmel Valley. Torrey Hill as a whole NOT part, is strongly in favor of keeping our identity with District 1. there is no reason to pick out one neighborhood to move them out of District 1.</p> <p>Please reconsider this offensive and discriminatory move. This is a gross injustice.</p>

12/3/2021 12:58	Prachee Prakash	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	A few streets of Torrey Hills South including my home have been excluded from District 1. This looks like an accidental omission and we hope it will be fixed on Dec 7 meeting. I can't possibly imagine 1 block of homes geographically within Torrey Hills can be excluded on purpose. This is a BIG small mistake and we expect it to be fixed before the maps are locked. Thankyou.
12/3/2021 11:29	Wenbing Hu	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Dear Commissioners: Thank you for deciding to return most of the Torrey Hills to District 1. However, the new map #89404 after last night's (12/1/2021) meeting (https://districtr.org/plan/89040?portal) still left 606 residents in District 6 even though they are part of the Torrey Hills master association. These 606 residents should also be included in District 1. Please return the WHOLE Torrey Hills community to District 1. In addition, please keep the originally natural boundary between District 1 and District 6 inside the Los Penasquitos canyon when you return the 606 residents back to District 1. Thank you for your consideration!
12/3/2021 10:04	Sohail Malad	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Torrey Hills cannot be split into two different districts with part of it falling into Mira Mesa - it makes no sense - one just has to look at a map. Further, the needs of the Torrey Hills community would be the same of its adjacent communities in Del Mar, La Jolla, Carmel Valley - how does Mira Mesa even enter into a convo?! Feels like this is re-districting gone awry.
12/3/2021 9:43	Suresh Koppolu	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Hello, Subject: Commission's consultant error of moving 606 residents to District 6 The 606 residences that were moved due to consultant's error to District 6 belong to District 1 should be corrected. These 606 units belong to Carmel Valley and have several ties to the community / schools / etc., and highly appreciate if the District Redistricting Commission can correct the error and move these 606 residences back to District 1. Thanks and have a nice day Suresh

12/3/2021 9:42	Mingzhu Zhang	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Thank you for deciding to return most of the Torrey Hills to District 1. However, the new map #89404 after 12/1/2021 meeting (https://districtr.org/plan/89040?portal) still left 606 residents in District 6 even though they are part of the Torrey Hills master association. These 606 residents should also be included in District 1. Please correct this error and return the WHOLE Torrey Hills community to District 1. In another word, please keep the original boundary between District 1 and District 6 inside the Los Penasquitos canyon when you return the 606 residents back to District 1.</p>
12/3/2021 8:15	Janakiram Ganesh Sankaranarayanan	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>This comment is with regard to the following issue: "At the December 1 meeting, the Redistricting Commission moved most of Torrey Hills back into District 1. Because of an error by the Commission's consultant, 606 residents were excluded and remain in District 6"</p> <p>As a resident of Torrey Hills, this error must be corrected ASAP. We are part of Torrey Hills and should remain part of district 1. We request you to correct this error.</p> <p>Thanks Ganesh</p>
12/3/2021 6:33	Steven Shafer	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Correct the error so that all of Torrey Hills is in District 1 Dear Re-Districting commission,</p> <p>We believe all of Torrey Hills should be in District 1. But an error with the current map leaves the St Augustine neighborhood out. Please correct this error such that all of Torrey Hills remains included in District 1.</p> <p>Thank you for your serious consideration of this important point. Best regards, Steve Shafer</p>

12/3/2021 6:31	Susanna Parma	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Correct the error so that all of Torrey Hills is in District 1 Dear ReDistricting commission,</p> <p>We believe all of Torrey Hills should be in District 1. But an error with the current map leaves the St Augustine neighborhood out. Please correct this error such that all of Torrey Hills remains included in District 1.</p> <p>Thank you for your serious consideration of this important point. Best regards,</p> <p>Susanna Parma</p>
12/3/2021 0:28	Lisa Morrison	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>We live on Coach Horse Ct. 92130 and bought this home specifically to allow our young kids to attend the Del Mar school district. I have been made aware that our home may be redistricted as part of Mira Mesa. As you are well aware, home prices here are significantly more than Mira Mesa and we specifically did not want to be in the Mira Mesa school district, taking out significant loans to afford our current home. Our children walk 2 blocks to school and we are part of the Amber Ridge association. It make no sense to change our district. We work full time and simply do not have the means to transport our children miles and miles away when school is next door. We researched for a long time and made sacrifices to afford this home so that the kids would be in this district with our neighbors. This is shocking and clearly must be a mistake. We pay homeowners fees and mello-roos to support and care for the community we live in. It is unreasonable for me to pay these fees for 92130 only to be told I must now use facilities in a different zip code.</p>
12/2/2021 23:44	Marc Mashhoun	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Correct the error so that all of Torrey Hills is in District 1 Dear ReDistricting commission,</p> <p>We believe all of Torrey Hills should be in District 1. But an error with the current map leaves the St Augustine neighborhood out. Please correct this error such that all of Torrey Hills remains included in District 1.</p> <p>Thank you for your serious consideration of this important point. Best regards,</p> <p>Susanna Parma</p>

12/2/2021 22:59	Hong Tian	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am a resident of Torrey Hills. The commission returned most part of Torrey Hills back to District 1 at the meeting on December 1st. I am grateful for that. However, there are still 606 residents of Torrey Hills have not been returned to District 1. This is a mistake that should not have occurred. They are all residents of Torrey Hills community. Please correct this error. We are a whole community. Please return them back to District 1. At the same time, the new plan also divides our community's Dog park and adjacent Penasquitos Canyon into District 6. Please return the Dog park to District 1 .Please remain the current canyon boundary between District 1 and District 6 from the middle of the Penasquitos Canyon.
12/2/2021 21:45	Stacey Higdon	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	We have lives in Torrey Hills for 21 years and my children attended all kindergarten thru high school in District one. There is no connected common land between our home and District six. Please reconsider keeping the entire Torrey Hills Community zoned in District one. Thank you, Stacey Higdon
12/2/2021 21:25	Phuong Hoang	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please move the whole Torrey Hills back to District 1, not just part of Torrey Hills. Thank you for your consideration!
12/2/2021 20:58	Maolin Cao	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The new map after meeting is https://districtr.org/plan/89040?portal . It still split Torrey Hills and left 606 residents in district 6 even though most of Torrey Hills was returned to its original District 1. It is splitting community again. I urge you to return Torrey Hills back to District 1 as a whole. The boundary between D1 & D5 should also be reverted back to its original, which is the center of Los Penasquitos Canyon. It does not make sense to redistrict current D1 non-population area to D5. Thank you! Maolin
12/2/2021 20:36	Jaemoon Kim	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I would like to stay District 1 (Carmel Valley) not District 6. Since our neighbor and schools are all in District 1, please move my home and my neighbors to District 1.
12/2/2021 20:15	Keihan Rafii	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	All of Torrey Hills should remain in Carmel Valley as it is all one unified community.
12/2/2021 20:10	Nousha Rafii	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Hi, I have lived in Carmel Valley for 18 years. The whole neighborhood feels very strongly that ALL of Torrey Hills is part of Carmel Valley. It should not be separated.

12/2/2021 19:44	Jason Parnes	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please do not move my Torrey Hills neighborhood to Mira Mesa; our schools are within walking distance to our houses and we very much want to keep our access to them.
12/2/2021 19:36	Jason Parnes	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please do not reassign any part of Torrey Hills to Mira Mesa, especially my neighborhood. We spent a lot of money to buy our houses for the schools and we pay Mello Roos taxes to ensure the needed educational funding stays local to our community. If the city wants Mira Mesa to have better schools they should tax them to pay for it - there are plenty of good areas there that can afford it.
12/2/2021 18:36	Jeff Liber	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I urge you to include all of torreyhills together. In district one. Leaving a small sliver of homes in a different district makes nos sense We relate to our neighbors in the north side of the canyon,
12/2/2021 18:05	Tanja Fichera	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	To have just three streets in our community redistricted (including our street) would be detrimental to the cohesiveness of the community and not to mention the reason we saved money and moved into this community was for the school district. We previously lived in the Mira Mesa school district and specifically wanted the best schools for our children and that is why we moved to Carmel Valley. To now find out that our future children would not go to school where their siblings went (and the school is 1/4 mile from our house) is beyond devastating. Please allow our home which we worked so hard to purchase to stay in the DMUSD/SDUHSD. Kind Regards, Tanja Fichera
12/2/2021 17:54	Carol Littler	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The Saint Augustine development (where we have lived for 20 years) is part of Torrey Hills, not Mira Mesa. Please correct your "Consultant's error" which excluded our development from Torrey Hills. Thank you.

12/2/2021 17:35	Yu Cai	12/7/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Dear Commissioners--</p> <p>Please make Torrey Hills community a whole in District 1. Please reunite the 606 Torrey Hills residents on the neighborhood streets of St Augustine, including Vereda Mar Del Sol, Vereda Sol Del Dios, Vereda Luz Del Sol, Corte Luz Del Sol with all our neighbors at St. Augustine. Please correct this grave error! Redistricting does not divide even number houses and odd number houses in the same neighborhood in two different districts! Redistricting does not put our home and mailbox in two different districts! Redistricting does not divide an apartment complex into two different districts! Redistricting does not put Vons and its back packing spaces in two different districts! Don't let HayStaq's mistake be a poster child of gerrymandering on behalf of the Redistricting Commissioners--you are much better than that! Thank you for your consideration and please follow through to make corrections! Concerned Torrey Hills Resident</p>
12/1/2021 21:03	Michael McDonald	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Michael McDonald and I live in District 3 and I'm with Asian Solidarity Collective. I am advocating for the commission to create an AAPI Empowerment District that will keep our Asian communities together. This is an opportunity to empower a community that has been historically underrepresented for decades. We need your support to draw council district lines that reflect the rich ethnic diversity of the neighborhoods they represent. I support an AAPI Empowerment district that is at least 40% Asian by population in D6. Rose Canyon should be used as a natural boundary. South University should be in D1 and North University should be kept in D6. The populated portion of northwest University City which extends west of the 5 should be a part of D6. All all of Kearny Mesa should be in D6, and the way to balance the population is to put Qualcomm Stadium into District 7. This also increases the Latinx population in District 9 AND the Mission Valley planning group would only be split amongst 2 districts, not 3. Please see map number 88714 for the changes I am recommending. Thank you.</p>

12/1/2021 20:00	Federico Sanchez	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Redistricting Committee: please consider keeping the entire Torrey Hills under in District 1; on the latest proposed maps Torrey Hill community gets chopped in half. The whole Torrey Hills shares no communities of interest with Mira Mesa and is separated by the 7.5-mile-long Los Penasquitos Canyon.</p> <p>The whole Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley are inextricably linked and inseparable; we share schools, school districts, parks, and shopping areas. We pay a large portion of our property tax to the Del Mar School Districts. We also share infrastructure in Carmel Valley such as the Carmel Valley Recreation Center and the Ocean Air Recreation that were paid for in large part by Torrey Hills. Please keep the whole Torrey Hills under district one.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
12/1/2021 18:42	Eunwha Lee	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Oppose to split Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley District.
12/1/2021 18:08	Sam Bedwell	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Sam and I live in the city Heights neighborhood and I'm with CA BAPAC</p> <p>I want to uplift the Arab, Muslim, Middle Eastern, East African community that lives in Clairemont Mesa, Linda Vista, and Serra Mesa in the areas surrounding the Islamic Center of San Diego.</p> <p>ICSD is a significant institution in this community and is the reason so many people of this community chose to live in Clairemont Mesa, Linda Vista, and Serra Mesa. Many Muslim families have kids that go to local schools in the area and frequent locally owned stores and restaurants in Clairemont Mesa, Linda Vista, and Serra Mesa.</p> <p>Please make changes to the preliminary map so that Clairemont Mesa, Linda Vista, and Serra Mesa are together in one district.</p> <p>We thank the commissioners for your time and we ask that you support and respect Arab, Muslim, Middle Eastern, and East African communities of interest.</p>

12/1/2021 17:53	Tim Guy	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board (DMMCPB) requests that Del Mar Mesa residential and MSCP open land Preserve communities be kept together under District 1 with our communities of interest.</p> <p>Our small community's voice will be lost if it is represented by two Council offices. D1 and D6 or D5 depending on how we are split. Splitting us wastes Council resources and hinders oversight of the Preserve.</p> <p>DMM Preserve has zero population, so there is no reason for any of it to be in D5 or D6 as suggested in some maps. Property owners in DMM ceded up to 75% of their property to create the DMM Preserve. The DMMCPB and D1 Council have been good stewards of the Preserve which was created as part of the Community Plan in accordance with the city's Multiple Species Habitat Plan.</p> <p>We oppose map 87525, which splits the DMM Planning Area into two Council Districts and puts a large portion of DMM Preserve in District 6 keeping the DMM residential community in D1.</p> <p>Please keep all of DMM together in D1 as it's logical and helps governance.</p>
-----------------	---------	-----------	---------------------	---	--

12/1/2021 17:53	Tim Guy	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board (DMMCPB) requests that Del Mar Mesa residential and MSCP open land Preserve communities be kept together under District 1 with our communities of interest.</p> <p>Our small community's voice will be lost if it is represented by two Council offices. D1 and D6 or D5 depending on how we are split. Splitting us wastes Council resources and hinders oversight of the Preserve.</p> <p>DMM Preserve has zero population, so there is no reason for any of it to be in D5 or D6 as suggested in some maps. Property owners in DMM ceded up to 75% of their property to create the DMM Preserve. The DMMCPB and D1 Council have been good stewards of the Preserve which was created as part of the Community Plan in accordance with the city's Multiple Species Habitat Plan.</p> <p>We oppose map 87525, which splits the DMM Planning Area into two Council Districts and puts a large portion of DMM Preserve in District 6 keeping the DMM residential community in D1.</p>
12/1/2021 17:37	Derek Reeves	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am writing to provide my support for district 1 map 877744 to keep Del Mar Mesa within the same District Map. Del Mar Mesa is a unique community that has much in common and shares a similar vision of how we would like our community governed. It would make absolutely no sense to split Del Mar Mesa into two parts, which would only diminish our ability to oversee issues that directly impact our small community. Please support district map 877744. Derek Reeves</p>

12/1/2021 17:21	Van Pham	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Linda Vista, Serra Mesa and Clairemont consists of refugee, immigrants, military families or low income folks that have some sort of shared history and experience... which is why there is such a closeness and understanding between these communities. To separate them would be like separating siblings. Unfortunately not all residents are familiar with the political process and advocating for redistricting and what it could mean for them. Please consider that as you listen to callers.</p> <p>If you live in any one of these areas you are certain to spend time and money in the others. Not only is there kinship but there is a stimulation of the local economy between these communities.</p> <p>I am calling today to ask you to keep Linda vista serra mesa and claremont mesa in one district. The demographics in these communities are reflective of one another and our voices deserve to be strengthened and Unified - not silenced or diluted in a district that has less in common with us. It clear what placing us in the wrong district can do, limit our voting power. Please help us strengthen it instead.</p>
-----------------	----------	-----------	---------------------	---	--

12/1/2021 17:19	Van Pham	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hi my name is Van I am from Linda vista district 7 and I serve on the board of the Linda vista town council and also am a member of Viet Vote.</p> <p>My family has been in Linda Vista for over 30 years. I went to Cubberley Elementary, ross elementary, Montgomery Middle School Kearny High School, and Mesa College.. schools all designed to serve the the communities of linda vista, serra mesa and Clairemont mesa. If you look on the school district sites of these schools, they will say the same. If you ask students, educators or working adults who grew up in these areas they would agree.</p> <p>Like many in these communities, we consist of refugee, immigrants, military families or low income folks that have some sort of shared history and experience... which is why there is such a closeness and understanding between these communities. To separate them would be like separating siblings. Unfortunately not all residents are familiar with the political process and advocating for redistricting and what it could mean for them. Please consider that as you listen to callers.</p> <p>If you live in any one of these areas you are certain to spend time and money</p>
12/1/2021 17:09	Patsy Y Bouzan	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Thank you for allowing me to comment on the preliminary redistricting map. I am disappointed to hear about this vote going on during the holidays when so many people are distracted by COVID, family time and holiday shopping. While I recognize the objective of creating districts with "equal" number of residents, the current redistricting plan goes through our neighborhood and homes just south of us (but part of our same development) would now be in a different district. This goal of creating "equal populations" within the districts does not make sense from a "neighborhood" standpoint. In this case, it seems better to use common sense and create a district based on natural land topography, existing neighborhoods/communities and worry less about making it perfectly balanced from a population count. There will always be fluctuation in populations and to try create the perfect balance is an impossible task. I would recommend your team come drive the communities and recognize the proposed map is non-sensical. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

12/1/2021 16:19	Phuong Vuong	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My comment will be shared in ASC's presentation today, but it is important to me to have it exist in written form too: I currently live in North University City. I advocate for keeping us in District 6. It is important to keep the Asian American community together so that we can organize around resources and services we need. Whether it is restaurants, grocery stores, immigration organizations, translation services, being together means we can draw these institutions together. Having a district of at least 40% Asian American residents enables us to fight for our city representation and have our voices heard more clearly.</p> <p>I want to point out that highway construction has divided communities of color and diminished our political unity. Why do we accept them as “natural boundaries” when they represent the biases of their planners and builders? Rose Canyon is a boundary we should respect if it creates structures that produce identification within a community. As a resident just north of it, I never venture into South University City below Rose Canyon because of its isolation due to the geographic feature bordering highway 5. Streets in North UTC dead end at Rose Canyon, making it a boundary.</p>
12/1/2021 15:55	Karin Zirk, Ph.D.	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Thank you very much for the proposal to keep Pacific Beach in one City Council District.</p> <p>However, I am deeply concerned that the recommendation to split Mission Bay Park between Council Districts 1 and 2 is not incorporated into the latest map. Because no one lives in Mission Bay Park there is no justification to keep the park solely in District 2. For many years the importance of this park to the region was recognized by having it split between two council districts. Given that Pacific Beach is immediately adjacent to the park, I would like to request a second time that the park be split up between districts 1 and 2 to include the concerns of all communities that have share a boundary with the park.</p> <p>Respectfully, Karin Zirk, Ph.D.</p>

12/1/2021 15:41	John Stump -City Stump	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I request that the Commission request analysis of the current 2011 D9 boundaries; so as to determine if maintenance of the historic boundaries could meet the requirements of the law. Further I recommend that the some 10,693 residents that were proposed to be added to D9, by map 87744, be considered for a new adjusted District Seven (D 7) along with San Diego State University -SDSU. Linking SDSU WEST with SDSU EAST in District 7 would accomplish the Chairman's goals and not dilute D 9</p> <p>Please consider the map and written comments sent by email as a portion of this testimony,</p>
12/1/2021 15:29	Lil Nover	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>You are proposing to move Torrey Hills from D6 to D1. You are taking a big part of Sorrento Valley along with that move. Please don't do this. If you want to take Torrey Hills fine but, keep the Torrey Pines business park which is in SV and everything east of that in SV. There is a mountain/preserve that separates Torrey Hills from SV. Cut it off there and leave SV more in tact. There is no population there just businesses. Please put all of Roselle and Sorrento Road back into D6. Thank you so much</p>

12/1/2021 15:08	Shital Parikh	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello Commissioners,</p> <p>Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board (DMMCPB) requests that Del Mar Mesa residential and MSCP open space Preserve communities be kept together under District 1 with our communities of interest.</p> <p>Our small community's voice will be lost if it is represented by two Council offices. D1 and D6 or D5 depending on how we are split. Splitting us wastes Council resources and hinders oversight of the Preserve.</p> <p>DMM Preserve has zero population, so there is no reason for any of it to be in D5 or D6 as suggested in some maps. Property owners in DMM ceded up to 75% of their property to create the DMM Preserve. The DMMCPB and D1 Council have been good stewards of the Preserve which was created as part of the Community Plan in accordance with the city's Multiple Species Habitat Plan.</p> <p>We oppose map 87525, which splits the DMM Planning Area into two Council Districts and puts a large portion of DMM Preserve in District 6 keeping the DMM residential community in D1.</p> <p>Please keep all of DMM together in D1 as it's logical and helps governance.</p>
12/1/2021 14:46	Kathryn Burton	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please move Del Mar Mesa Preserve back to its current place in District 1. The Commission asked to move the community of Torrey Highlands back to D5 but it is not necessary to split Del Mar Mesa Preserve which has no population between Districts 1 and 5. Please keep Del Mar Mesa Preserve whole and in its current configuration in District 1. The best way to care for and conserve Del Mar Mesa Preserve is to keep it in District 1 with the community that helped create it.</p>

12/1/2021 14:19	Wenbing Hu	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I strongly support the processed map, which keeps the Torrey Hills within Carmel Valley and District 1. Torrey Hills community is an integral part of Carme Valley. We not only share the same zip code and same school districts, but many resources and common interests as well. We go to the same churches in Carmel Valley and our children grow up together with the kids in other Carmel Valley areas. Carmel Valley is our identity. Thank you for keeping us in one community.</p>
12/1/2021 12:53	Joshua Bowman	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Joshua Bowman. I live at 4637 Corte Mar Del Corazon, SD 92130. After reviewing the revised redistricting plan, I am adamantly opposed to these changes as you are proposing moving half of my community out of Carmel Valley and link it to Mira Mesa. I have no idea why you would split Torrey Hills in half and not have constant representation for the community, and why should anyone representing my interest have an impact on the direction of Mira Mesa. If this passes, I will commit every effort to have anyone associated with passing this, get voted out of their seat.</p> <p>regards,</p> <p>Josh</p>

12/1/2021 12:25	Hitesh Patel	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello Redistricting Commission:</p> <p>Thank you for adding Torrey Hills to today's agenda.</p> <p>We have been long-time residents of Torrey Hills since 2004. As healthcare professionals, we have chosen to make our home in Torrey Hills because of shared values professionally and socially with the greater Carmel Valley Community.</p> <p>Our community, geographically separated by the Penasquitos Preserves from District 6, has focused considerable effort on Del Mar Mesa and Carmel Country Highlands stewardship.</p> <p>Our request and vote are to leave Torrey Hills within the same district of the Carmel Valley Community.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Best Regards,</p>
12/1/2021 12:09	Alex Zukas	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am concerned that the Commission is not listening to residents who have a community of interest but instead is using very general census categories to create district boundaries. A case in point is moving of Mt. Hope to D9 at the Commission's last meeting. As far as I can tell, no one from Mt. Hope has written or spoken at the Redistricting Commission meetings in favor of staying in D9. Before the last redistricting, Mt. Hope was in D4. See the U-T story from January 2021: https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/communities/san-diego/story/2021-01-18/forgotten-and-left-behind-mount-hope-residents-turn-to-each-other-new-leadership-to-build-community.</p> <p>The Commissioners moved Mt. Hope to back D9 from D4 (where there is a stronger community of interest as the U-T article notes) to moderately increase the Latinx percentage but to the disservice of the people who live in Mt. Hope who have not felt well served in D9 & wish to return to D4. I ask that the Commission reconsider its decision about Mt. Hope. It should remain part of D4 where it has a community of interest. This change will have little impact on the percentage of Latinx residents in D9 (it will remain above 40%) & create more compact districts & solid communities of interest in D4 & D9.</p>

12/1/2021 11:15	Alen Loubier	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please consider moving Torrey Hills back to District 1 and moving Torrey Highlands to District 5. We have much more in common with Carmel Valley (including schools) than Torrey Highlands that are part of the Poway school district. While I understand you have population goals, Torrey Hills has nothing in common with Mira Mesa and share school, infrastructure and the same community concerns as Carmel Valley. The lines to cut Torrey Hills out of CV and to cut Torrey Highlands out of district 5 seem very arbitrary and not logical. Thank you for your service.</p>
12/1/2021 7:55	Kate Kern	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I support the current Preliminary Map which presents both Rolando Park & Redwood Village in District 9 (D9). I feel that the current map that includes Mt. Hope is a fair compromise for D9. As for SDSU, I believe it should stay whole in D9 like other universities in San Diego.</p> <p>During the 2011 redistricting process our neighborhoods of Rolando Park & Redwood Village were shoved into District 4 at the end to make up for a population balance & due to only 3-4 Public Comments from residents in our neighborhood protesting the move at that time.</p> <p>Please consider that due to our affinity of historically being a "College Area" neighborhood it is our residents desire to be reunited in D9 (with our other "College Area" neighbors) so we can "collectively" work on issues that affect our area where we shop, do business, visit libraries, parks, depend on our Mid-City SDPD & our Fire station, etc.</p> <p>The ideal scenario across the map in general would be to keep all communities whole and/or with their communities of interest. Please consider and give all San Diego neighborhoods a successful platform to thrive on for the next decade.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

11/30/2021 23:38	Kelly Self	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The intent of the redistricting is to keep communities with their communities of interest. The proposed redistricting map proposes to separate Torrey Hills from all communities of interest in the surrounding Torrey Pines, Del Mar and Carmel Valley areas. Torrey Hills shares a school district, community centers neighborhood parks, local grocery stores and restaurants and everything else with its neighbors in Ocean Air, Del Mar Mesa and other surrounding areas. Please keep Torrey Hills with its communities of shared interests,
11/30/2021 22:58	Xuepan Guan	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	do not split the Torrey Hills from Carmel valley, it is weird that combine Torrey Hills with Mira Mesa, as there is a very clear boarder there. And Torrey Hills stay with Carmel Valley for a very long time, we share any facilities , and those facilities are near by. Further more, i even saw some communities are divided to two different districts, then how could they vote for the representatives ?
11/30/2021 21:36	Xuepan Guan	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	please do not split Torrey hills from carmel valley . it is very weird to combine them as there is a very clear boarder with mira mesa.
11/30/2021 20:36	Jenean and Tim Smith	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am strongly opposed to the dividing of Torrey Hills into two different districts. I favor retaining the the current district lines between Torrey Hills and Mira Mesa. The proposed change that divides Torrey Hills also divides neighborhoods and people that share common concerns for environmental stewardship and balanced growth. Although I recognize the Commission's goal of creating districts with "equal" number of residents, the plan does not make sense from a neighborhood standpoint. I implore you to drive these Torrey Hills neighborhoods and see for yourself the division you will create if you approve this plan. Our city representation needs to be consistent throughout our neighborhood to provide the best for our community.
11/30/2021 18:11	Abdul & Rabia Khan	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am a long time resident of Torrey hills over 20 years. All my children went to Carmel valley schools. We do like our neighbor hood. Please keep Torrey hills in district 1 with Carmel valley and Del Mar. Thanks
11/30/2021 18:10	Abdul Rashid Khan	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am a long time resident of Torrey hills over 20 years. All my children went to Carmel valley schools. We do like our neighbor hood. Please keep Torrey hills in district 1 with Carmel valley and Del Mar. Thanks

11/30/2021 14:54	Kathryn Burton	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>At the November 23, 2021 Redistricting meeting, the Commission directed Haystaq to put all of Torrey Hills back into District 1.</p> <p>However, there are substantial errors in Haystaq's #87525 map. Areas of Torrey Hills are still included in District 6. In addition to the Torrey Hills Dog Park, the areas mainly southeast of the dog park are included in District 6. This effects 606 residents of Torrey Hills.</p> <p>Some of the street areas are: Torrey Circle, Vereda Mar del Sol, Vereda Luz del Sol, Corte Luz del Sol, Vereda Sol del Dios, Terraza Mar Marvelosa and Corte Mar Asombrosa.</p> <p>Additionally, this map includes a "Carmel Mountain Rd" below the Torrey Hills Dog Park. There is no such road at this location. It is a continuation of Torrey Circle. The map also shows an area west of E. Ocean Air Dr. in District 6 which is incorrect.</p> <p>This map also puts the portion of Los Penasquitos Canyon that should be in District 1 into District 6.</p> <p>Please request that Haystaq refer to the 2011 city council district boundaries for guidance on where the appropriate boundaries should be placed.</p>
11/30/2021 12:27	Elizabeth Rabbitt	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>While redistricting is inevitable, our city put so much forethought into the development of our Del Mar Mesa Community plan I can only support Map 87744 as it preserves the continuity of our small community (Del Mar Mesa) together with the Preserve and Residential area, with our communities of interest and does not impact population deviation. Of the proposed maps ONLY this map will help us protect our MSCP lands as intended by the City charter by design when Del Mar Mesa was formed. Let's continue to protect this thoughtful design.</p>
11/30/2021 10:42	Chelsey Beckerman	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I would like to bring my comment to attention to not split the community of Scripps Ranch into two different districts. I am seeking your review to tweak the map under review and keep all of Scripps Ranch together in District 5 to keep our community whole. Thank you for your important consideration.</p>
11/30/2021 8:41	Betty Rodriguez	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Thank you for your hard work. We fully support the preliminary map and want to thank you for keeping linda vista in district 7.</p>

11/29/2021 19:37	Tulie Muezzinoglu	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please keep Torrey Hills neighborhood in District 1.</p> <p>The plan 87744 disregards natural boundaries and rips Torrey Hills apart from its community. Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley share infrastructure and some of those were paid for by Torrey Hills community. Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley are inseparable.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
11/29/2021 18:40	Kerem Muezzinoglu	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please retain Torrey Hills in District 1. This community belongs in Carmel Valley culturally and historically. Amenities, schools and long term incentives of this community aligns with the rest of Carmel Valley. Please avoid an artificial separation.</p>
11/29/2021 14:54	Tim Davey	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am Tim Davey. I live in Redwood Village and am a member of Rolando Park Community Council. We have been commenting that we want to be in District 9 as drawn in the map. We were in the old District 7 10 years ago. The Chollas Triangle Park will be located partially in Redwood Village. We did not know about the park planning meeting until the third and final meeting. Because we are not in District 9, we were not notified. Both areas are a part of the Mid-City Planning Group and the Mid-City Police Department and EACPC (Eastern Area Communities Planning Committee), which includes several of the District 9 neighborhoods of the College Area, which is in District 9.</p> <p>Redwood Village and Rolando Park are tied together by University and College Avenues. People in Rolando get confused and contact Rolando Park for events in their area. If we are in the same District, we could help them connect to the District Council to have them send representatives. We want to be in District 9.</p>

11/27/2021 9:59	Aaron E Banks	12/1/2021	Non-Agenda Comment		Dividing people according to religion is unconstitutional. As "latino/latina" is a religious regional definition designated to those from "Latin America" that wish to affiliate themselves with the Latin Church in Rome, structuring things accordingly is a violation of United States Government policy for the separation of church and state. "Latino/Latina" is NOT an ethnic description as the Spanish/Portuguese that established control over the regions were the most polyethnic people on the planet before the existence of the United States and had very little Latin blood themselves. What you're doing, if challenged in any honest courtroom, would be roundly undone and it begs the question if such definitions exist because of a mayor, Todd Gloria, and city attorney, Mara Elliot that publicly identify themselves as such, even declaring their religious affiliation on their Governmental, not personal, GOVERNMENTAL worksite pages.
11/27/2021 8:51	Ginita Wall	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Torrey Hills has a natural southern boundary, the Penasquitos canyon. Everything north of the canyon should be with Carmel Valley, everything south of the canyon should be with Mira Mesa. It makes no sense otherwise.

