

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

DATE: October 25, 2011

TO: 2020 Redistricting Commission

FROM: 2010 Redistricting Commission

SUBJECT: Recommendations for 2020 Redistricting Commission

INTRODUCTION

In 1992, voters amended the San Diego City Charter to create an independent Redistricting Commission, which would be vested with sole and exclusive authority to adopt a plan that specifies the boundaries of districts for the San Diego City Council in compliance with the law.

The 2010 Redistricting Commission of the City of San Diego (Redistricting Commission or Commission) has been meeting since October 2010 and recently adopted a plan that specifies new boundaries for the City Council districts. The Commission's task was more complex this year because it was also required to add a new Ninth Council District, as directed by City voters in a Charter amendment enacted in 2010. The boundaries set by the Commission will remain in effect until the next redistricting authorized by the San Diego City Charter.

The Commission adopted its Preliminary Redistricting Plan on July 21, 2011, and its Filing Statement and Final Redistricting Plan (Final Plan) on August 25, 2011. Both plans and additional supporting documents are attached to this memorandum. The Final Plan contains a detailed summary of the Commission's meetings, testimony, public outreach efforts, and the law and principles it used to prepare the plan. The Commission's website contains archives of documents and resources, including proposed maps, legal training presentations, meeting agendas, minutes, and transcripts. The website can be accessed at <http://www.sandiego.gov/redistricting>.

Although the Final Plan contains extremely detailed information regarding the 2010 Redistricting Commission, the Commission wished to prepare this memorandum to provide additional information for consideration by the next panel. The information included in this memorandum compiles comments from individual Commissioners and may or may not represent the views of the Commission as a whole.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2020 COMMISSION

At its final meeting on October 25, 2011, the Commission met to discuss the proposed recommendations below:

I. INITIAL TASKS

1. Subcommittees and Early Planning

In addition to selecting a Chair, the Commission should consider establishing subcommittees to analyze the following:

- *Budget* – to work with Commission staff to develop a budget for approval by the Appointing Authority
- *Bylaws* – to review the 2010 Commission bylaws and propose adopting and/or revising them
- *Hiring* – to oversee the hiring process for the Chief of Staff and Executive Secretary
- *Legal* – to work with the City Attorney's Office to contract for outside, specialized Voting Rights Act counsel to support the City Attorney
- *Mapping Consultant* – to oversee the Request for Proposals process for contracting of a mapping consultant and obtaining redistricting software
- *Outreach* – to create a basic outreach plan and oversee the hiring of a public outreach consultant
- *Timeline* – to draft the initial Commission timeline

The Commission should consider selecting different Commissioners to chair each subcommittee. The Commission might suggest that each subcommittee return with a work plan listing responsibilities and deadlines, and complete as many of those duties as possible early in the process, especially if the Chief of Staff has not yet been hired.

The Commission suggests that regular meetings be held at least twice a month, particularly as start-up tasks are being completed, to keep Commission business moving forward. The Commission suggests that the future Commission reach out to prior Commissioners and staff, if they are available and in accordance with Commission bylaws and the Brown Act, as they can serve as a resource.

One of the Commissioners had a background in City planning and served as a resource as the Commission dealt with technical aspects of the City's geography. The Commission suggests that the City Planning & Community Investment Department assign a staff member to attend Commission meetings as a similar resource.

2. Budget

The 2010 Commission budget is attached to this memorandum. The Commission suggests that the budget be prepared as early as possible, and that the Commission proactively

identify priorities and establish a reserve amount for unanticipated costs. The Commission suggests that funding be allocated so funds can easily be carried over across fiscal years.

The Commission also suggests that the line item for translation services be increased so that simultaneous interpretation services can be provided for more Commission meetings and public hearings.

3. Bylaws

The Commission Bylaws are attached to this memorandum. The Commission suggests that the next Commission begin with this document and consider whether revisions are needed. The Commission suggests that the next panel retain Article 5, Section 6 of the 2010 Commission Bylaws governing comments between Commissioners and the public, press, and government officials.

In order to maximize public access, minimize outside communications, and provide transparency, the Commission suggests that future Commissions continue to collect and publish communication logs identifying any communications that occur outside of Brown Act-noticed meetings.

4. Timeline and Registrar of Voters Deadlines

The Commission's timeline is attached to this memorandum. The Commission suggests that future Commissions take into account City Charter section 5.1, where it specifies a 30-day period during which the Final Plan is subject to the right of referendum, and consider that timeline along with the deadline set by the San Diego County Registrar of Voters. This year, the Commission committed to complete its Final Plan one month before the Registrar's deadline, to allow the 30-day referendary period to run before that deadline.

The Commission suggests consulting with the Registrar of Voters early and often to determine whether redistricting data may be requested prior to deadlines specified in the City Charter. While the City Charter states that the City shall be redistricted no later than nine months following the receipt of the final Federal Decennial Census information, this year the Registrar requested final redistricting data several months early because of a potential change to the election calendar.

II. CENSUS DATA

The U.S. Census Bureau releases population tabulations no later than April 1 of the year following the year in which the decennial Census is taken, but does not specify an exact release date for each state. This year, the Commission received 2010 Census data in early March 2011. The Commission suggests that future Commission staff identify a Census Bureau contact or other local government liaison familiar with Census data, particularly if the mapping consultant has not yet been hired, so that the Commission can adjust its timeline if needed.

III. MEETINGS, TESTIMONY AND PUBLIC OUTREACH

1. Online Mapping Tool

The Commission provided an online mapping tool as a free resource to the public. The program became a central location where all maps submitted to the Commission and developed by the Commission could be accessed. The Commission suggests that future Commissions continue to provide free access to an online mapping tool and provide training sessions open to the public.

2. Public Hearings

The Commission held far more meetings than the number required by the City Charter and suggests that future Commissions do the same, to ensure access to the proceedings and a full opportunity for people to be heard. The Commission encourages the next panel to hold at least one hearing in each City Council District and one hearing on a Saturday.

The Commission suggests that future Commissions continue to hold meetings in City facilities, such as libraries, Balboa Park meeting rooms, and recreation centers appropriate for public hearings, in order to minimize meeting costs. The Commission did not have to pay to use City facilities.

3. Public Outreach

The Commission and Commission staff benefitted from hiring a public outreach team to assist the Outreach Subcommittee and staff to maximize access to Commission proceedings, particularly for traditionally underserved communities. The Commission suggests that future Commissions continue to engage local professional services or otherwise dedicate a Commission staff person to work on communications and public outreach.

The Chief of Staff made presentations to meetings of approximately 40 neighborhood groups, community planning groups, town councils, and stakeholder committees across the city. The majority of these presentations were made early, prior to pre-map public hearings, in order to encourage early public participation in the redistricting process. The Commission suggests that future Commissions encourage the Chief of Staff and/or an outreach team to continue this type and scale of outreach to the community.

IV. CITY STAFF

The Commission benefitted greatly from using City staff and resources to reduce outside personnel costs. The Commission suggests that future panels continue to use existing City resources to the extent possible to save funds. (For example, the next Commission can also use available City space and furniture for the Commission office.)

The Commission suggests that the City identify a staff liaison in the Business Office or other department who would be fully dedicated to the Commission until the Chief of Staff is

hired, and available on a part-time basis thereafter to assist the Commission and Chief of Staff with administrative and procedural matters.

The Commission recognizes that many City staff took on Commission work in addition to their full workloads, most often without additional compensation. However, discussions of this allocation of City staff and resources occurred prior to the hiring of the Commission's Chief of Staff. The Commission suggests that such discussions occur at the City even earlier in the process, and that expectations regarding City staff time and services be more explicitly set and agreed to at the outset by both the affected department and the Commission. This should be addressed particularly for the following departments: the City Attorney's Office, CityTV, Communications and Purchasing & Contracting.

The Commission suggests that City departments continue to track costs associated with their work completed for the Commission, even if the Commission will not be formally billed, so that an accurate report of all costs can be publicly provided.

V. HIRING AND CONTRACTING

The Commission, Commission staff, and Purchasing and Contracting staff worked under extremely constrained timelines to procure professional services needed to complete the Commission's work. The Commission suggests that the City assign a dedicated staff person from the Purchasing and Contracting Department to the Commission to assist until all procurements are complete, and ensure the staff person does not have to take on Commission work in addition to a full workload. The Commission also suggests that Purchasing and Contracting present the full range of contracting options to the Commission and its sub-committees involved in hiring and contracting, to ensure the parties understand the full range of City procurement options, timelines, and limitations.

For the mapping consultant, the Commission suggests beginning the contracting process as early as possible, recognizing that redistricting is a specialized area, that there are a limited number of professional firms providing this service, and that other jurisdictions undergoing redistricting at the same time will be chasing the same resources.

VI. COMMISSION STAFF

The Commission began meeting in October 2010, but the Chief of Staff began work in February 2011. The Commission suggests beginning the hiring process as soon as possible so the Chief of Staff can more fully participate in Commission start-up tasks, including budget development, the timeline, and discussions regarding City department and staff time.

The position announcement for the Chief of Staff is attached to this memorandum. The Commission took care to avoid hiring any individual too closely tied to local political parties, political officials or organizations. The Commission recommends that the next panel do the same and suggests hiring an individual with knowledge and experience with municipal rules, regulations and procurement procedures.

VII. VOTING RIGHTS ACT COUNSEL

The City Attorney's Office provided legal support to the Commission under San Diego City Charter section 40. The City Attorney's Office assigned a deputy to the Commission, who provided legal guidance throughout the process, conducted numerous training sessions on all aspects of redistricting law for the Commission and the public, and who served as a daily resource to the Commission and staff. The Commission suggests that future Commission continue to work with the City Attorney's Office in this regard.

This year, the City Attorney's Office also contracted with a Voting Rights Act specialist from the Nielsen Merksamer law firm, who provided review of the Commission's preliminary and final plans, was available to consult with the City Attorney's Office, and gave a Voting Rights Act presentation to the Commission and the public. The Commission suggests that future Commissions retain outside counsel for the limited purpose of providing Voting Rights Act guidance, as this is a highly specialized area of law. The Commission suggests that such counsel be from out of town, with as little connection to San Diego as possible, in order to ensure there is no bias or legal conflicts.

VIII. GENERAL COMMENTS

The Commission suggests that the next Appointing Authority consider composing the Commission of members who live in different Council districts, who will know different areas of the City.

The Commission also suggests that an Executive Secretary position be added or otherwise submitted for approval by the City's Civil Service Commission or City Council, so the next Commission has a full range of hiring options available.

IX. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Commission would like to recognize the following firms, departments, facilities, and staff for their assistance during the 2010 redistricting process.

Consultants Assisting the Commission

A Star Staffing
ESRI
Humanability, Inc.
National Demographics Corporation
Nielsen Merksamer Parrinello Gross & Leoni LLP
SanGIS
Translation Solutions

Departments of the City of San Diego

Business Office
City Attorney's Office
City Clerk's Office
City Planning & Community Investment
CityTV
Communications
Financial Management

IT & IT Web Team
Library
Park and Recreation
Police
Print Shop
Purchasing and Contracting
Real Estate Assets

Facilities Used for Meetings

Balboa Park Club
Bayside Community Center
Forum Hall at Westfield UTC
Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation
Joan B. Kroc Center
La Jolla Woman's Club
Logan Heights Branch Library
Metro Operations Center

Otay Mesa-Nestor Branch Library
Point Loma/Hervey Branch Library
Regional Transportation Center
San Diego Concourse
Qualcomm Headquarters
Tierrasanta Recreation Center
Thurgood Marshall Middle School
Valencia Park/Malcolm X Branch Library

The Commission wishes to acknowledge the Year 2000 Redistricting Commission for its final report, which served as a resource to 2010 Commissioners and staff.

The Commission also would like to thank the many members of the public for their participation and input throughout the redistricting process.

Attachments:

1. Final Redistricting Plan (adopted August 25, 2011)
2. Preliminary Redistricting Plan (adopted July 21, 2011)
3. Redistricting Charter (San Diego City Charter)
4. Commissioner and Staff Biographies
5. Commission Bylaws
6. Commission Budget
7. Commission Timeline
8. Position Announcement - Chief of Staff
9. Public Participation Plan

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

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
11 AUG 26 AM 11:06
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

DATE: August 25, 2011
TO: City Clerk
FROM: 2010 Redistricting Commission
SUBJECT: Filing Statement and Final Redistricting Plan for the City of San Diego

INTRODUCTION

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

The seven-member Redistricting Commission voted 5-2 to adopt a Preliminary Redistricting Plan (the Preliminary Plan) on July 21, 2011. The Redistricting Commission then held five Post-Map hearings in various neighborhoods and four hearings downtown. The nine hearings were attended by 1,536 people, including 460 people who gave public testimony and 173 people who provided written comments. After many hours of deliberation regarding numerous neighborhoods and potential changes to the map, the Redistricting Commission ultimately made one change to the Preliminary Plan. The Redistricting Commission moved a portion of Linda Vista from District 6 to District 7 so the neighborhood would not be split among three Council districts. This revised map became the proposed Final Redistricting Plan (the Final Plan).

On August 25, 2011, the Redistricting Commission voted 7-0 to adopt the Final Plan, which includes this Filing Statement. The Final Plan complies with the redistricting criteria and legal requirements of San Diego City Charter sections 5 and 5.1; the U.S. Constitution; the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965; and related cases and statutes. The Redistricting Commission considered and relied upon traditional redistricting criteria in drawing and adopting new City Council district boundaries. The Redistricting Commission also added a 9th Council District, as directed by the voters of the City of San Diego in a Charter amendment enacted in 2010.

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

- Equalize the population by forming City Council districts designated by numbers 1 to 9, inclusive, which contain, as nearly as practicable, one-ninth of the total population of the City of San Diego as shown by the federal Census numbers of 2010;

- Avoid diluting the voting strength of protected classes as set forth in the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965;
- Provide fair and effective representation for all citizens of the City, including racial, ethnic, and language minorities, and be in conformance with the requirements of the U.S. Constitution and Federal statutes;
- Use contiguous territory to form districts, with reasonable access between population centers in the district;
- Use whole Census tracts or blocks to the extent it is practical to do so;
- Preserve identifiable communities of interest;
- Observe natural boundaries as district dividing lines;
- Draw districts as geographically compact as possible and practical to do so;
- Not draw districts for the purpose of advantaging or protecting incumbents;
- Recognize that the City has a well-organized group of communities and neighborhoods, which has created strong communities of interest; and thus, ensure that each community planning area and neighborhood is intact in a single district to the extent possible, while adhering to the law and applying and balancing traditional redistricting principles.

Meetings and testimony: The Redistricting Commission convened a total of 45 public hearings, each noticed in accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act.

The Redistricting Commission held 35 public meetings from October 21, 2010 through July 21, 2011, when it adopted the Preliminary Plan. These meetings included two Introductory Hearings in the community, and nine widely publicized Pre-Map Public Hearings, one in each City Council district and one held in Balboa Park, exceeding the requirement of the San Diego City Charter to hold at least four public hearings in various geographic areas of the City before the preparation of a Preliminary Plan. Approximately 850 people attended these hearings. During those hearings, the Redistricting Commission heard from more than 380 public speakers and received approximately 61 written comments (in addition to emailed comments, discussed below). During its regular meetings held after October 21, 2010 and before the Preliminary Plan was enacted, the Commission also heard from approximately 300 speakers and received 38 written comments.

As set forth above, after the Redistricting Commission adopted the Preliminary Plan on July 21, 2011, it held five Post-Map hearings in the community and four hearings downtown. The nine Post-Map hearings were attended by 1,536 people, including 460 people who gave public testimony and 173 people who provided written comments. The number of Post-Map hearings exceeded the Charter's requirement of three. The Final Plan was submitted to a vote at the final hearing on August 25, 2011.

Through the process, the Redistricting Commission received approximately 3,096 emails, 223 telephone comments, and 9,231 signatures on petitions. The Commission also received more than two dozen proposed maps from individuals and organizations. Many groups and individuals used the Commission's online redistricting mapping program to create and post maps. Maps also

were submitted to the Commission for posting on its website and online mapping program. The testimony, written submissions, telephone comments and maps were considered by the Commission before adopting the Final Plan.

Public outreach: Public outreach efforts included providing simultaneous interpretation in Spanish at the April 20, 2011 and April 30, 2011 Pre-Map Public Hearings and at the July 26, 2011 and July 30, 2011 Post-Map Public Hearings. Language assistance in Spanish was provided at the May 2, 2011 Pre-Map Public Hearing. Agendas, presentation materials, request to speak forms, written comment forms, and instructions on how to provide comment were provided in Spanish at the April 20, 2011, April 30, 2011, and May 2, 2011 Pre-Map Public Hearings. These materials also were provided in Vietnamese, Tagalog and Spanish at the May 9, 2011 Pre-Map Public Hearing. The Preliminary Plan filing statement was translated into Spanish and made available at Redistricting Commission meetings. The dedicated telephone comment line at the Commission office included English and Spanish options. A Commission staff member bilingual in Spanish provided language assistance to telephone callers, and translated public testimony at various Commission meetings. Since February, Commission Chief of Staff Midori Wong has made more than 40 presentations to town councils, community groups and stakeholder organizations. The Commission's legal counsel, Deputy City Attorney Sharon Spivak, gave legal presentations regarding redistricting law to the Commission and public throughout the process. Outside counsel gave a public presentation regarding the federal Voting Rights Act.

