

**2020 REDISTRICTING
COMMISSION OF THE
CITY OF SAN DIEGO**

DATE: November 15, 2021

TO: City Clerk

FROM: 2020 Redistricting Commission

SUBJECT: Filing of Preliminary Redistricting Plan for the City of San Diego

INTRODUCTION

The City of San Diego 2020 Redistricting Commission (“the Redistricting Commission” or “Commission”) is vested with sole and exclusive authority to adopt plans that specify the boundaries of districts for the Council of the City of San Diego (“City Council”). San Diego City Charter (“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 nine-member Redistricting Commission voted [7-2] to adopt a Preliminary Redistricting Plan (“the Plan”) on November 13, 2021. The Plan complies with the redistricting criteria and legal requirements of 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.

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 2020;
- Avoid diluting the voting strength of protected classes as set forth in the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 as much as possible;
- 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 26 public meetings between October 23, 2020 and November 9, 2021, each noticed in accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act (“Brown Act”). These meetings included twelve monthly meetings, nine widely publicized Pre-Map Public Hearings, one for each City Council district, and five additional special meetings, complying with the requirement of the Charter to hold at least nine public hearings before the preparation of a Preliminary Redistricting Plan. Pursuant to the Governor’s Executive Orders N-25-20, N-29-20, N-08-21, and N-15-21, which suspended certain requirements of the Brown Act due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the findings adopted by the Redistricting Commission pursuant to California Government Code section 54953(e) on October 21, 2021, all Redistricting Commission meetings were conducted virtually with all Commissioners and members of the public participating virtually, in the interest of public health and safety. Approximately 1,500 people attended these hearings.

During those hearings, the Redistricting Commission heard from more than 600 public speakers. To date, the Commission has received approximately 209 email/letter public comments and 319 webform public comments, which were all posted on the Redistricting Commission website. The Commission also received approximately 202 maps, 173 written testimony and 64 Communities of Interest (COI) submissions on Districtr, the online redistricting mapping tool. The Commission considered the testimony, written submissions, and maps before adopting the Plan.

Public outreach: Public outreach efforts included providing simultaneous interpretation in Spanish at the August 17, 2021, August 24, 2021, and September 14, 2021 Pre-Map Public Hearings. Agendas were provided in Spanish starting from the May 20, 2021 meeting to the present. For the meetings of May 20, 2021, June 17, 2021, and July 15, 2021, agendas were provided in Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Lao, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. Commissioners and the chief of staff provided community outreach presentations to approximately 21 community planning groups throughout the City of San Diego. In addition, the recordings of Redistricting Commission meetings were posted on the website.

The Commission has been committed to transparency in its proceedings. To maximize public access to its proceedings, the Commission procured online redistricting mapping software (Districtr) so the public could draw, share, propose, and submit maps to the Commission. Public training for the software was held on September 16, 2021, September 28, 2021, and October 5, 2021. Training videos were also available on the Commission’s website. All maps submitted to the Commission and developed by the Commission for consideration are available online (<https://portal.sandiego-mapping.org/#gallery>).

THE PRELIMINARY PLAN

A map of the Plan (adopted November 13, 2021) is attached. The Plan divides the City’s population of 1,389,899 into nine City Council districts of approximately equal population. The Commission’s goal was to draw districts with as close to a population of 154,433 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 5.35%. The largest City Council district has a population of 157,631 (+2.07% in population); the smallest district has a population of 149,363 (-3.28% in population). Demographics for the districts, including Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) and population by racial groups per district, are detailed in attachments to this statement. For consistency, this Plan uses the same terminology used by the 2020 Census to describe racial and ethnic groups.

This Plan is described below in detail. The Charter directs that the Redistricting Commission consider U.S. Census data. However, due to delays, the U.S. Census has not yet produced CVAP data for the 2020 Census. The United States Department of Justice (DOJ) uses CVAP to investigate and prosecute certain Voting Rights Act cases. In early 2021, the DOJ told the Census Bureau that it could use CVAP data from the 2019 American Communities Survey (ACS). CVAP data used in this plan refers to the data from the ACS.