11/24/2021 14:28	Shital Parikh	12/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello Commissioners,</p> <p>Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board (DMMCPB) supports map 85205, as it keeps the DMM Community together, with our communities of interest; the residential and MSCP Preserve lands as a whole under District 1.</p> <p>We are opposed to map 73954, that splits the DMM Planning Area into two Council Districts by putting DMM Preserve in District 5 while the rest of the residential community in District 1.</p> <p>DMM Preserve is roughly half of the DMM Planning Area. Our community of 400 homes will be represented by two Council offices, wasting resources and potentially threatening the Preserve.</p> <p>There is no population in the Preserve. Redrawing the PQ 73954 map to put the preserve back into D1 will have no bearing on the future of Torrey Highlands in the final map chosen by Commissioners.</p> <p>Property owners in DMM ceded up to 75% of their property to create the Preserve. The DMMCPB and D1 Council have been good stewards of the Preserve which was created as part of the Community Plan in accordance with the city's Multiple Species Habitat Plan.</p> <p>Please keep all of DMM together in D1 as it does not impact population deviation when the preserve portion is moved to D5.</p>
------------------	---------------	-----------	---------------------	---	--

11/23/2021 19:06	John w Stump	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>This sweet slice of pie is a graphic analogy to District Nine (D9) after the adopted Preliminary Map/Plan. As you can see the pie slice is a wedge shape proceeding south to the Mt. Hope area.</p> <p>The sweet brown pie has been changed by the Chairman's addition of a huge dollop of whipping cream changing the nature and calorie count of this district desert, from its existing 2011 District Nine.</p> <p>The proposed Gerrymandering of the new 2021 District Nine adds more Cream and I hope you enjoy some sweet brown pumpkin or sweet potato pie as part of your Thanksgiving feast.</p> <p>violates the principal of containing a District within "Natural Boundaries" or as you Counsel called them "...significant geographic or public infrastructure features... ". (Memorandum Preliminary Analysis of Draft Council District Maps, November 12, 2021, Page 2).</p> <p>I heard the Chairman's and others rationale for entering into an entire new significant geographic area - Mission Valley / San Diego River and crossing over significant public infrastructure features - The brackets of local serving major roads between Friars Road and Camino Del Rio south AND the entire Interstate 8 Kumeyaay Freeway. SEE the entire letter submitted by email.</p>
11/23/2021 18:04	Austin Tomaney	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Torrey Hills is a small community that has no substantial connection to Mira Mesa. It is geographically separated from Mira Mesa by a canyon and it has a long history with Carmel Valley in shared taxation for schools, parks and public facilities. We urge the commission to keep this in District 1.</p>
11/23/2021 17:13	Ed Gallagher	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I live in Pacific Beach and I serve on the PB Planning Group. I feel strongly that our district should remain intact from west of interstate 5 all the way to the ocean, including areas north of Mission Bay to at least include the areas of North PB including Bird Rock and Mt Soledad. The proposal to divide PB by placing the garnet-balboa Transit Area outside of our neighborhood is outrageous. The trolley station and area around it, east of Rose Creek and west of Interstate Five is a VITAL corridor for our community and ALL PB Residents should be able to have a voice in its development. I support Marcella Bothwell's comment that Mission Beach and South Mission should be included in our district as well since those neighborhoods also offer vital amenities to our community. DO NOT DIVIDE UP PACIFIC BEACH and KEEP DISTRICT 1 IN TACT. Thank you!</p>

11/23/2021 17:10	Tamar Caspi	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I want to identify a small technical error in the drawing of district 3 in the mission valley area. Friars Road is the new natural boundary for district 7 and the districts southward. However, two census tracts north of Friars, with 24 residents in the mission valley east neighborhood across from hazard center, have been oddly and needlessly included in district 3.</p> <p>No community of interest is served by this odd breakage across friars. No population issue is solved either. The neighborhood of Mission Valley east isn't kept whole by this: because if you look closely, the Fenton parkway section is partially north of friars and partially south of friars. And it has over 3500 residents that if moved, would disrupt the population balance. Likewise, the Mission Valley Planning group is split across friars but the commission realizes that some of mission valley needs to remain in District 7 for population reasons. So, since it appears that Friars Road is considered the significant path that forms a natural and sensible division between District 7 and others, For the sake of consistency, please do not include two small and low-population areas</p>
11/23/2021 16:59	Lily Higman	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Lily Higman. I am on the Mission Bay Cluster of Pacific Beach Schools. I am against the map where Pacific Beach is cut into two halves down Lamont Street. My most immediate concern is that our schools will be separated into two separate districts 3 in district 2 and 4 schools in district 1. This is a BAD situation for our community and our schools.</p> <p>Please do not approve this. Thank you. Lily Higman</p>
11/23/2021 16:42	Marcie Beckett	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please do NOT split Pacific Beach into 2 council districts. I am a lifelong resident of PB and have been fighting for my community for years. PB's issues are complex and it is difficult enough to keep one council member informed. If PB has 2 council members, our issues will be further diluted among 2 districts instead of 1. This is not a "minor revision"!</p> <p>Marcie Beckett</p>
11/23/2021 16:06	Laura P Ambrose	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As 40-year residents of Pacific Beach, we are definitely opposed to the idea of splitting our district in half. PB is a community, with its own downtown, schools, parks, rec center, etc. Please don't split the identity of this community in half with this redistricting plan.</p>

11/23/2021 15:56	Victor Li	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident of Torrey Hills, I find the proposed separation of Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley very disturbing. We are an integral part of the Carmel Valley community and share common public facilities, parks, community centers, shopping areas, schools and geographical locations. Furthermore, we share a combined sense of community and belonging. To separate Torrey Hills and move it to a distant neighborhood would be a giant disservice to our community. Torrey Hills residence spend the majority of our time and resources within the Carmel Valley community, walking to our schools, parks, and shopping centers. We can not do any of this within District 6. Please keep Torrey Hills with Carmel Valley and District 1. Thank you, Victor Li
11/23/2021 15:42	Jim Marshall	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am writing to express my dissatisfaction with the proposed map that cuts the historically united community of Pacific Beach into two districts. I can see no justification for this severing of a contiguous community of interest with historical roots and similar interests. It makes no sense! There is no rationale that could possibly justify doing this, except perhaps to satisfy the interest of a few who would stand to gain by this self-serving and inappropriate proposed splitting of our community. Do not support this transparent and obvious attempt at Gerrymandering for these selfish interests. Preserve the identifiable and historically unified community of Pacific Beach.
11/23/2021 13:33	John C Terell	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Split Mission Bay Park so that portions immediately adjacent to Pacific Beach are in proposed District 1. It would acknowledge the close connection of these areas to Pacific Beach and avoid parochial attitude to interest in the Park now that it is proposed to be adjacent to two districts. As Mission Bay is a citywide amenity with no permanent population, no community of interest is split by this action.
11/23/2021 13:23	John C Terell	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Do not make changes to the proposed map that result in splitting the Pacific Beach community. No community should be split as part of the redistricting process!
11/23/2021 12:12	Cathy Jiang	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident of Torrey Hills, I request that you reject any proposed map that would split up Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley or move them out of Council District One. We oppose Map #83035. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council 1. We are ONE community.

11/23/2021 12:12	Kate Lu	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a resident of Torrey Hill, I find it extremely disturbing that there are proposals to split the Torrey Hills neighborhood from the rest of Carmel valley. Using El Camino Real and Carmel Mountain Rd. to carve out a small piece of land and merge it with a district which is physically very separated from Torrey Hills, makes absolutely no sense. Torrey Hills and Carmel valley are one single neighborhood community with parks, schools, shops and restaurants within walking distance of homes on either side of the proposed divide. Nothing in district 6 would be considered walkable from Torrey hills. Separating Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley would be a disservice to the residents of Torrey Hills.</p> <p>Don't split up Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley and create an artificial divide within cohesive neighborhood. It goes against all principles of good redistricting.</p>
11/23/2021 11:56	Kevin Liu	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a resident of Torrey Hills. I oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.</p>
11/23/2021 11:46	Jian Gong	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a resident of Torrey Hills,I reject any proposed map that would split up Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley or move them out of Council District One. Torrey Hill is part of Carmel Valley, and shall always be! This redistrict without consent from Torrey Hill residents is not acceptable!! None of my neighbors agree with this change. I will fight every resource that I have to against the split!</p>
11/23/2021 9:45	Yunde Zhao	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a resident of Torrey Hills, I strongly oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. We share no communities of interest with District 6.</p>
11/23/2021 9:18	Peijuan Shen	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a resident of Torrey Hills. I oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.</p>

11/23/2021 8:57	Kunliang Guan	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am a resident of Torrey Hills. I oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We share common interest with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. I always tell friends that we live in Carmel Valley. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together. We are one community!
11/23/2021 8:53	Giampaolo Gemelli	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	It make no sense to chop up Pacific Beach into 2 pieces because this will marginalize the eastern portion of Pacific Beach, which is the most racially and economically diverse area of Pacific Beach. Furthermore, Mission Bay High School is the only high school in Pacific Beach and so should remain in the same council district for ALL of Pacific Beach. It makes more sense to move portions of Bay Park and/or Mission Bay Park into another district. Areas like Pacific and Ocean Beach experience unique issues, such as high numbers of transient/homeless people and the substantial increase in people during the Summer tourist months. Removing east PB from the current district boundary will drain already depleted resources further which is needed to address these issues. Please do not break up Pacific Beach just because people in La Jolla want to add Torrey Pines to the district.
11/23/2021 7:53	Jianguen Gong	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident of Torrey Hills. I oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.
11/23/2021 7:35	Tania Mitra	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	AAP1 residents continue to witness rise in violence and prejudice against Asian Americans in 2021. While there is no easy solution to many of the civic issues we face today, the commission can make a step towards positive change and make sure that District 6 is improved as an Asian Empowerment Seat. Representation matters now more than ever.

11/23/2021 7:33	Sparky Mitra	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	There has never been more conversation on diversity and inclusion than the past year alone - our Mayor and City Council are making strides to address this and the Redistricting Commssion should do so too. The AAPI community deserves to have our needs heard just as much as other communities of interests have been heard throughout this redistricting process. I urge the Commissioners to consider no less than 40% AAPI representation in District 6 specifically
11/22/2021 23:25	Xiaoyu Yu	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident of Torrey Hills. I oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.
11/22/2021 23:24	Jingjin Gao	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident of Torrey Hills. I oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.
11/22/2021 23:10	Shirley Gilbert	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I'm pleased that Clairemont has been kept whole but I don't think we belong with OB or Point Loma, Clairemont should extend from 5 to 805, south to Linda Vista, including Serra Mesa and Kearny Mesa.
11/22/2021 20:14	Yuli Wang	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident of Torrey Hills. I oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.
11/22/2021 16:25	Ethan Maristela	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	AAPI residents continue to be overlooked and ignored in civic matters. Please consider growing District 6's rich diversity by including UCSD and the adjacent neighborhoods which would increase AAPI representation in the future. Please do not ignore our needs in the redistricting process.
11/22/2021 16:16	Jason Xu	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a member of the AAPI community, I have always felt ignored in San Diego politics. Please make the minor changes to the current map that previous AAPI community members have voiced and make sure that we have at least 40% AAPI representation in District 6. Let's not wait another 10 years to do this right.

11/22/2021 16:12	Brendan Bergmann	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a resident of University City, as you are aware many AAPI residents and community leaders continue to voice the need for District 6 to be a 40% AAPI population district during the redistricting process. Please listen to the many people who have called in and written comment for nearly every meeting. We need to have BOTH a 40% AAPI population and 40% AAPI voting age population.</p>
11/22/2021 14:57	Johann Ammerlahn	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I would like to thank the Redistricting Commission for undertaking this important work and I appreciate the chance to comment on the proposed maps.</p> <p>As a resident of Carmel Valley, I am opposed to placing Torrey Hills in a different district than the rest of the community (74956). Torrey Hills shares infrastructure, amenities and, most importantly, school districts with the rest of Carmel Valley. Many/most of the current residents moved here to be part of DMUSD / SDUHSD, hence our community has a clear interest in avoiding splitting school districts across political boundaries.</p> <p>Further, while I understand that Change 1 (83035) is an attempt to more closely follow CPG boundaries, eliminating Carmel Mountain Road as the district boundary in favor of splitting at least 6 small, local, residential streets between districts seems less compact and more likely to divide "communities of interest" than the previous version (74956). Redistricting should not place literal next-door neighbors in different communities. How will we wrangle with our neighbors about local politics if we're not voting in the same elections?</p> <p>In summary, my preference would be to maintain Carmel Valley as a unified voice within largely contiguous political and school district boundaries.</p>

11/22/2021 9:32	Marcella Bothwell	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Thank you so much for the volunteer work that you are doing on behalf of the City attempting to please everyone according to their needs and wants. We very much appreciate the compromise preliminary map that you have approved</p> <p>which continues to keep the Pacific Beach community planning group area unified. We have multiple organizations which serve this specific planned area including the PB Planning Group, the PB Town Council, Beautiful PB, Discover PB and more. By keeping this area united will are able to continue our work in the neighborhood and community of Pacific Beach. We strongly oppose any map that should divide us between districts.</p> <p>We do have a small ask that Mission Beach planning area be included with Pacific Beach in District One. Pacific Beach and Mission Beach have long been contiguous and have worked closely together on many issues. The stewardship of Mission Bay by both Pacific Beach and Mission Beach residents is vital for well-being of Mission Bay so we respectfully request that Mission Bay be included in District 1 with us so we may continue our important work.</p> <p>Marcella Bothwell President, Pacific Beach Town Council</p>
-----------------	-------------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

11/21/2021 19:08	Chantilly Dobbins	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The first change to item 1 of the agenda should include a broader inclusion of Torrey Hills into District 1 (including homes on both sides of Carmel Mountain Road; and/or all homes along Ocean Air drive).</p> <p>We would welcome any counsel member to come visit our community: drive up the 5, and take the Carmel Mountain Road exit. Torrey Hills does not have common interests with Mira Mesa. We are not accessible geographically to that part of the city. We are part of Carmel Valley and share all similarities with them. It would be impossible for any of you to reach the conclusion that the current map is appropriate. It's clear the map drawers were in offices and didn't perform site visits; they have no obvious knowledge about our part of the city.</p> <p>If someone from Torrey Hills gets elected to the City Council, then Carmel Valley will be overrepresented with two members. Nobody here identified with Mira Mesa. It is inappropriate to divide up Torrey Hills, as it is a discrete community that would be unjustly minimized under the current proposal.</p>
11/21/2021 18:27	Rong Xu	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a resident of Torrey Hills. I oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.</p>
11/21/2021 16:19	Nancy Hartley	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a long-time resident of Clairemont, I thank you for preserving our community unit in this district map! I LOVE that this map also preserves community integrity for many other San Diego neighborhoods. It groups contiguous communities together who have intersecting interests. I truly believe these newly drawn districts will give us a City Council whose Members will be enabled to represent the unique needs of each District as well as take advantage of San Diego's diversity. The next 10 years will bring many changes, and having this current map will definitely help community leaders to give useful feedback to our Council Members, as well as be part of explaining to residents how each neighborhood can incorporate these changes.</p> <p>Great job, thank you!</p>

11/21/2021 13:07	Xinyi Li	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident of Torrey Hills. I strongly oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.
11/21/2021 13:05	Xu Yuan	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident of Torrey Hills. I strongly oppose splitting the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.
11/21/2021 13:00	Yumiao Han	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident of Torrey Hills. I request to keep Torrey Hills within Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.
11/21/2021 12:23	Wenbing Hu	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I oppose to split the Torrey Hills from Carmel Valley. We are a "community of interest" with Carmel Valley. We share all the infrastructure with Carmel Valley: Schools, school districts, libraries, recreation areas, shopping areas, open space and a zip code. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are one community.
11/20/2021 21:03	Dorris Huynh	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Dear Commissioners and Districts Councils. I'm resident of Torrey Hills at Sausalito community since 2000. This community belongs to Carmel Valley District 1. We are not at all related to District 6. Please consider not to change or redistricting our community. Thank you for your listening.

11/19/2021 18:21	Iain Richardson	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I and many other PB residents fully endorse the recent letter from Marcella Bothwell, President Pacific Beach Town Council. It would go against the Commissions guidelines to split the cohesive community of Pacific Beach between districts as others have proposed.</p> <p>In addition, keeping Mission Beach and Pacific Beach together in District 1 would be ideal. These communities have many common interests, concerns and issues, along with joint responsibility for the Mission Bay area. They have worked together very effectively over a long period on many of their shared issues and opportunities.</p> <p>I appreciate the very difficult task you have to do, and thank you for your efforts to generate a map that leverages the long-standing community strengths we currently enjoy in Pacific Beach and Mission Beach.</p> <p>Sincerely, Iain</p>
11/19/2021 17:57	Robert Dobbins	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a resident of Torrey Hills, and my home is located in the map snippet proposed for Change 1. It remains in District 6, even though we sit across the street from what is being proposed to be included in District 1. It is nonsensical for all communities around us (within 0.25 miles to the West, North, and in our backyard to the East) to be represented by District 1 but not us. It is even more disappointing that our representatives and contracted map drawers have gone out of their way to create such an odd tail within the proposed map that tears our community apart in what would be a punitive gerrymandering against our neighborhood.</p> <p>There is an easy fix: Make the map more contiguous (i.e., remove the tail in the map) and allow our neighborhood to continue working with other Carmel Valley communities with which we share a common school district and all other meaningful interests. Existing district communities should be prioritized for inclusion into what is supposed to be a coastal interest district before newly developed, in-land communities (such as Torrey Highlands, parts of Pacific Ranch, among others that blend into Black Mountain Ranch).</p>

11/19/2021 12:53	Carol Kelley	11/23/2021	Non-Agenda Comment	1	<p>Would like clarification on boundary lines of District 7 specifically as it applies to street, road, route/highway names/numbers. I am a resident of The Village Mission Valley --which is not in Mission Valley--it is in Tierrasanta. It is at the south eastern lower border of District 7 and accessible only by Santo Road which is off Friars Road, and it is east of the entrance to Route 15 North. I would like confirmation from the Restricting Committee (or Staff) that this property is within the borders of District 7 based on the Clairemont United Compromise Map (#74956) which has now been voted by the Commissioners as the Preliminary Redistricting Map. Thank you.</p>
11/19/2021 9:41	Shital Parikh	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>To Commissioners,</p> <p>On behalf of Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board, I would like to thank you for choosing a map that keeps all of Del Mar Mesa as a whole residences and the open space preserve, MSCP lands as one entity in District 1. We are thankful.</p> <p>I would also like to thank the map makers of the Compromise map for including our concerns in their map. We appreciate you addressing the needs of our community.</p> <p>Best Shital Parikh Vice Chair, Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board</p>
11/19/2021 9:01	Sameer Ovalekar	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	No on MAP 74956 No on splitting scripps ranch
11/19/2021 8:58	Manish Ovalekar	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>No on splitting scripps ranch.</p> <p>No on MAP 74956</p>
11/18/2021 9:12	Allison Leeds	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a resident of Torrey Hills,I request that you reject any proposed map that would split up Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley or move them out of Council District One. We oppose Map #74956, #72602, #70727. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are ONE community.</p>

11/18/2021 0:23	Daryl Wang	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a long time resident of the great community of Torrey Hills in Carmel Valley, we vehemently oppose the redistricting of our community in accordance with Map #72602 - SDCC out of Carmel Valley. Most residents of Carmel Valley purchased our homes for a premium for good reason and we are very proud of our community. This unjustifiable split will unfairly decrease the value of our homes...many of us put our lives' savings into. Please consider the negative impact to our proud community and our livelihoods.</p> <p>This change is unfounded and unjust. Thank you.</p>
11/17/2021 22:31	Liu Tang	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a resident of Torrey Hills, i request that you reject any proposed map that would split up Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley or move them out of Council District One.</p> <p>We oppose Map #72602, #70727, #74956. Keep Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are ONE community. Torrey Hills is separated from Sorrento Valley and Mira Mesa by a large canyon/nature preserve. Our community, our local shopping centers, and our schools are all in Carmel Valley. It makes no sense that we would be separated from the rest of our community in these redistricting plans.</p>
11/17/2021 10:40	Alex Wender	11/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	PLEASE KEEP GOLDEN HILL WITHIN THE DISTRICT 3 BOUNDARY.
11/16/2021 21:18	Cheryl Brierton	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please keep the Greater Golden Hill Community Planning area together with Balboa Park, as in your latest map. We have no parks other than Balboa, and have been working 40 years to get climate-friendly pedestrian and bicycle paths on the East Mesa. Our community plan was recently updated in 2016.</p>
11/16/2021 20:22	Anthonette Pena	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	PLEASE KEEP GOLDEN HILL WITHIN THE DISTRICT 3 BOUNDARY
11/16/2021 18:57	Lynn Edwards	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Like many others, I would like to thank you for your hard work and patience in listening to many voices from communities large and small and giving us all the same consideration.</p> <p>I support the Clairemont United Map 74956. It would return our community, Rolando Park, and Redwood Village to the College area, where we have historically always been until 10 years ago. This map reunites the communities in the SDSU area.</p>

11/16/2021 18:24	Helen Boyden	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Map 82668 presented this evening moves UCSD into district 6. This change effectively results in only one coastal district. This map also separates the Golden Triangle at Rose Canyon. Rose Canyon is supported as a preserve by residents in the north as well as the South as exemplified the Friends of Rose Canyon
11/16/2021 17:12	Sandra Gustafson	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am opposed to the proposed redistricting of Torrey Hills. Torrey Hills is a coastal community that is closer to the coast than Carmel Valley or Delmar Mesa, and ends at the base of the Los Penasquitos Lagoon directly across from Torrey Pines State Beach.</p> <p>Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley are inextricably linked and inseparable. We share schools, school districts, parks and shopping areas. We pay a large part of our property taxes to the Del Mar School Districts for several bonds that were passed recently. We share infrastructure in Carmel Valley such as the. Ariel Valley Recreation Center, Torrey Hills Park and Ocean Air Park. These were paid for in large part by Torrey Hills taxpayers.</p> <p>We share no communities of interest with District 6 and are separated by 7.5 miles of Los Penasquitos Canyon. Our community property values are considerably higher than those of current communities within District 6. Merging our Torrey Hills community into District 6 will have a direct and substantial negative impact on our property values.</p>
11/16/2021 14:38	Quentin Yates	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Thank you for reuniting Clairemont after it has been split for so long. I know there will be adjustments to the map, as there likely should be. However, please leave Clairemont in one piece and not use it to achieve another community's numbers.</p> <p>You have a tough job and your patience is to be commended. I, like most people in attendance, found the remarks of a few to be offensive to the Commission and some individual Commissioners. That is unacceptable to me and a great many others.</p>
11/16/2021 14:01	Kiran Mathur	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I live in Torrey Hills and pay taxes to be part of Carmel Valley and totally oppose being part of Mira Mesa. Do not want to be part of Mira Mesa at all and want to be part of Carmel valley only.

11/16/2021 13:49	Lisa Ross	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The Good: Master Planned Communities of Torrey Highlands & Pacific Highlands Ranch designed around the MSCP together in D1 ; Del Mar Mesa Community Plan area, also designed according to the MSCP, including Del Mar Mesa Preserve, in District 1 & Carmel Valley intact as well. Maximizes consistent environmental protection. The Bad: strange inclusion of large parts of Torrey Hills in D6. Torrey Hills facilities & shopping center are used by Carmel Valley and Del Mar Mesa residents. The "tail" reaching SR56 is a wildlife corridor. The west end of Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve should be returned to D1. And, the Torrey Pines Planning area is split & with no population in the south, easily changed. For a map that supposedly keeps communities together, putting Torrey Hills and Torrey Pines Community Plan areas together in D1 could easily be accomplished.</p>
11/16/2021 9:47	Susan I. Swisher	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a long time resident of Golden Hill, please keep it in the District 3 boundary. I vote, am active in civic affairs, talk with all of my neighbors and attend the community planning committee meetings. The majority of Golden Hill residents support remaining in District 3.</p>
11/16/2021 9:10	David Swarens	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please keep the Greater Golden Hill community unified in revising council districts. I have previously provided comment to that effect, and it looks like this is the current recommendation of several proposals which seem to now have the Commission's support. The City recognizes these as a unified community in all formal planning efforts, including the boundaries of the community planning group. And the "communities of interest", as well as natural and created boundaries (canyons and freeways) suggest these as the appropriate lines for council representation. As one who has been involved with planning and revitalization efforts for both areas, including community plan updates for each, and having served three terms as chair of the group representing GGH, I speak from decades of personal experience, with 29 years in Sherman and now a dozen years as a resident of Golden Hill /South Park, and one who has worked closely with Districts 3, 4, and 8 over the years. Thanks for your consideration of my comments and those from other members of the various affected neighborhoods.</p>
11/16/2021 8:38	Julia Boglione	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please keep Golden Hill within the District 3 boundary.</p>
11/16/2021 8:07	Lori Gowrie	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>PLEASE KEEP GOLDEN HILL WITHIN THE DISTRICT 3 BOUNDARY!</p>
11/16/2021 7:04	Olga Teplitsky	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>PLEASE KEEP GOLDEN HILL WITHIN THE DISTRICT 3 BOUNDARY!</p>
11/16/2021 6:50	Tershia d'Elgin	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>PLEASE LEAVE GOLDEN HILL WITHIN THE DISTRICT 3 BOUNDARY.</p>

11/15/2021 23:25	Joe Spinozzi	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please leave Scripps Ranch alone - it's a perfectly situated community with practically natural borders. I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/15/2021 22:52	Tim Davey	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Once again for Redwood Village and Rolando Park, we would like the map that would place both communities in DISTRICT 9. I was e-mailed the information for the new Chollas Triangle Park meeting this Wednesday. I saw in the newspaper that they were looking for funds for the park. Ten years ago the president of the Redwood Village Community Council had worked with other agencies to design a park . We were in the old District 7. We were always kept up to date. Since the project is now in District 9, we have not been kept up to date. The park will be on the north side of Chollas Parkway. Our community is on the south side. We will be the community that will using the park the most. We don't have a park. This park will be in walking distance. For this reason and others Redwood Village and Rolando Park should be where the residents want to be. That is District 9.

11/15/2021 22:16	Jenifer Robison	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I support separating UCSD from La Jolla (District 1). I graduated from UCSD in 1971, when UCSD students weren't welcome in La Jolla. Restaurants with empty tables couldn't seat us; clothing stores had nothing in our size; movie theaters were suddenly sold out. La Jollans never imagined there would be 40,000+ students, nor have they ever accepted it. Nothing has changed since 1971. La Jollans still don't welcome diversity (witness their 20-year legal battle against a Hillel Center, their outrage at "Black Lives Matter" chalk art). Back then, UCSD students looked to the north – Del Mar, Solana Beach, and Encinitas – for shopping, restaurants, rentals. Therefore, I sympathize with the current students' plea for their voting district to be united with today's interests – now to the east. La Jollans' only interest in keeping UCSD within District One is to preserve their "common interest" (sic, there is none), so that all those planning committees (12 at last count) can continue to object (ad infinitum) to anything UCSD proposes. After more than 50 years, the 40,000+ diverse student community deserves to finally be separated politically from the 40,000 La Jollans, with whom they have absolutely nothing in common.</p>
11/15/2021 17:40	Helen M Boyden	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please modify the the Commission's Final Preliminary Map, approved Nov 11, 2021 (https://distrctr.org/plan/74956?portal). by (1) Uniting the CArmel Valley area including Torrey Hills and the Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserving in District One as it is now (2) Adding the rest of Kearny Mesa to District 6 (3) Moving the Southeastern part of the Pacific Beach area to District 2 to improve population balance and improve D2 connectivity to Clairemont. Please keep University City (Golden Triangle) in one district as the above map.</p> <p>These changes can be seen in Map No. 81893 which has a 4% total deviation and has an Asian population of greater than 39%.</p>

11/15/2021 16:47	Pierre Sawaya	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Good Evening,</p> <p>As a resident, community member and parent residing in Torrey Hills, I would like to respectfully request that you keep Torrey Hills in district 1.</p> <p>Torrey Hills is a community within Carmel Valley and has been since its inception. Our schools, parks, sports, activities and communities are all intertwined and embedded within the Carmel Valley community. Torrey Hills is simply a neighborhood within Carmel Valley and therefore should absolutely be part of the same district. Torrey Hills has very little similarity with and connection to the other communities within district 6. Please keep this neighborhood aligned with the parent community it belongs to, which is Carmel Valley.</p> <p>Best,</p> <p>The Pierre Sawaya Family</p>
11/15/2021 15:00	John w Stump	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>EXTRACT FROM SUBMITTED LETTER</p> <p>Specifically, these maps add to District Nine (D9) and District Three (D3) territories which are outside of the existing 2011 Districts, their traditional settlement boundaries, and cross over the entire San Diego River geographical feature and the very significant infrastructure features between Friars Road and Camino Del Rio South – including the entire Kumeyaay I-8 Freeway. Most of District 9 (D9) and District Three (D3) are in an entirely different watersheds; but this new map reaches into the San Diego River water shed to capture speculative development interests and populations.</p> <p>I request and recommend that the Commission proceed by removing from the Preliminary Map:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove, from the Mid-City areas, the entire San Diego River geographical feature and the very significant infrastructure features between Friars Road and Camino Del Rio South – including the entire Kumeyaay I-8 Freeway; 2. Return, as a jumping off place to the 2011 District base map for D3, D4, and D9; and 3. Then adjust populations by carefully using limited Block Groups rather than whole area

11/15/2021 14:05	Karin Zirk, Ph.D.	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am strongly opposed to the current proposed draft map that separates Pacific Beach from Mission Beach, Mission Bay and Ocean Beach. Pacific Beach and Mission Beach multiple issues. I support the Community Collaborators map not the Clairemont centric map that takes a suburban community and mixes it with our more urban oriented beach communities. The coast should stay in one district not have to contend with the NIMBY attitude of Clairemont.
11/15/2021 10:16	Krista Lee Mills	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Can you/us please discuss the zoning law(s) for putting multiple units on what was once only one property? Many of us who live in Clairmont are concerned on many levels. We are concerned about putting so many people in one area, parking sewer/water, demands on roads, etc... Please address our concerns. Thank you, Krista Mills
11/15/2021 8:24	Betty Rodriguez	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am very pleased with the selection of the compromise map. Linda Vistans are most happy to be remaining in D7 with a Councilmember who knows our community well and has worked for us in a most positive way. I applaud you for your calmness among unfounded claims of your motives being less than honorable. Hopefully your tweaking will not affect linda vista remaining together and in D7. Thank you for your hard work
11/15/2021 8:06	Gary Wonacott	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Mission Beach is primarily a residential community with relatively small commercial districts dedicated to restaurants, liquor stores, and light shopping. Pacific and Mission Beach share the zip code 92109. Our post office is in PB. School age children in MB attend schools in PB and Bird Rock. MB residents shop for groceries, office supplies, dental and vision care, among other services in PB. Mission Beach and Pacific Beach are one giant, connected shoreline in San Diego. MB and PB share beaches and sea walls, and life guards and police and fire.</p> <p>Being left in D2 represents an existential threat to our community. Our population has decreased from 6,500 to 3,700 in the last ten years. Mission Beach is threatened by sea level rise, extreme nighttime airport noise, and short term rentals saturation with little or no representation at the City by our D2 representative. There is an ongoing effort by residents to merge the Mission Beach and Pacific Beach CPAs that would eliminate our vulnerability to small groups or individuals from taking over the Mission Beach Town Council and Mission Beach Precise Planning Board.</p> <p>We ask that you consider moving MB from D2 to D1.</p>

11/14/2021 23:17	Tim Davey	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>By looking at the map. I am not sure that Redwood Village and Rolando Park aren't in District 9 as we have been telling you. I was forwarded an announcement about the final GDP design for the Chollas Triangle Park. The flyer said the park is located at Chollas Parkway. Redwood Village was not notified about it because we aren't in District 9. We don't have a park and this is in walking distance and Chollas Parkway is in our community.</p> <p>10 years ago we were notified about the plan because we were in the old District 7. Some of the funds were going to come from the Crossroads Redevelopment Agency. Funds that were coming because El Cajon Blvd, University Ave, and Streamview Drive were blighted. Please listen to the residents and have us in District 9.</p>
11/14/2021 10:10	Yvonne Venger	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I applaud the panel for voting to keep UCSD in La Jolla. UCSD is squarely part of La Jolla and should remain so. Only permanent residents and taxpayers have a legitimate stake in districting. UCSD students do not fit into that category. They will not be in the area long enough to experience long term effects either way. Tax paying, voting residents are here for the long haul, and it is only our voices that should be seriously considered. We are the community which supports UCSD, and from which these students greatly benefit. Frankly, I'm confused as to why their petition was even considered. People are allowed to have their own perspective, it doesn't mean it's legitimate.</p>
11/14/2021 9:24	Delores Brandon	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please keep Clairemont whole. Please accept the Clairemont Town Council's proposed redistricting map. We are a community not simple blocks of random addresses. We live together and share infrastructure and civic issues. It has been well demonstrated that multiple representatives that are attempting to "also" serve Clairemont generally forget us, so please keep us together.</p>
11/14/2021 9:14	John Markowicz	11/16/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a resident of Clairemont, I appreciate the Commission keeping Clairemont united in one City Council District (per Commission meeting 11.13.21). Thank you for taking the time and effort to listen to our requests. Please do not change the Clairemont united map in any way that breaks up Clairemont into different City Council Districts.</p>
11/13/2021 20:25	Lissa Dun	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.</p>

11/13/2021 14:22	Shital Parikh	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I heard today that Council member Chris Kate addressed the Commissioners. That is illegal and unfair representation as I get only 2 min as a common citizen. I am very concerned as Council member Chris Kate, voted in favor of Developer Cisterra to enable rezoning from Agriculture to Industrial area on the boarder of Del Mar Mesa Preserve causing irreparable damage to the Preserve. You CANNNOT put DMM Preserve under Dist.. 6 and Chris Kate as we have legal proceedings against Cisterra so we can protect our DMM Preserve.</p> <p>Dist. 1 council at that time Barbara Bry voted against the development and rezoning from Agriculture to Industrial. City Council, District 1 understands the needs of DMM as they have been working with us since the inception of DMM. Please keep DMM intact under D1. Specially, as Kris Kate has crossed the line and influenced the commissioners by addressing them in public comment... which is not allowed. We get 2 min!!! He can't get that and hold an elected office. DMMCommunity Planning Board cannot address two city councils, it is a waste of our time and city council resources.</p>
11/13/2021 13:11	Brian Pollard	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Census Tract numbers/links (Rolando Prk and Redwood Village) https://statisticalatlas.com/neighborhood/California/San-Diego/Rolando/Race-and-Ethnicity#overview</p> <p>https://statisticalatlas.com/block-group/California/San-Diego-County/002703-1/Race-and-Ethnicity</p>

11/13/2021 13:03	Maura Deignan	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	My name is Maura Deignan and I live in the NorthPark neighborhood in District. The Chair's Map and the Clairemont map both strategically dilute the latinx and AAPI votes in district 9 and district 6 respectively. The Chair's map and Clairmont map purposely remove citizen Latinx voters to ensure that D9's representative will only cater to the needs and wishes of the affluent population in northern D9. Although the latinx population is slightly over 40% in D9 their Citizen voting age population is only 28.6%. This will make D9 effectively a colony district where the majority population has no say in how its district is run. Our Community Collaboration map puts the Latinx CVAP at 31.45% and the District 6 AAPI CVAP at 34.82% allowing all populations to have fair representation when selecting their district leader. We question the integrity of the Clairmont United map which disenfranchises the Latinx community and completely ignores the Black Community's work in helping to map the district lines for D4. This map is an exact duplicate of the Chair's map for District 4,8, and 9. This map also strategically disempowers the Black and Latinx communities. I strongly support the community collaboration map!
11/13/2021 11:53	Mark Reinbold	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	My name is Mark, my pronouns are he/him/his, and I live in the Downtown-Gaslamp neighborhood. I'm commenting today in support of the SDCC map that empowers the LGBTQ Community of interest as well as communities across San Diego. Please include all of Downtown and Little Italy into District 3 as well as all neighborhoods: *South of Friars Road *East of the 5 Freeway *North of the 94 Freeway *West of the 805 Freeway Please ensure District 6 empowers the AAPI Community of Interest
11/13/2021 10:48	James Lovell	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Don't divide Scripps Ranch for redistricting!! It would divide a close knit community that has working together for years!! I have lived here for 43 years, seen our community grow as one, and prosper. To divide it would be a slap in the face for all of us!
11/13/2021 10:45	Joan Lovell	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	"I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community."