The Redistricting Commission has been committed to transparency in its proceedings. To maximize public access to its proceedings, the Commission procured online redistricting mapping software so the public could draw, share, propose and submit maps to the Commission. Public training for the software was held on June 23, 2011. Maps submitted to the Commission and developed by the Commission for consideration were made available online. In addition, many Commission meetings were televised and videotapes of Commission meetings were posted to its website. The Commission's meetings were covered by a wide range of San Diego media, which also publicized upcoming hearings and disseminated information about the Preliminary Plan after its adoption.

THE FINAL PLAN

A map of the Final Plan (adopted August 25, 2011) is attached. The Final Plan divides the City's population of 1,301,617 into nine City Council districts of approximately equal population. The Commission's goal was to draw districts with as close to a population of 144,624 as possible, while ensuring districts were drawn in compliance with redistricting law and the principles set forth above. The Final Plan has a total population deviation of 4.59%. The largest City Council district has a population of 147,375 (+1.90% in population); the smallest district has a population of 140,738 (-2.69% in population). Demographics for the districts, including Citizen Voting Age Population and population by racial groups per district, are detailed in attachments to this statement.

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

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

DISTRICT 1

- Community Planning Areas
 - Carmel Valley
 - Del Mar Mesa
 - Fairbanks Ranch Country Club
 - La Jolla
 - Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—area west of Carson's Crossing bridge)
 - NCFUA Subarea II
 - Pacific Highlands Ranch
 - Torrey Hills
 - Torrey Pines
 - University
 - Via de la Valle
- Neighborhoods
 - Carmel Valley
 - Del Mar Heights
 - La Jolla (partial—area in La Jolla Community Planning Area)
 - La Jolla Village
 - North City
 - Pacific Beach (partial—area in La Jolla Community Planning Area)
 - Sorrento Valley (partial—area in University Community Planning Area)
 - Torrey Pines
 - Torrey Preserve
 - University City

- Demographics

- Total population: 147,375
- Deviation: +1.90% (+2,751 people)
- Historical: Approximately 96% of the population to be included in the new District 1 is presently included in City Council District 1.

- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Carmel Valley and La Jolla are connected by Interstate 5. Del Mar Heights Road and State Route 56 also connect communities. La Jolla and University City are connected by La Jolla Village Drive and Nobel Drive.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

- The Commission intended to keep coast and canyon communities together because they share common interests and concerns.
- The Commission agreed that the University of California - San Diego (UCSD) is a community of interest that is connected to the communities of University City and La Jolla, and all three should be kept together in one district. University City's close relationship to UCSD is further highlighted by the housing it provides for UCSD students and employees, and the services and business environment it provides to complement the university.
- The Commission did not wish to split North and South University City, in keeping with the principle that neighborhoods and community planning areas should be kept intact.
- The Commission agreed that the many high-tech businesses in this area should be kept in one district.
- The Commission wished to keep the La Jolla Community Planning Area intact in one district.
- The Commission determined that Carmel Valley is connected to and shares similarities with the western portions of District 1 and other coastal and coastal-influenced communities.
- The Commission determined that Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Hills, Via de la Valle and Fairbanks Ranch Country Club planning areas needed to be kept together in one Council district.
- Natural boundaries used include Interstate 805 and State Route 52. A portion of land east of Interstate 805 with a population of two people was included to keep the University Community Planning Area intact. This area, bounded by Interstate 805 on the west; the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad that passes through Soledad Canyon on the north and east; and MCAS Miramar on the east, is also included in District 1 because: (1) the area is joined to University City by Miramar Road, Eastgate Mall, and Nobel Drive; and (2) the area is separated from Mira Mesa by the railroad in Soledad Canyon. There are no bridges spanning the canyon and railroad that would connect the area to Mira Mesa. The area includes open space, the North City Water Reclamation Plant, and industrial uses such as

warehouses, distribution centers, storage facilities, and automotive-related commercial uses.

- Larger deviation was acceptable for this district in order to make the district cohesive and keep communities together.
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing other criteria and community of interest boundaries.

DISTRICT 2

- Community Planning Areas
 - Clairemont Mesa (partial—area west of Tecolote Canyon)
 - Linda Vista (partial—the Morena neighborhood and University of San Diego (USD))
 - Midway-Pacific Highway
 - Mission Bay Park
 - Mission Beach
 - Ocean Beach
 - Pacific Beach
 - Peninsula
- Neighborhoods
 - Bay Ho
 - Bay Park
 - La Jolla (partial—area in Pacific Beach Community Planning Area)
 - La Playa
 - Loma Portal
 - Midway
 - Mission Beach
 - Morena (including all of USD)
 - Ocean Beach
 - Pacific Beach (partial—area in Pacific Beach Community Planning Area)
 - Point Loma Heights
 - Roseville/Fleet Ridge
 - Sunset Cliffs
 - Wooded Area
- Demographics
 - Total population: 142,711
 - Deviation: -1.32% (-1,913 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 75.1% of the population to be included in the new District 2 is presently included in City Council District 2.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Pacific Beach, Mission Beach, Ocean Beach, Point

Loma and San Diego International Airport are accessible by Interstate 5. Midway Drive, Ingraham Street and Nimitz Boulevard are major connecting streets. Mission Bay Drive and Mission Bay Boulevard connect Mission Beach to Pacific Beach. The Pacific Beach area is connected to Interstate 5 by Grand Avenue and Garnet Avenue. Garnet Avenue and Balboa Avenue connect Pacific Beach to Bay Ho and Bay Park.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

- This district reflects an intent by the Commission to bring together the beach communities of Ocean Beach, Mission Beach and Pacific Beach, as well as the peninsula of Point Loma, into one district.
- The Commission determined that these areas share common issues including concern for their beaches and bays, tourism in the area, and environmental issues, including issues of traffic, noise and pollution impacts from San Diego International Airport/Lindbergh Field, which is also included in the district.
- The Commission determined that Downtown should be removed from this district, as it does not share common interests with these coastal areas, including concerns related to the impact of beaches on the district's neighborhoods.
- Although they are part of the Clairemont and Linda Vista community planning areas, the Commission determined that Bay Ho, Bay Park, and Morena should be included in the district, in recognition of the importance of Mission Bay to neighborhood residents and their proximity, recreational opportunities, and views related to the bay.
- The Commission determined that Loma Portal and Point Loma should be kept together because both are part of the Peninsula Community Planning Area, they are contiguous, and they share common concerns about the impact of the airport on their communities.
- The Commission determined that USD is a community of interest that needs to be kept as intact as possible. One Census block within it was determined to be too large and thus was split in order to unite the USD campus.
- The Commission included the Pacific Highway Corridor in District 2 because of its inclusion in the Midway-Pacific Highway Corridor Community Planning Area, its connectivity to adjacent areas in District 2, and its physical isolation from the communities in District 3. Interstate 5, elevated on fill, creates a fortress-like wall separating the Pacific Highway Corridor from the communities to its east. This area also has historically been used for industrial purposes, but is now being used for many airport-related commercial activities, including parking and car rental agencies that serve the airport in this district. Portions of the Pacific Highway Corridor, along with the majority of District 2, are located in the Coastal Zone established by the California Coastal Act.
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

DISTRICT 3

- Community Planning Areas
 - Balboa Park
 - Centre City
 - Greater Golden Hill
 - Greater North Park
 - Normal Heights
 - Old Town San Diego
 - Uptown
- Neighborhoods
 - Adams North
 - Balboa Park
 - Bankers Hill
 - Burlingame
 - Core-Columbia
 - Cortez Hill
 - East Village
 - Gaslamp Quarter
 - Golden Hill
 - Harborview
 - Hillcrest
 - Horton Plaza
 - Little Italy
 - Marina
 - Midtown
 - Mission Hills
 - Normal Heights
 - North Park
 - Old Town
 - Park West
 - South Park
 - University Heights
- Demographics
 - Total population: 147,117
 - Deviation: +1.72% (+2,493 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 57.5% of the population to be included in the new District 3 is presently included in City Council District 3.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Old Town, Mission Hills, Park West, Bankers Hill, Balboa Park, and Golden Hill are accessible by Interstate 5. University Heights,

Hillcrest, Balboa Park and Downtown are accessible by State Route 163 (Cabrillo Freeway). Hillcrest is connected to University Heights by University Avenue. University Heights and Normal Heights are connected by Adams Avenue and Interstate 805. The North Park and Normal Heights areas are connected to the South Park and Golden Hill areas by Interstate 805 and Interstate 15. Broadway and B Street connect the Downtown area to San Diego City College and Golden Hill.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

- The Commission determined that Balboa Park is a major common interest of many of the neighborhoods in this district.
- The Commission wished to unite the older, urban communities of character surrounding Balboa Park, including Hillcrest, Downtown, North Park, South Park, and Golden Hill.
- The Commission wished to move the district to the west, to fully include Mission Hills and Old Town, which are closely tied together and share common interests such as Presidio Park and historic preservation, as well as interests with the other neighborhoods in the district. Moving the district to the west resulted in excluding the Kensington-Talmadge area, but also prevented fragmentation of the City's Latino and new-immigrant population located in the City Heights area (see discussion of new District 9 below.)
- The Commission removed portions of City Heights from District 3 as City Heights does not generally share demographic and socioeconomic interests similar to the other neighborhoods in this district, and to allow City Heights to be united into a single new district, District 9.
- The Commission found the LGBT (Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender) Community to be a community of interest with a large population residing south of Interstate 8 in communities with similar housing of a certain age, which should be included in a single district to the extent possible within the boundaries of this Council district. The Commission considered that the LGBT community of interest has historically been represented by Council District 3 and wished to draw a district that respects this history and provides fair representation for the community.
- Testimony from the LGBT community supported including Downtown within this district, in contrast to residents of District 2's coastal areas who asked that Downtown be removed from their Council district.
- The Commission found that Mission Hills, Bankers Hill, Old Town, and Little Italy share common interests with other neighborhoods in the proposed district, after hearing public testimony indicating their common interests.
- The Commission wished to unite Mission Hills and Hillcrest in a single district, as both are part of the Uptown Community Planning Area.
- Golden Hill was united with District 3 based upon its proximity and connection to Balboa Park and to achieve population equality consistent with constitutional requirements.

- Downtown neighborhoods were found to share a community of interest, which was a compelling reason to unite them all. The addition of Little Italy added a slightly higher deviation for the district, but its inclusion with the rest of downtown was a compelling reason to include it with District 3 (as opposed to District 2).
- The Commission also wished to keep Downtown in a single district to better support the tourist and convention business based there.
- A small portion of land within Downtown's East Village Business Improvement District was kept in District 8 after a number of people testified that it is part of the Barrio Logan neighborhood, and its future development would have an environmental and health impact on an adjacent school within the Barrio Logan neighborhood.
- Natural boundaries for this district include Interstate 805, Interstate 8 and State Route 94 (Martin Luther King, Jr. Freeway)
- Although located primarily in the Mission Valley Community Planning Area, a block located west of Interstate 15 was added to District 3 in order to include residential units at the end of Cromwell Court.
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

DISTRICT 4

- Community Planning Areas
 - Eastern Area (partial—neighborhoods of Oak Park, Redwood Village, Rolando Park, and Webster)
 - Encanto Neighborhoods
 - Skyline-Paradise Hills
 - Southeastern San Diego (partial—area east of Boundary Road between Imperial Avenue and Logan Avenue)
- Neighborhoods
 - Alta Vista
 - Bay Terraces
 - Broadway Heights
 - Chollas View
 - Emerald Hills
 - Encanto
 - Jamacha
 - Lincoln Park
 - Lomita
 - Mountain View (partial—area east of Boundary Road between Imperial Avenue and Logan Avenue)
 - Oak Park

- Paradise Hills
 - Redwood Village
 - Rolando Park
 - Skyline
 - Valencia Park
 - Webster
- Demographics
 - Total population: 142,727
 - Deviation: -1.31% (-1,897 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 92.7% of the population to be included in the new District 4 is presently included in City Council District 4.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Rolando Park, Redwood Village, Broadway Heights, Emerald Hills, and Webster are connected by State Route 94 (Martin Luther King, Jr. Freeway). North Encanto and Emerald Hills are connected by Akins Avenue. State Route 54 (South Bay Freeway) connects Bay Terraces and Paradise Hills in the southern portion of District 4.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - The Commission largely respected the current boundaries of District 4, consistent with public testimony that the district be kept as close as possible to its present boundaries, while recognizing that it needed to lose population consistent with creating a new 9th Council District.
 - The Commission recognized that District 4 has a large, geographically compact African-American population and that it has historically been an African-American influence district. The Commission wished to draw a district that respected that history. The district also has a well-established community of interest surrounding its churches, schools, and neighborhoods. District 4's population will be 19.8% African-American, 41.5% Hispanic, and 23.9% Asian.
 - The Commission determined that the Webster and Oak Park communities should be included in District 4, consistent with public testimony regarding the interests of those communities.
 - To reduce the deviation and balance population numbers for the district, a portion of Mountain View was removed from District 4, also consistent with public testimony.
 - The Commission considered testimony regarding whether to include the communities of Redwood Village and Rolando Park in this district, instead of in a district that included San Diego State University. The Commission considered the population of Redwood Village and Rolando Park and determined that the neighborhoods should be kept whole and not divided between Council districts. The Commission included the areas in District 4 because of their contiguity and

compactness in this district, and to achieve population equality consistent with constitutional requirements.

- Natural boundaries for the district include the City's boundaries, Interstate 805, and State Route 94 (Martin Luther King, Jr. Freeway).
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria. (Note: There is a small portion of land adjacent to the district that is not part of the City of San Diego, but that is the site of a cemetery.)

DISTRICT 5

- Community Planning Areas
 - Black Mountain Ranch
 - Carmel Mountain Ranch
 - Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—area east of the San Diego Aqueduct)
 - Miramar Ranch North
 - Rancho Bernardo
 - Rancho Encantada
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area north of State Route 56 and east of the San Diego Aqueduct)
 - Sabre Springs
 - San Pasqual
 - Scripps Miramar Ranch
 - Torrey Highlands (partial—all but unpopulated Rhodes Crossing area)
- Neighborhoods
 - Black Mountain Ranch
 - Carmel Mountain Ranch
 - Miramar Ranch North
 - Rancho Bernardo
 - Rancho Encantada
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area north of State Route 56 and east of the San Diego Aqueduct)
 - Sabre Springs
 - San Pasqual
 - Scripps Miramar Ranch
 - Torrey Highlands (partial—all but unpopulated Rhodes Crossing area)
- Demographics
 - Total population: 143,961
 - Deviation: -0.46% (-663 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 65.3% of the population to be included in the new District 5 is presently included in City Council District 5.

- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Rancho Peñasquitos, Sabre Springs, and Scripps Ranch are connected north and south by Interstate 15. The Ted Williams Freeway (State Route 56) connects Torrey Highlands, Rancho Peñasquitos, Sabre Springs, and Carmel Mountain Ranch east and west.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

- The Commission determined that the neighborhoods in this district share similar socioeconomic factors.
- In accordance with public testimony, a group of neighborhoods was kept together based upon the community of interest formed by their inclusion in the Poway Unified School District, with the exception of Rancho Peñasquitos, which was split to balance population and achieve deviation in compliance with the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution. Therefore, a portion of this North City community was included in a district to its south. A natural dividing line for the split is State Route 56 and the San Diego Aqueduct. Portions of District 5 are within the San Diego Unified School District.
- The western boundary of District 5 was drawn in part to respect the desire of those who testified from District 1 that they wanted to keep coastal communities together. This decision kept Torrey Highlands in District 5, in part to achieve population equality consistent with constitutional requirements.
- The Commission determined that a number of the neighborhoods included in District 5 are affected by the threat of wildfires and share a common interest in that regard. Not all such neighborhoods could be included in District 5, however, because fire is an issue to more communities than can be included in one district, making it difficult to create a “fire district” that is sufficiently compact.
- The Commission determined that Rancho Encantada should be united with Scripps Miramar Ranch and Miramar Ranch North into one Council district. Rancho Encantada (now Stonebridge Estates) previously had been included in District 7, but was isolated from the rest of the population in that district and had a large geographic separation from it. The closest population center to Rancho Encantada in District 7 is south of Miramar in Tierrasanta. At the time of the last redistricting, Rancho Encantada had not yet been developed. Members of the public testified that the Scripps Miramar Ranch and Miramar Ranch North planning groups took responsibility for planning of Rancho Encantada, and that the Scripps Miramar Ranch planning group received facilities benefits assessment money from its development. Members of the public requested that the three areas be kept together because of their connection, as described above, and their contiguity.
- Natural boundaries include the City’s North and East limits, the Interstate 15 corridor and State Route 56. Interstate 15 is a significant central travel corridor that defines the district.