Additionally, 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. The Community Planning Area (CPA) and Neighborhood areas referred to in this Plan were obtained from San Diego County's Geographic Information System (SANGIS) and were available to the public in the District mapping software available on the Commission's website. 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
 - Fairbanks Ranch Country Club
 - La Jolla
 - NFCUA Subarea II
 - Pacific Beach
 - Pacific Highland Ranch
 - Torrey Highlands
 - Torrey Hills (partial – portion north of Carmel Mountain Road)
 - Torrey Pines (partial – excluding southern portion east of Interstate 5)
 - University (partial – portion east of Interstate 5)
 - Via de la Valle
- Neighborhoods
 - Carmel Valley
 - Del Mar Heights
 - La Jolla
 - North City
 - Pacific Beach (partial – portion north of Grand Avenue, Crown Point Drive, and Riviera Drive)
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial – eastern portion)

- Torrey Highlands
- Torrey Pines
- Torrey Preserve
- Demographics
 - Total population: 157,631
 - Deviation: +2.07% (+3,198 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 68.4% of the population to be included in the new District 1 is presently included in the current District 1.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. State Route 56 connects Carmel Valley, Torrey Highlands, and Rancho Peñasquitos. Del Mar Heights, Torrey Preserve, Torrey Pines, La Jolla, and Pacific Beach are connected by Interstate 5.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - Per the 2020 census data, District 1, as currently drawn, started out having a population of 166,620 and was over the ideal district size with a deviation of +7.91%. District 1 had the highest total population and deviation among the nine Council districts.
 - This map maintains two coastal districts.
 - University of California – San Diego (UCSD) was a point of contention for the community. Students and community groups provided testimony to request that UCSD and University City be moved to District 6. There were other District 1 residents and community groups who requested little to no changes to the 2011 District 1 boundaries.
 - The Commission decided to keep UCSD in District 1 to keep the district compact and contiguous. However, the Commission moved University City to District 6 in response to public testimony that a number of UCSD students live in northern University City and wanted to move to District 6 given their ties to the communities there.
 - The Commission kept most of Carmel Valley in District 1 but moved the southern portion and Torrey Hills to District 6 to balance population.
 - The Commission decided to move the coastal communities of La Jolla and Pacific Beach into the same district based on their common interests and concerns, including traffic, beaches and bays, tourism, and environmental issues including sea level rise.
 - The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing 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 2

- Community Plan Areas
 - Clairemont Mesa
 - Midway-Pacific Highway

- Mission Bay Park
- Mission Beach
- Ocean Beach
- Peninsula
- Neighborhoods
 - Bay Ho
 - Bay Park
 - Clairemont Mesa East
 - Clairemont Mesa West
 - La Playa
 - Loma Portal
 - Midtown (partial – portion west of Interstate 5)
 - Midway District
 - Mission Beach
 - Mission Hills (partial – portion west of Interstate 5)
 - Ocean Beach
 - North Clairemont
 - Pacific Beach (partial – southern portion adjacent to Mission Bay)
 - Point Loma Heights
 - Roseville/Fleet Ridge
 - Sunset Cliffs
 - Wooded Area
- Demographics
 - Total population: 149,363
 - Deviation: -3.28% (-5,070 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 65.7% of the population to be included in the new District 2 is presently included in the current District 2.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. Bay Ho, Bay Park, Mission Bay, Midway District, and San Diego Airport are connected by Interstate 5. Balboa Avenue is a connection point for Clairemont Mesa East, Clairemont Mesa West, Bay Park, and Bay Ho. North Clairemont and Clairemont Mesa East are connected by Interstate 805. Nimitz Boulevard, Midway Drive, Rosecrans Street, and Catalina Boulevard are major connecting streets.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - Per the 2020 census data, District 2 started out having a population of 149,985 and was under the ideal district size with a deviation of -2.88%.
 - This map maintains two coastal districts.
 - Pursuant to requests from the community, the Clairemont communities were reunited into one district given their common interests.
 - The Morena area was moved from District 2 to District 7 to unite Linda Vista into a single district.
 - The coastal communities of Ocean Beach, Mission Beach, Pacific Beach, as well as the peninsula of Point Loma remain in District 2. These areas share common issues, including concern for their beaches and bays, tourism, environmental

issues including sea level rise, traffic, noise, and pollution impacts from the San Diego Airport, which also remains in the district.