11/13/2021 10:20	Susan Duerksen	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I'm a homeowner in the Kensington neighborhood and a retiree who has lived in San Diego for 36 years. I strongly support the Communities Collaboration map.</p> <p>We must prioritize equity for the communities that have been disadvantaged for decades by our City government - NOT people like me. Everyone has exactly the same rights to representation, and it is past time to prioritize communities where that representation on Council has been unfairly lacking.</p>
11/13/2021 10:16	Tamar Caspi	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>On behalf of Navajo Community Planning Group... the effects of Mission Valley being separated into three different districts will be felt throughout Navajo. The Navajo Community worked diligently with the City of San Diego's Planning Department, representatives from the Mission Valley Planning Area and others in the re-vitalization of the Grantville Community via a Focus Plan Amendment to the Navajo Community Plan. Ample consideration, planning and assumptions during this time helped craft the current vision of East Mission Valley, Navajo and District 7, along with the mitigation measures and cost-sharing complexities of significant infrastructure improvements throughout. Having the possibility of two new council districts political and infrastructure needs infringe on the years of prior planning. Furthermore, we strongly support the notion that district boundaries should be set by physical/natural boundaries. Mission Valley and Navajo have some of the most environmentally sensitive lands as the San Diego River that runs through Mission Valley then through the Mission Trails Regional Park in Navajo deserve one Councilmember that can protect and implement improvements to these lands. We ask the commission to revise the map to keep the Interstate 8 freeway, the southernmost border of District 7 in Mission Valley.</p>

11/13/2021 10:15	Deborah Currier	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a homeowner in the Del Mar Heights area, I ask that you please support the 2021 Compromise Map 78392 which was submitted on November 9 or map 72525 which was approved by the commission on October 29 and to oppose the Collaborative Map 72602. Our area is a coastal community and shares natural boundaries, street lines, and other interests with the communities that are included in District 1 on maps 78392 and 72525, but has nothing in common with the communities shown on map 72602. Thank you.
11/13/2021 9:39	Carolyn Giust	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/13/2021 9:25	Phillip Wagner	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a long time resident of Pacific Highlands Ranch, I strongly oppose any suggestion of removing PHR from the Carmel Valley Community and/or District 1. This will be determinantal to the residents within PHR and surrounding area. Any proposal to make such a change should be rejected.
11/13/2021 9:21	Melissa Krause	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As one of the very first residents of Pacific Highlands Ranch I request you oppose any proposed map that would remove any portion of Pacific Highlands Ranch from the Carmel Valley Community and Council District 1. Any change of this nature is not in best interest if the community and is damaging to those who have made a long term investment in the area.
11/13/2021 9:09	Wallace Wulfeck	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As Chair of the Scripps Ranch Planning Group, I urge you to keep Scripps Ranch together and in District 5. Map 72525 does that. The Communities Collaboration Map could be made acceptable by moving the area south of Pomerado Rd, and Rancho Encantada back with the rest of Scripps Ranch north of Pomerado Rd. into D5. Pomerado Road is not a natural dividing line for Scripps Ranch: There is only a small strip of homes on the south side -- with a miles-wide band of Military property that separates those homes and Rancho Encantada from Tierrasanta. There are no connecting roads, no residents, and no public access even permitted in the Military area. We have strong connections with the communities to the north, including Miramar Ranch North, Sabre Springs, Carmel Mountain, etc. We have worked for years to re-unite Rancho Encantada with Scripps Ranch, which was done at the last redistricting in 2011, and to help Rancho Encantada join the Scripps Ranch community. The SRPG now includes both planning areas, by vote of the residents in 2016. Please do not divide us again. We strongly support Map 72525.

11/13/2021 9:08	David Gangsei	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is David Gangsei. I am a 20-year resident in the College Area, now District 9. I strongly support the Community Collaboration map for drawing new council districts. The Community Collaboration map is the fairest map and has purposely included Black, Latinx and AAPI community members in its drafting. As a resident of D9, I endorse the specific components of the Community Collaboration map to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take Qualcomm Stadium out of D9 - This community is 51% white and has very different infrastructure, concerns and values than the rest of D9. Adding this community dilutes the Latinx vote in D9 • Move Mt Hope and part of Mountain View back into D9 - These communities are 85% Latinx and deserve to elect representatives that care about their issues. Removing them from D9, significantly dilutes the Latinx voting power in the City
11/13/2021 8:56	Randall Hern	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.</p>
11/13/2021 8:55	Arthur Salm	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Arthur Salm. I'm a 25-year resident of Kensington in District 9. The current proposed maps would seriously dilute the AAIP and latinx populations in both my district and district 6. I urge you to adopt the Community Collaboration map, which will assure fair and balanced representation for all San Diegans.</p>
11/13/2021 8:39	Poonam Thadani	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please do not redistrict Scripps Ranch</p>
11/13/2021 8:36	Margaret N Waznis	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I support the San Diego Communities Collaboration map and urge you to approve it. To have our Rancho Penasquitos community united as one district is our hope. We ask you to remember how long we have been split. Let our diverse community come together and not be picked apart.</p> <p>Thanks very much</p>

11/13/2021 8:21	Mark Salata	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I don't understand dividing up University City (92122) into east and west because we have 5 public schools that serve the community - Doyle, Curie, Spreckles, Standley, and UCHS - across those lines. We have emergency service that is located in the west that serves both. We have the postal service in the west that serves both. We have the Standley Rec center and new pool in the west that serves both. Our University City Community Association serves both. And Governor Dr needs a full redesign along the whole length, including Governor Dr/Genesee intersection. Genesee should not be a secondary highway splitting UC. The natural boarder in terms of roads is 805 and 5 and 52. Unless you have a good equity argument to split UC, I don't understand why we should divide it.
11/13/2021 8:09	San Diego Rancho La Cresta Homeowners Association	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The Board of Directors of the San Diego Rancho La Cresta Homeowners Association, on behalf of the association and the 367 homeowners we represent, respectively request that the communities of Scripps Ranch (Scripps Miramar Ranch – including residents south of Pomerado Road, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada/Stonebridge) remain a community together in the single council district 5. These Scripps Ranch communities have shared interests and common requirements of the City Council in terms of governmental support (Infrastructure and Services). Breaking up these communities amongst different council members dilutes their political voice in securing this governmental support. The shared interests and common requirements of these communities are aligned geographically for consolidated support inside the city of San Diego. The map submitted by residents on 11/3 titled, "Keeping a community together makes sense", #74956 splits the community of Scripps Ranch in order to consolidate other communities. Scripps Ranch only has 36,000 residents and contains one zip code. This split should not be approved. Thank you.
11/13/2021 8:08	Cynthia Ribeiro	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	No on map 74956. Please keep our community together
11/13/2021 7:52	Karen Hern	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/13/2021 7:50	Kevin Yim	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/13/2021 7:47	Carla Watson	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Don't separate Scripps Ranch! The idea is ludicrous and makes absolutely no sense.
11/13/2021 7:43	Andrea Zajac	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Do not split Miramar North, etc, or any Scripps Ranch community into different zip codes.

11/13/2021 7:42	Rashid Mansoor	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please keep Scripps Ranch, Rancho Encantada and zip 92131 as is in district 5. Don't change anything.
11/13/2021 7:34	Jacqueline Kim	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please don't move Stonebridge (Rancho Encantada sp?) out of Scripps Ranch. Scripps Ranch is 1 community and would like to stay together.
11/13/2021 7:30	Rhea Dimdiman	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/13/2021 7:22	Victoria Lanning LaBruzzo	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	All the communities of Scripps Ranch should remain together in council district 5. The map submitted by residents on 11/3, Map #74956 is ironically named "Keeping a community together makes sense" or "Clairemont United" splits up the Scripps Ranch Community. Splitting up one community to unify another does not make any sense, especially when the Clairemont Mesa community is over 81,000 residents with 3 zip codes, whereas Scripps Ranch is 36,000 residents with only one zip code. Our community has common interests and requirements of the City Council and would potentially lose governmental support as our voice as community would be diluted between two districts. Geographically, South Pomerado and Rancho Encantada residents would be alienated from communities in their district. Scripps Ranch is primarily a residential community. Minimal commercial, minimal industrial, therefore the needs are different than a heavily commercial or industrial community.
11/13/2021 6:33	Lori Shelton	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956."
11/13/2021 5:58	Karen Schlegel	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/13/2021 5:35	Gaurav Kumar	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/13/2021 0:29	Natalie Schenker- Ahmed	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 23:41	Ellen Svatos	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Scripps Ranch together. Do not break it up into different districts. Keep our neighborhood in tack. Keep us in District 5

11/12/2021 23:36	Larry Davidson	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I ask the Commissioners to remove the Collaborative map from consideration. Organizations that have no idea of the true nature of communities in San Diego have made ill-considered, one-sided decisions based on self-interest. Numerical calculations on two-dimensional maps should not be the primary consideration in moving around citizens from other districts against their desires. Anyone who wants to move over 30% of the voting pollution of San Diego should drive around the multitude of neighborhoods. They should open their eyes to the wonderful diversity of existing communities of interest and our amazing natural surroundings. Agreeing to the demands of people from outside of San Diego is just wrong. We should decide our own future. Redistricting is a political process, but the goal should not be to stack the deck and split communities. This is asking too much of the citizens of San Diego
11/12/2021 23:32	Kelly O'Day	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 23:19	Cathy Pelland	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956. It is an absolutely horrible idea to even consider splitting up our community! Scripps Ranch should all stay in the same district. I don't know who came up with this ridiculous idea, but it is probably the ones that believe in what is being taught in the classrooms these days.
11/12/2021 23:18	Betty Symons	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 22:57	Quentin C Yates	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I urge you to accept the Clairemont United map. Please rejoin the community of Clairemont back together again and do not split it apart. We need one district, with one councilmember to help the community face the challenges that lay ahead. Thank you!
11/12/2021 22:55	Arlen Caraang	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 22:54	Judy Caraang	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 22:47	Gina Callipari	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please do not split neighborhoods apart. Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada belong together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956."

11/12/2021 22:46	Joella & Bob Martin	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	We strongly support keeping all of Scripps Ranch. MIRAMAR NORTH, and Encontada areas together under the new redistricting plan. Do not divide the ranch. We have a strong sense of neighborhood as evidenced by our Civic Association.
11/12/2021 22:30	Gary Wonacott	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am pleading for you to consider including Mission Beach to D1 in the compromise map. Leaving Mission Beach in D2 represents an existential threat to our community, which has seen its population of residents diminish from 6,500 in the 2010 census to only 3,700 in 2020. Many of our long term renter residents have been and continue to be evicted so that housing units might be used for short term rentals. Pacific Beach is not just our closest neighbor, but is where most Mission Beach residents and their kids shop and go to school. The only defining factor that differentiates us from Pacific Beach is a CPA boundary. We have a common boardwalk sea wall and beaches and many of our infrastructure issues are the same. Please move Mission Beach to D1.
11/12/2021 22:30	Nikki Levy	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please keep the Scripps Ranch community together in ONE district. I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. No on Map 74956. We have shared interests and a strong local community. Kids go to the same one middle school and same one high school. We shop in the same markets, we drive on the same streets. We need to have the same representation for our voices to be heard.
11/12/2021 22:23	Debbie Starr	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Do not split up Scripps Ranch in any redistricting plan!
11/12/2021 22:19	Cynthia Kurose	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	No on map 74956. I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community.
11/12/2021 22:08	Mehul Shah	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident of Pacific Highlands Ranch, I request that you reject any proposed map that would split up Pacific Highlands Ranch and Carmel Valley or move them out of Council District One. We support the 2021 Compromise Map #78392 and oppose Map 72602 – SDCC. Keep Pacific Highlands Ranch and Carmel Valley together and in Council District 1. We are ONE community.

11/12/2021 21:57	Chris Nielsen	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	University City's perspective on the effects of the three maps to be considered by the commission on Saturday November 13 can be found by searching for the tag #universitycityperspective in the redistricting submission gallery. In summary, we prefer the "Chair's" or "Commission Map" (72525) with small changes, we dislike the "Clairemont United" (74956) that moves 52,000 residents in University to another district, and believe the SDCC or "Collaboration" map (70727) is the worst for both University and the city as a whole, moving more that one-third of the entire population of the City into a new district.
11/12/2021 21:45	Ken Bickel	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 21:44	Colleen FitzSimons	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am writing to you as a resident from District 1 to strongly urge you to vote for the Communities Collaboration Map: Map #72602/#70727. It fairly addresses the concerns of all communities, especially those that are not being addressed by representatives from the coastal communities made up of single family homes. Allowing the status quo to continue after hearing from concerned community members is a failure of your duty as Commissioners. Thank you for your attention.
11/12/2021 21:21	Julie Tunnell	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community.
11/12/2021 21:12	Jason Kempster	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping scripps Miramar, Miramar ranch, Miramar ranch north and rancho encantada together in district 5. Please don't split our community. No on map 74956
11/12/2021 21:02	Sharon Nichols	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I oppose Map 74956 which splits off a section of Scripps Ranch from the rest of the community and divides its middle school from the rest of the feeder pattern. The community of Scripps Ranch is naturally bounded on the south by the Miramar Marine Base, a logical district boundary line that is used by other maps and defines the community itself. Please approve a map that utilizes this natural boundary and does not split this cohesive community and school pattern.
11/12/2021 20:58	Mary Lawler	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please do not split any neighborhoods apart. Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada belong together in District 5. Please DO NOT split our community. No on Map 74956!

11/12/2021 20:24	Harold Gallego	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 20:05	Denise Flynn	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956."
11/12/2021 20:01	Emilee Patel	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please DO NOT split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 19:53	Kathryn Burton	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The SDCC map is a redistricting abomination. It shifts 448,000 people, approximately one third of the San Diego's population, to other districts. It decimates Districts 1 and 2.</p> <p>This map is endorsed by Biocom and gives them everything they claimed they "deserved" during public testimony. (Steve Pomerence, 9/8/21; Melanie Cohn, 11/4/21.)</p> <p>The SDCC map ignores COIs and natural boundaries. It is rampant with economic gerrymandering, commandeering UTC, UCSD and the Golden Triangle from District 1 and delivering them to District 6.</p> <p>It creates one coastal district which contradicts the Commission's goal of retaining two coastal districts.</p> <p>It ignores communities of interest and separates scores of them.</p> <p>It is not necessary to cause such enormous upheaval in order to create a map that represents San Diego's diverse citizens. The goal with regard to District 6 has been to increase the Asian population. This can be accomplished without such a dramatic impact on the entire city and has been done in other maps. APAC does not support this map. That speaks volumes to me.</p>
11/12/2021 18:41	Robert Rohrbach	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No to Map 74956."

11/12/2021 18:39	Ruth Lim	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No to Map 74956."
11/12/2021 18:31	Gracie Modica	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 18:30	Amber Fielder	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 18:18	Bhavesh Mody	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 18:15	Laura White	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Absolutely necessary to keep all of Scripps Ranch in the Scripps Ranch High School area. "Please do not split neighborhoods apart. Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada belong together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956."
11/12/2021 18:06	Barbara Chicca	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please do not split neighborhoods apart. Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada belong together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on map 74956.
11/12/2021 17:42	Jennifer Madsen	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No to Map 74956.
11/12/2021 17:18	Krista Clausen	11/13/2021	angela frn	1	Please do not split neighborhoods apart. Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada belong together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 17:15	Helen Boyden	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The Commission Map (Chair's map 72525) is preferable to the other two. It moves only a hundred thousands residents from one district to another. It maintains many long standing COIs. It needs, however, to be modified. I have placed comments on map 72525
11/12/2021 17:11	Helen Boyden	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The SDCC redistricting map (72602/70727) is unacceptable. It moves about half a million residents from one district to another. It disrupts many COIs of longstanding connections. More detail can be found in my comments left with map 72602).
11/12/2021 17:07	Helen Boyden	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The Clairemont United Map (74956) Is unacceptable It moves about a quarter of a million resident from one districting to another, disrupting longstanding COIS of interest. I have made additional comments attached to the map.

11/12/2021 17:04	Helen Boyden	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The SDCC (72602/70727) redistricting map is unacceptable. It moves about a half a million residents from their current district to another. It disturbs many COIs. I have put additional comments under map 72602.
11/12/2021 16:58	Jennifer Sanderson	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Scripps Ranch 1 district, 92131.
11/12/2021 16:54	Carol Leighty	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please do not split the Scripps Ranch community. The area must be kept in tact.
11/12/2021 16:43	Suzanne Fero	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Scripps Ranch zoned together! No on map 74956!!
11/12/2021 16:37	Mike Houston	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No to Map 74956.
11/12/2021 16:34	Frederick Rand	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956. A big no on Map 74956. No no no. Just don't do it. Forget about it. No on Map 74956.</p> <p>In other words, keep Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5.</p> <p>Please do not split our community.</p> <p>No on Map 74956. A big no on Map 74956. No no no. Just don't do it. Forget about it. No on Map 74956.</p>

11/12/2021 16:31	John William Stump	11/13/2021	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>Please read full email submission of this date Let me see if I got the Legal Analysis correct? Quoting:</p> <p>“I have not participated in either drawing the proposed maps or the public hearing process leading up to them. Thus, I have no first-hand knowledge of the Commission’s application of the Charter’s factors and limitations to this point.” (Memorandum FROM: Craig A. Steele ,DATE: November 12, 2021, SUBJECT: Preliminary Analysis of Draft Council District Maps, Page My recommendations:</p> <p>Immediately , do professional analysis of langue minorities – Particularly in 2011 D9 and D6 Where limited English Speakers’ voting participation may be diluted by the “72525 (“Chair’s map”), and 74956 (“Clairemont United”)1”</p> <p>Immediately, do the other analysis required by the City Charter to ensure: ““Each redistricting plan shall 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.””</p> <p>Carefully consider whether any Cracking and Packing has occurred in any Map under consideration, as noted in the subject MEMORANDUM: “This standard led to the “cracking and packing” analogy I know Commissioners have heard about.</p>
11/12/2021 16:28	Christian Tresize	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I live in the Del Mar Mesa Community, currently in D1, and am strongly in favor of redistricting map 74956.It is important to keep our neighborhood intact as other alternatives would split our small community down the middle of the main road that runs through our neighborhood. It also will keep the Del Mar Mesa Preserve, a designated Open Space, heavily used for outdoor activities in our Community Plan area and for which we are dedicated to maintaining as one of the largest Open Space activity areas in the City.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this request.</p>
11/12/2021 15:59	Angela Frantz	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community.</p> <p>No on Map 74956.</p>

11/12/2021 15:58	Dan Bailey	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 15:57	Dan Bailey	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	No on realignment of Scripps Ranch.
11/12/2021 15:49	Kathleen McGrattan	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	No on map 74956. Scripps Ranch is a neighborhood. Please do not split our community. Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, Rancho Encantada are one community.
11/12/2021 15:44	Adam Hornstein	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 15:44	Janice Humphrey	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 15:32	Susan Jones	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956
11/12/2021 15:26	Mary Fetherling	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 15:23	Arcelia Stadtherr	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. No on Map 74956.
11/12/2021 15:13	Barbara Paddock	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community of Scripps Ranch. Ms. von Wilpert, I request you to vote "no" on Map 74956. Thank you for all you do for Scripps Ranch!

11/12/2021 13:03	Kathryn Kern	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I strongly support the Redistricting Map approved by the Commission on October 29, 2021 (Map #72525). I also support the United Map #74956 as a compromise & appreciate that this map was modified to include both Rolando Park & Redwood Village in D9 and acknowledges our desire to be reunited with the College area communities.</p> <p>To date, all comments, public and written, by Rolando Park residents and College-area neighboring communities support a move to D9.</p> <p>Although the process points out "communities of interest"; it is just as important to correct the disenfranchisement of our two neighborhoods that became minority voters during the last 2011 Redistricting process. This reunification will enable us to elect legislators who reflect our communities & affect any meaningful opportunities to impact public policy and lawmaking in our neighborhoods (collectively in the College Area). Voting Rights Act applies here.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the Collaborative map #72602/70727. We were never asked for input, nor have changes to this map been implemented based on our communities' public comments to date. There have been no comments made as to how this map specifically addresses any benefits to our neighborhoods to remain in D4 as disenfranchised minority voters.</p>
11/12/2021 12:34	Betty Rodriguez	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Thank you for all your hard work. It us much appreciated. So sorry you had to listen to such disrespectful language at previous meeting.</p> <p>I am in support of either the Chair's Map or the clairemint compromise map. They both seem to be best for our communities with the least disruption. I am not in favor of collaborative map.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

					<p>I support the commission approved map (72525) or the resident submitted map (74956) as part of the redistricting process. Both of these seem very thoughtful in grouping communities in a logical manner. I strongly oppose map 72602. I live in Carmel Valley and while I have nothing against different areas of the city, Carmel Valley, University City and Miramar have very different priorities, opportunities and challenges. Cutting our community in half and having our children go to school in another district does not make sense. Carmel Valley should have one elected representative that represents our concerns and that we can work with. Thank you for hearing our concerns and we trust that you will stick to the map (or similar) originally approved by the commission.</p> <p>King regards,</p>
11/12/2021 12:04	Alen Loubier	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Alen Loubier
11/12/2021 11:52	Dave Williams	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community
11/12/2021 11:50	Vivian Sink	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a Clairemont resident, I would like to keep Clairemont whole. I would love to see Clairemont United map 74956 put into effect. Thank you!
11/12/2021 10:51	Walter Burenin	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a Clairemont resident I would like to see the community of Clairemont United into one District after being split between two Districts for ten years. I recommend the Clairemont United map 74956

11.12.2021 10:36	Tim Guy	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello Commissioners,</p> <p>I'm writing to express support for the Clairemont United Compromise map 74956 from 11/3/21 as it ensures the Del Mar Mesa Community is kept together in District 1 under. Our second choice would be the modified commissioners map 72525 where DMM residences and DMM Preserve both stay in District 1.</p> <p>Keeping the Preserve in D1 makes sense for many reasons. The Del Mar Mesa Preserve and Del Mar Mesa are part of the same communities of interest, and have no land boundaries between them. The preserve also has no impact on the the population requirements, so changing it's district doesn't have a solid reason. Splitting DMM residences and Preserve two districts disables DMM Community Planning Board to oversee the Preserve and wastes Council resources</p> <p>Please keep the DMM community whole in D1 as our communities of interest are aligned with District 1.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
------------------	---------	------------	---------------------	---	---

					<p>Hello Commissioners,</p> <p>Del Mar Mesa Community is kept together in District 1 under the "Clairemont United Compromise map 74956 from 11/3/21. Map 74956 works for the Del Mar Mesa community.</p> <p>We can also accept a modified commissioners map 72525 where DMM residences and DMM Preserve both stay in District 1.</p> <p>The portion of DMM Preserve allocated to District 6 has zero population as it is MSCP land. So it does not impact deviation. Keeping DMM Preserve in D1 does not impact the commission's population requirements.</p> <p>As per map 72525 Torrey Highlands goes to D6, without a road access to D6, unless a road is built through DMM Preserve, which would cause irreparable damage to DMM Preserve habitat and go against SD Climate Action Initiative.</p> <p>DMM Preserve was created by clustering residential development to the West</p> <p>in order to free open space for Preserve on the East. They cannot be split in two districts.</p> <p>Splitting DMM residences and Preserve two districts disables DMM Community Planning Board to oversee the Preserve and wastes Council resources Please keep the DMM community whole in D1 as our communities of interest are aligned with District 1.</p>
11/12/2021 10:11	Shital Parikh	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Shital Parikh, VC Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board
11/12/2021 9:54	Paula Elliott	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a Clairemont resident I would like to see the community of Clairemont United into one District after being split between two Districts for ten years. I recommend the Clairemont United map 74956.
11/12/2021 9:44	Morteza Rahimi	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a Clairemont resident I would like to see the community of Clairemont United into one District after being split between two Districts for ten years. I recommend the Clairemont United map 74956.

11/12/2021 9:03	Karin Zirk, Ph.D.	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I strongly urge you to adopt the Communities Collaboration Map: Map #72602/#70727 https://districtr.org/plan/72602?portal and https://districtr.org/plan/70727 for the following reasons:</p> <p>It keeps the beach communities united.</p> <p>Beach communities face unique challenges that don't face other communities in terms of the positive and negative impacts tourism, short-term vacation rentals, and the high numbers of visitors from outside our communities.</p> <p>Sea-level rise is a huge concern not shared by residents in Clairemont or UCSD or any of the communities on the mesas.</p> <p>Being situated in the Coastal Zone and having Coastal Commission Oversight for planning, development, habitat restoration, etc. means things function differently here.</p>
11/12/2021 8:45	Annette Larson	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I have been a resident of Clairemont for 63 years and I would like to see our community united into one district. Clairemont needs one council representative, and should not be split up as it has been for the past 10 years. Please vote for the Clairemont United map 74956.</p>
11/12/2021 8:25	Michael Lynn Filio	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a Clairemont resident of 25 years, please keep Clairemont one district, one council, one community! I recommend the Clairemont United Map 74956! Thank you.</p>
11/11/2021 21:42	Keshav Gopinath	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. We have been together all these years and are happy with the way things are.</p>
11/11/2021 15:46	Gregg Lichtenstein	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am request that any redistricting map approved by this committee ensure that Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada are kept together in District 5. The community of Scripps Ranch should not be split into different districts.</p>
11/11/2021 10:34	Valerie Blease	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do NOT split our community.</p>

11/11/2021 8:35	John Stump -City Heights	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>http://enewspaper.sandiegouniontribune.com/infinity/article_share.aspx?guid=ecae2b67-359d-45ba-9899-d1cb09454439</p> <p>Your article misses the main Voting Rights point of this whole effort. Redistricting is not about keeping one subdivision or commercial business district together or even where elite colleges are placed. It is about preventing political manipulation to gerrymander away the voting rights of racial minorities.</p> <p>The Chairman's Map and the mislabeled Compromise map only deal with peripheral non voting rights questions. Both of these maps dilute the Hispanic, Black , and LGBTQ voting rights. These Middle Class subdivision maps are focused on housing development subdivisions rather than fair political participation.</p> <p>The very biased and frankly conflicted commission leadership [two commissioners the Chair and Kosmos are holdover Republican appointees on the SD Ethics Commission] have waited until this last Saturday meeting to even consider the Voting Rights race changes from the current 2010 Council Districts to the new Chairman's / Compromise maps. If the those maps continue then it would be better to not have the Commission get the 6 votes on a final map, [Population increases only require Council District changes North of Adams Avenue because of Coastal growth in District One]</p> <p>Complete email has been sent to Redistricting staff for distribution</p>
-----------------	--------------------------	------------	---------------------	---	--

11/11/2021 6:06	Jeff Steindorf	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>A 41-year resident of South UC, who was the planning officer for UCSD from 1984-2012 28, and I firmly oppose establishing Genesee as the district line. Educational, recreational, commercial, and worship facilities in both sides of Genesee serve all in South UC. The splitting of South UC would harm the spirit of this tightknit community and preclude fair and effective representation and services.</p> <p>The entire UCPG area, including all of South UC, should be in one district. The City's 1959 University Community Study, was designed to attract a UC campus to San Diego, and envisioned a "University city" or "City of the Mind" in which residential, commercial developments, and Scientific Research would develop synergistically with the campus. The extraordinary quality of UCSD and the adjacent biomedical and engineering companies that have developed provide the economic dynamo of the entire region.</p> <p>Preserve the integrity of the UCPG area, including all of South UC. Adoption of the proposed Genesee boundary would be a significant mistake, an unforced error. PLEASE abandon map #72525 and select #72602 or #70727 or #74956 and keep UC united.</p>
11/11/2021 3:14	Tim Davey	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am Tim Davey. I live in Redwood Village and a member of the Rolando Park Community Council. I am oppose to both the Collaboration and Clairemont Maps. They do not address the wishes of both communities to be reunited with the rest of the College Area in District 9. 10 years ago we were in the old 7 with them. Both communities went to the meetings and opposed being separated. Our voices were not heard. Ten years later it seems that our wishes will not be heard again. Other people who don't live or understand the dynamic of our communities should not dictate it. Both of our Post Offices and Mid-City Police Division are in 9. There is a controversy about Redwood Village boundary. There is a sign erected by the city on the 5400 block of University with our name on it. The boundary wasn't Chollas Parkway. We were involved in the Chollas Creek Triangle. We used to have our meetings at Teen Challenge when Darnall School wasn't available. Both are in District 9. I hope history isn't repeated again and please listen to the voices of our communities. DISTRICT 9</p>

11/10/2021 17:58	Neva Van Loton	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I respectfully request you select the Clairemont United Map 74956. As a life long Clairemont resident I know how intertwined the Clairemont, Linda Vista, Kearny Mesa and Serra Mesa communities are and all the mutual interests and issues we have in common. The planning boards and town councils of these communities work closely together to achieve our common goals and we would like to have one city council person to represent us all. Thank you for your consideration.
11/10/2021 11:24	Brian Ondek	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I fully and wholeheartedly support keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split up the Sripps Ranch community. Thank You!
11/10/2021 8:40	Donald Berkebile	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am the President of Scripps Ranch Village Master Association Of 1610 homes in Scripps Ranch and will be traveling and will miss the meeting. We (our large HOA) strongly supports keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community.
11/10/2021 6:53	Lorayne Burley	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support (Map 72525) keeping Scripps Miramar Ranch, Miramar Ranch North, and Rancho Encantada together in District 5. Please do not split our community. Map 74956 is particularly bad since it drives a knife through our community.
11/10/2021 1:24	Julie Gorog	11/13/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Do not split UC ALONG EAST OR WEST ON GENESSEE.
11/9/2021 14:38	Michael Hennessy	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	In the last ten years, residents of the Rolando Park neighborhood have been subjected to several quality of life issues that the current council district representative has either been unable or unwilling to address. Our neighborhood has been treated as a backwater, an unwanted stepdaughter. We need more effective representation at the City level, and that will only happen if you move Rolando Park into a district whose representative understands the College Area dynamics.