- Although the Commission did not wish to split communities and heard testimony from residents who wanted all of Rancho Peñasquitos in one district, a portion of Rancho Peñasquitos was removed from this district to achieve population equality consistent with constitutional requirements. This was unavoidable after the Commission's decision to unite Rancho Encantada, Scripps Miramar Ranch and Miramar Ranch North.
- The Commission also considered the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve to be a natural park that is of common interest to Mira Mesa to its south and Rancho Peñasquitos to its north.
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible, recognizing that the City's North and East boundaries have jagged lines, and while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

DISTRICT 6

- Community Planning Areas
 - Clairemont Mesa (partial—area east of Tecolote Canyon)
 - Kearny Mesa (partial—area north of Aero Drive)
 - Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—area between Carson's Crossing bridge and the San Diego Aqueduct)
 - MCAS Miramar (partial—area west of Interstate 15)
 - Mira Mesa
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area south of State Route 56 and west of the San Diego Aqueduct)
- Neighborhoods
 - Clairemont Mesa East
 - Clairemont Mesa West
 - Kearny Mesa
 - MCAS Miramar (partial—area west of Interstate 15)
 - Mira Mesa
 - North Clairemont
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area south of State Route 56 and west of the San Diego Aqueduct)
 - Sorrento Valley (partial—area in Mira Mesa Community Planning Area)
- Demographics
 - Total population: 140,738
 - Deviation: -2.69% (-3,886 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 37.2% of the population to be included in the new District 6 is presently included in City Council District 6. Approximately 51.7% of the population to be included in the new District 6 comes from the current District 5. (However, 65.3% of the population included in the new District 5 also

comes from District 5.) Approximately 7.5% of the population to be included in the new District 6 comes from the current District 1.

- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Mira Mesa, Miramar, and Kearny Mesa are connected north and south by Interstate 15 to the east. Mira Mesa, Miramar, North Clairemont, Clairemont Mesa East, and Kearny Mesa are connected by Interstate 805 in the west. Black Mountain Road and Kearny Villa Road connect Mira Mesa, Miramar West and Kearny Mesa to the north and south. State Route 52 connects Kearny Mesa and North Clairemont east and west.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

- The Commission determined that Mira Mesa and Sorrento Mesa should be kept together in one district, that Mira Mesa should not be divided, and that Mira Mesa is connected to Kearny Mesa and together they are a community of interest.
- The Commission determined that there is a community of interest among the Asian population in this proposed district that shares business interests, cultural activities, and social ties and concerns. That population is sufficiently geographically compact to comprise 33.5% of the district's population (the largest in the City), thus combining neighborhoods to provide fair and effective representation to the community, insofar as practicable while balancing the Commission's other redistricting goals, and adhering to redistricting law and principles.
- The Commission heard public testimony asking that Mira Mesa, Rancho Peñasquitos, Miramar, Kearny Mesa, North University City, Torrey Highlands and Sorrento Valley be combined into one district. The proposed district combines Mira Mesa and Kearny Mesa with portions of Rancho Peñasquitos, Miramar, Sorrento Valley, and other communities. It was not possible to keep the whole of Rancho Peñasquitos in this district and also address other competing redistricting interests and goals as described above. There was testimony seeking to add North University City to this district; however, there was also testimony that University City should be kept whole and forms a community of interest with the University of California – San Diego (UCSD) and La Jolla. The Commission determined that University City should not be split and that it wished to keep UCSD, University City and La Jolla united in a community of interest related to the university. Torrey Highlands and a portion of Sorrento Valley were not included in the district to address other competing redistricting interests and goals, including compactness, contiguity and population deviation. A portion of Sorrento Valley was not included because it is in the Torrey Pines Community Planning Area, which was kept intact in District 1.
- In the final week of hearings, the Commission heard testimony and received numerous petitions from members of the Park Village neighborhood of Rancho Peñasquitos, including many members of the Asian/Pacific Islander community,

who said they did not wish to be included in a district with Mira Mesa. Prior to the final week, the Commission had heard testimony from numerous members of the Asian/Pacific Islander community who stated that Rancho Peñasquitos and Mira Mesa form a community of interest around their common cultures and should be kept together. The Commission considered the conflicting testimony, the redistricting principles of compactness, contiguity, communities of interest, and natural boundaries, and analyzed the totality of the circumstances. Although the Commission did not wish to split communities, this portion of Rancho Peñasquitos was included in District 6 to achieve population equality consistent with constitutional requirements. This was unavoidable after the Commission's decision to unite Rancho Encantada, Scripps Miramar Ranch and Miramar Ranch North.

- A common area of interest to many of the communities in this district is MCAS Miramar. These communities include enlisted personnel and their families as well as social, business and commercial interests surrounding MCAS.
- The Commission determined that the North Clairemont area and Hickman Field should be included in one district, as Hickman Field serves the adjacent North Clairemont area.
- Natural boundaries for the district include Interstate 15, Interstate 805 and Aero Drive.
- Although they are part of the Clairemont and Linda Vista Community Planning Areas, the neighborhoods of Bay Ho, Bay Park, and Morena were removed from District 6 and included in District 2 in recognition of the importance of Mission Bay to those neighborhoods due to proximity, recreational opportunities, and views.
- The Commission made one change to this district from the Preliminary Plan: it moved a portion of Linda Vista that had been included in District 6 into District 7 so the community would not be divided into three Council districts. Thus, the area northeast of Genesee Avenue, including the neighborhoods of Linda Vista Hills, Chesterton, and Wheatley, with a population of 3,361, was moved from District 6 into District 7 for the Final Plan. This move provided Linda Vista with the opportunity for a greater voice in District 7. The Morena area, in the Linda Vista Community Planning Area, with a population of 2,569, remained in District 2.
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

DISTRICT 7

- **Community Planning Areas**

- East Elliott
- Kearny Mesa (partial—area south of Aero Drive)
- Linda Vista (partial— neighborhood of Linda Vista)
- MCAS Miramar (partial—area east of Interstate 15)

- Mission Valley
 - Navajo
 - Serra Mesa
 - Tierrasanta
- Neighborhoods
 - Allied Gardens
 - Birdland
 - Del Cerro
 - Grantville
 - Lake Murray (San Carlos - East)
 - Linda Vista
 - MCAS Miramar (partial—area east of Interstate 15)
 - Mission Valley East
 - Mission Valley West
 - San Carlos
 - Serra Mesa
 - Tierrasanta
- Demographics
 - Total population: 147,113
 - Deviation: +1.72 % (+2,489 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 53.5% of the population to be included in the new District 7 is presently included in City Council District 7.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Miramar East, Tierrasanta, Grantville, Serra Mesa, and Mission Valley East are connected north and south by Interstate 15. Mission Valley West, Mission Valley East, Grantville, and Del Cerro are connected east and west by Interstate 8. Miramar East, Tierrasanta, and Mission Trails Regional Park are connected east and west by State Route 52. Many of the neighborhoods border Interstate 8 and the San Diego River.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - The Commission determined that Mission Trails Regional Park and the communities that surround it, including Tierrasanta, Navajo and San Carlos, form a community of interest based on their close connection to the park and should be kept together.
 - The Commission determined that another community of interest in the area is the northern part of MCAS Miramar.
 - The San Diego River Basin runs along the Interstate 8 corridor, and the communities bordering it are united in this district for the first time. These neighborhoods share common issues including concerns about traffic, noise, and

flooding from the river. These neighborhoods include Mission Valley and the communities to its north, including Serra Mesa and Linda Vista, which also share common issues related to traffic.

- Residents of Tierrasanta and Navajo, which includes Allied Gardens, Del Cerro, San Carlos, and Grantville, testified that they are a community of interest.
- Many consider the part of Kearny Mesa south of Aero Drive to be part of Serra Mesa and it is included in this district.
- Mission Valley was included because of topography, connectivity, and schools. Topographically, the south slopes of the valley are steep and serve as a natural barrier between the communities located on the mesa to the south. The north slopes, however, are more gradual and there is not as clear demarcation from the communities to the north. The more gradual slopes also allow greater connectivity to the north; connecting streets include Napa Street, Colusa Street, Goshen Street, Via Las Cumbres, Ulric Street, Mission Center Road, and Mission Village Drive. With the exception of one residential project (the Mission Village Condominiums), located on the south side of Hotel Circle South between Taylor Street and Bachman Place, all other residential areas are north of Interstate 8; elementary school students from these residential areas attend elementary school in Linda Vista (Carson) and Serra Mesa (Jones and Juarez).
- The inclusion of Kearny Mesa south of Aero Drive was intended for the following reasons: (1) to recognize the interface between commercial and industrial development along Aero Drive and adjacent residences of Serra Mesa; and (2) because the Stonecrest residential development west of Interstate 15 relates more to Serra Mesa than to the industrial/commercial areas of Kearny Mesa to the north, and its elementary students attend Cubberley Elementary School in Serra Mesa. This area also includes the Serra Mesa-Kearny Mesa Library that primarily serves the Serra Mesa community.
- The Commission made one change to this district from the Preliminary Plan: it moved a portion of Linda Vista that had been included in District 6 into District 7 so the community would not be divided into three Council districts. Thus, the area northeast of Genesee Avenue, including the neighborhoods of Linda Vista Hills, Chesterton, and Wheatley, with a population of 3,361, was moved from District 6 into District 7 for the Final Plan. This move provided Linda Vista with the opportunity for a greater voice in District 7. The Morena area, in the Linda Vista Community Planning Area, with a population of 2,569, remained in District 2.
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries. The district does not bypass population unless required to unite communities of interest or otherwise achieve other criteria.

DISTRICT 8

- Community Planning Areas
 - Barrio Logan
 - Otay Mesa

- Otay Mesa-Nestor
 - San Ysidro
 - Southeastern San Diego (partial—neighborhoods of Grant Hill, Logan Heights, Memorial, Shelltown, Sherman Heights, and Stockton)
 - Tijuana River Valley
- Neighborhoods
 - Barrio Logan
 - Border
 - Egger Highlands
 - Grant Hill
 - Logan Heights
 - Memorial
 - Nestor
 - Ocean Crest
 - Otay Mesa
 - Otay Mesa West
 - Palm City
 - San Ysidro
 - Shelltown
 - Sherman Heights
 - Stockton
 - Tijuana River Valley
- Demographics
 - Total population: 144,830
 - Deviation: +0.14% (+206 people)
 - Historical: 100% of the population to be included in the new District 8 is presently included in City Council District 8.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous to the extent possible because of the need to equalize the population and to connect population in the South Bay to population in the north. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Grant Hill, Logan Heights, Barrio Logan, Shelltown, Otay Mesa-Nestor and the Tijuana River Valley are connected north and south by Interstate 5. Otay Mesa-Nestor and Otay Mesa are connected north and south by Interstate 805 and east and west by State Route 905.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - The Commission recognized that this district has very unique geography, which drives the district boundaries. The configuration requires that the South Bay be connected to communities to the north through a bay corridor under San Diego Bay, as historically has been the case. The district is geographically compact to

the extent possible. It must bypass population of other cities to reach from the southern portion to the northern portion of the district.

- The Commission left the South Bay portion of the existing district intact. The Commission did not wish to fragment or dilute the Latino population and voting population, and recognized and wished to respect the fact that this is a geographically compact population that is sufficiently large to form a majority-minority Latino Council District, as it has for many years. The new District 8 will include a population that is 75% Latino, 10.2% White, 4.6% African-American and 8.9% Asian. The voting age population of the district is 70.6% Hispanic, with 64% registered, according to U.S. Census statistics.
- The Commission also determined that the South Bay communities should remain together in one district because of common socioeconomic data and communities of interest.
- The Commission heard conflicting testimony regarding whether Shelltown should be included in District 8 or District 9. The Commission determined that Shelltown should remain in District 8 after considering the totality of the circumstances, including Shelltown's contiguity with the rest of the district and the need to achieve population equality consistent with constitutional requirements.
- The Commission wished to keep the Historic Barrio District together, including Barrio Logan, Sherman Heights, Logan Heights, Grant Hill, Stockton, and Memorial. The proposed District 8 also reflects an intention not to connect these communities with the Downtown business and commercial interests, because their interests are not the same as those of the Historic Barrio District.
- A small portion of land within Downtown's East Village Business Improvement District was kept in District 8 after a number of people testified that it is part of the Barrio Logan neighborhood, and its future development would have an environmental and health impact on an adjacent school within the Barrio Logan neighborhood.
- Natural boundaries include State Route 94 and the City limits.
- The San Diego Bay corridor between Imperial Beach and Chula Vista connects the southern and northern part of the district.

DISTRICT 9

- Community Planning Areas
 - City Heights
 - College Area
 - Eastern Area (partial— neighborhoods of Rolando and El Cerrito)
 - Kensington-Talmadge
 - Southeastern San Diego (partial—area east of Interstate 15 except Shelltown and the area east of Boundary Road)
- Neighborhoods
 - Azalea Park
 - Bay Ridge

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

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Kensington, Corridor, Teralta East, Cherokee Point Castle, Mount Hope, Mountain View, and Southcrest are connected north and south by Interstate 15. Corridor, Kensington, Talmadge, College Area West, Teralta East, El Cerrito, and Rolando are connected east and west by University Heights and University Avenue. Ridgeview, Mount Hope, and Mountain View are connected north and south by Interstate 805.

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

- The Commission expressed an intention to unite City Heights in one new Council District, including Cherokee Point, Corridor, Castle, Teralta East, Teralta West, and Ridgeview. City Heights had previously been in three Council districts.
- The Commission included the areas immediately to the north of City Heights, including Kensington, Talmadge and College, which permitted District 3 to be shifted west and allowed the Commission to form a district around the unique interests and needs of City Heights.
- The district has the largest population of immigrants in the City, which has unique needs in the community. The district also has a large number of low-income residents, kept together with the new immigrants because of their shared economic interests, including affordable housing, jobs, economic development, access to facilities like parks and libraries, and transit.
- The Commission considered the shared impacts of San Diego State University on surrounding areas to the south, including the university's impacts on traffic and housing, and included those communities.
- Natural boundaries include Interstate 8, Interstate 15 and Interstate 805.
- A portion of Mountain View was included in the district, consistent with testimony specifying where the area should be split, and to achieve population equality consistent with constitutional requirements.
- The district includes a majority-minority population of Latinos. The Commission did not wish to dilute the voting strength of this significant Latino community and drew boundaries that it believed provided fair representation. The new district will be diverse in ethnicity, with a large Latino population as well as significant African-American and Asian populations. The district's population is 50.3% Hispanic; 23.2% White; 11.2% African-American; and 13.4% Asian.
- The Commission heard conflicting testimony from those who wished the neighborhood of Kensington to be included in District 3, and those who advocated to keep it with Talmadge to keep the Kensington-Talmadge planning area intact. The Commission also received emails from residents of Normal Heights who did not wish for their community to be split, which would occur if part of Kensington were to be placed in District 3. The Commission engaged in a deliberative process, considering the totality of the circumstances affecting the placement of Kensington in a district. The Commission determined that it would violate its own principles if it had to split both Kensington and Normal Heights, and divide the Kensington-Talmadge planning area, to put a portion of Kensington into District 3 while still achieving population equality consistent with constitutional requirements. The Commission considered the totality of the circumstances and determined that Kensington should remain in District 9.
- The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries.

VOTE OF THE COMMISSION

The vote of the Commissioners on the Preliminary Plan on July 21, 2011 was 5-2, with Commissioners Ani Mdivani-Morrow and Theresa Quiroz dissenting.

The vote of the Commissioners on the Final Plan on August 25, 2011 was unanimous, 7-0.

[The remainder of this page has intentionally been left blank.]

EFFECTIVE DATE OF FINAL PLAN

The Final Redistricting Plan shall be effective 30 days after adoption and shall be subject to the right of referendum in the same manner as are ordinances of the City Council. If rejected by referendum, the same Redistricting Commission shall create a new plan pursuant to the criteria set forth in Sections 5 and 5.1 of the San Diego City Charter.