- Bay Ho and Bay Park were kept in District 2 due to the proximity, recreational opportunities, and views related to Mission Bay.
- 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/Downtown (excluding 10th Avenue terminal)
 - Greater Golden Hill
 - North Park
 - Mission Valley (partial – southern portion)
 - Old Town San Diego
 - Uptown
- Neighborhoods
 - Balboa Park
 - Bankers Hill
 - Burlingame
 - Core-Columbia
 - Cortez Hill
 - East Village
 - Gaslamp Quarter
 - Golden Hill
 - Grant Hill (partial – portion north of State Route 94)
 - Harbor View
 - Hillcrest
 - Horton Plaza
 - Little Italy
 - Marina
 - Midtown (partial – portion east of Interstate 5)
 - Mission Hills (partial – portion east of Interstate 5)
 - Mission Valley East (partial – southern portion)
 - Mission Valley West
 - North Park
 - Old Town
 - Park West
 - Petco Park
 - Sherman Heights (partial – portion north of State Route 94)
 - South Park
 - Stockton (partial – portion north of State Route 94)
 - University Heights

- Demographics
 - Total population: 155,037
 - Deviation: +0.39% (+604 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 94.2% of the population to be included in the new District 3 is presently included in the current 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, Downtown and Mission Valley are accessible by State Route 163 (Cabrillo Freeway). Hillcrest is connected to University Heights by University Avenue. North Park is connected to the South Park and Golden Hill areas by Interstate 805 and Interstate 15. Mission Valley is connected to University Heights by Interstate 805 and Texas Street. Broadway and B Street connect the Downtown area to San Diego City College and Golden Hill.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - Per the 2020 census data, District 3 started out having a population of 161,448 and was over the ideal district size with a deviation of +4.54%.
 - Normal Heights and Adams North were moved from District 3 to District 9 to decrease the district's total population. Normal Heights was also moved so the neighborhood's Community Planning Group is within a single Council district.
 - A portion of Mission Valley was added to District 3 for population balance.
 - Balboa Park remains a major common interest of many of the neighborhoods in District 3 and was left intact.
 - The older, urban communities of character surrounding Balboa Park including Hillcrest, North Park, South Park, and Golden Hill remained in District 3.
 - With the exception of the 10th Avenue terminal, Downtown remained within a single district. The 10th Avenue terminal area was moved to District 8 at the requests of residents of Barrio Logan because of the traffic, environmental, and health impacts it has on the adjacent community of Barrio Logan. The total population of the 10th Avenue terminal area moved to District 8 was 86 people.
 - University Heights remained intact within a single Council district.
 - The LGBTQ (Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender-Queer) community has historically had a large population residing south of Interstate 8 in communities represented by Council District 3. The district boundaries were drawn to respect and acknowledge this history and to provide fair representation for the LGBTQ 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 4

- Community Plan Areas
 - City Heights (partial – Ridgeview)
 - Eastern Area (partial – neighborhoods of Oak Park and Webster)
 - Encanto Neighborhoods
 - Skyline-Paradise Hills
 - Southeastern San Diego (partial – portion east of Interstate 15, north of National Avenue and east of South 43rd Street)
- Neighborhoods
 - Alta Vista
 - Bay Terraces
 - Broadway Heights
 - Chollas View
 - Emerald Hills
 - Encanto
 - Jamacha
 - Lincoln Park
 - Lomita
 - Mount Hope
 - Mountain View
 - Oak Park
 - Paradise Hills
 - Ridgeview
 - Skyline
 - Valencia Park
 - Webster
- Demographics
 - Total population: 157,198
 - Deviation: +1.79% (+2,765 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 87.1% of the population to be included in the new District 4 is presently included in the current District 4.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Broadway Heights, Emerald Hills, Ridgeview, 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
 - Per the 2020 census data, District 4 started out having a population of 145,708 and was under the ideal district size with a deviation of -5.65%.
 - 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 some communities that were historically part

- of District 4 and were moved to District 9 in the 2011 Plan requested to be moved back to District 4 and that this district needed to gain population.
- The Commission recognized that District 4 has a large, geographically compact Black population and that it has historically been a Black 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 15.28% Black, 48.77% Latino, and 21.3% Asian. The CVAP for this district will be 21.64% Black, 37.84 Latino, and 21.81% Asian.
 - The Commission determined that the Ridgeview, Mount Hope, and Mountain View communities should be included in District 4, consistent with public testimony on the interests of those communities.
 - Natural boundaries for the district include the City's boundaries, Interstate 15, 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.