					<p>Please find below the following statement on behalf of Neighborhood Voices:</p> <p>Neighborhood Voices continues to express strong support of the San Diego Communities Collaboration Map which was created by a city-wide coalition of multi-faceted organizations.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the Commissioners direct staff to prepare findings and legal review of the San Diego Communities Collaboration map and consider it as the final preliminary map by November 13.</p> <p>Neighborhood Voices' mission is to preserve and strengthen an AAPI Empowerment district in the City of San Diego. We urge the Commissioners to improve upon the current District 6 by considering the San Diego Communities Collaboration map, which includes the Convoy District, UCSD and all of North University City. Including students and the surrounding neighborhoods is important for many cultural and social reasons, including housing they can afford, places to work, and many Asian-language businesses. Doing so will increase the AAPI population to 41.3%.</p> <p>This map is the most equitable option to serve BIPOC residents across the City and reunites communities of interest after 10-20+ years of being separated.</p> <p>Please direct staff to prepare findings and legal review of the San Diego Communities Collaboration map and consider it as your final preliminary map.</p>
11/9/2021 10:47	Angeli Calinog	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	
11/9/2021 9:10	Peter Zakit	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Together with the Rolando Park Community Council board and 93 percent of council members, I strongly support the Redistricting return of Rolando Park to the College-area communities/District 9.</p>

11/9/2021 8:27	David A Kodama	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is David Kodama and I am a resident of D5 and a concerned citizen. Re: new City Council Districts, I support the San Diego Communities Collaboration (SDCC) Map. I urge the Commissioners to prepare findings and legal review of the SDCC map and consider it as the final preliminary map by November 13. This map is the most equitable option to serve BIPOC residents across the City as it reunites communities of interest after 10-20+ years of being separated, strengthens marginalized communities, and ensures an AAPI and student empowerment district. As a member of the AAPI community, I encourage the Commissioners to improve upon the current District 6 by considering the SDCC map, which includes UCSD and all of North University City. This district would reflect the breadth and diversity of our community, from the cultural hub in the Convoy District, through residential neighborhoods of all income levels and housing types, to the academic institution that brought so many of us to the region and continues to provide opportunity.</p>
11/9/2021 8:26	Larry Davidson	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I would like to thank you for the outstanding job you are doing. I wish I could apologize for or even explain the abuse to which you have been subjected. You have been insulted, bullied, and threatened during a process that has been hijacked by individuals engaged in verbal guerilla warfare. I would urge you not to be intimidated but to stay the course and remember your responsibility to the citizens of San Diego to act in an unbiased manner. It is critical to a fair and representative redistricting map that you evaluate the validated input you have received and act in accordance with the official guidance. Political considerations should be shunned and the data should speak. Your work with HaystaQ must provide the analytical data you need to make decisions. Competitive real estate conditions, high rents, and long commutes are real, but these are short term problems that redistricting cannot solve. Steps are already being taken to address the issues. For example, ongoing construction at UCSD will provide new, local housing, which was in such short demand in the 2021 school year. In addition, the new Blue Line</p>

11/9/2021 6:29	Robert P. Ito	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Robert Ito and I am the CEO of Ito Girard & Associates, a local infill real estate developer, active with the San Diego Japanese American Citizens League (SDJACL) and in support of the San Diego Communities Collaboration (SDCC) Map. I urge the Commissioners to prepare findings and legal review of the SDCC map and consider it as the final preliminary map by November 13th. This map is the most equitable option to serve BIPOC residents across the City as it reunites communities of interest after 10-20+ years of being separated, strengthens marginalized communities, and ensures an AAPI and student empowerment district of over 40%. As a member of the AAPI community, I encourage the Commissioners to improve upon the current District 6 by considering the SDCC map, which includes UCSD and all of North University City. This district would reflect the breadth and diversity of our community, from the cultural hub in the Convoy District, through residential neighborhoods of all income levels and housing types, to the academic institution that brought so many of us to the region and continues to provide opportunity. Please consider the SDCC map as your final preliminary map.</p>
11/8/2021 23:09	Ron Cho	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>We continue to urge the Redistricting Commission Members to prepare findings and legal review for the San Diego Communities Collaboration Map, and place it on the agenda for consideration as the Final Preliminary Map by the November 13th hearing. The Collaboration Map is the best option to serve BIPOC residents across the City, including increasing District 6 API population by over 41%.</p> <p>The Collaboration Map is a community map that represents the whole city not certain communities that have a vested interest in preserving the status quo. It is only fair to unite the communities of Claremont and Rancho Peñasquitos, and for the UCSD students to have representation and their voices heard.</p> <p>Redistricting Commissioners Malbrough, Nielsen, Hernandez, MacPhail and Roberts, please have the courage to advocate and support the Collaboration Map. You asked the community to submit a citywide map, we took your urging to heart and presented a map that is fair.</p>

11/8/2021 19:49	Lauren Garces	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello there commissioners! My name is Lauren Garces and I work with the Convoy District and serve with Neighborhood Voices San Diego in support of the San Diego Communities Collaboration (SDCC) Map. I urge the Commissioners to prepare findings and legal review of the SDCC map and consider it as the final preliminary map by November 13. This map is the most equitable option to serve diverse residents across the City as it reunites communities of interest after 10-20+ years of being separated, strengthens marginalized communities, and ensures an AAPI and student empowerment district of over 40%. As a member of the AAPI community, I encourage the Commissioners to improve upon the current District 6 by considering the SDCC map, which includes UCSD and all of North University City. This district would reflect the breadth and diversity of our community, from the cultural hub in the Convoy District, through residential neighborhoods of all income levels and housing types, to academic institutions that brought so many of us to the region and continues to provide opportunity. Please consider the SDCC map as your final preliminary map. Thank you for your time and dedication to serving all communities who need a voice!</p>
11/8/2021 13:46	Andrea Hetheru	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I highly recommend that the Commision follow the suggestions in Mr. John Stumpf's letter to the Commisssion dated 11/05/2021. I cite and concur with Mr. Stumpf's letter as follows:</p> <p>"I was concerned that the interim assisting City Attorney and the meeting Chair did not pick up fully the consensus of the Commissioners, as illustrated by the failed motion to adopt the Chairman's Preliminary Map and Findings PLAN. The consensus that was missed is that the majority of the Commission was that they wanted to be free to adopt a significantly different Map, Plan and findings.</p> <p>The conclusion of the Tuesday November 9th meeting must be to docket, Brown Act Notice and take whatever other steps necessary to allow the Commission to fully consider and adopt a significantly different "Preliminary Plan with an accompanying findings PLAN, at the Saturday November 13th meeting."</p>

11/7/2021 17:25	Barbara Gellman	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please leave District 1 with University City as is. No change in boundaries or moving UCSD out of the District. Those who attend UCSD chose to and the fact that they don't have housing on campus is the fault of the university; why did they accept more students than available housing? This is a very expensive university and as a parent, would be upset if my student couldn't find proper housing but it is not the fault of the community. We live here full time, the students don't, they are temporary.</p> <p>The other issue is, why are you trying to move similar ethnic/races into one area; I thought San Diego prides itself on being diverse.</p> <p>The students chose to attend UCSD, they knew where it is located and if they are unhappy now with the local residents and area, they can move to another city and university. Most of their socialization is on campus or with students that they live with off campus. Part of their education is learning to live with others whether in school, in a job, in a community.</p>
11/6/2021 15:35	Diane E Ahern	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am happy to see that after Thursday's long meeting, the Commissioners are now considering two maps. I again urge the Commissioners to keep communities whole ... including University City ... and to use existing boundaries (such as major highways and canyons and rivers) that geographically separate communities. I look forward to Tuesday's (11/09/2021) meeting.</p>
11/6/2021 14:50	Laura Cartier	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Dear Redistricting Commission,</p> <p>This is my second comment. After listening to the entirety of the Commission Meeting on Thursday, November 4, 2021, I still believe University City should remain as one entity, not divided, but remaining in District 1 is not a priority.</p> <p>Please do not split University City in half and put our community into two districts. We are one community and it is vitally important that we remain in one district with one representative. To split this community in half down Genesee would be hugely divisive and dilute what limited ability we currently have to participate in the political process. We care about our community and want to continue to be a whole entity, not divided.</p> <p>You must adjust the map to keep University City in one District.</p> <p>Sincerely, Laura Cartier UC Resident since 1969</p>

11/4/2021 19:51	Steve Leffler	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I will cede my time to Kate Glenn (Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council) and I am in support of her submittal ID: p6322 and map 73954 which re-unifies Rancho Penasquitos including Rancho Peñasquitos/Torrey Highlands/Black Mt. Ranch Community Planning areas in District 5 within the Poway Unified School District, retains the Merge 56 business district, and meets the other goals of the Redistricting Commission including an AAPI empowerment district in District 6.
11/4/2021 19:23	Kate Glenn	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	present screen and comments on the chairs map in relation to our contiguous communities of interest of RPQ-TH-BMR, map submission https://districtr.org/plan/73954 . I have three people ceding time: Alisa Cassell, Sandra Oshiro, and Betty Waznis
11/4/2021 19:10	Brian Reschke	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Requested changes to the map.
11/4/2021 19:10	Stephen Egbert	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep PQ commercial district with PQ residents Keep planning group area of PQ, TH, BMR together Observe natural boundaries which stop transport Don't repeated split communities. Equity. Chair map 72525 of p6346 splits 2 High, 2 Middle and 4 Elementary Schools boundaries Suggest #73954 map illustrates how to solve problem
11/4/2021 19:06	Van Pham	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	My name is Van Pham and I am on the board of the Linda Vista Town Council. The current preliminary map the commissioners voted on lacks the political courage to make changes that reflect the times and the diversity of the city as it disempowers BIPOC voters in San Diego. We also question the integrity and the legality of the Chair's map as it was done outside of the public's eye. Please listen to the people and their needs. This is extremely important and should not be treated as just another item to check off your list. Thank you Commissioner Nielsen for acknowledging that the SD Communities Collaboration map was the only map that satisfies many of the commission's stated goals. We hope the other Commissioners will see the SD Communities Collaboration map as a good alternative to the Chair's map. Thank you.

11/4/2021 18:26	Dr. DJ Kuttin Kandi	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Kandi and I am the Executive Director of Asian Solidarity Collective. The current preliminary map the commissioners voted on lacks the political courage to make changes that reflect the times and the diversity of the city as it disempowers BIPOC voters in San Diego. We question the integrity and the legality of the Chair's map as it was done outside of the public's eye.</p> <p>We recommend the Commission to either (1) do a revote and pick a different map for the preliminary map OR (2) have 2 preliminary maps for discussion for the next 5 special meetings. We recommend the San Diego Communities Collaboration map to be the second map since this map has gained immense support from organizations that serve BIPOC residents across the city. We need districts that reflect the needs of our population, beyond the coast.</p>
11/4/2021 17:25	Matthew Adams	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a 30 year resident of the Navajo area and former Planning Group member. Mission Valley should not be split into 3 council districts. The area has unique infrastructure needs from flooding issues to the need to accommodate future planned residential and non-residential growth. This It is a unique area with a singular vision under a single community plan and needs specific, focused council representation. The area should not be split into three districts.</p>
11/4/2021 17:19	Ian Grooms	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>In a previous comment, I requested that Clairemont be minimally divided. I am pleased that Chair Hebrank and the Commission listened to my request. This new map is a significant improvement compared to previous maps. Clairemont is now located in two districts as opposed to four. I recognize that it is challenging to fulfill everyone's requests, but I am grateful that Chair Hebrank and the Commission thoughtfully considered my comment. Since this map is an effective compromise with respect to Clairemont's division, I feel that no further map changes are necessary within Clairemont. Thank you.</p>

11/4/2021 16:36	Christine Lopez	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Christine and I live in the Mira Mesa neighborhood of District 6. The current preliminary map the commissioners voted on lacks the political courage to make changes that reflect the times and the diversity of the city as it disempowers BIPOC voters in San Diego. We question the integrity and the legality of the Chair's map as it was done outside of the public's eye. We recommend the Commission to either (1) do a revote and pick a different map for the preliminary map OR (2) have 2 preliminary maps for discussion for the next 5 special meetings. We recommend the San Diego Communities Collaboration map to be the second map since this map has gained immense support from organizations that serve BIPOC residents across the city. We need districts that reflect the needs of our population, beyond the coast. We will continue to advocate for moving Mt Hope and part of Mountain View back into D9 - These communities are 85% Latinx and deserve to elect representatives that care about their issues. Removing them from D9, significantly dilutes the Latinx voting power in the City. Thank you.</p>
11/4/2021 14:44	Phuong Vuong	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Phuong Vuong, and I am an Asian Solidarity Collective member. The current preliminary map the commissioners voted on lacks the political courage to reflect the times and the diversity of the city as it disempowers the city's BIPOC voters. We question the integrity and legality of the Chair's map as it was done outside of the public's eye. We recommend the Commission to either (1) do a revote and pick a different map for the preliminary map OR (2) have 2 preliminary maps for discussion for the next 5 special meetings. We recommend the San Diego Communities Collaboration map to be the second map since this map has gained immense support from organizations that serve BIPOC residents across the city. We need districts that reflect the needs of our population, beyond the coast.</p> <p>We will continue to advocate for the following: An AAPI empowerment district that is at least 40% Asian by population; and for UCSD and all of North University City to be placed with District 6 to create a student & AAPI empowerment district. As a graduate student at UCSD, I say that being grouped with BIPOC communities would better represent me. Thank you.</p>

11/4/2021 14:36	Samantha Mohn	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Samantha Mohn and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. We question the integrity and the legality of the Chair's map as it was done outside of the public's eye. We will continue to advocate for the following: An AAPI empowerment district that is at least 40% Asian by population and take Qualcomm Stadium out of D9 - This community is 51% white and has a very different infrastructure, concerns, and values than the rest of D9. Adding this community dilutes the Latinx vote in D9. Thank you Commissioner Nielsen for acknowledging that the SD Communities Collaboration map was the only map that satisfies many of the commission's stated goals. We hope the other Commissioners will see the SD Communities Collaboration map as a good alternative to the Chair's map. Thank you.</p>
11/4/2021 14:12	Rami Ibrahim	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Rami Ibrahim and I am submitting an eComment on behalf of The Partnership of the Advancement of New Americans (PANA) San Diego.</p> <p>The current preliminary map the commissioners voted on lacks the political courage to make changes that reflect the times and the diversity of the city as it disempowers BIPOC voters in San Diego. We question the integrity and the legality of the Chair's map as it was done outside of the public's eye. We recommend the Commission to either (1) do a revote and pick a different map for the preliminary map OR (2) have 2 preliminary maps for discussion for the next 5 special meetings.</p> <p>We will continue to advocate for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Take Qualcomm Stadium out of D9 - This community is 51% white and has very different infrastructure, concerns and values than the rest of D9. Adding this community dilutes the Latinx vote in D9. · Move Mt Hope and part of Mountain View back into D9 - These communities are 85% Latinx and deserve to elect representatives that care about their issues. Removing them from D9, significantly dilutes the Latinx voting power in the City. <p>Thank you.</p>

11/4/2021 13:05	Fred Erwin	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My wife and I primary shop and frequent places in and around the college ave and in district 9. In my spare time I am the owner of a restoration business and look to the college area businesses as models of how to grow within and from the community. Our desire is learn from and to bring businesses and organizations together that serve our Rolando Park community, which we feel are more closely aligned to those in district 9. This connection is more difficult if we are in two different districts.</p> <p>I support the Preliminary Redistricting Plan and the map approved by the Redistricting Commission (8-1) on October 29, 2021. It reflects Rolando Park's and my desire to reunite with other College Area neighborhoods north of our community. Our community of interest is in D9 as presented in the current map.</p> <p>Thank you, Fred Erwin</p>
11/4/2021 12:53	Heather Erwin	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My husband and I shop and frequent restaurants primarily around the college ave and in district 9. In my spare time I volunteered time to a Rolando Park group researching the specifics of how college area neighborhoods and the commerce around them were revitalized to promote a more vibrant and unified community.</p> <p>I support the Preliminary Redistricting Plan and the map approved by the Redistricting Commission (8-1) on October 29, 2021. It reflects Rolando Park's and my desire to reunite with other College Area neighborhoods north of our community. Our community of interest is in D9 as presented in the current map.</p> <p>Thank you, Heather Erwin</p>
11/4/2021 12:47	Freda Callahan	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My husband and I are definitely in favor of keeping Clairemont UNITED and want to see the adoption of the Clairemont United proposed D2 Map. Hard to understand why the Chair ignores the voices of many to achieve what HE wants. This is NOT the democratic process.</p>

11/4/2021 11:36	Bob Cummings	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Mission Valley should not be split between three districts. This is counter to the Commission's stated goals of keeping communities intact. Mission valley has unique infrastructure needs and is part of a single community plan. Mission Valley is poised to be a major job and residential center and spitting in into multiple districts would pose problems for the essential infrastructure needed in the coming decade. SDSU West can be put in District 9 for consistency with the university but the remainder should stay in District 7.
11/4/2021 9:56	Katherine Malchiodi	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please see that the map D2 benefits all districts and keeps Clairemont whole in one district. We have been split for too long. The RC map splits Clairemont. It is detrimental and disrupts schools and the voting process, etc. For the maintenance and improvement our wonderful home called Clairemont which is a vital area of San Diego , I encourage the Redistricting Commissioners to put us in one district and select the map D2. Thank you.
11/4/2021 8:56	Doug Kurtz	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Regarding the proposed Redistricting Maps, I am sharing my feedback as a resident of District 5 (Scripps Ranch). I strongly support ALL of the Scripps Ranch community remaining in the same district boundary, which would include Miramar Ranch North, Scripps Ranch, and Rancho Encantada. The issues important to Scripps Ranch are shared communitywide. The housing here was developed sequentially over the years as one contiguous community. I hope commissioners would recognize that and select a map that keeps this community together.
11/4/2021 8:39	Paul Malchiodi	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please see that all of Clairemont is in one district which makes it easier to address important issues for the maintenance and improvement of our vibrant community with one council area. Clairemont is a diverse area in and of itself with 115,000 people. It has been split for many decades and it is time to return Clairemont to what it was at its inception. The best map is D2. Thank you.
11/4/2021 7:22	Loren Fini	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Clairemont whole. One district one council.
11/4/2021 7:19	Alexis Knepp	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Clairemont whole. One district one council!

11/4/2021 4:22	Tim Davey	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I live in Redwood Village. Currently we do not have an active Community Council. I have become a member and attend Rolando Park Community Council. Our neighborhoods are connected by College and University Avenues.</p> <p>We have the same issues. We need to be in the same district with them. I like the map with both communities in District 9. 10 years ago we were in the old District 7. Our president of Redwood Village Community Council was very involved with the Chollas Triangle Plan. It never was fully funded. Now there are new plans for it. This is very important to us. We do not have any parks. We need to have an input because Chollas Parkway is in our community.</p> <p>Also, I have mailed pictures of the Redwood Village sign placed by the city on the 5400 block of University. Before the last redistricting, this area was part of us. We did not stop at Chollas Parkway, but University was our border. It is now in District 9. We did to be reunited with all of the community. Once again, DISTRICT 9 for Redwood Village and Rolando Park.</p>
11/3/2021 23:08	Quentin C Yates	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Clairemont should be left in one piece and in one city district and planning district not to mention schools being kept in the same groups. Move the east boundary to I-805 and the west boundary to I-5. Clairemont is a community that should be left whole, not a feeder community for others to take what they need and leave us with what is left.</p>
11/3/2021 22:04	Stella Bowers	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Clairemont Whole-One District-One Council
11/3/2021 21:56	Michael Lynn Filio	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Clairemont Whole-One District-One Council!
11/3/2021 18:39	Mark Schwartzel	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Clairemont in one district.
11/3/2021 18:29	Vivian Sink	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Clairemont Whole - One district, one council!
11/3/2021 9:19	Peter Zakit	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I strongly support the Redistricting return of Rolando Park to the College-area communities/District 9, as reflected in the "10/29/2021 Redistricting Commission Map".</p> <p>I grew up, was educated (RP Elementary, Horace Mann, Crawford, SDSU), and am now retired in Rolando Park.</p> <p>I appreciate and enjoy my community's character and diversity. The businesses I frequent, services I use, my local contacts and friends almost exclusively are located north of highway 94.</p> <p>Please support Rolando Park by making it part of District 9.</p>

11/2/2021 20:32	Rebecca Castelloe	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I strongly oppose the redistricting plan that would divide the community of Rancho Penasquitos.
11/2/2021 16:14	Bethany Gillingham	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please consider having clairemont be one district unified together.
11/1/2021 19:14	Julie Wilds	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please consider EVERY community when you are making your decision on the map. There is still time to do the right thing and use the Coalitions map. This map considers all of the communities and not just the wealthy beach communities. Too many communities have been broken up with no representation for ten years . This map will continue the destruction of their communities and their inability to get adequate representation in those areas. If SOME district must give up something, then why not make it a different district than the ones that have been punished for the last 10 years? Spread the wealth, so to speak. I understand that no one wants to be left out, but the Coalitions map does a much better job of reducing the pain, than the chairpersons map. The 9 people on this committee are just that "9 People" and they are supposed to be representing EVERY single person in San Diego, not just the more affluent areas. The burden of redistricting should be born by EVERY district and EVERY community, if they had been spared the injustice this last round, then they should shoulder the burden this time. No playing favorites... NOT FAIR.
10/30/2021 18:01	Kevin Gilbreath	11/4/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The 10/29 adopted map is an equitable compromise for all interested communities, but it seems to have two technical mistakes that can be easily fixed, and which only impacts 164 residents in total.</p> <p>First, it justifiably keeps all of Mission Valley north of Friars Road within District 7 except for one small portion opposite Hazard Center, between Frazee Road and Mission Center Road. Those two small tracts have only 24 residents in them. To maintain consistency, I respectfully request this small area be put into District 7.</p> <p>Second, the map uses the CA-52 freeway as the North/South boundary between Districts 5 and 7. This makes sense intuitively, except that the 2019 Mission Trails Regional Park (MTRP) Master Plan Update extends the park north of the 52 into the Military Facilities and East Elliot Planning Areas to help fulfill the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program legal obligations. There are only 140 people in those planning areas--it is principally open land for trails and preservation. To maintain the MTRP C.O.I. in that area, I respectfully request that the same open space area east of the I-15 be in District 7, keeping the same boundary between Districts 5 and 7 as today.</p>

10/29/2021 12:28	Bonnie Poppe	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The very idea that Golden Hill should be separated from South Park is ridiculous. These neighborhoods have been together for more than 100 years, and share the same concerns. Not to mention they are on the same side of the great divide of I94. I have owned property in South Park since 1985, and continue to do so, despite the fact that I am currently living in France. I cannot imagine what special interests have spurred this proposed division, but can only guess that it has something to do with development interests and money to be made. I wish to go on record as OPPOSING any division of Golden Hill and South Park.
10/29/2021 9:53	Helen Boyden	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	SD Communities Collaborative Map 70727 * Divides UC LJ and Carmel Valley into two districts * Divides District One into three districts * Separate LJ Farms and Black Horse Farms from the rest of the La Jolla neighborhood * Splits University City which is undergoing a community plan update * Has only one coastal district, contrary to public testimony

10/29/2021 9:43	Chris Nielsen	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I oppose adoption of the SD Community Collaborative Map as an interim map. It establishes one coastal district and disregards prior public testimony on this subject.</p> <p>This map splits important COI's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - COIs around school districts split in UC, La Jolla, Poway, and Kearny Mesa. - COIs around CPGs - UCPG, La Jolla PA, Torrey Pines PG, Carmel Valley PG, and Torrey Hills are split. - COIs around important environmental resources, including Penasquitos Lagoon, Torrey Pines, Del Mar Mesa, and Rose Canyon Open Space Park, greatly complicating the preservation of these MSCP lands. - University Towne Centre and (traditional) University City ("South UC") will be split by this map. The UTC/Golden Triangle Area, including the bio-tech hub and regional hospitals, is fully integrated with the surrounding residential communities of University City, Torrey Pines, and La Jolla, and all should remain in the same district. <p>This map complicates the final stages of the UC Community Plan Update by switching council districts at the end of the process, inviting last minute chaos.</p> <p>The D1 Neighborhoods of Carmel Valley, La Jolla, and University City will be split into different Council Districts.</p> <p>Please DO NOT USE this map.</p>
10/29/2021 9:32	Helen Boyden	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *splits current District 1 in three parts *Separates the La Jolla neighborhood by imoving La Jolla Farms and Black Horse Farms into District 6 * Creates One Coastal District instead of the two preferred by public testimony *Separates Rose Canyon Open Space park into two districts *Splits University City which is currently undergoing a Community Plan Update

10/29/2021 4:53	Shital Parikh	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I had my hand raised for 4 hours but was not called upon last night. Shital Parikh, VC Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board DMMCPB, Chair DMM Garden Club, Outreach Friends of DMM.</p> <p>Reference: Commission Chair's Map: The Preserve in DMM: integral part of DMM Community Plan & SD MSHP. Vital- recreational and environmental resource. It should not be split into two Districts 1& 6. Separating the residential part of DMM to D1 and a substantial part of the Preserve of DMM to D6 disables DMMCPB in effectively maintaining the Preserve due to difficulty in addressing two Councils.</p> <p>The portion of DMM Preserve allocated to Dist 6 has no population zero. It does not help balance deviation. The Preserve should be kept in D1 to keep DMM Intact without impacting the commission's requirements.</p> <p>I agree with John Breschke, keep Torrey Highlands in D5. Torrey highlands has no road access to D6. The only way for Torrey highlands to access D6, is to build a road through DMM Preserve , which would cause irreparable damage to DMM Preserve habitat and go against SD Climate Action Initiative.</p> <p>Please Keep DMM Community and Preserve intact, together in District 1.</p> <p>Request: accept the Dist 1 United's</p>
-----------------	---------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

10/28/2021 23:03	Anne-Marie (Nancy) Groves	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I have been a resident & homeowner of south University City for 48 years and worked at UCSD for 41 years, and am an elected member of the UC Planning Group now in my third term. I want to support D1UNITED- Alternative Map presented by Andy Weiss. North and South UC and UCSD MUST be kept in 1 district; north and south UC were developed as the UCSD shopping and bedroom community for UCSD. Many faculty and employees live in both North and South UC to be close to employment.</p> <p>I want to correct the mistatement that the dozen UCSD APSA students read from a script, that they have no say at the UCPG; they have the same vote that I do and have a seated voting member on the UCPG. Only 29% of the UCSD students are Asian, what about the other 70% who may not want to be part of far away MiraMesa. There is also a misperception that the UCPG should provide student housing. Planning groups provide citizen (including students) involvement in advising the City Council and the Planning Commission on development projects; we don't provide the projects, or developers or build. UCSD is responsible for student housing.</p>
10/28/2021 20:44	Brian Reschke	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Speaking about 92129 and our business district.
10/28/2021 19:22	Kristin Harms	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>We appreciate that the Commission has kept our community of University Heights intact and grouped us with some of the other historic neighborhoods of Uptown and Mid-City. While we do not support being grouped with the very dissimilar communities of Downtown and Mission Valley, we understand and appreciate the challenges of creating equitable districts of fairly equal size for all of San Diego.</p> <p>On that note, our Coalition supports the San Diego Preliminary Interim Map 5870 because it distributes population more equally between Districts 2 & 3 than the Commission Chair's Updated Preliminary Map 6030. The Preliminary Interim Map 5870 also makes more sense geopolitically than the Commission Chair's Map 6030 because it keeps the airport, and the coastal and military areas of the Midway District together with similar areas in District 2.</p> <p>That said, we recommend a minor change to the San Diego Preliminary Interim Map 5870 to achieve the Commission's goal of keeping Community Planning Groups whole. The area bounded by Washington Street, India Street, Laurel Street and Frontage Road should be moved from District 3 to District 2 to keep the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Area whole.</p>

10/28/2021 19:19	Diego Lynch	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Hello Commissioners, I am writing today to express the necessity of maintaining Golden Hill within District 3. Golden Hill is part of a cohesive neighborhood that stretches from Golden Hill all the way up North Park. This zone has the same sort of businesses, mix of single family homes and multi-family rental units. This area is served by one, ONE, bus line, and is easily accessible by bicycle all up and down 30th street. Any decision that impacts traffic or housing prices at any point along th 30th going up to Adams will have a heavy impact of Golden Hill. As such it is imperative that this area is kept whole.
10/28/2021 17:54	Marcella Bothwell	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello, my name is Marcella Bothwell, and I am president of the Pacific Beach Town Council. I thank you for your hard work and your well-intentioned construction of these different maps. In the latest preliminary map at the end of the last meeting, I need to mention a likely un intentioned action of dividing the Pacific Beach community as defined by our 1993 community plan and by its mission of the PB planning group. Please do not divide our small community and planning area. This is not reflected in the community split report. The commissioner's map seems to be a much better fit for at least the Pacific Beach community.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
10/28/2021 17:51	David Curtis	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident, I back claremont as a 1 district community or remaining the same. I hand my time to speak to Stephen Gross.
10/28/2021 17:30	Anthonette Pena	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a long time resident of Golden Hill, please consider leaving Golden Hill in District 3.
10/28/2021 17:18	Rebekah Hook-Held	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Rebekah Hook-Held, my pronouns are She/Her/Hers, and I live in the Del Cerro neighborhood. I'm writing to state my support of a map that empowers the LGBTQ Community of Interest as well as our neighbors in Districts 4, 8 and 9. Please include all of Downtown and Little Italy into District 3 as well as all neighborhoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> South of Friars Road <input type="checkbox"/> East of the 5 Freeway <input type="checkbox"/> North of the 94 Freeway <input type="checkbox"/> West of the 805 Freeway <p>Please ensure District 6 empowers the AAPI Community of Interest. Please include all of Barrio Logan in District 8. Thank you.</p>

10/28/2021 17:01	Quentin C Yates	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Clairemont in one piece! The time for division is over, but the time to unite is here. Clairemont has been split for far too long and therefor has split representation. We are facing some challenging times ahead with all of the proposed construction and the aircraft using Montgomery Field dropping over one ton a lead a year on our heads. I favor the coalition map joining Clairemont, Serra Mesa and Linda Vista as we have similar challenges that the other districts may not.
10/28/2021 16:55	Brenna Brock	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am a homeowner / resident of Golden Hill and want to emphasize my support for keeping Golden Hill in the same district as South Park.
10/28/2021 16:50	Brady Mahaney	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	My name is Brady Mahaney and I am a business owner in Golden Hill. I would like to state my preference that Golden Hill remains in District 3.
10/28/2021 16:32	Dr. Georgia Kayser	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am in support of the D1 United Updated Alternative Map because it keeps communities of interest together. Specifically, it keeps University City together with UCSD and UTC. There are many faculty, staff and students who live in District 1. The communities of University City and UCSD are very intertwined. I live in UC, our children go to school at the public elementary school in our district and I am a professor at UCSD. I am also an elected UCPG member and we are in the middle of a 30 year plan update for our district. Please preserve our community and don't divide this strong community of interest.
10/28/2021 14:56	Jantima Danford	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Jantima Danford and I serve on the APAC Board of Directors and the APAC Redistricting Sub-Committee.</p> <p>Thank you for adding Convoy and partial Kearney Mesa back into District 6. This will be gaining Torrey Highlands, Park Village, and part of University City and Clairemont to the east to rebalance the population makes sense. I am requesting to keep the District 6 API population as close to 40% or higher. This is achievable through APAC Maps 1 and 3.</p> <p>Please do your best to not split the communities of University City and Clairemont as much as possible.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p> <p>Jantima Danford APAC</p>

10/28/2021 12:06	Liz Saidkhanian	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment regarding the redistricting process.</p> <p>I am a Tierrasanta resident and very active in the community. In a previous career, I was the Deputy Chief of Staff for City Council District 7 and I am very familiar with these communities and the district boundaries.</p> <p>Given the population changes taking place, I think it makes the most sense for Scripps Ranch to be added to District 7 along with Tierrasanta and Navajo.</p> <p>A district that links communities along the 15 corridor would make the job of a District 7 councilmember much easier and increase the level of service a council office can provide to those communities.</p> <p>Furthermore, doing this would then allow for a Council District that succinctly connects Serra Mesa and Mission Valley since these communities are geographically linked and have intertwined community planning areas. I can't stress how important it is that these communities remained linked moving forward.</p> <p>There are several maps on the website that link Scripps Ranch and Tierrasanta including the Communities Collaboration Map. I support any of those options.</p>
10/28/2021 8:17	Joanne Worrall	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a resident of Rancho Peñasquitos since 1999, I am in complete support of the reunification of the whole of Rancho Peñasquitos back into District 5 as demonstrated in the SD Communities Collaboration map. The current split of RPQ between two districts makes absolutely no sense. We shop, dine out, and worship in District 5. Our police, fire, medical and EMT services are located in District 5. We use the libraries and parks in District 5. Our children attend schools in District 5. We are better served when our neighborhoods are not divided and we are represented by a single district supervisor who knows our neighborhood and our needs. And that should be the supervisor for District 5.</p>
10/28/2021 7:01	Laurie Saint	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Clairemont should be in one district. It doesn't make any sense to divide it up.</p>

10/21/2021 20:17	Freda Callahan	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Rather than chopping up Clairemont into oblivion as previously proposed, a single District Clairemont, Linda Vista and Serra Mesa would allow equity and balance in the budget allocation process. It would also allow access to public transportation to support population and density growth projections. The new proposal still assures equitable populations growth per the Multi Family and Affordable Housing plans. This new proposal has the endorsement not only of our local Clairemont residents but also a city wide coalition of organizations who understand the need for a unified Clairemont....WHOEVER THOUGHT UP THOSE OTHER PLANS FOR CLAIREMONT DOESN'T CARE OR CLAIREMONT as we do!</p>
10/21/2021 19:49	Lindsay Ball	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a resident of the Park Village neighborhood in Rancho Penasquitos. I strongly support keeping Rancho Penasquitos together as one unit and returning Park Village to D5. I support the proposed Map 2 which accomplishes this goal. I appreciate your consideration. Thank you.</p>
10/21/2021 16:27	Karen Derenthal Schmidt	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please re-work the redistricting maps to keep Clairemont united - the splintering of this great diverse community into four small bits will destroy the ability of community voices to be heard. This community does not deserve to lose all voice by being diluted and there are much better ways to re-size districts that do not destroy an entire community. Please see the Clairemont Community Planning Group map - https://districtr.org/plan/68527?portal - this achieves the goal and preserves each of the underlying communities without fundamental harm. Thank you.</p>

					<p>"By The Numbers"</p> <p>Census numbers determine redistricting. It is where we lived April 1, 2020, not where we worked nor went to school.</p> <p>The student population at UCSD is a considerable number (43,000). There is only residency on campus for about 15,000 students. Therefore, 2/3rds (about 30,000) of the students do not live on campus. Only the students in residence are applicable to redistricting.</p> <p>Because of COVID-19, there was mass evacuation of students from all our Colleges and Universities the end of March 2020. The numbers being used by the City Redistricting Commission do not reflect that mass exodus.</p> <p>The numbers need to be adjusted to reflect the actual students in residence on April 1, 2020. These numbers are available and verifiable. The students in residence dropped to zero on one campus and by as much as 8,000 on another.</p> <p>The real student residence numbers need to be confirmed prior to any District lines being drawn. Such adjustments affect multiple Districts.</p> <p>The question is - When is the City Redistricting Commission going to correct these numbers to reflect the actual students in residence on April 1, 2020?</p>
10/21/2021 16:18	Janie Emerson	10/28/2021	Non-Agenda Comment		
10/27/2021 15:35	Charlene Schade	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>As a Clairemont resident I would like to see the community of Clairemont united into one District after being split between two Districts for ten years. 10 years has been too long.</p>