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

Respectfully submitted,


On behalf of the 2010 Redistricting Commission of the City of San Diego:



Dr. Anisha Dalal, Chair



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

FINAL REDISTRICTING PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO




Adopted August 25, 2011

FINAL REDISTRICTING PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO



Adopted August 25, 2011

FINAL REDISTRICTING PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO



Adopted August 25, 2011

Dist	Tot. Pop.	Dev.	% Dev.	Hisp	NH Wht	NH DOJ Blk	NH DOJ Ind	NH DOJ Asn	NH DOJ Hwn	NH DOJ Oth	NH DOJ OthMR
1	147,375	2,751	1.90%	12,564	93,271	1,998	482	37,531	284	600	645
2	142,711	-1,913	-1.32%	19,619	108,477	3,847	1,102	7,341	577	753	746
3	147,117	2,493	1.72%	37,059	85,523	11,058	1,249	10,027	571	513	1,117
4	142,727	-1,897	-1.31%	59,188	16,839	28,251	497	34,043	1,620	279	2,010
5	143,961	-663	-0.46%	13,641	87,076	4,134	634	36,536	527	436	977
6	140,738	-3,886	-2.69%	22,547	61,527	5,835	793	47,158	963	483	1,432
7	147,113	2,489	1.72%	28,695	85,660	9,461	1,170	19,454	998	487	1,437
8	144,830	206	0.14%	108,630	14,776	6,671	402	12,859	482	209	801
9	145,045	421	0.29%	73,025	33,655	16,268	672	19,370	515	382	1,158
Total	1,301,617	6,637	4.59%	374,968	586,804	87,523	7,001	224,319	6,537	4,142	10,323
Ideal	144,624										

Dist	% Hisp.	% NH Wht	% NH DOJ Blk	% NH DOJ Ind	% NH DOJ Asn	% NH DOJ Hwn	% NH DOJ Oth	% NH DOJ OthMR
1	8.5%	63.3%	1.4%	0.3%	25.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%
2	13.7%	76.0%	2.7%	0.8%	5.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%
3	25.2%	58.1%	7.5%	0.8%	6.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.8%
4	41.5%	11.8%	19.8%	0.3%	23.9%	1.1%	0.2%	1.4%
5	9.5%	60.5%	2.9%	0.4%	25.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%
6	16.0%	43.7%	4.1%	0.6%	33.5%	0.7%	0.3%	1.0%
7	19.5%	58.2%	6.4%	0.8%	13.2%	0.7%	0.3%	1.0%
8	75.0%	10.2%	4.6%	0.3%	8.9%	0.3%	0.1%	0.6%
9	50.3%	23.2%	11.2%	0.5%	13.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.8%
Total	28.8%	45.1%	6.7%	0.5%	17.2%	0.5%	0.3%	0.8%

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

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

Dist	H18+ 18+ Pop	NH18+ Pop	NH18+ Wht	NH18+ DOJ Blk	NH18+ DOJ Ind	NH18+ DOJ Asn	NH18+ DOJ Hwn	NH18+ DOJ Oth	NH18+ DOJ OthMR	Tot. Reg.	Hisp. Reg.	Asn. Reg.	Fil. Reg.	Asn + Fil. Reg.	Tot. Vote	Hisp. Vote	Asn. Vote	Fil. Vote	Asn + Fil. Vote
1	119,971	9,524	76,924	1,587	369	30,477	215	420	455	78,244	4,206	7,369	594	7,963	53,225	2,418	3,584	332	3,916
2	124,166	15,152	97,315	2,935	955	6,196	458	625	530	81,777	5,873	1,478	660	2,138	52,432	3,120	860	344	1,204
3	130,812	29,174	80,248	9,420	1,139	9,021	492	445	873	82,508	10,540	1,894	823	2,717	51,040	5,481	1,080	460	1,540
4	103,218	38,396	14,782	20,384	402	26,739	1,216	188	1,111	59,934	18,812	2,076	3,869	5,945	30,135	8,486	916	1,936	2,852
5	107,410	8,879	68,016	2,788	461	26,075	369	287	535	79,382	6,383	5,824	2,054	7,878	54,650	3,730	3,186	1,146	4,332
6	111,742	15,681	52,083	4,222	654	37,147	736	341	878	67,623	8,973	6,729	3,296	10,025	42,922	4,946	3,308	1,770	5,078
7	115,970	19,302	72,139	6,490	893	15,306	753	320	767	75,930	8,008	3,367	1,012	4,379	50,243	4,291	1,755	545	2,300
8	103,299	72,895	13,285	5,276	342	10,456	402	148	495	46,452	29,751	371	2,109	2,480	22,521	13,439	146	1,146	1,292
9	105,661	46,451	30,508	11,608	577	15,144	403	270	700	51,012	12,761	3,649	561	4,210	25,384	5,176	1,667	245	1,912
Total	1,022,249	255,454	505,300	64,710	5,792	176,561	5,044	3,044	6,344	622,862	105,307	32,757	14,978	47,735	382,552	51,087	16,502	7,924	24,426

Dist	% H18+ Pop	% NH18+ Wht	% NH18+ DOJ Blk	% NH18+ DOJ Ind	% NH18+ DOJ Asn	% NH18+ DOJ Hwn	% NH18+ DOJ Oth	% NH18+ DOJ OthMR	% Hisp. Reg.	% Asn. Reg.	% Fil. Reg.	% Asn + Fil. Reg.	% Hisp. Vote	% Asn. Vote	% Fil. Vote	% Asn + Fil. Vote
1	7.9%	64.1%	1.3%	0.3%	25.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	5.4%	9.4%	0.8%	10.2%	4.5%	6.7%	0.6%	7.4%
2	12.2%	78.4%	2.4%	0.8%	5.0%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	7.2%	1.8%	0.8%	2.6%	6.0%	1.6%	0.7%	2.3%
3	22.3%	61.3%	7.2%	0.9%	6.9%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	12.8%	2.3%	1.0%	3.3%	10.7%	2.1%	0.9%	3.0%
4	37.2%	14.3%	19.7%	0.4%	25.9%	1.2%	0.2%	1.1%	31.4%	3.5%	6.5%	9.9%	28.2%	3.0%	6.4%	9.5%
5	8.3%	63.3%	2.6%	0.4%	24.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	8.0%	7.3%	2.6%	9.9%	6.8%	5.8%	2.1%	7.9%
6	14.0%	46.6%	3.8%	0.6%	33.2%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	13.3%	10.0%	4.9%	14.8%	11.5%	7.7%	4.1%	11.8%
7	16.6%	62.2%	5.6%	0.8%	13.2%	0.6%	0.3%	0.7%	10.5%	4.4%	1.3%	5.8%	8.5%	3.5%	1.1%	4.6%
8	70.6%	12.9%	5.1%	0.3%	10.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.5%	64.0%	0.8%	4.5%	5.3%	59.7%	0.6%	5.1%	5.7%
9	44.0%	28.9%	11.0%	0.5%	14.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	25.0%	7.2%	1.1%	8.3%	20.4%	6.6%	1.0%	7.5%
Total	25.0%	49.4%	6.3%	0.6%	17.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.6%	16.9%	5.3%	2.4%	7.7%	13.4%	4.3%	2.1%	6.4%

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

Dist	Special Tabulation								American Community Survey (ACS)								
	Total CVAP	Hisp CVAP	NH Wht CVAP	NH Blk CVAP	NH Asn CVAP	NH Ind CVAP	NH Hwn CVAP	NH MR CVAP	Total CVAP	Hisp CVAP	NH Wht CVAP	NH Blk CVAP	NH Asn CVAP	NH Ind CVAP	NH Hwn CVAP	NH MR CVAP	NH Oth CVAP
1	100,002	7,008	74,461	1,033	15,823	77	45	1,555	100,195	7,061	74,504	1,027	15,955	97	64	1,944	2,400
2	118,227	11,229	98,569	2,241	3,740	432	435	1,539	118,220	11,226	98,389	2,305	3,823	642	473	2,243	2,347
3	110,862	17,859	76,871	7,683	4,936	620	370	2,448	110,716	17,906	76,292	7,724	5,040	1,305	432	4,018	4,069
4	80,658	21,391	15,189	20,389	20,137	145	1,750	1,628	80,844	21,413	15,244	20,284	20,508	225	1,983	2,443	5,856
5	93,762	7,203	66,431	2,746	15,101	336	211	1,752	93,257	7,158	65,563	2,820	15,471	394	213	2,535	1,814
6	99,790	12,061	55,955	2,817	25,984	330	348	2,241	99,346	12,091	55,644	2,784	25,628	488	404	3,261	4,218
7	108,693	14,177	75,529	5,987	9,167	656	990	2,204	108,961	14,188	75,494	6,088	9,453	889	1,000	3,032	3,574
8	72,200	41,567	15,840	6,032	7,334	233	133	1,018	72,390	41,568	15,906	6,311	7,579	594	158	2,115	9,207
9	70,999	18,704	31,803	10,246	8,230	380	172	1,457	70,292	18,464	31,232	10,497	8,136	615	191	2,156	5,362
Total	855,192	151,199	510,647	59,174	110,451	3,209	4,453	15,842	854,220	151,076	508,267	59,839	111,592	5,249	4,919	23,746	38,847

Dist	Special Tabulation								American Community Survey (ACS)								
	% Total CVAP	% Hisp CVAP	% NH Wht CVAP	% NH Blk CVAP	% NH Asn CVAP	% NH Ind CVAP	% NH Hwn CVAP	% NH MR CVAP	% Total CVAP	% Hisp CVAP	% NH Wht CVAP	% NH Blk CVAP	% NH Asn CVAP	% NH Ind CVAP	% NH Hwn CVAP	% NH MR CVAP	% NH Oth CVAP
1	83.4%	7.0%	74.5%	1.0%	15.8%	0.1%	0.0%	1.6%	83.5%	7.0%	74.4%	1.0%	15.9%	0.1%	0.1%	1.9%	2.4%
2	95.2%	9.5%	83.4%	1.9%	3.2%	0.4%	0.4%	1.3%	95.2%	9.5%	83.2%	1.9%	3.2%	0.5%	0.4%	1.9%	2.0%
3	84.7%	16.1%	69.3%	6.9%	4.5%	0.6%	0.3%	2.2%	84.6%	16.2%	68.9%	7.0%	4.6%	1.2%	0.4%	3.6%	3.7%
4	78.1%	26.5%	18.8%	25.3%	25.0%	0.2%	2.2%	2.0%	78.3%	26.5%	18.9%	25.1%	25.4%	0.3%	2.5%	3.0%	7.2%
5	87.3%	7.7%	70.9%	2.9%	16.1%	0.4%	0.2%	1.9%	86.8%	7.7%	70.3%	3.0%	16.6%	0.4%	0.2%	2.7%	1.9%
6	89.3%	12.1%	56.1%	2.8%	26.0%	0.3%	0.3%	2.2%	88.9%	12.2%	56.0%	2.8%	25.8%	0.5%	0.4%	3.3%	4.2%
7	93.7%	13.0%	69.5%	5.5%	8.4%	0.6%	0.9%	2.0%	94.0%	13.0%	69.3%	5.6%	8.7%	0.8%	0.9%	2.8%	3.3%
8	69.9%	57.6%	21.9%	8.4%	10.2%	0.3%	0.2%	1.4%	70.1%	57.4%	22.0%	8.7%	10.5%	0.8%	0.2%	2.9%	12.7%
9	67.2%	26.3%	44.8%	14.4%	11.6%	0.5%	0.2%	2.1%	66.5%	26.3%	44.4%	14.9%	11.6%	0.9%	0.3%	3.1%	7.6%
Total	83.7%	17.7%	59.7%	6.9%	12.9%	0.4%	0.5%	1.9%	83.6%	17.7%	59.5%	7.0%	13.1%	0.6%	0.6%	2.8%	4.5%

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

FINAL PLAN - COMMUNITIES BY DISTRICT

– DISTRICT 1 –

Community Planning Areas

Carmel Valley
Del Mar Mesa
Fairbanks Ranch Country Club
La Jolla
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve
(partial – area west of Carson's Crossing
bridge)
NCFUA Subarea II
Pacific Highlands Ranch
Torrey Hills
Torrey Pines
University
Via de la Valle

Neighborhoods

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

– DISTRICT 2 –

Community Planning Areas

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

Neighborhoods

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

FINAL PLAN - COMMUNITIES BY DISTRICT

– DISTRICT 3 –

Community Planning Areas

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

Neighborhoods

Adams North	Horton Plaza
Balboa Park	Little Italy
Bankers Hill	Marina
Burlingame	Midtown
Core-Columbia	Mission Hills
Cortez Hill	Normal Heights
East Village	North Park
Gaslamp Quarter	Old Town
Golden Hill	Park West
Harborview	South Park
Hillcrest	University Heights

– DISTRICT 4 –

Community Planning Areas

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

Neighborhoods

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

FINAL PLAN - COMMUNITIES BY DISTRICT

– DISTRICT 5 –

Community Planning Areas

Black Mountain Ranch
Carmel Mountain Ranch
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial –
area east of the San Diego Aqueduct)
Miramar Ranch North
Rancho Bernardo
Rancho Encantada
Rancho Peñasquitos (partial – area north of
CA-56 and east of the San Diego
Aqueduct)
Sabre Springs
San Pasqual
Scripps Miramar Ranch
Torrey Highlands (partial – all but
unpopulated Rhodes Crossing area)

Neighborhoods

Black Mountain Ranch
Carmel Mountain Ranch
Miramar Ranch North
Rancho Bernardo
Rancho Encantada
Rancho Peñasquitos (partial – area north of
CA-56 and east of the San Diego
Aqueduct)
Sabre Springs
San Pasqual
Scripps Miramar Ranch
Torrey Highlands (partial – all but
unpopulated Rhodes Crossing area)

– DISTRICT 6 –

Community Planning Areas

Clairemont Mesa
(partial – area east of Tecolote Canyon)
Kearny Mesa
(partial – area north of Aero Drive)
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve
(partial – area between Carson's Crossing
bridge and the San Diego Aqueduct)
MCAS Miramar
(partial – area west of I-15)
Mira Mesa
Rancho Peñasquitos
(partial – area south of CA-56 and west of
the San Diego Aqueduct)

Neighborhoods

Clairemont Mesa East
Clairemont Mesa West
Kearny Mesa
MCAS Miramar
(partial – area west of I-15)
Mira Mesa
North Clairemont
Rancho Peñasquitos
(partial – area south of CA-56 and west of
the San Diego Aqueduct)
Sorrento Valley
(partial – area in Mira Mesa CPA)

FINAL PLAN - COMMUNITIES BY DISTRICT

– DISTRICT 7 –

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

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

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

– DISTRICT 8 –

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

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

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

– DISTRICT 9 –

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

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

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

	Current District	Population	Proportion of New District	Proportion of Current District
District 1				
	1	141,421	96.0%	70.9%
	2	5,952	4.0%	3.6%
	5	2	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	147,375		
District 2				
	2	107,117	75.1%	64.7%
	6	35,594	24.9%	22.8%
	Total	142,711		
District 3				
	2	52,524	35.7%	31.7%
	3	84,610	57.5%	55.6%
	6	8	0.0%	0.0%
	8	9,975	6.8%	6.2%
	Total	147,117		
District 4				
	4	132,238	92.7%	86.4%
	7	10,489	7.3%	7.1%
	Total	142,727		
District 5				
	1	47,406	32.9%	23.8%
	5	94,016	65.3%	56.4%
	7	2,539	1.8%	1.7%
	Total	143,961		
District 6				
	1	10,624	7.5%	5.3%
	5	72,760	51.7%	43.6%
	6	52,326	37.2%	33.5%
	7	5,028	3.6%	3.4%
	Total	140,738		
District 7				
	3	39	0.0%	0.0%
	6	68,388	46.5%	43.7%
	7	78,686	53.5%	53.5%
	Total	147,113		
District 8				
	8	144,830	100.0%	89.9%
	Total	144,830		
District 9				
	3	67,559	46.6%	44.4%
	4	20,788	14.3%	13.6%
	7	50,428	34.8%	34.3%
	8	6,270	4.3%	3.9%
	Total	145,045		

FINAL REDISTRICTING PLAN

ONLINE MAP AND DATA

ONLINE MAP

- Access sd-redistricting.esri.com (create log-in if first time user)
- “File” --> “Open” --> “Shared Plans” --> “Everyone”
- Select “Final Plan” or Plan ID 43601

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

The Esri tool will be available until December 2011.

SHAPEFILE AND EQUIVALENCY FILE

- <http://www.sandiego.gov/redistricting/documents/index.shtml>
- Under “Final Redistricting Plan,” select the shapefile and/or equivalency file to view and download.
- Note on equivalency file: Census block number 060730090002000 is assigned to District 7 because most of the population lives in that district. However, the Final Plan assigns part of this block to District 2 because it is part of the University of San Diego. The parcels assigned to District 2 are:

APN 4370101900

APN 4370102200

APN 4370102100

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

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
11 JUL 22 AM 10:27
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE PRELIMINARY PLAN

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

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

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

DISTRICT 1

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

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

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

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

DISTRICT 2

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

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

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

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

DISTRICT 3

- Community Plan Areas

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

- Neighborhoods

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

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

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

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

DISTRICT 4

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

- Neighborhoods
 - Alta Vista
 - Bay Terraces
 - Broadway Heights
 - Chollas View
 - Emerald Hills
 - Encanto
 - Jamacha
 - Lincoln Park
 - Lomita
 - Mountain View (partial—area east of Boundary Road between Imperial Avenue and Logan Avenue)
 - Oak Park
 - Paradise Hills
 - Redwood Village
 - Rolando Park
 - Skyline
 - Valencia Park
 - Webster
- Demographics
 - Total population: 142,727
 - Deviation: -1.32% (-1,897 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 94% of the population to be included in the new District 4 is presently included in City Council District 4.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Rolando Park, Redwood Village, Broadway Heights, Emerald Hills, and Webster are connected by State Route 94 (Martin Luther King, Jr. Freeway). North Encanto and Emerald Hills are connected by Akins Avenue. State Route 54 (South Bay Freeway) connects Bay Terraces South and Paradise Hills in the southern portion of District 4.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - The Commission largely respected the current boundaries of District 4, consistent with public testimony that the district be kept as close as possible to its present boundaries, while recognizing that it needed to lose population consistent with creating a new 9th District.
 - The Commission recognized that District 4 has a large, geographically compact African-American population and that it has historically been an African-American influence district. The Commission wished to draw a district that respected that history. The district also has a well-established community of interest surrounding its churches, schools, and neighborhoods. District 4's population will be 19.8% African-American, 41.5% Hispanic, and 23.9% Asian.

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

DISTRICT 5

- Community Plan Areas
 - Black Mountain Ranch
 - Carmel Mountain Ranch
 - Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (partial—western area)
 - Miramar Ranch North
 - Rancho Bernardo
 - Rancho Encantada
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area north of State Route 56 or east of Salmon River Road)
 - Sabre Springs
 - San Pasqual
 - Scripps Miramar Ranch
 - Torrey Highlands
- Neighborhoods
 - Black Mountain Ranch
 - Carmel Mountain Ranch
 - Miramar Ranch North
 - Rancho Bernardo
 - Rancho Encantada
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area north of State Route 56 or east of Salmon River Road)
 - Sabre Springs
 - San Pasqual
 - Scripps Miramar Ranch
 - Torrey Highlands
- Demographics
 - Total population: 143,961
 - Deviation: -0.46% (-663 people)

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

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

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

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

DISTRICT 6

- Community Plan Areas

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

- Neighborhoods

- Clairemont Mesa East
- Clairemont Mesa West
- Kearny Mesa
- Linda Vista (partial—area northeast of Genesee Avenue)
- MCAS Miramar (partial—area west of Interstate 15)
- Mira Mesa
- North Clairemont
- Rancho Peñasquitos (partial—area south of State Route 56 and west of Salmon River Road)
- Sorrento Valley (partial—area in Mira Mesa Community Planning Area)

- Demographics

- Total population: 144,099
- Deviation: -0.37% (-525 people)
- Historical: Approximately 38.6% of the population to be included in the new District 6 is presently included in City Council District 6. Approximately 50.5% of the population to be included in the new District 6 comes from the current District 5. (However, 65.3% of the population included in the new District 5 also comes from District 5.) Approximately 7.4% of the population to be included in the new District 6 comes from the current District 1.

- Contiguity

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

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

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

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

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

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

DISTRICT 7

- Community Plan Areas

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

- Neighborhoods

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

- Demographics

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

- Contiguity

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

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

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

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

DISTRICT 8

- Community Plan Areas

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

- Neighborhoods

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

- Demographics

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

- Contiguity

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

- Findings and Reasons for Adoption

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

DISTRICT 9

- Community Plan Areas

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

- Neighborhoods

- Azalea Park
- Bay Ridge
- Castle
- Cherokee Point
- Chollas Creek
- Colina del Sol
- College East

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

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

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

VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY PLAN AND UPCOMING HEARINGS

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

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

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

July 21, 2011

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

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Anisha Dalal", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Dr. Anisha Dalal

Chair of the City of San Diego 2010 Redistricting Commission

On behalf of the 2010 Redistricting Commission:

Dr. Anisha Dalal

Frederick W. Kosmo, Jr.


Carlos Marquez


Ani Mdivani-Morrow


Arthur Nishioka


David Potter


Theresa Quiroz














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

—DISTRICT 1—

Community Planning Areas

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

Neighborhoods

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

—DISTRICT 2—

Community Planning Areas

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

Neighborhoods

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

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

—DISTRICT 3—

Community Planning Areas

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

Neighborhoods

Adams North	Horton Plaza
Balboa Park	Little Italy
Bankers Hill	Marina
Burlingame	Midtown
Core-Columbia	Mission Hills
Cortez Hill	Normal Heights
East Village	North Park
Gaslamp Quarter	Old Town
Golden Hill	Park West
Harborview	South Park
Hillcrest	University Heights

—DISTRICT 4—

Community Planning Areas

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

Neighborhoods

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

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

—DISTRICT 5—

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

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

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

—DISTRICT 6—

Community Planning Areas

Neighborhoods

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

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

PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

COMMUNITY PLANNING AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOODS BY DISTRICT

—DISTRICT 7—

Community Planning Areas

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

Neighborhoods

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

—DISTRICT 8—

Community Planning Areas

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

Neighborhoods

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

—DISTRICT 9—

Community Planning Areas

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

Neighborhoods

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN

ONLINE MAP

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

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

Questions?

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

ARTICLE II

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Section 4: Districts Established

For the purpose of electing members of the Council the City shall be divided into eight Districts as nearly equal in population as practicable. A ninth Council district shall be created in the redistricting following the 2010 national decennial census, at which time the City shall be divided into nine (9) council districts as nearly equal in population as practicable. Thereafter the boundaries of such districts shall be subject to alteration and change under the provisions of this Charter.

In any redistricting plan adopted by the Redistricting Commission pursuant to Section 5.1 or ordinance adopted by the Council establishing, changing or altering the boundaries of any Council district, the redistricting plan or ordinance may describe the new boundaries by reference to a map on file in the office of the City Clerk; a metes and bounds description of the new boundaries need not be contained in said redistricting plan or ordinance.

(Amendment voted 03-10-1953; effective 04-20-1953.)

(Amendment voted 09-17-1963; effective 02-11-1964.)

(Amendment voted 11-06-1990; effective 02-19-1991.)

(Amendment voted 06-02-1992; effective 07-13-1992.)

(Amendment voted 06-08-2010; effective 08-16-2010.)

[Prior Language](#)

Section 5: Redistricting

In the event that any voting precinct which may be established at the time this Charter takes effect or which may be thereafter established is partly within two or more such districts, said precinct shall be allocated to the District in which a majority of the voters within such precinct resides, and said district boundaries shall be changed accordingly. The City shall be redistricted pursuant to Section 5.1 of this Charter at least once in every ten (10) years, but no later than nine months following the receipt of the final Federal Decennial Census information.

Any territory hereafter annexed to or consolidated with The City of San Diego shall at the time of such annexation or consolidation be added to an adjacent District or Districts by an ordinance of the Council. However, if any territory annexed, deannexed or consolidated upsets the approximate equality of the populations of the established

districts, a redistricting shall be conducted pursuant to Section 5.1 of this Charter, except that the nomination period for appointment to the Redistricting Commission shall commence on the July 1 immediately succeeding the annexation, deannexation or consolidation and the Redistricting Commission shall be constituted no later than the next November 1.

In any redistricting, the districts shall be comprised of contiguous territory and made as equal in population as shown by the census reports, and as geographically compact as possible, and the districts so formed shall, as far as possible, be bounded by natural boundaries, by street lines and/or by City boundary lines.

(Amendment voted 06-02-1992; effective 07-13-1992.)

Prior Language

Section 5.1: Redistricting Commission

The members of the City Council shall be elected by districts, as follows:

Subject to the provisions of the City Charter relating to referendum and initiative powers of the people, the sole and exclusive authority to adopt plans which specify the boundaries of districts for the City Council is vested in the Redistricting Commission, to be established by this Section.

Commencing in the year following the year in which the national decennial census is taken under the direction of the United States Congress at the beginning of each decade, the Redistricting Commission shall adopt plans that redistrict the City into nine (9) Council districts designated by numbers 1 to 9 inclusive. Those districts shall be used for all elections of Council members, including their recall, and for filling any vacancy in the office of member of the Council, subsequent to the effective date of this Section (and until new districts are established).

No change in the boundary or location of any district by redistricting as herein provided shall operate to abolish or terminate the term of office of any member of the Council prior to the expiration of the term of office for which such member was elected.

Districts formed by the Redistricting Commission shall each contain, as nearly as practicable, one-ninth of the total population of the City as shown by the Federal census immediately proceeding such formation of districts.

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.

To the extent it is practical to do so, districts shall: preserve identifiable communities of interest; be geographically compact-populous contiguous territory shall not be bypassed to reach distant populous areas; be composed of whole census units as developed by the United States Bureau of the Census; be composed of contiguous territory with reasonable access between population centers in the district, and not be drawn for the purpose of advantaging or protecting incumbents.

The Redistricting Commission shall be composed of seven (7) members who shall be appointed by the Presiding Judge of the Municipal Court, San Diego Judicial District. In the event that the Presiding Judge declines to make the appointments, they shall be made by a Municipal Court Judge selected by vote of the Judges of the Municipal Court, San Diego Judicial District. Should the Judges of the Municipal Court decline to so act, then the Redistricting Commission shall be appointed by a panel of three retired Superior Court Judges drawn at random by the City Manager in the fashion described in Penal Code sections 900(a) and 902. In the event that all of the preceding individuals decline to act, then the Redistricting Commission shall be appointed by a majority vote of the City Council in the fashion set forth below. The term "Presiding Judge," as used herein below, shall include any person or any body acting to appoint the Redistricting Commission pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph.

The City Clerk shall solicit nominations for appointment to the Redistricting Commission in accordance with this Section and shall distribute to the news media the announcement of a thirty (30) day nomination period (which shall commence on July 1, 2000, and on July 1 of every year in which a national decennial census is taken) and the guidelines for selection of Commission members.

Individuals or organizations desiring to nominate persons for appointment to the Commission shall do so in writing to the City Clerk within the nominating period. The City Clerk shall transmit the names and information regarding all nominees with the names of nominating individuals and organizations to the Presiding Judge immediately upon the close of nominations. The Presiding Judge shall appoint the members constituting the Commission no later than November 1, 2000, and on November 1 of every year in which a national decennial census is taken. The Presiding Judge shall appoint women and men who will give the Redistricting Commission geographic, social and ethnic diversity, and who, in his or her judgement, have a high degree of competency to carry out the responsibilities of the Commission. The appointees shall include individuals with a demonstrated capacity to serve with impartiality in a nonpartisan role.

Each member of the Commission shall be registered to vote in The City of San Diego.

Persons who accept appointment to the Commission, at the time of their appointment, shall file a written declaration with the City Clerk stating that within five (5) years of the

Commission's adoption of a final redistricting plan, they will not seek election to a San Diego City public office. The members of the Redistricting Commission shall serve until the redistricting plan adopted by the Commission becomes effective and any and all legal and referendum challenges have been resolved.

Any vacancy in the Redistricting Commission which occurs after the Commission is constituted shall be filled within seven (7) calendar days by the Presiding Judge of the San Diego Municipal Court, San Diego Judicial District, following the same procedure and using the same criteria established with this Section and making the selection from the same pool of individuals given consideration for appointment when the Commission was constituted.

Within twenty (20) days after the membership of the Commission is appointed, it shall hold its first meeting at a time and place designated by the City Clerk.

All Commission meetings shall be open to the public and Commission records, data and plans shall be available, at no charge, for public inspection during normal business hours in the office of the City Clerk. Copies of records and plans shall be provided, for a reasonable fee, to any interested person.

The Commission shall elect a chair and a vice chair and shall employ a chief of staff, who shall serve at the Commission's pleasure, exempt from Civil Service, and shall contract for needed staff, technical consultants and services, using existing City staff to the extent possible.

Aye votes by 5 members of the Commission shall be required for the appointment of its chief of staff, the election of its chair, and the adoption of the final redistricting plan and a majority vote of the Commission shall be required for all other actions. A majority of the entire Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business or exercise of any power of the Commission.

The Commission shall make every reasonable effort to afford maximum public access to its proceedings. It shall solicit public comment and shall hold at least four (4) public hearings in various geographic areas of the City before the preparation of a preliminary redistricting plan.

At least thirty (30) days prior to the adoption of a final plan, the Commission shall file a preliminary plan with the City Clerk, along with a written statement of findings and reasons for adoption which includes notation of all criteria employed in the process and a full analysis and explanation of decisions made by the Commission.

During the thirty (30) day period after such filing, the Commission shall hold at least three (3) public hearings in various geographic areas of the City before it adopts a final plan. Upon approval of the final plan, the Commission shall adjust the boundaries of any or all of the Council districts of the City pursuant to the final plan. Said final redistricting plan shall be effective thirty (30) days after adoption and shall be subject to the right of referendum in the same manner as are ordinances of the City Council. If rejected by referendum, the same Commission shall create a new plan pursuant to the criteria set forth in Sections 5 and 5.1.

Within sixty (60) days after the members of the Commission are appointed, the Commission shall adopt a budget and submit it to the Presiding Judge. If he or she approves it, it shall be forwarded to the City Council for its consideration. The City Council shall appropriate funds to the Commission and to the City Clerk adequate to carry out their duties under this Section.

If any part of these amendments to Sections 4 or 5 of the Charter or the addition of Section 5.1 to the Charter or their application to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications which reasonably can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.

(Addition voted 06-02-1992; effective 07-13-1992.)

(Amendment voted 06-08-2010; effective 08-16-2010.)

[Prior Language](#)

Section 6: Qualified Electors

The qualifications of an elector at any election held in the City under the provisions of this Charter shall be the same as those prescribed by the general law of the State for the qualification of electors at General State Elections. No person shall be eligible to vote at such City election until he has conformed to the general State law governing the registration of voters.

Section 7: Elective Officers Residency Requirement

An elective officer of the City shall be a resident and elector of the City.

In addition, every Council member shall be an actual resident and elector of the district from which the Council member is nominated. Any Council member who moves from the district of which the Council member was a resident at the time of taking office forfeits the office, but no Council member shall forfeit the office as a result of redistricting.

The Council shall establish by ordinance minimum length of residency requirements for candidacy to elective office, whether by appointment or election.

(Amendment voted 09-17-1963; effective 02-11-1964.)

(Amendment voted 11-04-1969; effective 01-29-1970.)

(Amendment voted 11-06-1979; effective 12-17-1979.)

[Prior Language](#)

Section 8: Election Code

Within ninety (90) days after this amendment has been ratified by the State Legislature the Council shall adopt an election code ordinance, providing an adequate and complete procedure to govern municipal elections, including the nomination of candidates for all elective offices. All elections provided for by this charter, whether for choice of officers or submission of questions to the voters, shall be conducted in the manner prescribed by said election code ordinance.

(Amendment voted 04-22-1941; effective 05-08-1941.)

[Prior Language](#)

Section 9: Nominations

Nominations of candidates for all elective offices shall be made in the manner prescribed by the election code ordinance provided for in Section 8 of this article.

(Amendment voted 04-22-1941; effective 05-08-1941.)

[Prior Language](#)

Section 10: Elections

Elective officers of the City shall be nominated and elected by all of the electors of the City except that City Council members shall be nominated and elected by the electors of the district for which elective office they are a candidate.

Commencing with the year 1996, the municipal primary elections to the office of Council member for Districts 1, 3, 5, and 7 shall be held on same date in each election year as the California State primary election, and the general municipal election for these offices shall be held on the same date as the California State general election for that year.

Commencing with the year 1998, the municipal primary elections to the offices of Council member for Districts 2, 4, 6, and 8 shall be held on same date in each election year as the California State primary election, and the general municipal election for these offices shall be held on the same date as the California State general election for that year.

Commencing with the next municipal primary and general elections following the redistricting occurring after the 2010 national decennial census, and every four years

thereafter, the municipal primary and general elections to the office of Council District 9 shall be held.

Commencing with the year 1984 the elections to the offices of Mayor and City Attorney shall be held every four (4) years. The municipal primary election for the offices of Mayor and City Attorney shall be held on the same date in each election year as the California State primary election, and the general municipal election for these offices shall be held on the same date as the California State general election for that year. All other municipal elections which may be held under this Charter shall be known as special municipal elections.

All elective officers of the City shall be nominated at the municipal primary election. In the event one candidate receives the majority of votes cast for all candidates for nomination to a particular elective office, the candidate so receiving such majority of votes shall be deemed to be and declared by the Council to be elected to such office. In the event no candidate receives a majority of votes cast as aforesaid, the two candidates receiving the highest number of votes for a particular elective office at said primary shall be the candidates, and only candidates, for such office and the names of only those two candidates shall be printed upon the ballots to be used at the general municipal election.

At the general municipal election held for the purpose of electing Council members other than the Mayor the electors of each Council district shall select from among the candidates chosen at the primary election in that district one candidate for the office of the Council member whose term expires the succeeding December. At the general municipal election held for the purpose of electing any other elective officer there shall be chosen by all of the electors of the whole City from among the candidates chosen at the primary one candidate to succeed any other elective officer whose term expires in December succeeding the election.