10/27/2021 11:31	Julie Wilds	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I would like the commission to support the Clairemont United Map with all of Clairemont, Linda Vista and Serra Mesa united into District 6. I ask this because we do not want to lose a voting cycle and we can work together with these similar communities to ensure fairness, equality, and diversity. Due to the Complete Communities plan by the Mayor and increased density that is planned for our area, we will have the correct numbers to make this work. Having these "like" communities together will lead to appropriate and targeted infrastructure updates, safety, and continuity for all residents, will keep this area vital and thriving. Please consider making Clairemont United your choice, so it can thrive and remain an integral part of San Diego and not an after thought.
10/27/2021 2:58	Bart Ziegler	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	My name is Bart Ziegler and I live (and/or work) in Golden Hill. Thank you, Commissioners, please leave Golden Hill in District 3.
10/26/2021 22:49	Diane Shutt	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Keep Clairemont together!!!! Don't allow the breakup of our historic community!!!
10/26/2021 17:20	Helen Dominguez	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hi,</p> <p>My family are long time residents of Rancho Penasquitos in Park Village. We have lived in our home for 17 years. My children have grown up and attended schools in Rancho Penasquitos, participated in PQ sports, and attend church in Rancho Penasquitos. I disagree with the preliminary map which does not address concerns for Park Village residents. I support map 2, which REJOINS Park Village with greater Rancho Penasquitos, back to its original community.</p> <p>Special interest groups political agenda which previously divided Park Village should not have been allowed to divide our Rancho Penasquitos community. I highly recommend that Park Village residents are heard and supported, and is rejoined with greater Rancho Penasquitos.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and support.</p> <p>Helen Dominguez</p>

10/26/2021 16:04	Tershia d'Elgin	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello, esteemed Commissioners, How grateful we are to you for the 11th-hour sacrifices that led to the Interim Preliminary Map with Golden Hill still safely tucked into its eponymous niche within Greater Golden Hill Planning Area. Recognizing that voices north of Interstate 8 may be loud enough to destabilize your decision to preserve Golden Hill in District 3, we beg you to hold strong! There are so many reasons. Redevelopment is already chomping at our trees, gardens, parking, and open spaces that were specified for parks in the Plan Update. District 8 feels even more vulnerable to chomping. We have worked hard to keep the streets and rights of way empty of trash, to encourage homeless into living arrangement, to diminish the effect of gang tagging and violence. These challenges are more intense in much of District 8, and we'd as soon not backslide. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
10/26/2021 14:17	Cassandra Wong	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I insist that Convoy District stay in District 6 to accomplish the goal toward a majority-minority Asian District. I am in strong support of APAC's #1 and #3 maps for an Asian Pacific Islander American empowered district. The draft preliminary maps that the Redistricting Commission recently released shows the lack of understanding of the Asian community in the past 10 years. It is a fact that the Convoy district is a huge part of our Asian community and needs to be included in D6. This is where our Asian stores and restaurants are located, where we commune with one another. To remove this from D6 is an insult to the San Diego Asian American community.</p>
10/26/2021 11:16	Charles Depagter	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>First claremont was divided now the commission wants to split it in four. The city crams down high density housing now the powers to be want stop our voices from being heard. All in the terms of fairness to other council districts. What in common does my area have with Scripps Ranch? The district is a community that should not be split into four.</p>

10/26/2021 10:57	Rachel Toughiri	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Rancho Penasquitos was split in the 2011 redistricting effort. It's past time to reunite us (as Linda Vista is being reunited), and the 2021 Redistricting map should so reflect.</p> <p>The heart and soul of Rancho Penasquitos, and the true district commonality is our membership in the Poway Unified School District, along with Rancho Bernardo ("RB"), Carmel Mountain Ranch ("CMR"), Torrey Highlands, ("TH"), Black Mountain Ranch ("BMR") and Sabre Springs ("SS").</p> <p>This is important because most residents of RB, SS, CMR and RP moved here because of the PUSD school district. Our school district, our children, and</p> <p>the school-related activities – with their long-standing sports rivalries, marching band rivalries, Science Olympiad, academic leagues, cheerleading, scouting, etc. - define and link our communities.</p> <p>In addition to obvious and overwhelming commonality of the PUSD, the proposed North County Inland /District 5 district with a re-unified RP would also encompass those communities that have Fire Safe Councils that coordinate with the San Diego County Fire Safe Council. Mira Mesa does not have a Fire Safe Council. Fire is an ever-present danger to Park Village.</p> <p>Additionally, the communities in the proposed NCI/District 5 district with a re-unified RP are all part of the</p>
10/26/2021 10:47	Barbara Mitana	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please keep the Greater Golden Hill neighborhoods of Golden Hill and South Park together in the same district as Balboa Park. Our communities are stronger together and we depend on Balboa Park for our green space as we</p> <p>have no other parks within our community boundary. Thank you.</p>

10/26/2021 9:40	Jim Varnadore	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Ladies and gentlemen,</p> <p>I sent this e-mail today and thought you might like to see it.</p> <p>Dear Ms. Campbell and Council members, The newspaper quotes the Redistricting Commission chairperson saying, “Unfortunately, with roughly 80,000 residents Clairemont is too large to be in a single district without significantly altering the other eight council districts.” (Local Oct 26, B1).</p> <p>Altering districts is the Commission’s duty, the thing it’s charged to do. Avoiding altering the other districts isn’t a suitable explanation for any Commission proposal. The 2011 Redistricting Commission massively altered districts as it created new district-9; all the while meeting legal requirements and preserving communities of interest.</p> <p>In 2011 City Heights itself was gathered from districts 3, 4, and 7 into new district-9. With roughly 80,000 residents City Heights wasn’t then and isn’t now too large to be in a single district.</p> <p>The 2021 Commission and its chairperson have an easier job than did their 2011 predecessors. They should have credible and justifiable explanations for proposed boundary changes.</p> <p>Jim Varnadore</p>
-----------------	---------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

10/26/2021 9:18	Barbarah Torres	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Splitting Clairemont into four districts will by definition quadruple the efforts needed for local and state government agencies, community-based organization, constituents, and stakeholders to coordinate and deliver any type of engagement effort in the community of Clairemont. This unprecedented split will potentially leave Clairemont “parentless”, with not one representative feeling a sense of responsibility for the community or its residents. Furthermore, this additional monumental barrier mandates engaging four different channels / council offices, escalating the amount of red tape volunteer-led organizations will need to navigate in order to outreach to local government and continue delivering community services, potentially dealing a fatal blow to any effective implementation of projects and services.</p> <p>Residents and community groups in Clairemont have firsthand experience in the detrimental effects of a split neighborhood and that is why Clairemont residents are expressing the need for Clairemont to be united into ONE district. Please support the unity of our community and prioritize Clairemont under a single district.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
10/26/2021 4:31	Tim Davey	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>On the new map, I am not able to see if Redwood Village and Rolando Park are going to be in District 9 as the other maps had shown. I mailed pictures to you of the Redwood Village sign in front of Burlington and Northgate Market on the iversity. The city placed this sign years ago. This part of our community was placed in District 9 ten years ago. Council member Monica Montgomery-Steppe believed 5400 block of Unit until someone told her that our community is bounded by Chollas Parkway not the whole of University Avenue. Even if we lost this part of our community, the proposed Chollas Triangle project will effect Redwood Village tremendously. The old plan included a pocket park. We don't have any parks. We would like to be able to participate in the development as we did 10 years ago. Once again I believe Redwood Village and Rolando Park be in District 9.</p>
10/25/2021 22:33	Virat Deepak	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I want park village to be part of Rancho Penasquitos district</p>

10/25/2021 19:11	Joel Pointon	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	The proposal that Clairemont be sacrificed and split into 4 different council districts is ridiculous in light of the democratic rights of the residents of Clairemont to be represented effectively. For too long we have been split in half with 2 districts and never allowed to have a unified voice for representation. Perhaps it is time that other elite communities volunteer to be subjected to this sort of division. I suggest that communities like La Jolla be given consideration for being drawn and quartered as was deemed suitable for Clairemont. Clairemont has paid its dues! It is time to share the pain equally.
10/25/2021 15:18	Robert Higdon	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	My family has lived in the College Area now District 9 since 1979. I have experienced the area and the people of this and surrounding neighborhoods through various school, church and community involvement. My work with the San Diego Unified school district has also given me perspective related to people and issues of this area. That said and having reviewed the literature and on going redistricting process I find, agree and support the district boundaries as outlined by MAP #1.
10/25/2021 14:42	Deb Christensen	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Park Village should be reunited with all Rancho Penasquitos and removed from District 6. Currently, Park Village isn't in the same school district as Mira Mesa and other D6 communities it's currently in. Put back so Rancho Penasquitos can be wholly united.</p> <p>The heart and soul of Rancho Penasquitos, and the true district commonality is our membership in the Poway Unified School District, along with Rancho Bernardo ("RB"), Carmel Mountain Ranch ("CMR"), Torrey Highlands, ("TH"), Black Mountain Ranch ("BMR") and Sabre Springs ("SS").</p> <p>This is important because most residents of RB, SS, CMR and Rancho Penasquitos moved here because of the Poway Unified School District. There are many commonalities RP shares with the PUSD constituent member communities – diversity of populations, similar housing stock, age of infrastructure, rental vs. owner occupied statistics, and demographics.</p> <p>As a realtor and #1 listing agent in Park Village, Park Village is one of the most sought after neighborhoods in Rancho Penasquitos and home values maintain their value due to the Poway Unified School District, therefore it makes sense to reunite it with all the rest of Penasquitos. Home prices aren't even comparable to Mira Mesa, Kearny Mesa, etc... so map2 makes the most sense!</p>

10/25/2021 13:50	Ian Grooms	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am grateful that the City's redistricting commission has thoughtfully redrawn the southeastern communities' maps. Such communities have been underserved for decades, and the redistricting process will hopefully correct and/or improve longstanding disparities in these communities.</p> <p>For the first time in City history, the community of Clairemont could be divided into four separate council districts. As a Clairemont resident, I staunchly oppose this proposal. I have personally observed inequities existing between the two portions of Clairemont. In District 2, millions of dollars have been allocated to projects such as pipeline replacements, utility undergrounding, traffic roundabouts, and street resurfacing. In District 6, a considerably smaller amount of money has been allocated to such projects. The entire community of Clairemont is in desperate need of infrastructure improvements. The community needs one councilmember who can advocate for its collective needs. Dividing Clairemont would increase inequity and limit opportunities for district-wide advocacy at City Hall. I urge this commission to thoughtfully reconsider the district boundaries and unify Clairemont. If unification is not possible, I request that the City limit the number of districts that include Clairemont. Thank you.</p>
10/25/2021 13:33	Catherine Zumberge	10/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please keep all of University City in district one. UCPG does a great job, and UC is inextricably linked to both La Jolla and UCSD. Our community's interests are not the same as Mira Mesa's. It seems tone-deaf to break up LJ, UC, and the university.</p>
10/24/2021 19:55	Kyle Hofmann	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Maps 1, 3A, and 3B all ignore an unchangeable geographic fact: Los Peñasquitos Canyon separates Park Village from Mira Mesa. There will never be a direct route between them unless the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve is developed. That makes Peñasquitos Creek the natural geographic southern border of District 5, just as in Map 2. The upcoming extension of Camino Del Sur and the Merge 56 development will tighten the connection between Park Village and Rancho Peñasquitos even further. I urge you to accept Map 2's boundaries for District 5.</p>

10/22/2021 10:16	Louis Anthony Rodolico	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I think that the San Diego Preliminary Map 1 would best serve University</p> <p>https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/haystaqdna_map1_report.pdf</p> <p>Which shows District 6 as; UCSD, Golden Triangle and Mira Mesa. These communities have a lot in common. I also would like to get out from under the dominance of La Jolla for a decade. Our past 4 council members have all been from La Jolla, there is no space for anyone else.</p> <p>We need to complete the road system in south UC and the dark money relationship between Westfield Mall and La Jolla has been an impediment. There will be pressure from La Jolla to keep the Bridge in District 1.</p> <p>On December 15, 2016 Chris Cate voted to build the Regents Road Bridge,</p> <p>since he will be the District 6 council member until next year maybe he will be amenable to putting the Bridge on the ballot where it should have been from day one.</p> <p>Westfield Mall wants all cars funneled up Genesee, the more cars the more rent they can charge. However this congestion extends ambulance service times see:</p> <p>https://clairemonttimes.com/universities-unfinished-roads-and-missing-train-station/</p>
10/22/2021 9:03	Olga Teplitsky	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello, as a Golden Hill resident, I am deeply opposed to the proposed redistricting of my neighborhood into District 8, which is separated from us by a very busy 8-lane freeway and is a different City Planning Area. Golden Hill residents' priorities are intertwined with our schools, our businesses, and our open spaces here, all of which we engage to protect and improve.</p>
10/21/2021 20:07	Philip M Linssen	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I wish to express my support for Map 1, I am a resident of Kensington with Commercial interests on Adams Ave, and am pleased to see Normal Hieghts and Kensington fall under one district, and not divided.</p> <p>Thank You Philip Linssen</p>

10/21/2021 19:37	Renay Johnson	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I agree in using natural boundaries and not software. Since D3 is impacted already, how is it proposed to add Linda Vista/Mission Valley? to an already packed district? Remove the labels. I notice "black", "Asian", "Latino" is used yet I don't see "White" used for D1. If you must use labels, use them all. Maybe remove the labels which is what the city is supposed to be doing anyway. More input for district planning committees and talking with members of the community could have been used instead of relying on complicated software. More public input from many and not just a few.
10/21/2021 19:37	Alex Villafuerte	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	My name is Alex Villafuerte and I work and spend a lot of time in the current District 6. I am the co-chair of the San Diego API Coalition, Director of Communications of Asian Business Association, and a member of the Queer Asian Pacific Islander Middle Eastern Desi American Coalition. I'm writing to ensure that the Asian and Pacific Islander community is strongly represented in District 6. An Asian-empowerment district that connects Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus. I support map 2 with two minor changes. Please include Convoy District in District 6. It is important for many cultural and social reasons, including many Asian-language businesses and services. Please use Rose Canyon on the east side of the 5, and the planning area boundary on the west side of the, as the southern boundaries. It is important to our community to include the student population. Students have deep ties to the rest of the proposed district 6, including housing they can afford, places of work, and entertainment in the Convoy District. To accommodate these changes, please move Del Mar Heights into District 5.

10/21/2021 18:46	Pamela Peredo	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Thank you for your time. I am a young professional who lives and works as a resident of the University City (UTC) area, a graduate of San Diego State University, and an involved member of the National Association of Asian American Professionals San Diego (NAAAP SD) and work with the CalAsian Chamber of Commerce on programs that support Asian-owned businesses throughout the state. I am requesting that the “Convoy Pan Asian Cultural and Business Innovation District” be kept in the AAPI empowerment district to ensure our communities are tied to the resources and businesses which represent our shared cultures. Additionally, as an active local, my experience and insights from connecting with UCSD students and neighbors have translated into increased engagement and interest due to proximity and accessibility to like-minded communities.
10/21/2021 18:07	Stephen Shepherd	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Please keep Downtown in District 3. I am a District 3 resident and believe Downtown interests (housing, LGBT empowerment, etc) are more closely shared with the other neighborhoods in this District than being grouped with coastal communities.
10/21/2021 17:34	Christine Moore	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	My name is Christine Moore I am proud to serve on the Board of Directors of the SD Asian Business Association. I would like to express my support to keep the Convoy District in San Diego City Council District Six to unite the Asian American Pacific Islander Empowerment Community. The Convoy District is arguably the heart of San Diego’s AAPI community and, in keeping with the goal of uniting communities of interest, it should not be separated from the other residents and businesses in Council District Six. District Six has a significant AAPI population and to separate core AAPI businesses from AAPI residents creates a physical and cultural split of a community that is deserving of its own representation. I urge the Committee to keep San Diego’s AAPI residents and businesses and Convoy District within Council District Six.

10/21/2021 17:14	Chizuko Okuma	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I have been a resident of Clairemont for over twenty years, and I can tell you that Clairemont has played a second-tier role in elections because it is split in half. This community is primarily working class and working professional families, that doesn't have the time or resources to influence local government, like Point Loma and La Jolla do. Once and for all, I'm asking you to unite Clairemont. Stop carving it up in order to meet the demands of wealthier neighborhoods to the west that have never and will never be cut in half like Clairemont. They do not speak for us, and if you continue with the maps you've drafted you will continue to silence our voices.</p> <p>Haystaq entirely ignored the instructions when it comes to Clairemont. We ask that you do the following:</p> <p>1) Reunite Clairemont into one Council district</p> <p>2) Try to keep community planning groups intact</p> <p>You have a choice to make about what message you send to the public. Does every neighborhood actually matter, or do the voices of a small number of wealthy and politically influential people trump all the rest of us?</p>
10/21/2021 17:06	Jessica Edwards	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I have lived in Rancho Penasquitos for my entire life and am very proud of it. I've lived in Park Village since I was 2 years old. I attended Park Village Elementary, Mesa Verde Middle School, and Westview High school.</p> <p>It is critical for the Park Village community to remain part of the rest of Rancho Penasquitos city council district. We go to the same schools, shop in the same grocery stores, support the same local businesses and are proud to be part of the Rancho Penasquitos community. Please do not allow us to be cut off from the rest of the community we've known and be grateful for for so long. Keep us together!</p>

					<p>As a Rancho Peñasquitos resident of Asian descent, and as a homeowner in the Park Village neighborhood for the past 18 years, I am in favor of reuniting Park Village and Torrey Highlands neighborhoods with the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos within District 5 for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. The geographically contiguous neighborhoods of Rancho Peñasquitos (including ParkVillage), Torrey Highlands and Black Mountain Ranch are “communities of shared interests” with the rest of District 5. They are joined by natural landforms and separated from District 6 by the vast Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve.</p> <p>2. The District 5 communities of Sabre Springs, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Peñasquitos, Torrey Highlands, Black Mountain Ranch are all part of the Poway Unified School District. □</p> <p>3. Our District 5 neighborhoods share goals, interests and social activities.□</p> <p>4. The District 5 communities have similar legislative concerns and will benefit from representation by the same City Council District representative.□</p> <p>5. The communities have multiple shared roadways providing easy and reasonable access between the population centers within the District 5 communities.</p> <p>I respectfully request that the neighborhoods of Park Village and Torrey Highlands be allowed to rejoin the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos in District 5.</p>
10/21/2021 16:47	Sandra Oshiro	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	Thank you.
10/21/2021 15:52	Trevor Atchley	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I support Map2. Please rejoin Rancho Penasquitos with district 5. The neighborhoods have little in common with district 6 and should align with the Poway Unified School District.

10/21/2021 15:14	Adele Atchley	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I strongly support the redistricting effort of map 2, to have Park Village be in District 5. I have lived in the Park Village community since 1986. I lived with my parents and attended the PUSD schools and I own a home in Park Village where my 3 children all attended or are currently attending the PUSD schools. Park Village has always been a strong representation of the Rancho Penasquitos community. I agree with this statement: The heart and soul of Rancho Penasquitos, and the true district commonality is our membership in the Poway Unified School District, along with Rancho Bernardo ("RB"), Carmel Mountain Ranch ("CMR"), Torrey Highlands, ("TH"), Black Mountain Ranch ("BMR") and Sabre Springs ("SS"). This is important because most residents of RB, SS, CMR and RP moved here because of the PUSD school district. Our school district, our children, and the school-related activities – with their long-standing sports rivalries, marching band rivalries, Science Olympiad, academic leagues, cheerleading, scouting, etc. - define and link our communities.</p> <p>Park Village residents have the most commonalities with the neighborhoods mentioned. In addition, having a fire safety council, which does not exist in district 6, is extremely important for PV residents.</p>
10/21/2021 14:25	Thaddeus Braun	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I live in Rancho Penasquitos. we live just south of hwy 56, on the west side of black mountain road. we live here because we wanted the Poway school district, as did our PQ friends. the school related activities are the most powerful definer of rancho penasquitos. simply select Map2 as the new city council district boundaries for us. Stop playing games with rancho penasquitos, and put us together again.</p>

10/21/2021 13:35	Jantima Danford	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Jantima Danford a resident of San Diego and I am in strong support of APAC's #1 and #3 maps for an Asian Pacific Islander American empowered district. See maps attached. Need to include the neighborhoods of each map.</p> <p>Map #1 includes these neighborhoods: Black Mountain Ranch, Rancho Penasquitos, Torrey Highlands, Mira Mesa, Sorrento Valley, Miramar, Partial Kearny Mesa</p> <p>Map #3 includes these neighborhoods: Carmel Valley, Torrey Highlands, Mira Mesa, Sorrento Valley, Miramar, Kearny Mesa</p> <p>More comments will be sent by email too.</p>
10/21/2021 12:40	Troy Murphree	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I live in the College Area Community in Council District 9 and have been working with adjacent communities on the redistricting maps. We have spent many hours on this effort and out of 4+ designs our preferred map looks most like your Map #1. It provides an east-west oriented district along El Cajon Blvd and Adams Ave. Your other maps provide what looks like gerrymandering, without the southern projection having much in common with the big issues affecting the northern part of District 9 (e.g., SDSU).</p> <p>The best option for the redistricting of CD9 is Map #1. Please adopt map #1. Thank you.</p>

10/21/2021 12:28	Helen M Boyden	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Having lived in both University City and La Jolla, I noted: All four HaystaqDNA maps break up the University City Planning Group which is currently undergoing a three-year process to update its community plan. None of the four HaystaqDNA maps restore Bird Rock--its Bird Rock Community Council and its Maintenance Assessment District--as requested early on in the process.</p> <p>Maps 1 and 3A connect La Jolla with North San Diego by a narrow, 2.5 mile long corridor with 573 residents. It has a hospital, outpatient facility, research facilities and two golf courses. Not compact.</p> <p>Map 2 divides current District One into three disparate districts and connects La Jolla and part of University City to Clairemont, not cited by District One as a Community of Interest.</p> <p>Map 3B leaves University City, north and south, west of Regents Road connected to La Jolla and UCSD, but does not recognize that Regents Road is not continuous, but is interrupted by Rose Canyon. You cannot drive on Regents Road between these two areas.</p> <p>I urge the commission not to accept any of these flawed maps and send Haystaq back to the drawing board to consider options that make more sense.</p>
------------------	----------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

					<p>As a resident of Park Village I believe Map 2 is the appropriate redistricting map because, the heart and soul of Rancho Penasquitos, and the true district commonality is our membership in the Poway Unified School District, along with Rancho Bernardo (“RB”), Carmel Mountain Ranch (“CMR”), Torrey Highlands, (“TH”), Black Mountain Ranch (“BMR”) and Sabre Springs (“SS”). This is important because most residents of RB, SS, CMR and RP moved here because of the PUSD school district. Our school district, our children, and the school-related activities – with their long-standing sports rivalries, marching band rivalries, Science Olympiad, academic leagues, cheerleading, scouting, etc. - define and link our communities.</p> <p>In addition to obvious and overwhelming commonality of the PUSD, the proposed North County Inland /District 5 district with a re-unified RP would also encompass those communities that have Fire Safe Councils that coordinate with the San Diego County Fire Safe Council. Mira Mesa does not have a Fire Safe Council. Fire is an ever-present danger to Park Village.</p> <p>Additionally, the communities in the proposed NCI/District 5 district with a re-unified RP are all part of the Palomar- Pomerado Health District. Mira Mesa is not part of this district.</p>
10/21/2021 12:18	Anthony Artero	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	
10/21/2021 12:14	Blair Chaney Jennings	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Map number 2 is the preferred one. Please make Rancho Penasquitos whole again.</p>
10/21/2021 11:36	Ale Herrera	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello, as a Golden Hill resident, I am deeply opposed to the proposed redistricting of my neighborhood into District 8, which is separated from us by a very busy 8-lane freeway and is a different City Planning Area. Golden Hill residents' priorities are intertwined with our schools, our businesses, and our open spaces here, all of which we engage to protect and improve.</p>

10/21/2021 11:15	Clarissa Reyes Falcon	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Clarissa Falcon and I am a Board member of the SD Asian Business Association. I would like to express my support to keep the Convoy district in District 6, as part of the Asian American Pacific Islander Empowerment Community. The Convoy area is at the forefront of empowering AAPI business owners. The Redistricting Committee should prioritize keeping businesses and “communities of interest” of ethnic enclaves together. Asian Americans are one of the most underrepresented groups in the City and as San Diego moves to be more progressive, it’s important for the AAPI community to have a strong and non-diluted voice when it comes to expressing positions on policy, economic interests, business and community-related interests. Currently the draft maps have the Convoy area outside of District 6 which splits a major AAPI business district from a large AAPI community enclave. I support the AAPI community and it is of high importance that the Convoy district remain in-tact as part of District 6 in the AAPI Empowerment Community.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
10/21/2021 9:25	Barry Taylor	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Golden Hill must remain in District 3 to “preserve identifiable communities of interest” which exists currently. Golden Hill is linked with South Park and Hillcrest with deep cultural and social ties. A cursory review demonstrates this. GH residents shop in South Park and Hillcrest. The SD LGBT Center is in Hillcrest. Many attend religious services in Downtown, South Park, and Hillcrest. Many of us work in District 3. We depend on the unique medical services that are available *only* in Hillcrest and Downtown/Bankers Hill. As a vulnerable population, we must remain represented by the D3 leadership and other D3 community leaders. Please do NOT support any action that removes GH from District 3.</p>
10/20/2021 22:25	Becky Palenske	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Regarding the Council District realignment , I'm in support of Proposed Map2 reuniting Park Village and the surrounding communities in relation to PUSD and our neighborhood's common interests.</p>

10/20/2021 21:44	Kate Glenn	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Kate Glenn, a long-time resident of Rancho Peñasquitos, a small business owner, and a community leader on the RP Town Council. I am submitting this letter in support of Proposed Map Number 2.</p> <p>The heart and soul of Rancho Peñasquitos and the district commonality of our surrounding communities is the Poway Unified School District. Rancho Bernardo (“RB”), Carmel Mountain Ranch (“CMR”), Torrey Highlands, (“TH”), Black Mountain Ranch (“BMR”) and Sabre Springs (“SS”) included.</p> <p>This is important because most residents of RB, SS, CMR and RP moved here because of the PUSD school district. Our school district, our children, and the school-related activities – with their long-standing sports rivalries, marching band rivalries, Science Olympiad, academic leagues, cheerleading, scouting, etc. - define and link our communities.</p> <p>The proposed North County Inland /District 5 district with a re-unified RP would also encompass those communities that have Fire Safe Councils that coordinate with the San Diego County Fire Safe Council.</p> <p>There are many other commonalities RP shares with the PUSD constituent member communities – diversity of populations, similar housing stock, age of infrastructure, rental vs. owner-occupied statistics, and demographics.</p>
10/20/2021 15:21	Lynn Haims	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>After viewing the map options prepared by the Commission, I support the adoption of Map #2. I am a Clairemont resident and feel it makes sense for Clairemont to share a district with La Jolla and University City.</p>
10/20/2021 15:06	Gary Weber	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I urge you to not split Normal Heights along Adams Avenue. It would split our community planning area into halves and leave us at the outer reach of two council districts, an after thought. Taken as a whole our community is quite diverse, closely matching the City's demographics.</p>

10/20/2021 14:52	Peter Zakit	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I strongly support the Redistricting return of Rolando Park to the College-area communities/District 9.</p> <p>I own and occupy the Rolando Park home my parents bought new in 1950, was locally educated (RP Elementary, Horace Mann, Crawford, SDSU), and returned to Rolando Park in 2008.</p> <p>I appreciate and enjoy my community's character and diversity. The businesses I frequent, services I use, my local contacts and friends almost exclusively are located north of highway 94.</p>
10/20/2021 12:41	Amy Sheridan	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please support Rolando Park by making it part of District 9.</p> <p>I would like to urge the commission to keep Clairemont united in a single Council district as is proposed in Map 2. I think it is important to treat the community of Clairemont as a single district with an elected representative that is from Clairemont who understands our neighborhood and our issues. Thanks for your consideration.</p>
10/20/2021 10:52	Wade Booth	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Please keep the Scripps Ranch community within District 5. Given our close ties to Sabre Springs, Carmel Mountain, and Rancho Penasquitos, it makes no sense to group us with Tierra Santa, San Carlos, and Del Cerro as set out in proposed alternative map #2.</p>
10/20/2021 9:34	Cheryl O'Brien	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Rolando Park and Redwood Village should be redistricted to District 9 and rejoin our other College-area neighbors. This makes the most sense for our neighborhood concerns.</p>

10/20/2021 9:09	Erik N. Weber		Non-Agenda Comment		<p>Picking District 9 or 4 is like asking if I prefer to be punched in the face or kicked in the balls.</p> <p>That said, Monica Montgomery has been a huge disappointment, and the broken roads continue to show it. She's more concerned with "beautification projects" than with actual road and sidewalk maintenance.</p> <p>District 9 would be preferred at this point, but only in the same way a new diaper would be preferred. As long as the same failed progressive policies continue to be promoted and implemented in a once great city, we're still going to see the same old crap come out. Speaking of crap, public defecation is becoming trendy nowadays. San Diego might want to create its own poop tracker app as well as poop patrol, just like San Francisco has. That's at least a nice way to create new jobs. And with the lucrative pay that cleaning feces off of sidewalks can provide, it should get the Netflix-binging, stimulus check mooching slackers off of their couches and back into the workforce. One more thing: Get rid of the COVID-19 vaccine mandates, because they are counterproductive and UnAmerican. Medical decisions should be an individual's choice, period, end of story.</p>
10/19/2021 22:03	Fox Russell	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Rolando Park needs to be in district 9. I lived in redwood village on Meridian from 2001-2014 and was in district 9 for most of that time, I now live in Rolando park since 2017 because I like the "college" area and spend most of my time between the 94 and 8 freeway and feel strongly that my neighbors and I would like to be included in district 9 as our little villages share common interests and goals with our neighbors north of University Ave.</p>
10/19/2021 11:33	Cara Tobiason	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>In regards to the redistricting committee, we live in Golden Hill and have heard that there's talk of potentially removing our neighborhood from District 3 and adding it into District 8. We would strongly prefer to remain in District 3.</p>
10/19/2021 9:46	Elizabeth Schoeffel	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a long time resident of Greater Golden Hill (23 years) and feel most strongly that that our community should remain in District 3.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that the Redistricting Commissioners will hear the input from numerous area residents that share my request and concern.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

10/18/2021 21:33	Michelle Camaya Julian	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Michelle Camaya Julian and I live in the Carmel Mountain area. I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment.</p> <p>There has been a shortage of affordable housing that a lot of Asian students at UCSD are seeking for housing in the nearby areas including Mira Mesa where they identify with their Asian culture and I heard that the (pick one: Rancho Penasquito OR Clairemont) folks want to be reunited with their community. I support that as no community should be split!he voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p>
------------------	---------------------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

10/18/2021 17:56	Britni Eseller	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Britni Eseller and I live in North Pacific Beach and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9. Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map</p>
10/17/2021 21:10	Olga Teplitsky	10/21/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello, I am just writing to restate that I want our property to remain in Greater Golden Hill and not be separated from the Greater Golden Hill Planning Area or District 3. We belong with the Uptown and Midcity neighborhoods!</p>

10/12/2021 21:33	Anjanette Maraya	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I live in SAN CARLOS (D7) and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9.</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map for D3,4,8,9.</p>
10/12/2021 19:00	Ravi Gopinathan	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hello, my name is Ravi Gopinathan from Carmel Valley and I'd like to express my support for having Carmel Valley be a separate district from La Jolla. I support the creation of an Asian empowerment district, of course without decreasing the population of district 1. I support changing UCSD to be part of district 6 so that UCSD has a stronger voice given the similar interests in its student population. In Carmel Valley, we have a lot more in common with Rancho Penasquitos with more people with kids, with more families, and working people.</p>

10/12/2021 18:15	Virginia Velasquez	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Virginia, I live in Mira Mesa and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map for Districts 3, 4, 8 and 9. Thank you.</p>
------------------	--------------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

10/12/2021 18:14	Khue Tran	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Khue Tran and I live in Mira Mesa. I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. As a UCSD alumni and now San Diego resident, this district would reflect the breadth and diversity of our community, from the cultural hub in the Convoy District, through residential neighborhoods of all income levels and housing types, to the academic institution that brought so many of us to the region and continues to provide opportunity. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9.</p>
10/12/2021 18:05	Michael Sands	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Would like the Asian Pacific American Coalition's prop map 1</p> <p>I'm in support of asian empowerment dist.</p> <p>thanks much Michael Sands</p>