After the result of an election for any office is declared, or when an appointment is made, the City Clerk, under his hand and official seal, shall issue a certificate therefor, and shall deliver the same immediately to the person elected or appointed, and such person must within ten days after receiving such certificate file his official bond, if one be required for his office, and take and subscribe to the oath of office required of him by this Charter, which oath must be filed with the City Clerk.

(Amendment voted 04-22-1941; effective 05-08-1941.)

(Amendment voted 06-05-1956; effective 01-10-1957.)

(Amendment voted 11-06-1962; effective 01-21-1963.)

(Amendment voted 11-04-1975; effective 12-01-1975.)

(Amendment voted 11-08-1988; effective 04-03-1989.)

(Amendment voted 11-03-1992; effective 12-18-1992.)

(Amendment voted 06-08-2010; effective 08-16-2010.)

Prior Language

2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONERS

Anisha Dalal

Commissioner Dalal is a native San Diegan and is currently serving as Principal at the School of Communication, San Diego High Educational Complex in San Diego Unified School District. She has served as a mathematics teacher and administrator in San Diego Unified School District for the last twelve years and taught in school districts in Los Angeles and Fremont as well. Dr. Dalal earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Structural Engineering from the University of California, San Diego and a Master of Arts degree in Educational Leadership at San Diego State University. She also was part of the first graduating class of a joint doctoral program in Educational Leadership with the University of California, San Diego, San Diego State University, and California State University, San Marcos, where she earned her Doctorate of Education (EdD). She is a member of the Association of California School Administrators.

Dr. Dalal's awards and recognitions include the 2001 "Outstanding Graduate Student Award" by the Department of Administration, Rehabilitation, and Postsecondary Education at San Diego State University and "Competent Toastmaster Recognition" in 1995. Most recently, Dr. Dalal presented a paper on her dissertation study at the American Educational Research Conference (AERA) in San Diego in 2009.

Commissioner Dalal is Chair of the 2010 Redistricting Commission. This is her first public agency appointment.

Carlos Marquez

Carlos Marquez is the Vice-Chair of the Redistricting Commission for the City of San Diego. He currently serves as the founding Executive Director for HONOR Fund. Marquez previously served as the Director of Community Programs & Public Affairs for the San Diego Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender (LGBT) Community Center, where he managed the agency's civic engagement and public policy initiatives, helped develop the region's first anti-bullying policy and supervised a cutting-edge support services program for LGBT Latinos and their families. Marquez has dedicated his career to serving the underrepresented, advocating on behalf of service workers during his time at SEIU Local 221 and in support of early education programs and civil liberties while at the United Way of America and the ACLU's National Legislative Office, respectively. He currently holds a Bachelor's degree in Political Science from San Diego State University.

"The opportunity to help realize an equitable and transparent redistricting process on behalf of the citizens of San Diego is an opportunity I didn't want to wait ten more years to pursue. I look

forward to working with my colleagues and fellow residents to ensure the map we recommend for the coming decade is reflective of the rich diversity of America's finest city."

Frederick Kosmo

Mr. Kosmo graduated from the University of Southern California School of Law with Honors, and is a Partner in the local San Diego law firm, Wilson Turner Kosmo LLP. In the community, Mr. Kosmo has been active serving on both the 2009 and 2010 Federal Magistrate Judge Selection Committees. He has served in many positions in the legal community, including as the President of the Association of Business Trial Lawyers and President of the William L. Todd Inn of Court. Mr. Kosmo also served for many years as an Austin Guild Director at Saint Augustine High School, and he actively supports the San Diego Chapter of Make-A-Wish.

Mr. Kosmo wanted to serve on the Redistricting Commission to make sure that the process was fair to everyone in San Diego. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, Mr. Kosmo wanted to do his part to protect *"government of the people, by the people, and for the people."*

Ani Mdivani-Morrow

Ani Mdivani-Morrow has a Master of Science in Geography and currently owns a small business. She is founder and president of a non-profit organization and an author of a children's book.

She has been a resident of San Diego since 1994 and hopes to contribute her experience and more importantly her expertise in the process of redistricting.

Her experience as a teacher and as business owner, as well as her diverse cultural background and professional background in physical and social geography, including urban geography, will help in the fair apportionment of City districts.

Arthur Nishioka

Commissioner Nishioka is Manager of Planning at Kyocera International, Inc. in Kearny Mesa and has degrees from the University of Michigan and the University of Illinois. He has resided in Hillcrest, North Park, and currently resides with his wife and sons in Rancho Bernardo.

"It has been a privilege and honor to serve on the 2010 Redistricting Commission for our City. I enjoyed going to see the many neighborhoods and meeting many wonderful and caring San Diegans during the Commission's public hearings."

Dave Potter

Dave Potter has 43 years of consulting and public sector experience in urban/regional and environmental planning in San Diego. He manages Potter & Associates, a planning and environmental consulting firm he established in 1993. Previously, he served over 21 years with the City's Planning Department in a number of positions, including Deputy Planning Director. He is certified by the American Institute of Certified Planners and the Institute of Certified Managers and is a member of the American Planning Association and the Association of Environmental Planners. His education includes a Master of City Planning degree and a Bachelor of Arts degree in Social (Urban) Studies from the Ohio State University. He was also a Research Fellow at the Inter-American Housing and Planning Center in Bogotá, Colombia.

In addition to the Redistricting Commission, Dave is currently serving on the Mission Bay Park/Improvement Oversight Committee. His other public service appointments include Medical Marijuana Task Force, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group, Strategy 2020 Committee, NTC Citizens Implementation Advisory Committee, Sewer Cost of Service Stakeholders Group, Air Transportation Action Program Working Group and MTS Comprehensive Operational Analysis Citizens' Advisory Committee.

After retiring from the City, Dave contributed his understanding of city planning and community development by serving on and chairing the Clairemont Mesa Planning Committee and the Community Planners Committee or CPC. CPC was established by the City to advise the City Council, Planning Commission, and Planning Department on matters related to the General Plan and respective Community Plans.

In fulfilling his military obligation, Dave was a Captain in the U.S. Air Force and served in Vietnam.

Dave pledges to support meaningful public input, impartiality, non-partisanship, and transparency in carrying out the responsibilities of the Commission.

Theresa Quiroz

Commissioner Quiroz has lived in City Heights in San Diego for 24 years. For 15 years she has been a volunteer community advocate, working in such areas as Latino issues, City Heights issues, affordable housing, disability and transit.

"The 2010 redistricting will be a turning point for this city. My years as a volunteer and advocate give me the ability to be a part of making the outcome of the process a positive one for San Diego."

2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION STAFF

Midori Wong Chief of Staff

As Chief of Staff, Ms. Wong administers the daily operations of the Commission and acts as the primary liaison between Commissioners, City officials and staff, stakeholders, and community members. She is grateful to continue to make public service a focal point in her career thus far, having held positions in state, regional, local, and tribal government. Most recently prior to joining the Commission, Ms. Wong worked as a land use and environmental planner at the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). An alumna of the University of California - San Diego, she graduated Phi Beta Kappa with a BA in Urban Studies and Planning and Environmental Studies minor. Board and membership affiliations include the UCSD Urban Studies and Planning Steering Committee, the Junior League of San Diego, and the Urban Land Institute San Diego/Tijuana Chapter.

Ms. Wong is grateful for the assistance of the Commission Executive Secretaries, Ms. Janet Comer and Ms. Julie Corrales, and Mr. Joseph Walker of the Business Office.

Sharon Spivak Deputy City Attorney

Sharon Spivak served as legal advisor to the 2010 Redistricting Commission. She is a Deputy City Attorney in the Government Affairs Unit of the Office of the San Diego City Attorney. Ms. Spivak specializes in the areas of election law, ethics and conflicts of interest, First Amendment, constitutional law, and open meeting and public records laws. She serves as advisory counsel to the San Diego City Council, City Clerk and other City departments, and previously served as counsel to the City's Elections Task Force and Charter Amendment Commission. Before joining the City, she worked as a litigator with a national law firm. Prior to that, she spent 13 years as a newspaper reporter, winning numerous awards for her coverage of government and politics at the local, state and national levels. Ms. Spivak has a bachelor's degree in journalism from Northwestern University and a juris doctor degree from the University of San Diego School of Law.

CONSULTANTS ASSISTING THE COMMISSION

Humanability, Inc.

Public Outreach Consultants

Paula Roberts, Principal & Project Manager

For 15 years, Paula Roberts led outreach and communications at Sweetwater Authority, a public water utility in San Diego County. In this role, she built and strengthened the agency's reputation as an innovator in ecosystem restoration, resource protection and supply diversity. She created videos and narratives that helped the agency secure grants, favorable bond ratings, and numerous awards. Paula managed crisis communications and served as spokesperson for 9/11, the San Diego Fire Storm, community rescues, property damage claims and high-profile litigation. She worked with the community and media to involve constituents in agency decisions, and informed stakeholders about activities, construction and programs ranging from its multi-million-dollar desalination facility to pipelines and educational partnerships. Paula piloted programs to improve outreach to multi-cultural consumers and advised industry Education and Regulatory Communications sub-committees.

Following her work with Sweetwater Authority, Paula led public involvement for a Midwestern regional planning agency, and served as communications consultant and advisor for a watershed district. Major projects included managing a comprehensive plan training program that certified more than 200 planning professionals from stakeholder agencies, providing communications expertise to the MN Governor's Metropolitan Area Water Supply Committee, managing fare hearings for the regional transit system, and a communications audit and upgrade for Metro Mobility. Paula regularly wrote executive speeches, op-ed columns, press releases, newsletters and web content, managed public hearings, and facilitated meetings and focus groups. She provided multicultural outreach programs targeted to constituents of Hispanic, Hmong, East African, Somali and Vietnamese descent, members of the disabled community, and economically disadvantaged communities.

Clint Carney

Senior Associate

Clint Carney has more than 20 years of experience in government, public affairs and the legal profession. He specializes in developing and implementing successful strategies for grassroots campaigns and building coalitions of community, business and government leaders to develop solutions for a variety of policy and project issues.

Clint utilizes email, direct mail, social media, websites and other forms of community outreach to build momentum for client projects, including commercial and residential real estate developments, water, transportation and energy infrastructure, municipal contracting opportunities, and public policy. He has managed successful campaigns for ballot measures and candidates.

Before entering a career in public affairs, Clint served on the staff of San Diego City Councilmember Brian Maienschein. In addition to serving as Chief of Policy, he represented specific communities, and worked with residents, community, business and government leaders. He developed solutions to a variety of neighborhood concerns, ranging from addressing new development project impacts to coordinating infrastructure improvements such as freeway, street and water facility construction.

In the community, Clint sits on the boards of the National Family Justice Center Alliance, the Outdoor Education Foundation, San Diego Teen Court, the United Way's Home Again program that addresses chronic homelessness, and Partnerships with Industry, a job training and placement program for adults with developmental disabilities.

Genevieve DePerio Fong
Associate

Genevieve has over 10 years of local political and community relations experience in the San Diego region. As a recent project manager of the Southeastern Economic Development Corporation, Genevieve managed a public infrastructure project, the redevelopment activities of two redevelopment project areas, and various educational campaigns. She worked alongside the community and other stakeholders to achieve community buy-in, facilitate community involvement, and increase understanding of particular redevelopment goals. Previously, Genevieve worked at a large public affairs consulting firm, assisting in public relations for the construction of large public projects of the City of San Diego Water Department and the North County Transit District SPRINTER. She has successfully planned and executed various special events, including dedications and ribbon-cutting ceremonies. She has also served as a representative for two San Diego City Councilmembers and briefly for the Mayor's Office, providing constituent services and advising on policy and land-use issues.

In the community, Genevieve has volunteered for various political campaigns, sports events with the San Diego Sports Commission, and feeding the homeless downtown.

Marisa Farpon
Spanish Translator

Marisa started her career as a Translator/Interpreter working in Spain for the Departments of Defense and the Air Force. During her work with the U.S. Government in Spain, she served as Interpreter between the U.S. and Spanish Air Forces, and performed all translations of job descriptions, personnel grievances/complaints, and correspondence generated by the U.S. Personnel Office.

After moving to San Diego in 1989, Marisa began working for Sweetwater Authority. There she held the positions of Management Secretary and Board Secretary, and frequently evaluated Spanish language materials prepared for public outreach and communications.

While employed at Sweetwater Authority, Marisa also completed two years of training as a Medical and Court Interpreter/Translator at the Southern California School of Interpretation. She began consultation as a private translator/interpreter in 2005, and has provided technical, legal and medical translation for clients throughout the region.

The following firms also served as consultants assisting the Commission:

A Star Staffing

ESRI

National Demographics Corporation

Nielsen Merksamer Parrinello Gross & Leoni LLP

SanGIS

Translation Solutions

**BYLAWS
&
OPERATING PROCEDURES
of the
CITY OF SAN DIEGO 2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

ARTICLE 1 Name and Purpose

Section 1. The name of this commission is the CITY OF SAN DIEGO 2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, with each member registered to vote in the City of San Diego. All of the activities of this Commission will be conducted in its official name.

Section 2. The sole and exclusive authority to adopt plans which specify the boundaries of districts for the City Council is vested in the Commission. After the decennial census, the Commission will adopt plans that redistrict the City into nine (9) Council Districts designated by one (1) to nine (9) inclusively. Those districts will be used for all elections of Council Members, including their recall, and for filling any vacancy in the office of member of the Council. No change in the boundary or location of any district by redistricting as herein provided will operate to abolish or terminate the term of office of any member of the Council prior to the expiration of the term of office for which such member was elected.

Districts formed will each contain, as nearly as practicable, one ninth (1/9) of the total population of the City as shown by the Federal census immediately preceding such formation of districts.

Section 3. It is the intent of the Commissioners to perform their duties to ensure fair and equitable redistricting for all racial, ethnic and language minorities, and be in conformance with the requirements of the U.S. Constitution and federal statutes as amended and the San Diego Charter.

Section 4. To the extent it is practical to do so, districts will preserve identifiable communities of interest; be geographically compact-populous contiguous territory will not be bypassed to reach distant populous areas; be composed of whole census units as developed by the United States Bureau of the Census; be composed of contiguous territory with reasonable access

between population centers in the district, and not be drawn for the purpose of advantaging or protecting incumbents.

- Section 5. Positions and opinions of the Commission will not be established or determined by any other criteria than contained in Section 5 of the San Diego Charter.

ARTICLE II - Commissioners

- Section 1. Members of the Commission will be composed of seven (7) persons who have been appointed by three (3) retired Judges of the Superior Court, San Diego Judicial District drawn at random by the City Clerk pursuant to Section 5.1 of the San Diego Charter.
- Section 2. The Judges will appoint women and men who will give the Commission geographic, social and ethnic diversity, and who in their judgment, have a high degree of competency to carry out the responsibilities of the Commission. The appointees will include individuals with a demonstrated capacity to serve with impartiality in a non-partisan role.
- Section 3. Any vacancy in the Commission which occurs after the Commission is constituted will be filled within seven (7) calendar days by the same procedure and using the same criteria as the appointment of the initial Commissioners.
- Section 4. Any vacancy created by continuous absences (without approval of the Chair) will not exceed three (3). Upon such occurrence the Commission, by the majority vote, can recommend to the Appointing Authority, removal of the member for cause.

ARTICLE III - Officers and Chief of Staff

- Section 1. Officers will include a Chair and Vice Chair.

Their duties are as follows:

The Chair will convene and conduct regularly scheduled and or special Commission meetings, order committee meetings and other activities germane to the Commission.

All public statements will be the responsibility of the Chair and any inquiries will be directed to his or her attention.

The Vice Chair will chair meetings and duties in the absence or instruction of the Chair.

- Section 2. The Commission shall employ a Chief of Staff who shall serve at the Commission's pleasure, exempt from Civil Service, and shall contract for needed staff, technical consultants and services, using existing City staff to the extent possible. Aye votes by 5 members of the Commission shall be required for the appointment of its chief of staff.

The duties of the Chief of Staff will be consistent with the job description approved by the Commission, and consistent with such other instructions or requests that are later provided by the Commission.

- Section 3. The Chairperson of the 2010 Redistricting Commission will be the point of contact for the Chief of Staff and will supervise the Chief of Staff's work for the purpose of performance evaluation. The Vice-Chairperson will be the designated alternate should the Chairperson not be available.

The Redistricting Commission requires that the process of redistricting be open and transparent to the fullest extent possible. It is only with the trust and cooperation of the public that the Commission can succeed in its task. To ensure that the Commission's standards are met, Commissioners require the Chief of Staff to abide by the following:

- The Chief of Staff shall keep a log of all substantive communications the Chief of Staff has with the public, organizations or interest groups. This log will be published on the Redistricting Commission website. The log will include the name of the person or organization, date of contact and general description of the communication.
- The Chief of Staff will also collect information for a similar log from Commissioners and publish this on the Redistricting Commission website.
- The Chief of Staff shall not have private meetings or discussions with the Mayor, or any member of the City Council, or their representatives. This provision, however, is not intended to

prohibit the discussion by the Chief of Staff with such persons of procedural information, such as discussion of the time, place and list of items on the agendas of upcoming meetings, conversations necessary to coordinate the holding of public meetings, or conversations necessary to conduct the day-to-day operations of the Commission.