10/12/2021 18:03	Andrea Hetheru	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My concern as pertains to this meeting is that the map choices that will be generated by HaystaqDNA are going to be done using tools not generally and/or easily at the public's disposal. This leaves the public and, perhaps, the Commissioners at the mercy of the few choices HAYSTAQ presents to us. Additionally, there may be San Diegans with high social capital and/or other resources that have access to the same or similar expertise, data, and software as HAYSTAQ though many others do not. The former would be at an advantage in counter-proposing maps should any residents find that necessary.</p> <p>Does that not seem anti-democratic, lacking transparency and ripe for violation of Due Process--- since substantive Due Process and Equal Protection are inextricably linked?</p> <p>If the public is limited to the DISTRICTR mapping tool for our proposed maps, shouldn't the Commission be so limited? Shouldn't all mapping tools and info be at the general disposal of all residents? Although the hiring of redistricting mapping consultants is now standard across the nation, the concern expressed in this comment is seemingly well-validated. See the October 2017 article published in The Atlantic, "How Redistricting Became a Technological Arms Race."</p>
10/12/2021 17:59	Leonardo Gantz	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>In favor of asian empowerment district.</p> <p>I prefer APA (Asian Pacific American) Coalition proposed map number one please</p> <p>Thank you leo</p>
10/12/2021 17:57	Gabriel Vicente	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Gabriel Vicente and I live in Mira Mesa and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p>

10/12/2021 17:51	Angelica	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Angelica and I live in Golden Hills and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9. Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community. I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North D9. Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and REVISED unity map for Districts 3, 4, 8,9</p>
10/12/2021 17:47	Cynthia Hickman	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I would like an Asian Empowerment District. I like the Asian Pacific American Coalition's proposed map #1</p>

10/12/2021 17:37	Charles Joseph Zepeda	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Charles and I live in Otay Ranch in Chula Vista and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment.</p> <p>This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8 All of Mount Hope in D9 Golden Hill in D3 Adams North in D9</p> <p>We would be eternally grateful for the support and hope that empowering our communities further strengthens the growth and unity of San Diego as a whole</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank you.</p>
10/12/2021 17:30	Sandra Stahl	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I live in District 7 and would prefer this</p> <p>Mission Valley neighborhoods west of I-5 are transferred to District 3; consider adding Kearny Mesa from District 6 to District 7 in compensation,</p>

10/12/2021 17:14	Kristina Piggy Mananquil	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Kristina and I live in D4 and I am an organizer with Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities. Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition we want Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9. Many are working class families, have to work multiple jobs, live with family to afford rent, have multi generational families to take care of and many of us continue to experience the effects of COVID during this pandemic. Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED Unity Map. Thank you.</p>
10/12/2021 17:14	Chad Adapon	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Chad and I live in Chula Vista and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment.</p> <p>We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community.</p>

10/12/2021 16:59	Helen M Boyden	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I live in La Jolla adjacent to University City and UCSD The directions make no mention of La Jolla or much about the coast., a Community of Interest. Connection to La Jolla is made indirectly with District Two instructions: "Try to maintain 2 coastal districts." These two coastal districts should be One and Two as they are now and as they are experienced in coastal concerns.</p> <p>Current inland districts should not extend to the coast as many current map submissions do. The directions should cite the need for expertise in dealing with coastal and any other special interest expertise.</p> <p>The directions should Consider that La Jolla and UCSD and University City remain together as their history dates back to the inception of UCSD, University City and adjacent parts La Jolla Shores and La Jolla Farms.</p>
10/12/2021 16:58	Bruce Cameron	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I wish to make my comments by telephone . I am a board member of the largest HOA in Pacific Highlands Ranch and wish to provide input into our district remaining with Carmel Valley in District 1.</p>

10/12/2021 16:52	Arlene King	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Arlene and I live in Bonita and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank you.</p>
10/12/2021 16:50	Gene Case	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>Hi, my name is Gene Case, and I am community member and supporter of Asian Solidarity Collective. I'd like to show my support for the Asian empowerment District 6 and also support the revised unity map for district 3,4,8 and 9. This district would reflect the breadth and diversity of the city's AAPI community, from the cultural hub in the Convoy District, through residential neighborhoods of all income levels and housing types, to the academic institution that brought so many of us to the region and continues to provide opportunity. As far as the revised unity map, the community members of each district support it because it empowers black and latinx communities. Please support empowering the AAPI community in D6 and the revised unity map. Thank you.</p>

10/12/2021 16:48	Jonathan Chau	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Jonathan Chau and I live in Paradise Hills and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. By including UCSD and the adjacent neighborhoods that house its employees, students and faculty, we can increase AAPI representation in this district from 30% to over 40%.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity</p>
------------------	---------------	------------	---------------------	---	--

10/12/2021 16:42	Mae Case	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Mae Case and I am a member of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and also support the REVISED Unity Map for Districts 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>We'd like to see the communities of Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in one district in order to build Asian empowerment. Please seriously consider the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities. Based on the community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9. Thank you for your time!</p>
10/12/2021 16:24	Josen Diaz	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I live in Rolando Park, and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9. Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities. Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map:</p> <p>Shelltown and Southcrest in D8 All of Mount Hope in D9 Golden Hill in D3 Adams North in D9</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank you.</p>

10/12/2021 15:27	Samantha Mohn	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Samantha and I live in City Heights and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9. Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley, and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community. I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3, and Adams North in D9.</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank you.</p>
10/12/2021 15:12	Nem Pantig	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Nem and I live in District 4. I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9. Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley, all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community. I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities. Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank you.</p>

10/12/2021 15:00	Rami Ibrahim	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Rami Ibrahim, and I am writing on behalf of PANA San Diego. We are writing to you in support of the REVISED unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black, Latinx, Immigrant and Refugee communities in the City of San Diego.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in District 8, all of Mount Hope in District 9, Golden Hill in District 3, and Adams North in District 9.</p> <p>All of these areas in San Diego are home to large BIPOC, Immigrant, and Refugee populations, some of whom came as refugees in the 1990s and have been here for over 30 years. As newcomer communities, the majority speak a primary language other than English at home, and are limited English proficient.</p> <p>These communities of interest must be retained to ensure that their shared needs as BIPOC, Immigrants, and Refugees, such as affordable housing, equitable transportation access, and English Language Services, are adequately addressed by the City of San Diego.</p>
10/12/2021 14:40	Lynn Edwards	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>This past week, the Rolando Park Community Council board voted unanimously and 93 percent of council members voted in favor of being redistricted to District 9 from District 4.</p> <p>Please consider that for this community of interest, our issues and concerns more closely align with other communities adjacent to University Ave., El Cajon Blvd., and Adams Ave.</p> <p>Similarly, there are communities in District 9 that would like to be in District 4 because their interests align more closely with communities in District 4 than District 9.</p> <p>Lynn Edwards, Rolando Park Community Council Co-President</p>

10/12/2021 14:39	Eric Tandoc	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Eric Tandoc and I live in National City. I am a member of the Philippines-U.S. Solidarity Organization of San Diego (PUSO SD). I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment.</p> <p>We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8 All of Mount Hope in D9 Golden Hill in D3 Adams North in D9</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank you.</p>
------------------	-------------	------------	---------------------	---	--

10/12/2021 13:53	Maya Misra	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Maya Misra. I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective, have worked as an educator at UCSD for four years, and lived in UTC as a graduate student. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and support the *revised* Unity Map for Districts 3, 4, 8 and 9. By connecting Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, and Miramar westward to Carmel Valley with UTC and the UCSD campus, we would increase AAPI representation in District 6 from 30% to over 40%. UCSD students are binding threads of the social fabric of San Diego, and many of us continue to live in the area long after we have completed our studies. UCSD students care deeply about surrounding areas to the east, often opting to live in Kearny Mesa and Mira Mesa where they can culturally identify with their community and access affordable housing.</p> <p>Lastly, the revised Unity Map for Districts 3, 4, 8 and 9 seeks to better empower Black and Latinx communities by including Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, all of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3, and Adams North in D9. Please support these efforts to ensure that our communities of color have voting power!</p>
10/12/2021 13:47	Teresa Naval	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a student who lives on UCSD's campus. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the revised Unity Map for 3, 4, 8, and 9. Connecting Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, Carmel Valley, UTC, and the UCSD campus will help strengthen the Asian community, as anything less than a 40% AAPI district will diminish the voice and voting power of our communities. By including UCSD and neighborhoods that house employees, students, and faculty, we can increase AAPI representation to over 40%. I also support this revision because it also empowers and enhances the voices of Black and Latinx communities.</p>

10/12/2021 13:12	Genel Ronquillo	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	My name is Genel Ronquillo and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9. Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. I am here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black and Latinx communities. Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3, Adams North in D9. Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank you.
10/12/2021 12:50	Lynn Haims	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident in Bay Park, I would like to submit that many residents in the D2 portion of Clairemont DO NOT want to be moved into District 6. Our needs and issues are different, and we are better supported by the councilmember who represents the beach communities. We border Mission Bay and are affected by issues related to transportation, height limits, density and parking, vacation rentals and other such topics that are not pertinent to the residents of District 6. There is NOT a significant AAPI population in this area.
10/12/2021 12:50	Annie Rios	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As someone who was born, raised and still lives in San Diego I am in staunch support of the revised Unity Map for Districts 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers all members in our community. It makes sure that those historically in the areas of those districts are proportionately represented and it ensures that voices are given weight to decide what representatives are best for their interests in City Hall. As a lifelong resident of Encanto neighborhood in District 4, I am proud of the Unity Map, that incorporated so many voices and culturally relevant thoughts. I strongly urge you to follow what was laid out by the people for the people and use the Unity Map moving forward.

10/12/2021 13:47	Teresa Naval	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I am a student who lives on UCSD's campus. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the revised Unity Map for 3, 4, 8, and 9. Connecting Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, Carmel Valley, UTC, and the UCSD campus will help strengthen the Asian community, as anything less than a 40% AAPI district will diminish the voice and voting power of our communities. By including UCSD and neighborhoods that house employees, students, and faculty, we can increase AAPI representation to over 40%. I also support this revision because it also empowers and enhances the voices of Black and Latinx communities.
10/12/2021 13:12	Genel Ronquillo	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	My name is Genel Ronquillo and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9. Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. I am here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black and Latinx communities. Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3, Adams North in D9. Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank you.
10/12/2021 12:50	Lynn Haims	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	As a resident in Bay Park, I would like to submit that many residents in the D2 portion of Clairemont DO NOT want to be moved into District 6. Our needs and issues are different, and we are better supported by the councilmember who represents the beach communities. We border Mission Bay and are affected by issues related to transportation, height limits, density and parking, vacation rentals and other such topics that are not pertinent to the residents of District 6. There is NOT a significant AAPI population in this area.

10/12/2021 12:50	Annie Rios				As someone who was born, raised and still lives in San Diego I am in staunch support of the revised Unity Map for Districts 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers all members in our community. It makes sure that those historically in the areas of those districts are proportionately represented and it ensures that voices are given weight to decide what representatives are best for their interests in City Hall. As a lifelong resident of Encanto neighborhood in District 4, I am proud of the Unity Map, that incorporated so many voices and culturally relevant thoughts. I strongly urge you to follow what was laid out by the people for the people and use the Unity Map moving forward.
10/12/2021 10:58	Joriel	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Joriel and I live in University Heights. I am an Asian Social Worker, currently working with people experiencing homelessness. I support the Asian Solidarity Collective, and I support the building of Asian empowerment in District 6. I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map.</p>
10/12/2021 9:58	Olga Teplitsky	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	This is Olga Teplitsky and as a 10 year + resident, and I deeply oppose mapping that shifts Golden Hill out of District 3.

					<p>My name is Nancy and I live in Tierrasanta and work in City Heights. I am the Civic Engagement Organizer at PANA and member of Asian Solidarity Collective.</p> <p>I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED</p>
10/12/2021 9:56	Nancy Nguyen	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	unity map.
10/12/2021 9:41	Anthonette Pena	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I deeply oppose mapping that shifts Golden Hill out of District 3

10/12/2021 9:18	Iman Zermeño	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Iman& I live in KearnyMesa and I am a member of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank you.</p>
-----------------	--------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

10/12/2021 9:01	Stacey Uy	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Stacey Uy and I live in District 3. As a Filipinx-Chinese daughter of immigrants, I am a supporter of Asian Solidarity Collective, and I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9. Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. I heard that the Rancho Penasquito folks want to be reunited with their community, and I support that as no community should be split.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for D3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities. Based on wide community input received by the coalition, these changes were made to the original unity map: 1) Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, 2) All of Mount Hope in D9, 3) Golden Hill in D3 4) Adams North in D9.</p> <p>This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district in D6 would intentionally dilute the voice of our community. Please follow the work done alongside communities of color and support the REVISED Unity Map for D3, 4, 8, 9.</p>
10/12/2021 8:47	David Swarens	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am writing to state in unequivocal terms my opposition to any plan which splits the Greater Golden Hill community into multiple council districts.</p> <p>As an active resident who has worked over the years with council districts 3, 4, and 8, and served on community planning groups for both Southeastern San Diego and Greater Golden Hill, and had the honor to chair the later, I know first hand how the "wrong" district boundaries can have unfortunate impacts on neighborhoods and communities.</p> <p>Even with superlative councilmembers (and there have been some), it can be a challenge to get their attention when the boundaries don't match community character, leaving neighborhoods effectively without representation at the City Council.</p>

					<p>My name is Raibyn Cabiling and I live in Escondido and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment.</p> <p>This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p>
10/12/2021 8:39	Raibyn Cabiling	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	
10/12/2021 8:30	Charles Cannon	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	I work on the UCSD campus and support this movement
10/12/2021 8:03	Robert Fanella	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a long-time resident and Community Activist for the Greater Golden Hill community. I spent years on the Planning Committee and also sat on the board of the Greater Golden Hill Community Development Corporation for many years in addition to serving on numerous committees. I could not believe when I learned that your Redistricting Commission is trying to separate our portion of the neighborhood from South Park. Since, the onset of the COVID pandemic I have not been privy to these issues aside from sporadic reports from other activists in the Greater Golden Hill community. Having our community separated *again* has direct negative consequences to our community-on-a-whole that should be made aware to all of the residents of Golden Hill through proper notification. These decisions should not be made arbitrarily by a commission of people with no historic community memory. Please, no offense to Vivian Moreno in D8, but we are really geographically and demographically part of the D3 Greater Golden Hill Community, which includes the Golden Hill, South Park and Brooklyn Heights. Our Golden Hill Community believes that money is better spent on community development and</p> <p>not community separation. How</p>

10/12/2021 8:02	Michael Kravcar	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am a resident and business owner in Golden Hill. It comes to great surprise to find out that your Redistricting Commission wants to remove our neighborhood from South Park. South Park has always been an important part of the Greater Golden Hill area along with Brooklyn Heights (that of which the real estate agents have lumped into South Park), and the other smaller communities of Greater Golden Hill. We worked very hard to be a part of District 3 and had accomplished this some years back. Historically, we always worked together for the common good of the whole Greater Golden Hill community. Given my years of community activism, I can tell you first hand, that the split community was much more difficult to advocate for especially with regards to community cohesiveness and community improvement. From CA-94 to I-15 to Juniper and then to the Park and I-5, we are a very unique and distinct neighborhood. I implore you to tell all politicians that the Golden Hill Community finds your redistricting inappropriate and insensitive, with horrible impact to our community. Please note that your redistricting website is too difficult to navigate</p>
10/12/2021 6:39	Barry Taylor	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My family and I are opposed to any designs that would separate Golden Hill from South Park, Hillcrest, North Park, Balboa Park and Naval Medical Center San Diego. These areas are tightly interwoven and interdependent. Economically, culturally, and geographically inseparable, any attempts to argue otherwise are false narratives.</p> <p>Let me state clearly that NOT ONE of the groups proposing that GH be separated from District 3 has consulted any of the community leaders who have worked so hard for the last 30+ years to improve our neighborhood. We are witnessing the work of outsiders attempting to sacrifice GH for their own purposes.</p> <p>As I stated prior, LGBTQ+ families depend on the South Park and Hillcrest area for our shopping, restaurants, food, and support.</p> <p>What's more, stripping GH away from District 3 would plunge Golden Hill residents into a FOOD DESERT - with no walkable access and none of the services we have come to rely upon.</p> <p>For these reasons and more, please do NOT consider any plan that separates Golden Hill from District 3.</p>

10/12/2021 2:00	Romali Licudan	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Romali Licudan and I live in Paradise Hills and I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank you.</p>
-----------------	----------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

10/12/2021 1:24	Krysada Phounsiri	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Krysada Phounsiri and I live in Chula Vista. I am a supporter of the Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED unity map. Thank</p>
-----------------	-------------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

10/12/2021 1:00	Dyno Corrales	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Dyno and I live in National City and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities. Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9.</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED Unity Map. Thank you.</p>
-----------------	---------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

10/12/2021 0:59	Eric Alfonso	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Eric and I live in Southeast San Diego and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities. Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3 and Adams North in D9.</p> <p>Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED Unity Map. Thank you.</p>
-----------------	--------------	------------	---------------------	---	---

10/12/2021 0:55	Pebblz	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Pebblz and I live in Southeast San Diego and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. I support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and I support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9.</p> <p>Please connect Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus in order to build Asian empowerment. We are here asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.</p> <p>I also support the REVISED Unity Map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on the numerous community input received by the coalition, the following changes were made to the original unity map: Shelltown and Southcrest in D8, All of Mount Hope in D9, Golden Hill in D3, and Adams North in D9 Please support building Asian empowerment in District 6 and the REVISED Unity Map. Thank you.</p>
10/11/2021 17:06	Jantima Danford	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am giving my time to Cynthia Suero-Gabler to give the Asian Pacific American Coalition (APAC) PowerPoint Presentation.</p>

10/11/2021 16:41	Kristopher Snyder	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am homeowner and resident of Golden Hill and I oppose the redistricting effort to separate Golden from South Park/North Park. As a community Golden Hill, South Park and North park and intertwined. The community has made tremendous progress to clean up and grow local businesses. Separating Golden Hill will sidetrack so much progress and divide a community for no reason.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>vehemently oppose any motions to redistrict Golden Hill from South Park. Redistricting Golden Hill would subvert the 2016 Golden Hill Community Plan Update and negate any progress that was made to make the neighborhood safer and cleaner. We want to be more like South Park and not more like Grant Hill. This is clearly a power grab from greedy real estate investors at the expense of residents who actually pay the majority share of taxes and take care of this neighborhood. Please do not redistrict our neighborhood and kill the great stri</p>
10/11/2021 16:30	Cynthia Suero-Gabler	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>My name is Cynthia Suero-Gabler, Vice Chair of APAC. I will be giving a presentation tomorrow. Three APAC Board members will be giving me their time for my presentation: Jantima Danford, Natasha Wong, and Sandy Spackman. They will all be submitting speaker slips seeding their time to me. I will submit a speaker's slip today as well. Please allow me to share my screen during the presentation.</p>
10/11/2021 11:42	Sandy Spackman	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am giving my time to Cynthia Suero-Gabler to give the Asian Pacific American Coalition (APAC) PowerPoint Presentation.</p>
10/11/2021 11:22	Natasha Wong	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I am giving my time to Cynthia Suero-Gabler to give the Asian Pacific American Coalition (APAC) PowerPoint Presentation.</p>

10/9/2021 18:12	Dinesh Martien	10/12/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>I have heard about proposals to split North and South University City such that they would be in two different City Council Districts. Please do not do this. University City is one community, with one community plan, and should be contained in a single council district.</p> <p>Rose Canyon is an important natural resource. If North and South UC were split, Rose Canyon would effectively be no council member's responsibility. Please keep both sides of Rose Canyon in one council district.</p> <p>University City has long identified as a single community. The community should be represented by a single member on the City Council.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Best Regards, Dinesh Martien</p>
10/6/2021 15:37	Samantha Mohn	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	<p>My name is Samantha Mohn and I live in City Heights in District 9. I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. Normal Heights should be in D9: Normal Heights is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. Since D9 is the second Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense for Normal Heights to be a part of D9. As a resident of City Heights I frequent Normal Heights to shop, dine, and hang out with friends. I also notice residents from both Normal Heights and City Heights go to each other's neighborhoods to dine, shop, and hang out. Please support the unity map which empowers Black and Latinx communities in the city of San Diego.</p>

10/6/2021 12:56	Stacey Uy	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	<p>Hi, my name is Stacey Uy. I live in District 3 and I'm a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. I'd like to advocate for the unity map for Districts 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities, and was created with community input to ensure the D8 Latinx empowerment district and D9 retains representation.</p> <p>-Golden Hill should be in D8: Golden Hill was a historically Latinx neighborhood before it became gentrified over the years. Since D8 is the Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense that Golden Hill is a part of D8.</p> <p>-Normal Heights should be in D9: Normal Heights is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. Since D9 is the second Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense for Normal Heights to be a part of D9.</p> <p>-Mission Valley should be in D3: Mission Valley residents share similar values to those in D3. Many D3 residents eat and shop in Mission Valley.</p> <p>-Ridgeview should be in D4: The Ridgeview-Webster neighborhood has always historically been in D4 and was cut in half 10 years ago. According to residents there, north of</p>
10/6/2021 10:17	Margaret Rattanachane	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	<p>I am with Asian Solidarity Collective (ASC) in San Diego, California. ASC is the regional lead organization for the AAPI & AMESMA Redistricting Collaborative and our Collaborative hosted three community workshops to educate the community about redistricting, obtain communities of interest information, and obtain community mapping priorities. The AAPI and AMESMA communities in San Diego are diverse and face a variety of shared issues such as, community members come from poor and working class families who struggle to afford rent and adequate living conditions. Many families are multi-generational and are refugees and or children and families of immigrants that take care of elders and young children. We ask that the northeast portion of National City bounded by D Avenue and 16th St., which represents the significant API communities in National City, should be kept with the large Filipino, Pacific Islander, and Laotian communities in the area by being grouped with Paradise Hills in southeastern San Diego. If possible, they should also be kept with Bay Terraces and Alta Vista due to similar community interests.</p>

10/5/2021 20:34	Laila Aziz	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	Yes to unity map
10/5/2021 17:01	Gary Wonacott	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	<p>My name is Gary Wonacott, a long time resident of Mission Beach and past president of the Mission Beach Town Council. While I speak for myself, I do believe that many of the residents of Mission Beach would agree that we need to maintain La Jolla intact to the extent possible, including keeping UCSD in D1. La Jolla residents for decades have worked to protect environmentally sensitive areas, including those that surround UCSD, as the alternative, taking UCSD out of D1, opens the door for investors and developers to come in and undue these many decades of work. We in Mission Beach have seen how investors can come into a community and without any regard for environmental issues, convert a community into a hotel. Environmental challenges, like sea level rise, can only be addressed if communities are left sufficiently intact to work together. We need La Jolla to stay intact if for no other reason than we need their corporate heritage to be there for all of us.</p>
10/5/2021 16:46	Tamar Caspi	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	<p>As a D7 Navajo resident I believe it is vital to keep Navajo and Tierrasanta together: this is absolutely critical for advocacy for Mission Trails Regional Park. The 2010 redistricting committee's final report shows why it is a community of interest. That report is still fundamentally sound and truly encapsulates 5/6 principles driving the process, and based on the minor population deviations since then, this 2020 redistricting committee should only need to make minor adjustments. For example, it does not align with the principles to keep Scripps Ranch in D7 as it is not a contiguous neighborhood. A handful of streets here and there ultimately make all the difference to bring district 1 down to the average and bring districts 4 and 9 up to the average. Many callers make intriguing points, but that clearly and obviously overemphasize various principles over others. The commission ought to remember that disrupting the lines to make political statements is not one of the six principles of redistricting. Please stick as close as possible to the current map, and adjust around the edges to keep the general consistency of our council districts. Thank you!</p>
10/5/2021 16:30	Susanne Friedrich	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	Make University Heights a separate community

10/5/2021 7:38	Ken Horsley	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	support the Uptown & Mid-City Neighborhoods Map proposed by the Community Coalition of University Heights because it keeps University Heights as a single Community of Interest (COI), and groups University Heights with the older residential communities of the Uptown, Mid-City, and College areas. It also excludes the largely commercial, multi-family, and fast-growing communities of Downtown, Little Italy, and Mission Valley which have very different needs and priorities. The Uptown & Mid-City Neighborhoods Map also respects existing neighborhood and community planning group boundaries and does not split them into different Council districts.
10/5/2021 7:12	Suzanne LaTour	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	support the Uptown & Mid-City Neighborhoods Map proposed by the Community Coalition of University Heights because it keeps University Heights as a single Community of Interest (COI), and groups University Heights with the older residential communities of the Uptown, Mid-City, and College areas. It also excludes the largely commercial, multi-family, and fast-growing communities of Downtown, Little Italy, and Mission Valley which have very different needs and priorities. The Uptown & Mid-City Neighborhoods Map also respects existing neighborhood and community planning group boundaries and does not split them into different Council districts.
10/4/2021 20:09	Alejandrina Herrera	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	My family, friends, neighbors, and I are strongly opposed to any attempts at redistributing the Golden Hill area away from District 3. For us, redistricting is a threat to the very structure of our lives. I hope that I don't need to recount the ongoing struggles that LGBTQ+ families face to just exist. Families like mine fight side by side with others in our community and live freely in places like Hillcrest, South Park, and North Park. Golden Hill has become a vibrant, thriving, and safe community that embraces diversity in all forms. Let me state clearly that we view any attempts to divide our community as threats to our basic civil rights. We will articulate this in the media, in the streets, on social media, in print, and with activism. We are able to walk around our community which also includes South Park and North Park without feeling scared. We shop and walk to these communities to support local shops that we believe have common beliefs. Our very lives depend on it. We chose to live here based on our on common community. Crossing the 94 shows a distinct lifestyle than ours.

10/4/2021 19:41	Brenna Brock	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	As a Golden Hill resident, I strongly recommend that Golden Hill stay in the same district as South Park. The two neighborhoods have a long history together and are extremely interconnected. They are both part of the Greater Golden Hill planning area and share many of the same concerns, such as the canyons that abut both neighborhoods. Meanwhile, for better or worse, I-94 creates a major barrier to Golden Hill having that same interconnection with neighborhoods south of the highway. Moving Golden Hill into a different district from South Park makes no sense and would dilute the power of both neighborhoods to be adequately represented
10/4/2021 18:45	Valerie Hodge Reynolds	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	My husband and I have lived in and owned our home for over 23 years. We are both in the service industry and appreciate the feeling of confidence that comes with being seen and heard. The idea of re-districting does not make us feel confident of that as citizens of Golden Hill. Thank you for taking this under careful consideration. From a neighborhood that is already lining the pockets of developers, without the acknowledgment of the beautiful diversity that makes up Golden Hill and it's surrounding barrios.
10/4/2021 18:31	Ingrid Ramirez	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	Terrible idea. Why separate us from the districts that are similar in character.
10/4/2021 16:29	Cheryl Brierton	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	Please when Redistricting, do not split up the Greater Golden Hill planning zone north of Highway 94 at "A" Street. We had this before at a previous census, and the elected official for the tract below "A" Street never paid any attention to our needs. Golden Hill's 32nd Street Canyon Open Space area with endangered species was split in two. We lost representation for our community.
10/4/2021 12:31	Dr. Andrew Zakarian	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	I would urge the commission NOT to redistrict Golden Hill, there are many important reasons to stay in District 3, as we have been and continue to be associated more closely with South Park and District 3 socioeconomically and culturally. Please do not change our status!
10/4/2021 12:25	Barbara Haslem	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	I strongly disagree with redistricting Golden Hill to with neighborhoods across I-94. Our neighborhood and interests fit more with South Park, which is within walking distance and is our main shopping area. It makes no sense to separate our area into a district with neighborhood with which we are not as familiar and do not have as many common interests. This is not a useful change for us or for the neighborhoods south of 94.

10/4/2021 11:50	Olga Teplitsky	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	I strongly oppose the redistricting of Golden Hill from District 3 to District 8. This will strongly impact the massive progress we've made as a community in the last decade that I have been a home owner here - creating a safe, diverse community. Not only does it not make sense geographically, it will pull the strong collaboration between the neighborhoods away from each other. This is not acceptable!
10/4/2021 10:55	Alex Wender	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	I strongly oppose moving Council District 3 to Golden Hill to District 8. We are closer to Golden Hill and should not be lumped in with another district.
10/4/2021 9:33	Laura Mays	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	I am here to record my opposition to dividing our cohesive canyon neighborhood (South Park, 32nd street canyon). We have always had strong support from our district 3 representatives in the preservation and maintenance of our canyon and surrounding environment. Taking away our southern section and placing it within the 8th district (with all the warehouses and industrial concerns on Market St. south of SR94) makes no sense and is inherently suspicious. Thanks, Laura Mays
10/4/2021 8:57	Brenda Hrynkiw	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	I am a resident writing to express my staunch opposition to the proposed redistricting of Golden Hill. Speak to any person who lives here, and I know they will all agree that the proposal does not make sense. The vast majority of our shopping, socializing, and general living is made locally in the South Park area. I can assure you that it is a rare occurrence whenever I venture down south of the 94. This random initiative leads me to believe that there are some disingenuous, "backdoor" reasons for this nonsensical scheme. As public servants, you have an obligation to listen and work for citizens' best interests; this redistricting initiative is NOT it!
10/4/2021 8:33	Barry Taylor	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	My family, friends, neighbors, and I are vehemently opposed to any attempts at redistributing the Golden Hill area away from District 3. For us, redistricting is a threat to the very structure of our lives. I hope that I don't need to recount the ongoing struggles that LGBTQ+ families face to just exist. Families like mine fight side by side with others in our community and live freely in places like Hillcrest, South Park, and North Park. Golden Hill has become a vibrant, thriving, and safe community that embraces diversity in all forms. Let me state clearly that we view any attempts to divide our community as threats to our basic civil rights. We will articulate this in the media, in the streets, on social media, in print, and with activism. Our very lives depend on it.

10/4/2021 7:39	Laura Mays	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	Do NOT divide our cohesive canyon neighborhood into separate council districts. We have many common causes that would suffer from bureaucratic confusion
10/3/2021 20:39	Diego Lynch	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	<p>If I say I live in Golden Hill, people don't know what I am talking about. If I say that I live in the Southeast part of South Park, they immediately know I that I live in the area south of A and north of the 94. That is because this is a coherent neighborhood; the bars, cafes, groceries, etc. that are in golden hill have an identical character to those in South Park. The mix of multi-unit apartments and single-family homes are the same. Dividing this neighborhood off from North Park, South Park, and the entire geographical cluster of mesas north of the 94 and east of the park and downtown, is illogical. Because of their quaint character, these neighborhoods are red meat for developers to re-develop into the luxury condos that have rendered hillcrest uninhabitable for working-class renters. Coherent democratically represented neighborhoods are the only vehicle for resisting mass displacement and an explosion of rental costs that probably will decimate communities south and north of the 94; any effort to divide our neighborhood can only make it easier for real estate capital to assert its will. This would be bad, keep golden hill with south park.</p>
10/3/2021 17:51	Glenn Bundy	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	<p>My name is Glenn Bundy and I have been a homeowner and resident of Golden Hill for 37 years. I strongly oppose the redistricting of Golden Hill from District 3 to 8. I have personally met Mayor Gloria, Councilmember Whitburn, Senator Atkins as they have campaigned door to door over the years.</p> <p>I have been active in the community, have replanted trees, attended GGHCP group and have enjoyed the emerging business and restaurant district of South Park that is within walking distance. In order for me to participate in District 8 activities, I would have to drive across the 94. I think District 8 has may challenges based on their proximity to the border, the crime activity of Barrio Logan and Sherman Heights, and I do not want to lose the progress that Golden Hill has made with the plans for a sustainable development, and safer community. Please consider the strong plea of many residents that have lived and voted in Golden Hill for many years. DO NOT REDRISTRICK US TO DISTRICT 8. Thank you for your time and attention to this grave matter.</p>

10/3/2021 17:28	Dennis Emerling	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	<p>My name is Dennis Emerling and I have been a resident of Golden Hill for 37 years. I oppose the redistricting of Golden Hill from District 3 to District 8 for many reasons. The community is cohesive as it is and works well with residents of South and North Park to improve our business district, our open space areas, our updated Greater Golden Hill Community Plan, safety and community clean up. We have spent many years developing personal relationships with our council members and have been active in improving our neighborhood. Shopping, voting, sharing community gatherings have all been done in District 3 for me. The issues of San Ysidro and the border are very different from the issues of Golden Hill. I do not want to dilute the work, the attention from our current elected officials and the future progress we see for District 3. I very much oppose a change to our community spirit.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my vehement opposition to the change.</p>
10/3/2021 15:11	Nadezhda Wall-Rossi		Non-Agenda Comment		<p>Park Village is part of Rancho Penasquitos, not Mira Mesa! We need to speak in a strong, united voice!</p>
10/2/2021 16:16	Susan I. Swisher	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	<p>My name is Susan Swisher and I have been homeowner and resident of Golden Hill for the past 28 years. I strongly oppose any motions to redistrict Golden Hill from District 3 to 8.</p> <p>Firstly, there has been no clear explanation of the motivation for this redistricting nor involvement of community members. The issues between Golden Hill and San Ysidro or Sherman Heights are vastly different. Redistricting Golden Hill would also subvert the 2016 Golden Hill Community Plan Update and negate any progress that was made to make the neighborhood safer and cleaner. The redistricting makes me question the reason and ask if it is motivated by developers?</p> <p>We long term residents pay the majority share of taxes, participate in community planning, and restore open space from our own initiative. DO NOT REDISTRICK GOLDEN HILL FROM DISTRICT 3. The majority of Golden Hill residents feel the same and are feeling severely disempowered. Thank you care of this neighborhood. Please do not redistrict our neighborhood and kill the great strides that have been made in making Golden Hill a great place to live. Thank you for your service.</p>

10/2/2021 10:00	Nathan Tobiason	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	I am against redistricting Golden Hill from the 3rd to the 8th district. As a long time Golden Hill resident, the 94 freeway (established over 60 years ago) has been a good dividing line between the 3rd district and the 8th. South Park has historically been a part of Golden Hill - not originally a separate neighborhood. The community of South Park and Golden Hill are much more similar and easier to represent together than Golden Hill with Barrio Logan and San Ysidro. While the 8th is already a strange district geographically, it is much more light manufacturing/commercially oriented than Golden Hill - which like South Park and North Park is almost purely residential + small consumer facing businesses like restaurants/shops. Redistricting seems like an attempt to undermine the ability for our representative to be able to focus on our Golden Hill community's interests. I would like to point out Golden Hill Recreation Center and Golden Hill park are both north of A Street; It seems strange that new districting lines would remove some of our own best public features from our own Representation.
9/29/2021 11:28	Andrew Hrynkiw	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	I Andrew Hrynkiw, a homeowner and resident of Golden Hill, vehemently oppose any motions to redistrict Golden Hill from South Park. Redistricting Golden Hill would subvert the 2016 Golden Hill Community Plan Update and negate any progress that was made to make the neighborhood safer and cleaner. We want to be more like South Park and not more like Grant Hill. This is clearly a power grab from greedy real estate investors at the expense of residents who actually pay the majority share of taxes and take care of this neighborhood. Please do not redistrict our neighborhood and kill the great strides that have been made in making Golden Hill a great place to live. Thank you for your service.
9/29/2021 10:54	Lori Gowrie	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	I am against the district line moving Golden Hill south of A Street into district 8. Not even sure why this would be considered due to the fact they are north of Hwy 94.