- The Chief of Staff must keep the website current.

ARTICLE IV - Meetings

- Section 1. Commission meetings will be open to the public and all records and data will be available at no charge to the public for inspection in the Office of the City Clerk during normal business hours. Copies of records and plans shall be provided, for a reasonable fee, for any interested person.
- Section 2. The Chair will establish regular and special meetings according to the requirements of the activities of the Commission and provide notices to the public thereof.
- Section 3. The Commission shall make every reasonable effort to have meetings to afford maximum public access to its proceedings. It will solicit public comment and will hold at least four (4) public hearings in various geographic areas of the City before the preparation of a preliminary redistricting plan.
- Section 4. Commission staff shall make its best efforts to count the number of members of the public attending a meeting and enter such tally into that meeting's minutes. Commission staff shall also make its best efforts to include the number of phone calls, emails, and visits staff fielded from the public in the previous month. Commission staff shall report at each regular meeting the status of receipt of final Census data until such information is officially received.
- Section 5. Within sixty (60) days after the Commissioners are appointed, the Commission will adopt a budget and submit it to the Appointing Authority. If it is approved, the budget will be forwarded to the City Council for its consideration. The City Council shall appropriate adequate funds to the Commission and to the City to carry out their duties

- Section 6. At least thirty (30) days prior to the adoption of the final plan, the Commission will file a preliminary plan with the City Clerk, along with a written statement of findings and reasons for adoption which includes notation of all criteria employed in the process and a full analysis and explanation of decisions made by the Commission.
- Section 7. During the thirty (30) day period after the filing, the Commission will hold at least three (3) public hearings in various geographic areas of the City before it adopts a final plan. Upon approval of the final plan, the Commission will adjust the boundaries of any or all of the Council districts of the City pursuant to the final plan. The final redistricting plan will be effective thirty (30) days after adoption and will be subject to the right of referendum in the manner as are ordinances of the City Council. If rejected by referendum, the same Commission will create a new plan pursuant to the criteria set forth in Sections 5 and 5.1 of the City Charter.

ARTICLE V - Policies

- Section 1. Decision for comportment or action of the Commission will be by majority vote of members.
- Section 2. Commissioners will request acknowledgment from the Chair to speak to an issue.
- Section 3. Commissioners are expected to attend all meetings.
- Section 4. Persons who accept appointment to the Commission, at the time of their appointment, shall file a written declaration with the City Clerk stating within five (5) years of the Commission's adoption of a final redistricting plan, they will not seek election to a San Diego City public office. The members of the Commission will serve until the redistricting plan is adopted and becomes effective and all legal and referendum challenges have been resolved.
- Section 5. To avoid conflicts of interest, all Commissioners will be governed by the highest standards of conduct in compliance with any applicable conflict of interest laws regarding their actions or decisions on issues of redistricting matters which may be of personal or financial benefit to themselves, members of their immediate or extended family and associates.

Section 6. Commissioners shall be mindful that the City Charter requires that they have “a demonstrated capacity to serve with impartiality in a non-partisan role.” Commissioners should avoid any action or communication that could be interpreted to compromise their ability to serve in that regard.

In addition, the Commission is committed to transparency, fairness and openness with the public. Thus, to the extent possible, Commissioners should attempt to avoid communications regarding Redistricting Commission business outside of public meetings.

Commissioners shall not, however, communicate outside of a public meeting with the Mayor or any member of the San Diego City Council, or their representatives, regarding redistricting matters. If the Mayor or any member of the City Council, or their representatives, wish to present testimony or public comment, such testimony or public comment shall only be accepted if it is presented orally at a public meeting or presented in writing and disclosed to the public either before or during a public meeting. This paragraph shall not restrict the Commission Chair from communicating with City staff regarding administrative matters of the Commission.

Commissioners shall publicly disclose all substantive communications they have regarding redistricting with any member of the public, or organizations or interest groups, regarding redistricting outside of public meetings. This provision is not intended to prohibit the discussion of procedural information, such as discussion of the time, place and list of items on the agendas of upcoming meetings.

Communications include all oral, written and electronic communications. Copies of all written and electronic materials received by a Commissioner regarding redistricting matters shall be forwarded to the Chief of Staff for distribution to all Commissioners and the public.

The Commission shall keep a log of all substantive communications between Commissioners and the Mayor or any member of the City Council, or their representatives, the public, organizations and interest groups, that occur outside public meetings. The log will include the name of the person or organization, date of contact, and general description of the communication. The log will be published on the Redistricting Commission website and regularly updated.

Section 7. Commissioners and Commission staff should not publish opinions about Commission redistricting matters on social networking websites. This

paragraph is not intended to prohibit the publication of information regarding the time, place and agendas of upcoming meetings.

Section 8. Commissioners and Commission staff shall make reasonable effort to archive operational information such as selection of IT and office resources, off-site locations, meeting attendance, budget matters, PR/marketing logistics and other such operational information that will be beneficial to the 2020 Redistricting Commission. Creating such an “Institutional Memory” is intended to facilitate and make more efficient future Redistricting Commissions. The City Clerk shall be asked to maintain such archives.

ARTICLE VI - Amendments

Section 1. These Bylaws may be amended by majority vote of the Commissioners and be submitted to the Chief of Staff to be sent out with regular Commission notices.

These Bylaws were approved at a meeting of the CITY OF SAN DIEGO 2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION on November 22, 2010 and amended on February 3, 2011.

REDISTRICTING COMMISSION 2010

FINAL BUDGET

	FY 2011 - Prorated figures	FY 2012 - Prorated figures	Redistricting Commission Final Budget
Staffing Costs			
1.00 Chief of Staff	\$ 81,932	\$ 81,932	\$ 163,864
1.00 Executive Secretary	\$ 36,801	\$ 44,162	\$ 80,963
Subtotal	\$ 118,733	\$ 126,094	\$ 244,827

Other support staff/professional services

Consulting / legal services	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 15,000
Consulting / mapping and outreach services	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 90,000
As-Needed Sign Language Interpreter Services	\$ 1,867	\$ 1,867	\$ 3,733
As-Needed Spoken Language Interpreter Services	\$ 5,530	\$ 5,530	\$ 11,060
City Attorney Support	\$ 24,661	\$ 24,661	\$ 49,321
City Clerk Support	\$ 12,258	\$ 12,258	\$ 24,516
Subtotal	\$ 96,815	\$ 96,815	\$ 193,630

Non-Personnel Expense

Advertising/Noticing	\$ 3,000	\$ -	\$ 3,000
Advertising/Chief of Staff	\$ 700	\$ -	\$ 700
Advertising/Executive Secretary	\$ 700	\$ -	\$ 700
Application Support/Labor	\$ 250	\$ 250	\$ 500
Cell Phone	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,000
Meeting Expenses	\$ 250	\$ 250	\$ 500
Network Access Charges		\$ 3,050	\$ 3,050
Office Supplies	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 1,000
Phone Service - Long Distance	\$ 250	\$ 250	\$ 500
Postage	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 1,000
Print Shop Services	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 8,000
Redistricting/Mapping Software	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000
Rent	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Transportation Allowance - Mileage	\$ 375	\$ 375	\$ 750
Transportation Allowance - Parking	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,250	\$ 2,500
Subtotal	\$ 27,775	\$ 11,425	\$ 39,200

Initial office expenditures

Fax Machine - hardware	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Modular/Cubicle Furniture	\$	500	\$	-	\$	500
Moving/Relocation costs	\$	1,800	\$	-	\$	1,800
Network Printer - hardware	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Network Ready Computers	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Office Furniture	\$	800	\$	-	\$	800
Office phones - hardware	\$	1,000	\$	-	\$	1,000
Office Software	\$	750	\$	-	\$	750
Phone/Data/Fax connection	\$	800	\$	-	\$	800
Scanner - hardware	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Subtotal	\$	5,650	\$	-	\$	5,650
Totals	\$	248,973	\$	234,334	\$	483,307
Contingency Reserve	\$	8,347	\$	8,347	\$	16,693
Grand Total	\$	257,320	\$	242,680	\$	500,000

Note: Non-Personnel expenditure allocation is subject to actual expenditure patterns. Transfers within each expenditure category may take place based on actual business needs.

2010 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

2011 WORKING TIMELINE

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT*
1 Procure mapping and outreach consultant services as needed										
2 Receive legal training by City Attorney's Office										
3 Conduct introductory public hearings (2)										
4 U.S. Census data released										
5 Receive publicly submitted preliminary redistricting plans and input										
6 Conduct pre-map public hearings (9)										
7 Develop preliminary redistricting plan										
8 Procure additional legal services as needed										
9 File preliminary redistricting plan and statement of findings										
10 Conduct post-map public hearings (5)										
11 Make revisions to preliminary redistricting plan										
12 Adopt final redistricting plan										
13 Final redistricting plan subject to right of referendum (30-day period)										
14 Complete Commission final report										
15 Close consultant contracts and Commission office										
16 Provide community presentations and conduct outreach										
17 Commission meetings (additional opportunities for public testimony)										
18 Maintain and submit communication logs										

**The Redistricting Commission shall serve until the redistricting plan adopted by the Commission becomes effective and any and all legal and referendum challenges have been resolved (City Charter Article II, Section 5.1).*



November 8, 2010

Number: U0002

The Redistricting Commission for the City of San Diego is accepting resumes for the unclassified position of

CHIEF OF STAFF
Redistricting Commission for the City of San Diego

Salary Range: Dependent on qualifications and experience

Recruitment: Open to all Qualified Candidates

Filing Deadline: December 3, 2010. Candidates are encouraged to apply promptly as interviews and selection may begin upon receipt of resumes from qualified individuals.

The City:

With more than 1.3 million people, the City of San Diego is the eighth largest city in the United States and the second largest in California. The City of San Diego's diverse population, great educational institutions, unsurpassed quality of life and world-renowned location makes it the ideal place to work, live and play.

As one of the region's largest employers, the City of San Diego has a combined Fiscal Year 2011 operating budget of approximately \$2.8 billion and employs over 10,000 highly dedicated employees. Additional information about the City of San Diego can be obtained on the City's website: www.sandiego.gov

The Position:

The Redistricting Commission, subject to the provisions of the City Charter relating to referendum and initiative powers of the people, has the sole and exclusive authority to adopt plans which specify the boundaries of districts for the City Council. The Redistricting Commission must abide by San Diego City Charter Article II section 5.1.

There is currently one vacancy for Chief of Staff. The position reports directly to the Redistricting Commission and will perform the following duties:

- 1 - Supervise and train staff and assist in their hiring.
- 2 - Attend all Redistricting Committee meetings.

- 3 - Assist the Redistricting Commissioners and provide technical and demographic assistance to help them in formulating redistricting plans and maps and analyzing plans and maps brought forth.
- 4 - Work with the City Attorney's Office and Legal Counsel to obtain legal assistance where necessary to insure compliance with the Constitution, voting rights Act, the Brown Act and the City of San Diego Charter.
- 5 - Organize all aspects of the Redistricting Commission meetings, including working with City TV, and providing translation services as needed.
- 6 - Oversee the continuous update of the website and all other media outreach.
- 7 - Assist the Redistricting Commission in its efforts to fulfill its public participation plan.
- 8 - Compile databases of election returns and demographic characteristics at the census tract level.
- 9 - Compile expert reports, studies and court findings pertaining to redistricting.

NOTE: There is an expectation that the term of employment is from January 2011 to December 2011, but the Chief of Staff shall serve at the Commission's pleasure. This is a full-time position but will require a flexible schedule to allow for attendance at evening meetings.

Qualifications:

The ideal candidate will possess the following qualifications:

- Excellent communication, interpersonal, writing and computer skills.
- Highly ethical and objective, with the ability to navigate in a political environment without being political, and serve in an unbiased and impartial way.
- Strong interpersonal skills especially with traditionally underserved communities.
- Strong leadership/management/supervisory skills.
- Be a self-starter with a high degree of initiative. Ability to handle multiple assignments and work well under pressure.
- Good judgment, a high degree of political acumen.
- A working knowledge of the City of San Diego and its diverse communities.
- Ability to interact with public officials, community leaders, and the general public in a tactful manner.
- Ability to produce informational/educational materials relevant to redistricting.
- Ability to communicate complex and technical information in a simple, clear and straightforward manner, including the use of graphs and tables as needed.
- Relevant experience, education and training which would provide the candidate with the knowledge, skills and abilities required to perform assigned duties.
- Experience working in support of a governing board is desirable.
- A strong background in urban planning is desirable.
- Strong quantitative analytical abilities, including a thorough understanding of common data analysis tools and programs.

Any combination of education and experience that demonstrates these qualifications may be qualifying.

Management Benefits:

The successful candidate will be eligible for participation in the City's Flexible Benefits Plan that offers several optional benefit plans or a taxable cash option; \$50,000 in City-paid life insurance; paid annual leave accruing at 22 days per year for the 1st through the 15th year of service; defined benefit City retirement with CalPERS reciprocity for those with eligible service and a mandatory 1% contribution to the 401(a) plan and 0.25% contribution to a retiree medical trust (with a City match to each); and optional deferred compensation (457) and 401(k) programs. Retirement benefits for current City employees may differ for this unclassified position. For further information contact the Human Resources Department at (619) 236-6313 and/or the Risk Management Department at (619) 236-6600. The benefits currently offered to employees may be subjected to future modifications.

Selection Process:

To be considered for this position, please submit two copies of each of the following: your current resume, a letter of interest highlighting your relevant work experience, and a list of three work-related references to in an envelope marked "*CONFIDENTIAL: Unclassified Recruitment* – Chief of Staff Redistricting Commission" to:

City of San Diego
Human Resources Department
1200 Third Avenue, Suite 1316, MS 56L
San Diego, CA 92101

Submission may also be sent via email to pholmberg@sandiego.gov. Candidates will be advised of the status of the recruitment following selection of the position. If you have any questions, please contact the City's Human Resources Department at (619) 236-6313.

The City of San Diego has an active Equal Opportunity/ADA Program for employment and vigorously supports diversity in the workplace.

Human Resources Director

City of San Diego Redistricting 2010 Strategic Public Participation Plan

The Strategic Public Participation Plan was developed by Humanability for the 2010 Redistricting Commission's outreach purposes. Portions describing the legal requirements for the redistricting plan are intended for discussion only and are not to be solely relied upon for legal review or analyses.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

- Executive Summary
- Background
- Situation Analysis

2. Goals/Objectives

- Business Goals/Objectives
- Public Participations Goals/Objectives

3. Implementation

- Key messages
- Talking points

4. Evaluation

5. Appendices

- A. Media and Vehicles for Public Participation
- B. Outreach Team Deliverables and Schedule
- C. Public Hearings and Commission Meetings
- D. Participation Methods by Audience
- E. Participation Plan Implementation Matrix

1. Introduction

Executive Summary:

The City of San Diego 2010 Redistricting Commission (Commission) requires a strategy to assure it provides clear, consistent and accurate information to stakeholders, maximizes public involvement, and addresses public concerns about fair and equal political participation and representation.

The Outreach Plan was developed to help the Commission identify and interact with 1) community planning groups (CPGs), 2) “key stakeholders” – individuals and groups that can help increase public participation and credibility among residents, 3) members of the media who should be kept informed about Commission activities through media outreach, and 4) “other stakeholders” -- members of the public who are or might be interested in the work of the Redistricting Commission, that should be kept informed about Commission actions through public outreach or awareness activities.

Background:

The Redistricting Commission requires effective communication to inform members of the public and key stakeholders about its work, about opportunities for members of the public to participate in the redistricting process, and to help the Commission effectively obtain valuable public comments that will help shape the redistricting plan. Communication ranges from personal interaction between Commissioners and representatives with individuals, to prepared documents, web materials, messages facilitated through the media, and information shared at formal public hearings and meetings.