9/29/2021 13:50	Kathy Vandenheuvel	10/5/2021	Agenda Item Comment	2	<p>As a long-time volunteer and resident in the Greater Golden Hill Community, I feel very strongly that our community needs to be kept together. Please do not divide South Park and Golden Hill as was done in years past. My former volunteer roles have included President of the Greater Golden Hill CDC as well as the Chair of the Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee and I have seen how important it is to keep the community together so we can have a unified voice for our community's priority projects and needs. Greater Golden Hill is a relatively small community (compared to Downtown or North Park) and splitting us up further dilutes our ability to get our fair share of resources from the City.</p> <p>In addition, please keep Greater Golden Hill in the same district as Balboa Park. Greater Golden Hill does not have any park space and relies on the adjacent Balboa Park (which includes Golden Hill Park and the Golden Hill Recreation Center) for all of our park recreation needs.</p>
9/28/2021 19:52	Michael McDonald	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Michael and I've lived in Normal Heights for 10 years and I am a member of Asian Solidarity Collective. I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. Normal Heights is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. Since D9 is the second Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense for Normal Heights to be a part of D9. The unity map that was presented, is the product of community leaders and long-time residents from different districts and neighborhoods coming to a consensus on a map that empowers black and Latinx communities in San Diego. This was a monumental achievement rarely seen in today's divisive climate and commissioners should take that into account. The reality is that D3 is too populated and should be split up and the unity map is the best solution.</p>

9/28/2021 18:32	Adina Weinig	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. Normal Heights should be in D9: Normal Heights is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. Since D9 is the second Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense for Normal Heights to be a part of D9.</p> <p>Mission Valley should be in D3: Mission Valley residents share similar values to those in D3. Many D3 residents eat and shop in Mission Valley. Please support the unity map which empowers Black and Latinx communities in the city of San Diego.</p>
9/28/2021 18:23	Karen Botiller	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I would like to see PQ united with other neighborhoods in District 5. We should all be together in the Poway Unified School District.</p>
9/28/2021 18:06	Kathleen Hallahan	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>As President of the East Village Residents Association, founding member of the Little Italy Residents Association, member of the Downtown Residents Group, and representative on many committees in downtown, I can testify to the positive energy, communal spirit, and supportive environment that has been created between the downtown neighborhoods. The dynamics of urban living in all the neighborhoods are enriched by this interaction.</p> <p>We recognize that our shared issues, challenges and potential success are interdependent, and rely on close co-ordination and communication.</p> <p>If one neighborhood is torn from the others by separation of district identification and representation, it would be a senseless error that will result in lost of clarity, efficiency, and prosperity throughout downtown.</p> <p>The urban core neighborhoods must remain in one district.</p>

9/28/2021 17:35	Mae Case	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Mae Case, I'm a first generation filipina immigrant and nearly lifelong resident of District 4, and member of Asian Solidarity Collective. While I recently moved out of the district, many of my family members, childhood friends and small business that I support still reside and remain in D4. I'm calling today in support of the the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9. I fully support empowering the Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>And when it comes to D4 in particular, The Ridgeview-Webster neighborhood has always historically been in D4 and was cut in half 10 years ago. According to residents there, north of Home Ave is where Mid-City starts, and south of Home Ave is where D4 should start.</p> <p>I'd also like to urge the commission to consider adding the Mt Hope Community Garden into D4. Many D4 residents have a plot at this community garden, even though it's currently in District 9. This is a gathering place for many D4 residents and should be in D4.</p> <p>I'm urging you today to please support the unity map which empowers Black and Latinx communities in the city of San Diego. Thank you.</p>
9/28/2021 17:29	Ellen Nash	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I support the unity map for District 3,4,8,9 because it best empowers the black and Latino communities</p>
9/28/2021 17:24	Czeska Cabuhat	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I am in support of Asian Solidarity Collective's Unity Map. Specifically because I live in D3 and believe Mission Valley should be considered as D3. I also send my time in Mission Valley businesses and residences. Mission Valley is similar to the neighborhood that I live in, Hillcrest, because there are many renters. The community events in Mission Valley brings people from my neighborhood to Mission Valley because of our shared values.</p>
9/28/2021 17:00	Sina Hajhassan	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Hello. As a District 3 resident, I'd hope you consider keeping the neighbors of downtown San Diego together to ensure consistent and cohesive representation of our Downtown core. Thank you.</p>

9/28/2021 16:58	Christine Lopez	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Christine Lopez and I work with Think Dignity, a grassroots homeless advocacy agency in San Diego. I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Based on our growing community and interests, Golden Hill should be in D8. Golden Hill was a historically Latinx neighborhood before it became gentrified over the years. Since D8 is the Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense that Golden Hill is a part of D8. Normal Heights is another growing community with shared interests, and because of this Normal Heights should be in D9. Normal Heights is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. Since D9 is the second Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense for Normal Heights to be a part of D9. We need to empower our communities by keeping them together with like-minded interests. Please support the unity map which empowers Black and Latinx communities in the city of San Diego.</p>
9/28/2021 16:08	Maya Misra	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Maya Misra and I am with Asian Solidarity Collective. I support the Unity Map for Districts 3, 4, 8 and 9 because it best empowers Black and Latinx communities in San Diego. In particular, Mission Valley should be in District 3. While some view Interstate 8 as a natural boundary between districts, the importance of the Mission Valley area to residents of D3 cannot be understated, as many people in this community shop and eat in Mission Valley. Additionally, Normal Heights should be in District 9 given that its population is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. With a substantial portion of San Diego's voting populace comprised of Latinx folks, we must maximize voting power for this community by ensuring that D9 includes Normal Heights. This would allow D9 space to grow as a second Latinx empowerment district. This Unity Map has been very thoughtfully conceived— with much discussion and care placed on minimizing harm for marginalized communities in the process of redrawing district lines. I urge you to support the Unity Map in an effort to empower our communities of color in San Diego for the years to come.</p>

9/28/2021 15:58	Eric	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Eric and I live in D4. I am with Asian Solidarity Collective (ASC). I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. As I am a resident of D4 for over 35 years, I am advocating for Ridgeview to be in D4: The Ridgeview-Webster neighborhood has always historically been in D4 and was cut in half 10 years ago. North of Home Ave is where Mid-City starts, and south of Home Ave is where D4 should start. Mt Hope Community Garden to be in D4: Many D4 residents have a plot at this community garden, even though it's currently in District 9. This is a gathering place for many D4 residents and should be in D4. This space has also been significant in my family's story as my great-grandfather was cremated there in 2014. Thank you so much for your time and we ask that the Unity Map is respectfully supported.</p>
9/28/2021	Maya	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Maya and I live in D4. I am with Asian Solidarity Collective (ASC). I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. As I am a resident of D4 for over 35 years, I am advocating for Ridgeview to be in D4: The Ridgeview-Webster neighborhood has always historically been in D4 and was cut in half 10 years ago. North of Home Ave is where Mid-City starts, and south of Home Ave is where D4 should start. Mt Hope Community Garden to be in D4: Many D4 residents have a plot at this community garden, even though it's currently in District 9. This is a gathering place for many D4 residents and should be in D4. This space has also been significant in my family's story as my great-grandfather was cremated there in 2014. Thank you so much for your time and we ask that the Unity Map is respectfully supported.</p>

9/28/2021 15:55	Dyno Corrales	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Dyno and am with Asian Solidarity Collective (ASC). I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. I am advocating for Ridgeview to be in D4: The Ridgeview-Webster neighborhood has always historically been in D4 and was cut in half 10 years ago. North of Home Ave is where Mid-City starts, and south of Home Ave is where D4 should start. Mt Hope Community Garden to be in D4: Many D4 residents have a plot at this community garden, even though it's currently in District 9. This is a gathering place for many D4 residents and should be in D4. This space has also been significant in my family's story as my grandfather-in-law was cremated there in 2014. Thank you so much for your time and we ask that the Unity Map is respectfully supported.</p>
9/28/2021 15:46	Kristina Mananquil	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Kristina Mananquil and live in D4. I am an Organizer with Asian Solidarity Collective (ASC). I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. As I am a resident of D4 for over 35 years, I am advocating for Ridgeview to be in D4: The Ridgeview-Webster neighborhood has always historically been in D4 and was cut in half 10 years ago. North of Home Ave is where Mid-City starts, and south of Home Ave is where D4 should start. Mt Hope Community Garden to be in D4: Many D4 residents have a plot at this community garden, even though it's currently in District 9. This is a gathering place for many D4 residents and should be in D4. This space has been a big part of my life as a child as my family and I would visit monthly to pay respects to my uncle. The space has also been significant in my family's story as my grandfather was cremated there in 2014. Thank you so much for your time and we ask that the Unity Map is respectfully supported.</p>

9/28/2021 15:29	Rami Ibrahim	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Rami Ibrahim and I am writing on behalf of the Partnership of the Advancement of New Americans (PANA) San Diego. Our organization supports the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black, Latinx, Immigrant and Refugee communities.</p> <p>In concern for District 9, a largely Black, Latinx, Immigrant and Refugee district, we urge you to consider including Normal Heights, City Heights, Southcrest, and Shelltown together in District 9. All of these areas in San Diego are home to large BIPOC, Immigrant, and Refugee populations, some of whom came as refugees in the 1990s and have been here for over 30 years. As newcomer communities, the majority speak a primary language other than English at home, and are limited English proficient.</p> <p>City Heights, Normal Heights, Southcrest, and Shelltown must remain united in a single District to ensure that their shared needs as BIPOC, Immigrants, and Refugees, such as affordable housing, equitable transportation access, and English Language Services, are adequately addressed by the City of San Diego.</p>
9/28/2021 14:42	Diana Go	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Diana and I have been living in Paradise Hills in D4 for over 20-years and I am with Asian Solidarity Collective.</p> <p>I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. Living and growing up within D4, I know how important connection and community has been for those residing in this neighborhood. The unity map, specifically, upholds that value of community by including Mt Hope Community Garden in D4 as many D4 residents have a plot there, even though it's currently in District 9. This is a gathering place for many D4 residents that emphasizes access to healthy foods and including it in D4 would positively impact the way D4 connects and grows as a community.</p>
9/28/2021 14:25	Kenneth Moore	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I have been a resident of District 3 for more than six years and a resident of Downtown San Diego for a majority of that time. As you consider redistricting, I'd urge you to keep all the Downtown San Diego communities together. All these neighborhoods are closely connected and should have cohesive representation. Thank you.</p>

9/28/2021 14:18	Khue Vi Tran	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Khue Tran and I'm with Asian Solidarity Collective.</p> <p>I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Normal Heights should be in D9: Normal Heights is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. Since D9 is the second Latinx empowerment district and needs to grow in population, Normal Heights should be part of D9. - Mission Valley should be in D3: Mission Valley residents share similar values to those in D3, and many eat and shop in Mission Valley. - Ridgeview should be in D4: The Ridgeview-Webster neighborhood has always historically been in D4 and was cut in half 10 years ago. According to residents there, north of Home Ave is where Mid-City starts, and south of Home Ave is where D4 should start. - Mt Hope Community Garden should be in D4: Many D4 residents have a plot at this community garden, even though it's currently in D9. This is a gathering place for many D4 residents and should be in D4. - Shelltown and Southcrest should be together in D9: Residents in these two neighborhoods have historically advocated to be kept together.
9/28/2021 13:29	Stacey Uy	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Stacey Uy. I'm a member of Asian Solidarity Collective and I live in South Park, District 3. I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Golden Hill should be in D8. Golden Hill was a historically Latinx neighborhood before it became gentrified over the years. Since D8 is the Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, Golden Hill should be a part of D8. Normal Heights should be in D9: Normal Heights is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. Since D9 is the second Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense for Normal Heights to be a part of D9. Mission Valley should be in D3: Mission Valley residents share similar values to those in D3. Many D3 residents eat and shop in Mission Valley. Ridgeview should be in D4: The Ridgeview-Webster neighborhood has always historically been in D4 and was cut in half 10 years ago. Please support the unity map which empowers Black and Latinx communities in the city of San Diego.</p>

9/28/2021 12:06	Christian L.	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Christian L. and I live in Hillcrest, a part of District 9</p> <p>I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities.</p> <p>Golden Hill should be in D8: Golden Hill was a historically Latinx neighborhood before it became gentrified over the years. Since D8 is the Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense that Golden Hill is a part of D8.</p> <p>Normal Heights should be in D9: Normal Heights is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. Since D9 is the second Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense for Normal Heights to be a part of D9.</p> <p>Mission Valley should be in D3: Mission Valley residents share similar values to those in D3. Many D3 residents eat and shop in Mission Valley.</p> <p>Please support the unity map which empowers Black and Latinx communities in the city of San Diego.</p>
9/28/2021 12:05	Alex Blum	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Alex Blum and I live in District 3. I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. In particular, I feel that Mission Valley should be part of District 3. Mission Valley residents share similar values to those in D3. Many D3 residents eat and shop in Mission Valley. I grew up going to the Mission Valley mall, and just this past weekend I went to a climbing gym in Mission Valley. The area is part of my community and should accordingly be part of my district. Thank you!</p>
9/28/2021 12:01	Elida Chavez	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I am Elidia Chavez, 47 year Oak Park-D4 resident. I agree with the map that includes D9, D8, D4. D3. It represents all the multicultural community including some of us Native Americans. The approval of this map will include our districts in getting equal equity funds, jobs, training, infrastructure, climate change, health and survival resources. Let's keep our communities embracing unity and not dispare. Thank you.</p>
9/28/2021 11:44	Barry Pollard	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>support of our Community Unity Map which includes our adjustments to the current D4 map, which includes growth to the west, (Mt Hope) and Ridgeview to the North</p>

9/28/2021 10:45	Howard Wayne	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	The Linda Vista Planning Group unanimously voted to recommend to the Redistricting Commission that the entirety of Linda Vista be placed in a single council district. With one dissenting vote, the Linda Vista Planning Group voted that Linda Vista be joined in a council district with all of Clairemont.
9/28/2021 9:13	Samantha Mohn	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	My name is Samantha Mohn and I live in City Heights in District 9 and I'm with Asian Solidarity Collective. I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. Normal Heights should be added to D9. Normal Heights is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. Since D9 is the second Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense for Normal Heights to be a part of D9. Please support the unity map which empowers Black and Latinx communities in the city of San Diego.
9/28/2021	Alexi Glines	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities, which have historically been underinvested in.</p> <p>Ridgeview should be in D4: The Ridgeview-Webster neighborhood has always historically been in D4 and was cut in half 10 years ago. According to residents there, north of Home Ave is where Mid-City starts, and south of Home Ave is where D4 should start.</p> <p>Mt Hope Community Garden should be in D4: Many D4 residents have a plot at this community garden, even though it's currently in District 9. This is a gathering place for many D4 residents and should be in D4.</p> <p>Please support the unity map which empowers Black and Latinx communities in the city of San Diego.</p>

9/27/2021 22:51	Iman Zermeno	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	My name is Iman and I'm with Asian Solidarity Collective. I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. I believe that Golden Hill should be in D8 since Golden Hill was a historically Latinx neighborhood before it became gentrified over the years. Since D8 is the Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense that Golden Hill is a part of D8. I also believe that Normal Heights should be in since it is 40% Latinx and 60% people of color. Since D9 is the second Latinx empowerment district and it needs to grow in population, it makes sense for Normal Heights to be a part of D9. Please support the unity map which empowers Black and Latinx communities in the city of San Diego.
9/27/2021 19:51	Serena Francisco	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	Along with Asian Solidarity Collective, I support the unity map for District 3, 4, 8, and 9 because it best empowers Black & Latinx communities. Please support the unity map which empowers Black and Latinx communities in the city of San Diego.
9/27/2021 19:26	Julie Ann Sih	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Julie Ann Sih and I have been a resident of the Park Village area of Rancho Peñasquitos for more than 25 years.</p> <p>Ten years ago, a petition was circulated at Asian restaurants in the Convoy area, to show "community support" for moving the Park Village neighborhood, which has a large percentage of residents of Asian descent, into City Council District 6. This so-called "community support" did not come from the affected residents. No one asked Park Village. In fact, we had no idea that anything was afoot until it was too late for us to object.</p> <p>For the past ten years, Park Village residents with children attending Westview High School have not been able to bring up concerns with our own councilmember, such as the interminable road work on Camino del Sur that was not getting completed seven years ago. When I contacted the staff of the councilmember of District 5, in which the high school was located, I was asked, "Do you live in District 5?" Since my answer was no, apparently my opinion didn't count.</p> <p>I hope that the the current redistricting will re-unite Park Village with the rest of Rancho Peñasquitos. Thank you.</p>

9/27/2021 18:20	Racine Chao	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Hi, I am a citizen of API descent and living in San Diego for more than 20 years. I support combining Rancho Penasquitos area with district 6 (which includes Mira Mesa, Convoy...) to form an API empowered district.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
9/27/2021 10:13	Lisa Ohmstede	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I am a resident/homeowner of Park Village and I implore you to please consider uniting Rancho Penasquitos with the other neighborhoods north of 56, in District 5.</p> <p>These communities have many similar concerns and shared resources: The same school district, which is a different district than their neighbors to the south. Common thoroughfares, parks, houses of worship, grocery stores, libraries, first responders, etc. PQ was split 10 years ago, against the vocal objections of its residents on both sides of the 56. It's time to rectify this problem for the next 10 years. Park Village is an integral part of PQ, not an extension of Mira Mesa. Merge 56 will create a prime route through Park Village to the north, further cementing our common interests with the remainder of PQ.</p> <p>While it is true that some neighborhoods will always need to be divided in less than ideal ways, no neighborhood should have this burden for 20+ years. PQ deserves to be reunited. A united PQ is something that Mira Mesa and the AAPI community also agree upon. The public comments from those communities have been overwhelmingly in favor of uniting PQ in District 5.</p>

					<p>Thank the commissioners for their service.</p> <p>My name is Tim Konzen and I live in Rancho Penasquitos. I've provided many community services over the years from planting trees, coaching; baseball, basketball, & soccer to leading events for the YMCA. I've also have served 30+ yrs in local places of worship.</p> <p>What I want to see: PQ united with other neighborhoods north of 56, in District 5.</p> <p>Why? These communities have many similar concerns and shared resources: The same school district, which is a different district than their neighbors to the south. Common thoroughfares, parks, houses of worship, grocery stores, libraries, first responders, etc.</p> <p>PQ was split 10 years ago, against the vocal objections of its residents on both sides of the 56. It's time to rectify this problem.</p> <p>Park Village is an integral part of PQ, not an extension of Mira Mesa. Merge 56 will create a prime route through Park Village to the north, further cementing our common interests with the remainder of PQ.</p> <p>While it is true that some neighborhoods will always need to be divided in less than ideal ways, no neighborhood should have this burden for 20+ years. PQ should be reunited.</p>
9/27/2021 9:09	Timothy Konzen	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	
9/26/2021 21:21	Catherine Fowler	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	Rancho Penasquitos should be reunited into one district.

9/24/2021 18:21	Hitendra Zhangada	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>PQ was split 10 years ago, against the vocal objections of its residents on both sides of the 56. It's time to rectify this problem.</p> <p>Park Village is an integral part of PQ, not an extension of Mira Mesa, and now will be an access point to Merge 56 and Torrey Highlands.</p> <p>PQ deserves to be reunited.</p> <p>A united PQ will make everyone happy, both residents of PQ and the adjacent communities.</p> <p>Please unite our communities.</p>
9/24/2021 16:32	Ronald Askeland	9/28/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Please reunite Ranch Penasquitos into a single district. These communities have many similar concerns and shared resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The same school district, which is a different district than their neighbors to the south. - Common thoroughfares, parks, libraries, first responders, etc. <p>PQ was split 10 years ago, against the vocal objections of its residents on both sides of the 56. It's time to rectify this problem.</p> <p>Park Village is an integral part of PQ, not an extension of Mira Mesa, and now will be an access point to Merge 56 and Torrey Highlands.</p>
9/24/2021 8:23	Melinda Renken	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Reunite Park Village with Rancho Peñasquitos. Simply put, it makes sense to do so. Residents of Park Village utilize the resources of PQ, Not Mira Mesa. Our children attend Poway Unified Schools & utilize PUSD bussing, we do much of our daily shopping on the PQ side, we enter freeways mostly on the PQ side, we utilize PQ parks. The Peñasquitos Preserve marks a physical boundary, both physically and mentally. It makes sense for Park Village to be a part of the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council district.</p>

9/23/2021 21:49	Timothy Cockerham	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>PQ was split 10 years ago for the greater good of the districts. PQ has served its duty and deserves to be whole again. As a native PQ resident of over 50 years this community is the same throughout and desires to have a common council representative. PQ events have slowly become less successful</p> <p>in the years since the split from Fireworks to The Fiesta to snow on the hill. Please make PQ part of a signal council seat. PQ is part of PUSD and all of San Diego in PUSD should share a council person. No San Diego residential community should ever be split for more than one cycle of redistricting, there is a reason things were broken up around communities. Its time to make PQ whole again.</p>
9/23/2021 21:27	Donna Goodwin	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Please consider placing all of Rancho Penasquitos in the same council district. I live in Park Village, and our community has felt like the ugly step-sister of District 6. Our councilman focuses most of his attention on the communities south of us and we are treated as though we are part of Mira Mesa, which we are not. I rarely venture into Mira Mesa. Our children attend a different school district than the communities south of us, and our community focus is with our fellow Rancho Penasquitos residents. Our</p> <p>community should all be represented by the same council member.</p>
9/23/2021 21:11	Blair Jennings	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Merge Park Village back into Rancho Penasquitos, we are not part of Mira Mesa and have no relation to said section of the city. The last redistricting did us a major disfavor by asserting that our area had an association which was totally false. Please fix this travesty.</p>
9/23/2021 17:59	Melanie Jensen	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Please reunite our community with the rest of PQ in District 5. Our communities have similar concerns and shared resources. We are also in the same school district, unlike our neighbors to the south. We have common parks, libraries, and first responders. Park Village is an integral part of PQ, not an extension of Mira Mesa. A united PQ will make everyone happy.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>

9/23/2021 17:57	Cynthia Suero-Gabler	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Good evening, my name is Cynthia “CK” Suero-Gabler and I serve as the Vice President of APAC, the Asian Pacific American Coalition. We are in favor of a majority minority API district. We are nearing the midway point of our process, doing our due diligence to conduct public meetings as we listen to constituents and collectively draft a preliminary map(s) that is/are fair and equitable that celebrates our API community that is rich in culture and diversity.</p> <p>Thank you Commissioners for adding the new mapping tool allowing us to manipulate maps with accurate Census data. This tool has been very helpful when meeting with our community members as we hear their thoughts and feedback as to how they would like to see the lines drawn. We value the voices of our community and feel it is necessary to take the time to listen and consider their input.</p> <p>We look forward to presenting to you at a future date and time. Thank you for your time.</p>
-----------------	----------------------	-----------	---------------------	---	--

9/23/2021 15:50	Helen M Boyden	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	1	<p>The Mapping Tool contains some information that is not substantiated by other sources.</p> <p>The Boundary shown between Districts One and Two takes a strange turn and puts Bird Rock Elementary School in District Two. If you search sdvote.com for BRES's address, you are told it is in Council District One. The Mapping Tool boundary does not match the Registrar of Voter Records.</p> <p>The "Green" areas are fuzzy and do not contain all the appropriate areas: Here is what Pottery Canyon looks like on a City Map. https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/potterycanyontrailmap.pdf</p> <p>Pottery Canyon is also defined on the City Map for the La Jolla Shores Planned District. I walk by the eastern portion nearly every day.</p> <p>The Mapping Tool only outlines the portion including the road and trail. I have heard that other identifiable "green" areas in the north City are also not included In the Mapping Tool.</p> <p>Using these two changes helps support the position of District One United</p>
-----------------	----------------	-----------	---------------------	---	--

9/23/2021 14:14	Darshana Patel	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Darshana Patel. I'm a resident of Park Village - the neighborhood in Rancho Peñasquitos that was put into D6 ten years ago, against my and the vast majority of my community's, repeated expressed public comments.</p> <p>I would love to see the D6/D5 boundary be reset to the natural boundary of the Los Peñasquitos Preserve and have the Park Village and Canyonview neighborhoods reunited with the rest of our community in PQ for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar concerns and shared resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The same school district, which is a different district than their neighbors to the south. * Common thoroughfares, parks, libraries, first responders, etc. • Although some neighborhoods may need to be divided in less than ideal ways, no neighborhood should have this burden for 20+ years. PQ deserves to be reunited. • A united PQ is something that has overwhelming support based on public comments from the API community and surrounding areas. • Having our small portion of PQ separated from the rest of our community for the past ten years has had a negative impact on our district - especially when it comes to park services, road repair, and large-scale development projects. <p>Thank you</p>
9/23/2021 13:30	Sandy Sparkman	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I am Sandy Spackman, secretary and board member of APAC. I support a strong Asian influence district 6. Please draw the boundary for district 6 to include highly concentrated Asian voters according to the 2020 census.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Sandy Spackman</p>
9/23/2021 9:01	Natasha Wong	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I would like to support an Asian Empowerment District in San Diego.</p>
9/22/2021 18:51	Sandra Oshiro	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I would like to revise my previous comment. In error, I stated that I am in favor of reuniting all of Rancho Penasquitos in District 6. I was mistaken and had District 5 and District 6 mixed up. *Correction: I would like all of Rancho Penasquitos to be reunited in District 5. As a Park Village resident in the southern part of Rancho Penasquitos and within District 6 boundaries, I would like to rejoin District 5 so that all of 92129 is together. We have similar needs and concerns and it just makes logical sense. Thank you.</p>

9/22/2021 17:09	Patricia Granger	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Please don't break up the La Jolla Shores Planned District. I have been a resident of La Jolla Shores Heights for forty years. I learned very early on that it was very important to know what was being planned for your community and particularly for your neighborhood. My home is across La Jolla Village Drive from UCSD. That's why I joined the La Jolla Shores Association and why it is important to me to have easy access to its meetings.</p> <p>Please do not break up this easily accessible and very successful planning group and keep District One United.</p>
9/22/2021 17:04	Sandra Oshiro	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My comment is in regards to reuniting all of Rancho Penasquitos 92129 under one district, D6. During the last redistricting, our Rancho Penasquitos community was split in two, moving residents south of the SR-56 into District 5. As a resident, I was opposed to this redrawing of district boundaries. Despite our Town Council voting against this separation, the signatures that were collected from residents who were against this separation, and the large turnout of residents opposed to the separation at the redistricting hearings, our community of Rancho Penasquitos was split up. My neighborhood of Park Village was assigned to District 5 and represented by a city council member who also held the interests of a large business population from Mira Mesa and Kearney Mesa. Moreover, our Park Village neighborhood has been the only group of residents belonging to the Poway Unified School District; the majority of District 5 are in the the San Diego Unified School District. Our needs and our interests have been ignored and underrepresented for the past ten years because they have not aligned with the majority of the district we were assigned. I urge you to reunite Rancho Penasquitos under District 6. Thank you.</p>
9/22/2021 11:06	Robert Steck	9/23/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I have lived 12 years at my current residence in La Jolla, and am involved with community activities such as the community planning association, Kiwanis, and my local parish. I just wanted to offer my support for District One United, and state my desire to keep intact the current district delineation. Thank you.</p>
9/16/2021 15:00	Ellen Nash	9/16/2021	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>Announcement regarding Southeastern group. Opportunity to form a coalition with other neighborhoods and Districts.</p>

9/16/2021 14:58	Cynthia Suero-Gabler	9/16/2021	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>Good afternoon, my name is Cynthia Suero-Gabler and I am the Vice Chair of APAC San Diego, the Asian Pacific American Coalition. We are in the process of conducting a series of community outreach redistricting deep dive meetings via Zoom this month in an effort to listen to our constituents' input regarding how to draw an Asian Empowerment District map that is fair and inclusive. After we do our due diligence to listen to our community and conduct research, we will work collaboratively to draw several preliminary maps based on the input we received. Then, we will present our findings to our constituents for final input before drafting the final map(s) of which we will present to you in mid October. Since we are just starting our outreach meetings, it is premature to agree with any existing maps at this time. APAC values our constituents and we look forward to conducting an equitable and engaging process to ensure everyone's voice is valued and considered.</p>
9/14/2021 18:17	Lynn Edwards	9/14/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Ten years ago, Rolando Park and Redwood Village were redistricted from District 7 to District 4 after we had asked to be part of the new District 9. David Moty suggested that communities that border El Cajon Blvd and University share common concerns and issues and I would like to reiterate that.</p> <p>Mount Hope and Mountain View have stated that they would like to be in District 4. Those communities could be moved to District 4 and Rolando Park and Redwood Village could be swapped to District 9 so that we can work with other communities along University and El Cajon Blvd with similar concerns including transit and infrastructure.</p>
9/14/2021 17:25	Ellen Nash	9/14/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Please provide 2010 maps. Please provide information regarding the significant loss of residents in D4.</p> <p>As a lifelong d4 resident. We want to retain current neighborhoods and to address the reduction add former neighborhoods as well as add other neighborhoods.</p>

9/14/2021 17:20	Samantha Jenkins	9/14/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>As the current chair of the skyline paradise hills planning group and a resident of the Bay terrace community. I would like to speak today in preservation and expansion of San Diego City Council District4. My council district has a rich cultural history that is steeped in the diversity and pride of its residents of the Black, AAPI in Latin X communities. Although the historical foundations and creation of this community and its neighbors is attached to our region and nation's shameful history of discrimination and redlining, our residents still seek to build upon and uphold the legacy and history of social justice movements that have been rooted here. This community, while it has the assets of its people has historically and continually been under resourced and divested as it relates to opportunities related to economic growth and development. Members of our community alliance who are working towards the development of a map in this redistricting effort seek to expand District 4 to include areas that will help us build and preserve our political power and economic growth. We believe that advocating for these issues will help us improve the quality of our lives and the future of our children.</p>
9/14/2021 16:59	Feroza Ardeshir	9/14/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Feroza Ardeshir. My husband and I have been living in University City, South of Rose Canyon for 39 years. We were drawn to the area because of its proximity to the UC San Diego campus, where my husband has been a Professor of Biological Sciences for 40 years, and was the executive Vice-Chancellor for 6 years. I worked at Scripps Research and Agouron Institute as a scientist. Both these institutions are within District1. Our residential area houses many who work in the biotech parks of Torrey Pines Mesa. We are involved members of the UCSD community. I am a mentor for undergraduates and have been active in a social justice non-profit, Alliance4Empowerment, organizing several summits on campus to raise awareness and educate about Women's issues and Human Trafficking. I was also a teacher in a Montessori School in my neighborhood which served many UCSD families for pre-school, elementary school and child-care. It is a convenient commute to campus from our community. My husband and I urge the Redistricting Commission to keep the University Community Planning Area united, and to keep it in District 1. District 1 forms a community of interest, please keep it united!</p>

9/14/2021 16:42	Cynthia Suero-Gabler	9/14/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	Good afternoon, my name is Cynthia Suero-Gabler and I am the Vice Chair of APAC San Diego, the Asian Pacific American Coalition. We are in the process of conducting a series of community outreach redistricting deep dive meetings via Zoom this month in an effort to listen to our constituents' input regarding how to draw an Asian Empowerment District map that is fair and inclusive. After we do our due diligence to listen to our community and conduct research, we will work collaboratively to draw several preliminary maps based on the input we received. Then, we will present our findings to our constituents for final input before drafting the final map(s) of which we will present to you in mid October. Since we are just starting our outreach meetings, it is premature to agree with any existing maps at this time. APAC values our constituents and we look forward to conducting an inclusive and engaging process to ensure everyone's voice is heard and is taken into consideration.
9/14/2021 16:39	Darin Noyes	9/14/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	My goals in redistricting are to (1) increase voter population, (2) expand the economic base, (3) and to maintain elected representation. In reviewing the maps, my areas of interest are (1) Ridgeview, (2) Chollas Creek, (3) and El Cerrito.
9/13/2021 20:59	Hannah Schalyo	9/14/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	Hi I am a UCSD student and I believe that UCSD and University City should be joining District 6 in order to fully create an AAPI district in San Diego. This would allow for more voices to be heard and more people to be able to make impactful decisions in regards to what our county should look like. Otherwise these voices would just be muddled in with the other voices as they were split in between districts.
9/13/2021 20:56	Jasmine Shafie	9/14/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	I am a UCSD Student and I believe that UCSD and University City should be able to join District 6 in order to create the first AAPI majority district. I think that it's important to be able to truly hear the different opinions from all groups. This would allow for change to actually be made that help make impactful improvements to our county.

9/13/2021 13:54	Jeanine Erikat	9/16/2021	Non-Agenda Comment	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a Policy Associate at PANA and wanted to uplift the letter we submitted via email. Due to word count I have include a short excerpt from our letter below.</p> <p>City Heights is home to a diverse population of BIPOC refugees and immigrants, including a high concentration of Latinx, Southeast Asian, and African communities. PANA supports and works closely with the Somali, Oromo, Amharic, Eritrean, Arab, and Karen and Burmese communities in City Heights, some of whom came as refugees in the 1990s and have been in City Heights for over 30 years. City Heights has historically seen high numbers of refugee resettlement, relying on strong community networks for mutual aid and support. From our community mapping sessions, we concluded that City Heights boundaries include El Cajon Blvd to the north, 54th Street to the east, Interstate 805 to the west, and Home Avenue to the south. Some community landmarks are as follows: The City Heights Tower, Colina Del Sol Park, The Community College Mid-City Adult Learning Center, 50th street and University, Oak Park Elementary School, the City Heights library, and Ali's Chicken & Waffles.</p>
9/13/2021 9:13	Mary Wood		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>I am a resident of District 6. I oppose putting UCSD in our district. The students are transients. They do not have to live with the results of their voting choices. District 6 is composed of multicultural, diverse, and multi-ethnic voters. We are great as we are. Let UCSD stay with La Jolla.</p>
9/9/2021 12:07	Shreyas Anantha Ramaprasad		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>I'm in support of the redistricting</p>

9/8/2021 20:07	Alexis Goldschmidt	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	As an Asian-American student, I am here to advocate for the UC San Diego community to be united with District 6. Housing costs in the surrounding La Jolla area have dramatically changed making it harder for students to find affordable housing. As students, we deserve to have issues such as these heard and dealt with. The redistricting of our community would help with that. The AAPI community is asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important now than ever to provide full representation of our diverse community and student body. This commission should consider AAPI RESIDENTS and STUDENTS as communities of interest. Therefore, UCSD campus and nearby student population centers should be removed from District 1 and united with District 6 to create strong STUDENT and AAPI representation.
9/8/2021 19:29	Brandon Kao	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	Hello, my name is Brandon Kao. I am a 2nd-year student with the Chinese American Student Association at UCSD. I would like to voice my support for redistricting the UCSD Campus and nearby student population centers from district 1 to district 6 to better represent the student and AAPI population distribution as stated by my peers earlier so as to better address housing and transportation issues. Thank you.
9/8/2021 19:16	Wesley Quach	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Wesley Quach and I represent the Convoy District Partnership, Asian Business Association San Diego, and the SD Asian Pacific Islander (API Coalition). I also serve on the board of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association. I am in support of the map that was presented by UCSD Associated Students and Neighborhood Voices which incorporates the entirety of Sorrento Valley, the UCSD area, and parts of Carmel Valley and UTC into District 6. This map will create an API empowerment district that consists of nearly 42% API population and meets the redistricting guidelines of being geographically compact, contiguous, and maintains within allowed variance the same population as other districts. The API population has grown 20% in the last decade and it is vital that we have a true API empowerment district.</p> <p>I believe that the core of the current District 6 should not be separated, including the areas of Kearny Mesa, including the Convoy District, Miramar, Mira Mesa, and Sorrento Valley.</p> <p>The proposed map also benefits the communities of Clairemont and Rancho Penasquitos (where I grew up) who will be reunited after ten long years.</p>

9/8/2021 19:00	Samuel Tsoi	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Samuel Tsoi and I am a resident of Clairemont and a member of San Diego API Coalition. I am urging the Commission to ensure that the AAPI community is represented in District 6. An Asian-empowerment district that connects Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus would take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community.</p>
9/8/2021 18:58	Lindsey Lue	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Hi my name is Lindsey Lue,</p> <p>I am a current resident of Mira Mesa and currently work in the UTC area and a student at UCSD and I support the proposal presented during the forum prior by Associated Students and Neighborhood Voices.</p> <p>I was a former resident in the 92036 zip code of La Jolla and chose to move out of the area due to housing prices and the lack of AAPI community. While living in La Jolla, It was difficult to find the AAPI community I had available at work and I found myself only considering neighborhoods with more affordable housing options and where I felt there was adequate AAPI representation. Moving to Mira Mesa, it allowed for me to join a community with AAPI community and representation and housing affordability. This said, I want to advocate for a AAPI empowerment district with home affordability in D6 that contains Kearny Mesa, Sorrento Valley, Mira Mesa, Miramar, and UTC/ University City Area.</p>

9/8/2021 18:51	Woo-Jin Shim	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Woo-Jin Shim I am a resident of Mira Mesa and work in Kearny Mesa. As an active volunteer for the Korean American Community in San Diego. I am here to ensure that the AAPI community is represented in District 6. An Asian-empowerment district that connects Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus. By including UCSD and the adjacent neighborhoods that house its employees, students and faculty, we can increase AAPI representation in this district from 30% to over 40%. There has been a shortage of affordable housing that a lot of Asian students at UCSD are seeking for housing in the nearby areas including Mira Mesa where they identify with their Asian culture.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
9/8/2021 18:44	Alex Villafuerte	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Alex Villafuerte and I'm the co-chair of the San Diego API Coalition. I work and spend a lot of time in District 6 and I am here to ensure that the AAPI community is represented in District 6 in a Asian-empowerment district that connects Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, and all of UTC and the UCSD campus. This district would reflect the breadth and diversity of our community, from the cultural hub in the Convoy District, through residential neighborhoods of all income levels and housing types, to the academic institution that brought so many of us to the region and continues to provide opportunity. Additionally, I support neighbors in Rancho Penasquitos and Clairemont to be reunited with their community. Given the data in the 2020 Census, anything less than a 40% AAPI district would be disappointing and would dilute the voices of our community.</p>
9/8/2021 18:20	Hayden Schill	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Dear all, I am a graduate student at UC San Diego, and am on the leadership board of the graduate and professional student association. Skyrocketing housing costs have dramatically changed this area. The vast majority of students cannot afford to live in La Jolla, and being a part of District 6 would allow the student population to better vouch for more affordable, high density housing in our local community. More students than ever have immense difficulty finding housing, and homelessness among students are increasing. Thank you for your support and value of our students populations in the San Diego community.</p>

9/8/2021 18:07	Kayla Isabel Chen	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	Hi, I am a current UCSD student and will be living in La Jolla in a few weeks. One of the main issues students face is the housing crisis in La Jolla where students are struggling to find a place that is accessible to campus and is also affordable for them. As someone who was personally affected by this crisis, it is important that we have a voice in these matters. Therefore, The UCSD campus should be removed from District 1 and united with District 6 where students will be able to find solutions for housing and accessibility for incoming students and future students who wish to attend UCSD later on.
9/8/2021 17:47	Kevin Ing	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	By including UCSD and the adjacent neighborhoods that house its employees, students and faculty, we can increase AAPI representation in this district from 30% to over 40%. This commission should consider AAPI RESIDENTS and STUDENTS as communities of interest. Therefore, UCSD campus and nearby student population centers should be removed from District 1 and united with District 6 to create strong STUDENT and AAPI representation.
9/8/2021	Joan Yan	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	I am Joan and I am a student at UCSD part of the Chinese American Student Association and I'm concerned about housing issues as well as increasing AAPI voices in San Diego, which would be supported by including UCSD in District 6. Housing and transportation are going to be major issues facing the UCSD community and we deserve a councilmember who answers to our community rather than a smaller, older community that does not accommodate our students and workforce. Skyrocketing housing costs have dramatically changed this area. Most people who are here because of the University cannot afford to live in La Jolla, and the institution should not be divided from the people it employs. This commission should consider AAPI RESIDENTS and STUDENTS as communities of interest. Therefore, UCSD campus and nearby student population centers should be removed from District 1 and united with District 6 to create strong STUDENT and AAPI representation.

9/8/2021 17:41	Aliya Srey	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	I'm Aliya, I am a third year student at UCSD in the Chinese American Student Association and currently live in District 1. Increasing housing cost has dramatically changed this area. Majority of those affiliated with UCSD do not live in La Jolla, they reside in neighborhoods to the north or east. District 6 would be more reflective of the breadth and diversity of our community, from the cultural hub in the Convoy district, through residential neighborhoods inclusive of all income levels and types of housing. This commission should consider Asian American Pacific Islander RESIDENTS and STUDENTS as communities of interest. Therefore, UCSD campus and nearby student population centers should be removed from District 1 and united with District 6 to create a strong STUDENT and AAPI representation. This moment in time is too important. Anything less than 40% AAPI district would be to intentionally dilute the voice of our community.
9/8/2021 17:38	Terence Liu	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	My name is Terence Liu and I am a fourth year student from UCSD, and I am writing in concern to adding UCSD to District 6. As a student and an Asian American, I would like our voices to be better represented because we face problems like inaccessible housing and racial discrimination. Many students are still looking for housing and are met with expensive living costs, and there have been increase in violence against Asians due to COVID-19. If our community is added to District 6, I believe the problems we face will be better addressed. Thank you

9/8/2021 17:29	Barbara Dunbar	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>As a resident of the Bird Rock neighborhood at the south end of La Jolla, I would encourage redrawing the redistricting map to maintain community and neighborhood coherence regarding areas within Council District 1 (CD1). Currently, the Park La Jolla Apartments property in the La Jolla neighborhood of Bird Rock is in Council District 2 (CD2). Please add that portion added back to CD1.</p> <p>Bird Rock is a unique and cohesive neighborhood which includes the Bird Rock Maintenance Assessment District. It makes no sense to have the neighborhood split into two Districts. A number of our residents are members of the La Jolla Community Planning Association, the Bird Rock Community Council, and various other La Jolla community committees and groups.</p> <p>I support the preservation of CD1 in its current configuration and the inclusion of the entire, cohesive La Jolla Community within the CD1 boundaries, including the portion of the Bird Rock neighborhood that is in La Jolla but currently part of CD2.</p> <p>CD1 communities work well together and share common interests including coastal access, environment protection, climate action plans, enhanced outdoor recreational opportunities, and managed growth. These communities have strong community planning groups which communicate well with each other.</p>
9/8/2021 17:21	Michael Lin	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>This commission should consider AAPI RESIDENTS and STUDENTS as communities of interest. Therefore, UCSD campus and nearby student population centers should be removed from District 1 and united with District 6 to create strong STUDENT and AAPI representation. I am a student at UCSD and I am concerned with increasing student and AAPI voices in San Diego, which would be supported by the proposed redistricting of UCSD and its surrounding population centers to District 6.</p>

9/8/2021 17:05	Kathleen Dang	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Kathleen Dang, Vice President of NAAAP San Diego, an Asian American Pacific Islander nonprofit organization serving local professionals in networking, professional development, and community service.</p> <p>I am here to ensure that the AAPI community is represented in District 6. An Asian-empowerment district that connects Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community. This district would reflect the breadth and diversity of our community, from the cultural hub in the Convoy District, through residential neighborhoods of all income levels and housing types, to the academic institution that brought so many of us to the region and continues to provide opportunity.</p>
9/8/2021 16:59	Lisa Ross	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I support keeping the current District 1 boundaries. D1 is compact, with communities of common interest connected by transportation and wildlife corridors. It is uniquely focused on managed growth and environmental protection of the city's coastal MSCP canyon, mesa lands and waters. Please keep Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Hills, Carmel Valley, Pacific Highlands Ranch, Torrey Pines, University City, La Jolla Shores, La Jolla and Bird Rock in their traditional district.</p>
9/8/2021 16:42	Margaret Rattanachane	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>As an employee in District 6, I am here to advocate for the API community in District 6, an Asian-empowerment district that connects Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus.</p> <p>I am asking you to take seriously the decades of marginalization, underrepresentation, and rising violence against the AAPI community.</p>

9/8/2021 16:37	Nicole Muir	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Although the students of UCSD are a major population in La Jolla, our needs and wants from the community we live, learn, and grow in are not considered because of our status. Our voices in local government are stifled by the more pronounced voice of our rich, single homeowner neighbors, who don't have ill-intent in ignoring our pleas, but rather, see us as a transient population. With the current housing crisis impacting many students from UCSD as a result of covid rules and a limited housing market, it is clear that we are plagued by issues that need to be considered rather than placed on the backburner. Unfortunately, for the community leaders of district 1, affordable housing is far from being on their agenda for the community. If the UCSD student population continues to remain within district 1, it is clear that this housing issue, and many other issues students face, will not be addressed. That is why I believe that grouping UCSD with district 6 would give us students the strongest chance of finding our voice and achieving our own advocacy within our community.</p>
9/8/2021 16:36	Isabelle Kay	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Dear commissioners and staff, I am writing because I may not be able to attend today's meeting on September 8 in person. I have been a staff member at UC San Diego for 32 years and I live where I do on Gilman Drive precisely because I can walk or bike to work in 15 minutes or less. Many of my colleagues live equally close to the campus for the same reason. My job involves managing the Scripps coastal reserve, which is immediately west of campus on the bluffs and shoreline, and the Kendall-Frost Marsh Reserve in NE Mission Bay. I serve on the University city planning group because integrating the campus and the surrounding communities is vitally important to the health of the Mission Bay and Scripps watersheds and the coastal ocean. Currently, the university is working with the UCPG to solve road conditions that are hazardous for bicycles. In my opinion, it is vitally important for the University to remain in the same District as its neighbors, and that is the district that comprises University city and La Jolla.</p>
9/8/2021 16:29	Tony Huynh	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Tony Huynh. I am a resident of Mira Mesa. I am a member of QAPIMEDA. I am here to ensure that the AAPI community is represented in District 6. An Asian-empowerment district that connects Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus. It is more important than ever to provide full representation to our community.</p>

9/8/2021 15:55	Jolina Bui	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	I am a UCSD student concerned about the lack of accommodation for students lacking housing for the upcoming academic year.
9/8/2021 15:40	Chenyang Rickard	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Chenyang (Sunny) Rickard, I am the president of Alliance of Chinese Americans San Diego (ACA), API Community Member. I am here to urge the redistricting committee to preserve the AAPI community's representation in District 6. I urge the Redistricting Commission to adopt the Neighborhood Voices (NV) Map - an Asian-empowerment district that connects Kearny Mesa, Mira Mesa, Miramar, west through Carmel Valley and all of UTC and the UCSD campus. This district would reflect the breadth and diversity of our community, from the cultural hub in the Convoy District, through residential neighborhoods of all income levels and housing types, to the academic institution that brought so many of us to the region and continues to provide opportunity. AAPI community has become an integral part of San Diego community. The API community's contribution to San Diego's education, culture, art, history and economy is undeniable. It's overdue to have a district that truly represent AAPI community's interest.</p> <p>Chenyang (Sunny) Rickard</p>
9/8/2021 15:15	Siddhant Baldota	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	I support redrawing UCSD from district 1 to district 6 for high density housing
9/8/2021 15:11	Jade Coniglio	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I am a resident of the UC San Diego campus area in La Jolla, and I would like the redistricting commission to consider students and AAPI residents as primary communities of interest. Over half of nearly 32,000 undergraduate students enrolled at my university are permanent SoCal residents, many of which who live near/on campus or commute from within the San Diego region. One of the issues students are specifically facing right now is housing difficulties. This year, more students are at risk for becoming unsheltered during the academic year, due to the ongoing housing crisis (limited availability and lack of affordability of on campus and neighborhood living spaces). This is an issue where student voices must be considered a top priority in their respective districts, as the voices of local students (including those with children) are too often filtered out of local political conversations concerning their own neighborhoods. Therefore, UCSD campus and nearby student population centers should be removed from District 1 and united with District 6 to create STRONG STUDENT and AAPI representation within their own communities.</p>

9/8/2021 12:52	Lilly Cheng	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Good Evening Redistricting Commissioners,</p> <p>I urge the Redistricting Commission to adopt the Neighborhood Voices proposed redistricting map for District 6. It is critical to keep District 6 as an API Empowerment District that allows for API Voters and Representation by including UCSD and the adjacent neighborhoods that house its employees, students and faculty, we can increase AAPI representation in this district from 30% to over 40%! I support the Neighborhood Map because of its compactness and cohesiveness in keeping neighborhoods together. It is not only a good map but other benefits of the NV Map includes: 1) Uniting Rancho Penasquitos and Clairemont communities which will serve all communities in neighborhood representation. 2) This district would reflect the breadth and diversity of our community, from the cultural hub in the Convoy District, through residential neighborhoods of all income levels and housing types, to the academic institution that brought so many of us to the region and continues to provide opportunity.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Lilly Cheng</p>
9/8/2021 10:01	Ron Cho	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I'm Ron Cho, API Community Member, Member of the Mayor Gloria's API Advisory Group, Board Member of the City of San Diego Parks & Recs, and President of APAPA San Diego. Speaking as an API Community Member, I urge the Redistricting Commission to adopt the Neighborhood Voices (NV) proposed redistricting map for District 6. The NV Map not only preserves District 6 as an API Empowerment District but fortifies it to provide a greater voice for API Voters and Representation! The NV Map is cohesive, contiguous and compact in keeping neighborhoods together. Other benefits of the NV Map include uniting Rancho Penasquitos and Clairemont communities which will serve all communities in neighborhood representation.</p>

9/8/2021 9:23	Fiona Tang	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>My name is Fiona Tang, and I am a student who both lives and works at UCSD. I have been in La Jolla for one year now, and will continue to live in the area for the next couple of years.</p> <p>As a college student, I believe that it is crucial that students can participate in student-specific issues such as the current housing issues or lack of accessible transportation. Personally, I would like to see a future where the district and community leaders have the interests of the students and those who live on campus at heart. These are issues in which students' voices should be heard, and they should be given the representation to address these issues at hand.</p>
9/8/2021 8:55	Natasha Wong	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Hello, My name is Natasha Wong. I am a resident of San Diego and a board member of the Asian Pacific American Coalition. I support an Asian Empowerment District because I believe having Asian representation in our government. Thank you.</p>
9/7/2021 23:59	Samir Nomani	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I am Samir Nomani, I am a fourth year student leader at UCSD who will be living on-campus in the upcoming year. As a student Asian-American, representation in the affairs of state is very important to me. Thus, the redistricting commission should consider AAPI residents and students as communities of interest. Therefore, UCSD campus and nearby student population centers should be removed from District 1 and united with District 6 to create strong student and AAPI representation.</p>
9/7/2021 22:06	Dennis-Michael Broussard	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I want to see District 6 remain an Asian influenced community - however, I do not think taking UTC and UCSD from District 1 is the way to do that - I believe D6 should look south to Linda Vista and incorporate the growing Vietnamese community, as it is close to the Convoy area.</p>

9/3/2021 17:11	Christine Mailloux	9/8/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I live in District 1 and I am urging the Commission to keep the areas of District 1 that comprise the University City Planning Group together within District 1. I also urge the Commission to keep the core of District 1, including University City, UTC, La Jolla, and UCSD together in District 1. These areas have many common interests and have been part of the same community plan since 1959. By keeping these areas together through common local government representation, you will ensure a strong and vibrant local community which will benefit the entire San Diego region. These areas have evolved over time to become a strong community of interest. Residents live in South UC and La Jolla and work in UTC and at UCSD. Our UC Cluster schools serve families in south UC and UTC. Many University City families have students in schools in La Jolla and UTC. Transportation closely links these areas and these areas will all be impacted collectively by new development, the trolley and other changes. Our open space and canyons are connected and create natural boundaries. These areas should have a unified voice and opportunity to speak on issues that impact their entire area.</p>
9/1/2021 17:18	Michael Herndon	9/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I would like to express on behalf of myself and my neighbors our strong support for maintaining two council districts to serve the beach and adjacent areas. The diversity opinions and issues require separate voices at times in order to properly represent the constituencies.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Michael Herndon Board Member, PBTC</p>

9/1/2021 17:08	Jeff Heden	9/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Our District and the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board, not unlike other involved and forward-thinking districts and planning boards, have been proactively involved in the numerous processes needed to evaluate and improve the many new developer improvements and city-lead infrastructure projects impacting our neighbors, including potable water, sewerage and recycled water service.</p> <p>We have been able to do this over the years by performing our due diligence on these projects, getting knowledgeable on all aspects of the improvements and learning what project features and size, including density and rezoning, of each are in the best interest of our constituency. We are, and would like to continue to remain, a proven advocate for our beaches, canyons, preserves, open space, lagoons, parks and reasonable, planned development.</p> <p>I would never pretend to know what our neighbors to the south and east want or need, what inland trails they may want preserved what types of new development they can live with and whether they can tolerate unchecked and growing traffic and reduced public parking.</p> <p>We chose to live here in order to enjoy the many beautiful and family-oriented recreational opportunities. Our current district is working, and our planning boards are engaged and happy. Please</p>
9/1/2021 16:47	Larry Davidson	9/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I support the group, D1 United, that is seeking to keep District 1 boundaries in the current locations. As a resident of La Jolla, I believe that these boundaries were hard-won during the last cycle of redistricting and that they have worked well for the vast majority of residents in the District. The District encompasses an area that is geographically contiguous with diverse communities that have common natural boundaries (e.g., coastal zones and canyons), shared interests (e.g., commercial areas and transportation corridors, and requirements for environment protection of similar types (e.g., floodplains, shorelines, canyons, and wildlife).</p>

9/1/2021 15:54	Dyno	9/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>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.</p>
9/1/2021 15:50	Kristina Mananquil	9/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>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.</p>

9/1/2021 15:45	Helen M Boyden	9/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The entirety of CD1 is served by a growing transportation corridor including Rail Lines highways and other intercommunity resources.</p> <p>Such an area is best serve by having one Councilmember who is attentive to all these important issues.</p>
----------------	----------------	----------	---------------------	---	--

9/1/2021 14:17	Barbara & David Dunbar	9/1/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>Dear San Diego Redistricting Commission members,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
8/22/2021 11:12	Steve Rodriguez		Non-Agenda Comment		<p>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/</p>

8/19/2021 12:19	Chris Nielsen	8/19/2021	Non-Agenda Comment	<p>Dear Redistricting Commissioners,</p> <p>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:</p> <p>1. Keep the University Community Plan area together</p> <p>a. We have been a Community Plan area with the same boundaries for over 30 years.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>
-----------------	---------------	-----------	--------------------	--

8/19/2021 12:19	Chris Nielsen	8/19/2021	Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>2. Keep the University Community Plan area in District 1.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3. Keep District 1 the same if possible.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sincerely, Chris Nielsen UCPG Chair 50 Year University City Resident</p>
-----------------	---------------	-----------	-----------------------------------	--

8/18/2021 23:33	John William Stump	8/19/2021	Non-Agenda Comment	<p>RE: Non Agenda Written Testimony for Regular Meeting of August 19, 2021</p> <p>Community of Interests - Actual Residential Population v. Special Tourism Business Districts and Areas</p> <p>Dear Honorable Chairman Hebrank, Honorable Vicechair Malbourn, and Honorable Commissioners,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to participate at last night's Special Meeting. The meeting was well organized and professionally conducted.</p> <p>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".</p> <p>At last evening's 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 request.</p>
8/18/2021 23:33	John William Stump	8/19/2021	Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>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 Filipino 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 in District 7 and Kearney Mesa); the Japanese 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.</p>

8/18/2021 23:33	John William Stump	8/19/2021	Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>“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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; <p>Natural and man-made features, including streets, highways, canals, hills, etc.” ((REDISTRICTING FOR COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT: A Legal How-To Guide, ACLU NoCal, ACLU SoCal, CA Common Cause, 2021 page 8).</p>
8/18/2021 23:33	John William Stump	8/19/2021	Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>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.”</p> <p>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.</p>

8/18/2021 23:33	John William Stump	8/19/2021	Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>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.</p> <p>Similarly, Little Italy; Downtown's Chinese District; Little Saigon, Roseville, La Jolla's Duval enclave, 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.</p>
8/18/2021 23:33	John William Stump	8/19/2021	Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>All the best,</p> <p>/s/</p> <p>John Stump, resident, property owner, and taxpayer in current Districts Four and Nine</p>

8/18/2021 10:58	Allison Goldhammer	8/11/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>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.</p> <p>As an active member in my community I feel I speak for many of us when I say it is unrealistic to 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.</p>
8/17/2021 16:49	Lynn Haims	8/19/2021	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>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.</p>
8/17/2021 15:43	Carrie Munson	8/19/2021	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>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.</p> <p>President, Clairemont Town Council Foundation Vice President, Clairemont Town Council Director at large, Harborheights of Bay Ho Architectural Committee</p>

8/13/2021 18:46	John William Stump		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>RE: Initial Principals and Comments City Of San Diego Redistricting</p> <p>Dear Honorable Chairman Hebrank, Honorable Vicechair Malbourn, and Honorable Commissioners,</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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.</p>
-----------------	--------------------	--	--------------------	---

8/13/2021 18:46	John William Stump		Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>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.</p> <p>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/Swetzer, 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.</p>
8/13/2021 18:46	John William Stump		Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>All the best,</p> <p>/s/</p> <p>John Stump, resident, property owner, and taxpayer in current Districts Four and Nine</p>

8/11/2021 17:42	Bradley Liu	8/11/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
8/11/2021 17:29	Jade Coniglio	8/11/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>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?</p>
8/11/2021 17:04	Alexis Appel	8/11/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>I am a former student of UCSD, class of 2021.</p> <p>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.</p>

8/11/2021 17:03	Samir Nomani	8/11/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	<p>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.</p>
-----------------	--------------	-----------	---------------------	---	--

					<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep the University Community Plan area together <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Sincerely, Chris Nielsen</p>
8/11/2021 12:52	Chris Nielsen	8/11/2021	Agenda Item Comment	3	UCPG Chair
8/11/2021 12:26	Abigail Glatt		Non-Agenda Comment		<p>I am a former UCSD student who believes that our community aligns more with communities to the north and east of us; Mira Mesa, 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.</p>

8/9/2021 18:59	Ahmed Akhtar		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>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.</p>
7/30/2021 11:05	Joe Long		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>Dear San Diego City Redistricting Commissioners,</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 2011 total Vietnamese American voter registration roll is 13,701 * 2021 total Vietnamese American voter registration roll is 30,124 <p>-----</p> <p>-</p> <p>More than double within the past 10 year.</p> <p>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 & 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</p> <p>Thank you, Joe Long</p>

7/29/2021 16:03	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>By way of introduction, my name is Ralph Peters. I am the subcommittee Chair of the Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council redistricting subcommittee.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>
-----------------	-----------------------------	--	--------------------	--

7/29/2021 16:03	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>The survey will be open throughout the summer and updated results will be periodically provided to the San Diego Redistricting Commission.</p> <p>To summarize, the Community response was overwhelmingly in support of (1) reunifying Rancho Penasquitos, and (2) Rancho Penasquitos remaining in a PUSD-centric City Council district, with fellow Poway Unified communities such as Rancho Bernardo, Sabre Springs, and Carmel Mountain Ranch.</p> <p>The survey questionnaire itself is attached as Exhibit. A.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss in public session any questions the Commission may have regarding the above.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted for your consideration, Rancho Penasquitos Redistricting Subcommittee</p> <p>Sincerely, Kate Glenn, President Rancho Peñasquitos Town Council</p>
7/29/2021 16:03	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>EXHIBIT A 1. What 92129 Neighborhood do you live in? ANSWERS RESPONSES</p> <p>Park Village 53% Los Peñasquitos 8%</p> <p>Adobe Bluffs 8%</p> <p>Canyon View 7%</p> <p>Sundance 7%</p> <p>Rolling Hills 6% Torrey Highlands 5%</p> <p>Deer Canyon 3%</p> <p>Sunset Hills 3%</p> <p>Non-Resident 0% 2. How long have you lived in Rancho Penasquitos ANSWERS RESPONSES</p> <p>20-30 years 27%</p> <p>30-40 years 18%</p> <p>5-10 years 15% 1-5 years 15%</p> <p>10-15 years 12%</p> <p>15-20 years 10%</p> <p>40+ years 3% 3. Do you know what city council District you live in? ANSWERS RESPONSES</p> <p>Not Sure 36%</p> <p>District 6 35%</p> <p>District 5 29%</p>

7/29/2021 16:03	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	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%
7/29/2021 16:03	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	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%

7/29/2021 16:03	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	9, Would you want RP to be a part of a comprised Mira Mesa and Kearny Mesa District? Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree 195 84% 31 13% 5 2% 1 0% 1 0% 10. Would you prefer that the City Council district for RP join RP with other PUSD Communities? Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree 2 1% 6 3% 15 6% 44 19% 166 71%
-----------------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--

7/29/2021 16:03	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	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? Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Neutral Agree Strongly Agree 3 1% 4 2% 15 6% 52 22% 159 68% 12. Would you prefer RP be a part of a City Council district that includes Mira Mesa and Kearney Mesa? ANSWERS RESPONSES No 97% Undecided 2% Yes 0%
-----------------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	---

7/29/2021 16:03	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>13. Based on your selection above how do you rate your decision Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree</p> <p>52 22% 9 4% 7 3% 31 13% 133</p> <p>57% 14. Do you consider the RP Community to have more in common with Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch and Sabre Springs ANSWERS RESPONSES</p> <p>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? ANSWERS RESPONSES</p> <p>Yes 96% Undecided 2% No 2%</p>
7/29/2021 16:03	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Non-Agenda Comment (Continued)	<p>Would you like to help us elevate our 'Reunite RP' Campaign? ANSWERS RESPONSES</p> <p>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%</p>
7/28/2021 13:55	Klaus Mendenhall		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>When giving consideration to the up coming redistricting, should there be any consideration for adjusting District 2 boundaries, I believe the area currently included in district 2 should be made a part of the District reflecting the balance of the current Clairemont Boundaries in their District.</p>

7/14/2021 10:11	Pastor Dale W Huntington		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
6/10/2014 7:23	David Moty		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>Respectfully yours, David K. Moty Chair, Kensington Talmadge Planning Group</p>

6/4/2021 18:15	Brian Reschke		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>Subject: Rancho Penasquitos Planning Board Response to Rancho Penasquitos Town Council Redistricting Subcommittee's March 1, 2021 letter.</p> <p>Dear Redistricting Commissioners,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sincerely yours,</p> <p>Brian Reschke, Chair Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board CC: District 6 ChrisCate@sandiego.gov</p>
----------------	---------------	--	--------------------	---

6/2/2021 19:44	Pat Sexton		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Again, thank you for the presentation and I look forward to a return attendance and update.</p> <p>Pat</p>
6/2/2021 15:26	Howard Wayne		Non-Agenda Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

3/31/2021 18:01	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Written materials mailed.	<p>Dear City of San Diego Redistricting Commissions,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>San Diego Redistricting Commissioners,</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">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
-----------------	-----------------------------	--	---------------------------	---

3/31/2021 18:01	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Written materials mailed (Continued)	<p>3. (“PUSD”) and the diverse ethnic and cultural attractions of the constituent PUSD communities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>6. Many ‘RP” Boy and Girl Scout Troops have members from BMR, CMR, SR, TH, and/or RB.</p> <p>7. Income levels in ‘RP” are within a hairsbreadth of the other PUSD communities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>9. Our crime statistics are similar – far less than Mira Mesa.</p> <p>10. Most ‘RP”-ers do their shopping locally or in CMR, not Mira Mesa.</p> <p>11. Many of us worship in RB.</p> <p>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”.</p>
-----------------	-----------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	---

3/31/2021 18:01	Kate Glenn and Ralph Peters		Written materials mailed (Continued)	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Yours,</p> <p>Ralph Peters Ralph Peters, Chair, RP Town Council Redistrict Committee Email: rptcredistrict21@gmail.com</p> <p>Kate Glenn Kate Glenn, President, RP Town Council</p> <p>cc: RPTC Redistricting Committee Secretary</p>
3/18/2021 8:53	Diana Martini	3/18/2021	Agenda Item Comment	7 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!