Situational Analysis

The 2010 San Diego Redistricting Commission is charged with drawing new boundaries for the City’s Council Districts, including a new, ninth, Council District authorized by voters in 2010. The Commission is committed to a transparent and impartial process that reflects the values and population makeup of all City voters – **“Everybody Counts.”** The Redistricting Commission will create a redistricting plan that 1) affords fair and equal access to political representation for the City’s residents and communities, and 2) complies with the City Charter and other statutory requirements;

Several factors pose challenges to accomplishing the Mission of the 2010 San Diego Redistricting Commission. These issues include:

The identity, role and task of the Commission is not clearly understood by the general public or the media:

- Because it occurs just once every 10 years, redistricting is not a familiar topic for most residents
- The redistricting process requires analysis of complex U.S. Census Data, natural boundaries, constructed potential boundaries such as freeways or city limits, and other neighborhood characteristics
- The Redistricting Process was changed following a Court decision that rejected an earlier City Redistricting Map (1990)
- The City’s Redistricting Process occurs at the same time as Redistricting efforts at the County of San Diego and State of California; those efforts are different than the City

process but also affect City residents, creating the potential for public confusion between the various efforts

- The Commission may be challenged by community expectations that its process will be flawed or biased
 - A prior Redistricting Map for the City Council was rejected by the Courts due to gerrymandering
 - The Commissioners are not widely known and previously inexperienced in holding political office – they do not have established reputations or the support of well-established large constituencies often associated with public office
- Specific effort is required to assure adequate participation by San Diego's growing ethnic populations and other communities of interest.
 - Recent data indicates that non-Caucasian residents participate less than their Caucasian counterparts in the political process, although their population exceeds the number of Caucasian residents.
- Many residents rely solely on media and Internet sources of information about the political process.
 - The media may confuse issues and agencies when dealing with redistricting.
 - The media may not have the tools to adequately evaluate complex demographic data and mapping tools.
 - The media considers controversy a key factor in identifying news, which makes it likely that interest groups or individuals that disagree with or oppose the efforts of the Commissioners may be featured more often or more prominently than those who support and positively acknowledge the Commission.
- The Redistricting Commission operates under tight financial and time constraints that hamper its ability to assure information saturation among City residents.
 - The Commission has no budget for providing paid advertisements or mailers to all City residents.
 - In the past decade, regulations changed to allow concentrated, non-local, ownership of television and radio stations; as a result, free public service announcements are seldom, if ever, available to promote public understanding of complex political activities like redistricting.

2. Goals and Objectives

Business Goals/ Objectives

- 1) Create a legally-compliant preliminary City Council Districts map that
 - a. adjusts the boundaries to incorporate a ninth district
 - b. assures as equal representation as practicable as possible
 - c. reflects demographic changes
 - d. reflects public comment
- 2) Submit a legally-compliant final map and plan document that
 - a. responds to public comments
 - b. adequately reflects the San Diego's communities of interest.

Outreach Goals/Objectives

- 1) Increase stakeholder participation in the public comment process
 - a. compared to prior years
 - b. by underrepresented groups as a proportion of the total

3. Implementation

Key Theme/Message:

Everybody Counts. Redistricting is an impartial public process that seeks to create City Council boundaries that fairly represent all residents of San Diego. Public participation is critical to assure that the new map reflects the City's character and makeup of its residents.

Talking Points:

- 1) **Redistricting creates City Council Districts with nearly equal numbers of residents, assuring equal political representation** among people in neighborhoods across the City. The numbers and, in many cases, the types, of people in particular neighborhoods have changed since 2000. The new Districts should reflect those changes.
- 2) **Public comments will help shape the new Districts.** The Commission must identify neighboring communities that share interests and characteristics that would indicate the neighborhoods should be combined in a particular district. Public comments by individuals about their communities increase the Commissioners' ability to understand how neighborhoods should be grouped.
- 3) **The process will create a new, 9th District** in response to the voter decision creating a "Strong Mayor" form of government.
- 4) **The Redistricting process was designed to be fair and impartial.**
 - a. Members of the Redistricting Commission were appointed by retired County Superior Court judges selected at random, and were selected through an open and public process.
 - b. The City Council and its members have no authority over the Redistricting Commission or process; Districts cannot be drawn to help or oppose the incumbent Mayor or City Council Members.

Audiences:

Strategic Public Participation messages will target distinct audiences, including members of Community Planning Groups (CPGs), community leaders and activists (key stakeholders), members of the Media (Media), people with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and City of San Diego residents/the general public (other stakeholders).

Tactics and Strategies

- a. CPG/Key Stakeholder Identification: The Outreach Team identified Key Stakeholders to reach out to City residents most likely to participate in Redistricting activities or influence other interested parties to provide comments to the Commission. These Stakeholders include the City's 55 Community Planning Groups and the City's Community Planners Committee, as well as other business and community organization leaders, identified in the Key Stakeholders by District list provided to staff.
- b. Stakeholder Emails: The Commission will provide notices by Emails to its key stakeholders by District for hearings, and citywide for progress reports, requests for participant feedback, and newsletters. Staff and the outreach team will provide follow up with key stakeholders and add interested parties to the stakeholder list throughout the Redistricting Process.
- c. Media Contacts: Reporters and editors at print and electronic newspapers, television stations and radio stations that serve City residents in each District are identified in the Media Contact list provided to staff.
- d. Media Releases and Advisories – The Commission will provide media advisories for each of its public hearings, as well as topical news releases, opinion editorials and feature articles to explain its process and outcomes.
- e. Public Hearings and Meetings: The Commission's public participation methods include an aggressive schedule of public hearings at various stages of the process as follows: 2 introductory hearings, 9 pre-map hearings, and 9 post-map hearings. The hearings will be held at locations in each existing City Council District to provide maximum opportunity for comments by members of the public facing transportation barriers. The Commission will also hold regular business meetings open to the public at the City Council Chambers in downtown San Diego, which is adjacent to the trolley. The Council will also televise and video-record its meetings and hearings, making them available at its Website, subject to City TV crew availability.
 - i. LEP Participation: The Commission will provide Spanish interpretation at specified hearings to remove language barriers in the communities most impacted by people with limited English proficiency (LEP), and will provide translated written hearing materials for the City's largest populations of people with LEP. The Commission will also provide materials with simple language and illustrations to assist those with low literacy levels.

- f. Group Presentations – The Commission’s Chief of Staff will provide presentations to and accept comments from Community Planning Groups and other organizations throughout the City on an invitational basis, providing notification of these opportunities to Planning Group contacts, the media, key stakeholders, and public hearing participants. As requested, the Chief of Staff will work with representatives from communities of interest to provide culturally appropriate presentations and obtain comments from specific groups of participants with LEP.
- g. City Website – The Commission will disseminate information and accept public comments via its website, which will incorporate Spanish language materials and a Google translate option.
 - i. Interactive mapping – The Commission’s Website will provide constituents the opportunity to submit proposed maps through the use of interactive mapping software, and will provide a training session about its use to interested stakeholders.
- h. Print Materials – The Commission will provide invitational flyers, fact sheets and newsletters in portable document format (pdf) for printing by stakeholders and on its website. The Commission will provide hard copies of materials at its hearings, meetings and presentations.
- i. Comment Line – The Commission will operate a telephone comment collection line with instructions provided in both English and Spanish, will transcribe comments recorded by constituents, and will provide translation of comments recorded in languages other than English.

4. Evaluation

Public Participation Outcomes: The Strategic Outreach plan will be considered successful if it generates:

- a. public comments from representatives of significant communities of interest from each of the existing Council Districts
- b. hearings attendance and public comments that exceed past City Redistricting Efforts by 15 percent
- c. hearings attendance and public comments that compare favorably to participation levels achieved in comparably sized Cities
- d. hearing attendance and public comments by percentage of population that compare favorably to those for the County of San Diego and State of California

Outcomes will be evaluated by documentation of hearing attendees and comments received through the City Website, telephone comment line, at presentations and by mail.

5. Budget

The Outreach Team has been allocated \$25,000 for the deliverables identified in its contract. Other costs related to the Strategic Outreach plan are incorporated in the Commission’s budget for staff and public hearings.

6. Appendices

- A. Media and Vehicles for Public Participation
- B. Outreach Team Deliverables and Schedule
- C. Public Hearings and Commission Meetings
- D. Participation Methods by Audience
- E. Participation Plan Implementation Matrix

Media and Vehicles for Public Participation

Public Participation for Redistricting 2010 incorporates the following media:

- Electronic and print newsletters
- Printed and online meeting materials
- Translation and Interpretation
- Culturally appropriate design
- Fact Sheets/FAQs
- Promotional flyers
- Posters
- Web site
- Facebook page
- Electronic messaging and bulletins
- Media releases
- Media advisories
- Opinion editorials
- Feature articles
- Interactive mapping software
- Video recordings of Commission Meetings and Public Hearings
- Multi-media presentations
- Public hearings, meetings and comments
- Presentations to Community Planning and other stakeholder groups
- Targeted multi-cultural outreach
- Telephone comment line
- Email and written comment collection
- Training events

APPENDIX B. Outreach Team Deliverables

Task	Deadline Date, Within:
2.1.1 – Develop Strategic Outreach Plan and Community Partnerships <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research, develop stakeholder contact lists, contact by telephone or in person as directed by staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Districts 4 and 8 (16 minimum) Districts 5 and 7 (16 minimum) Districts 2 and 3 (16 minimum) Districts 1 and 6 (16 minimum) Networking with Partner Groups Report to Chief of Staff Stakeholder Concerns and Provide Suggestions to Responses 	<i>65 working days of Notice to Proceed (NTP)</i> <i>Ongoing until contract expiration</i> <i>Ongoing until contract expiration</i>
2.1.2. – Create Materials that Remove Language, Literacy, Experience Barriers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage Translation of Materials Evaluate Materials for Consistency and Effectiveness Create Activity Booklet 	<i>65 working days of NTP</i> <i>65 working days of NTP</i> <i>65 working days of NTP</i>
2.1.3. – Develop Multiple Formats for Comment Collection, Track and Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop Script for general phone line comment collection Support Chief of Staff, Executive Secretary with Comment Collection reports as needed 	<i>65 working days of NTP</i> <i>Ongoing until contract expiration</i>
2.2.1. – Develop Meeting Checklists, Review/Prepare PowerPoint Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop Meeting Procedure and Supplies Checklists Review and Provide Comments on presentations; develop additional presentation materials as needed/desired 	<i>65 working days of NTP</i> <i>Ongoing until contract expiration</i>
2.3/2.4 – Provide Information and Work with the Media <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate with Mapping Consultant to identify access barriers and opportunities for online mapping tool Identify Information Distribution Opportunities Citywide As needed/desired, work with Chief of Staff to create and distribute Media Releases Fact Sheet Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) Sheet Newsletter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue 1 Issue 2 Issue 3 Issue 4 Create News Briefs/Drop-In Articles 	<i>90 working days of NTP</i> <i>Ongoing until contract expiration</i> <i>Ongoing until contract expiration</i> <i>90 working days of NTP</i> <i>90 working days of NTP</i> <i>60 working days of NTP</i> <i>90 working days of NTP</i> <i>120 working days of NTP</i> <i>150 working days of NTP</i> <i>Ongoing until contract expiration</i>
2.5 – Additional Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Media Training 	<i>Ongoing until contract expiration</i>

APPENDIX C. Public Hearings and Commission Meetings

Introductory Public Hearings

Monday, March 21, 2011 - 6:30 p.m.
City of San Diego Metro Operations Center
(MOC) II – Auditorium
9192 Topaz Way, San Diego, CA 92123

Tuesday, March 22, 2011 - 6:30 p.m.
Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation -
Community Room
404 Euclid Avenue, San Diego, CA 92114

Pre-Map Public Hearings - all begin at 6 p.m. unless otherwise noted

Tuesday, April 19 (District 4)
Valencia Park/Malcolm X Library
Community Room
5148 Market Street, San Diego, 92114

Wednesday, April 20 (District 8)
Otay Mesa-Nestor Library
Community Room
3003 Coronado Avenue, San Diego, 92154

Monday, April 25 (District 5)
Qualcomm Headquarters
Main Services Building - Main Lunch Room
5775 Morehouse Drive, San Diego, 92121

Wednesday, April 27 (District 7)
Tierrasanta Recreation Center
Rooms 2 and 3
11220 Clairemont Mesa Blvd, San Diego,
92122

Special Weekend Hearing – 10 a.m.
Saturday, April 30 (Citywide)
Balboa Park Club
Santa Fe Room
2144 Pan American Road West, San Diego,

92101

Monday, May 2 (District 3)
Regional Transportation Center
Showroom
4001 El Cajon Boulevard, San Diego, 92105

Wednesday, May 4 (District 2)
Point Loma/Hervey Library
Community Room
3701 Voltaire Street, San Diego, 92107

Monday, May 9 (District 6)
Bayside Community Center
Grand Hall
2202 Comstock Street, San Diego, 92111

Wednesday, May 11 (District 1)
La Jolla Woman's Club
715 Silverado Street, La Jolla, 9203

Post-Map Public Hearings

Following approval, this schedule will be provided online at
<http://www.sandiego.gov/redistricting/meetings/publichearings.shtml>.

Commission Meetings

Fifty one candidates were interviewed, and seven Commissioners selected, in a public meeting held by the Appointing Authority on October 1, 2010.

The 2010 Redistricting Commission held its first meeting October 21, 2010, and is expected to meet through September 30. Meetings are generally held the 1st and 3rd Thursdays of each month at 4:00 pm. at the City Administration Building, 202 C Street San Diego, CA 92101, in the Committee Room on the 12th floor. Dates and times are subject to change; up-to-date information is provided at
<http://www.sandiego.gov/redistricting/meetings/index.shtml>.

APPENDIX D.

Participation Methods by Audience

	Community Planning Groups (CPGs)	Media	Key Stakeholders	LEP Participants (LEP)	Other stakeholders (Other)
Business Objective 1: <u>Create Publicly Responsive, Legally Compliant Draft Map by July 15, 2011</u> Business Objective 2: <u>Create Publicly Responsive, Legally Compliant Final Map no later than September 15, 2011</u>					
Communication Objectives: <u>Maximize public participation overall, by District, and by previously underrepresented groups</u> 1. Maximize public awareness 2. Remove barriers to participation 3. Increase public understanding about impact of participation, legal requirements and public safeguards	-Email notices -Flyers -Pub Hearings -Presentations -Fact Sheets / FAQ -Talking points -Website -Comment line -Mapping software and training -Newsletters and bulletins -Hearings located in each district	-Media Advisories -Feature articles -Public Hearings -Fact Sheets/FAQ -Website -Op Editorials -Media training -Talking points	-Email notices -Flyers -Website -Pub Hearings -Presentations -Comment line -Mapping software and training -Locations with mass transit and pedestrian access -Newsletters and bulletins	-Spanish Language Flyers -Ethnic media notification -Public Hearings with Spanish Interpretation near highly concentrated Spanish LEP populations -Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese & Tagalog hearing materials, Fact Sheets/FAQ, newsletters -Media Advisories -Feature articles -Simple words and pictures materials -Culturally appropriate presentations -Spanish comment line -Website Google translate -Training for web mapping -Locations with mass transit and pedestrian access -Advisories for translation assistance	-Email notice list -Flyers -Posters -Website -Media notification -Public Hearings -Fact Sheets/FAQ -Comment line -Mapping software and training -Locations with mass transit and pedestrian access -Checklist features for accessibly meetings -Materials in alternate formats -Website zoom feature, tags for illustrations -Newsletters and bulletins
Key Message: <u>"Everybody Counts"</u> Tailored by Audience →	Tell the Commission about your community's historical, current and developing characteristics	Inform the public about participation opportunities, impact and outcomes	Tell Commission about your constituents, encourage participation	The Commission wants to understand where San Diego's communities of interest are located	The Commission wants to know what makes your neighborhood special

APPENDIX E.

Participation Plan Implementation Matrix

Purpose	Audience(s)	Timing Frequency	Message	Method Channel	Accountability
Increase participation through increased awareness	CPGs Media LEP Key Stakeholders Other	Prior to each hearing	Everybody counts – <i>Attend a San Diego Redistricting public hearing and/or submit a comment to the Commission</i>	Electronic notices Flyers Posters Media advisories Facebook posts Website Multiple formats for comment collection	<u>Outreach Team</u> : Content development/review, key stakeholder and media contact lists, personal contacts or distribution as requested by staff. <u>Staff</u> : General and media distribution, Web and Facebook posts, comments transcription
Increase participation by removing barriers	LEP Other	Ongoing	Everybody counts – <i>The San Diego Redistricting Commission welcomes your participation and provides accessible public hearings and meetings</i>	Electronic flyers, website, meeting instructions, directions to locations, location evaluation, meeting procedures, checklists Foreign language and accessibility accommodations Multiple forms for submitting comments	<u>Outreach Team</u> : Multicultural design, content development/review, checklists, location review, sign content, expert LEP and access advice, written Spanish translation. <u>Staff</u> : language and accommodation approval, arrangements
Increase public understanding of Redistricting process, progress and outcomes	CPGs Media LEP Key Stakeholders Other	-Initially -After pre-map hearings -After post-map hearings -At conclusion of process -Ongoing	Everybody counts – <i>This is how public participation can influence or has influenced San Diego's 2010 Redistricting process and outcome.</i>	Video-recordings Public Hearings Presentations Meeting Materials Talking Points Opinion Editorials Website Fact Sheets/FAQs Flyers Posters Newsletters Media advisories Feature articles Online mapping & training	<u>Outreach Team</u> : Multicultural design, content development/review, development of media materials, assistance with comment summaries, mapping accessibility and training development assistance, expert advice for LEP access, media response, crisis communications. <u>Staff</u> : Manage video-recordings, hearings and presentations, approve final content, post and distribute materials. Seek expert advice and media assistance