DISTRICT 5

- Community Plan Areas
 - Black Mountain Ranch
 - Carmel Mountain Ranch
 - Miramar Ranch North
 - Rancho Bernardo
 - Rancho Peñasquitos
 - San Pasqual
 - Scripps Miramar Ranch (partial – portion north and east of Pomerado Road)
 - Torrey Highlands (partial – portion east of Camino del Sur and north of Carmel Valley Road)
- Neighborhoods
 - Carmel Mountain Ranch
 - Miramar Ranch North
 - Rancho Bernardo
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial – excluding portion that is in the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Community Plan Area and the westernmost portion that is in the Torrey Highlands Community Plan Area)
 - Sabre Springs
 - San Pasqual
 - Scripps Ranch (partial – portion north and east of Pomerado Road)
 - Torrey Highlands (partial – portion east of Camino del Sur and north of Carmel Valley Road)
- Demographics
 - Total population: 151,981
 - Deviation: -1.59% (-2,452 people)

- Historical: Approximately 93.2% of the population to be included in the new District 5 is presently included in the current District 5.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. San Pasqual, Rancho Bernardo, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Rancho Peñasquitos, Sabre Springs, Miramar Ranch North, and Scripps Ranch are connected north and south by Interstate 15. State Route 56 connects Rancho Peñasquitos, Sabre Springs, and Carmel Mountain Ranch east and west.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - Per the 2020 census data, District 5 started out having a population of 158,760 and was over the ideal district size with a deviation of +2.80%.
 - 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. There was also public testimony requesting that Park Village be reunited with Rancho Peñasquitos.
 - 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 to move Torrey Highlands and the southern portion of Scripps Ranch to District 6, was in part to balance population deviation.
 - This district contains the northeastern most portion of the city.
 - The Commission heard testimony 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.
 - 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.
 - 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 equalize population.

DISTRICT 6

- Community Plan Areas
 - East Elliott (partial – excluding southeast portion)
 - Kearny Mesa (partial – portion west of State Route 163)
 - Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve
 - Military Facilities
 - Mira Mesa
 - Rancho Encantada
 - Scripps Miramar Ranch (partial – portion south and east of Pomerado Road)
 - Torrey Hills (partial – excluding portion north of Carmel Mountain Road)

- Torrey Pines (partial – southern portion east of Interstate 5)
- University (partial – portion east of Interstate 5)
- Neighborhoods
 - Carmel Valley (partial – portion in the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Community Plan Area and portion in the Torrey Hills Community Plan Area that is west of El Camino Real and south of Carmel Mountain Road)
 - East Elliott
 - Kearny Mesa (partial – portion west of State Route 163)
 - Miramar
 - Mira Mesa
 - Rancho Encantada
 - Rancho Peñasquitos (partial – southeastern portion)
 - Scripps Ranch (partial – portion south and east of Pomerado Road)
 - Sorrento Valley
 - Torrey Hills
 - University City (partial – portion east of Interstate 5)
- Demographics
 - Total population: 154,326
 - Deviation: -0.07% (-107 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 56.5% of the population to be included in the new District 6 is presently included in the current District 6.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Scripps Ranch, Mira Mesa, Miramar, and Kearny Mesa are connected north and south by Interstate 15 and transition to State Route 163. Sorrento Valley, Miramar, University City, and Kearny Mesa are connected by Interstate 805. Torrey Hills, Sorrento Valley, and University City are connected north and south by Interstate 5.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - Per the 2020 census data, District 6 started out having a population of 152,358 and was under the ideal district size with a deviation of -1.34%.
 - The Commission determined that there is a community of interest among the Asian population in this district that shares business interests, cultural activities, and social ties and concerns. The Asian population is sufficiently geographically compact to comprise 39.43% of the district's population (the largest in the City) and a CVAP of 32.44% 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.
 - In recognition of its cultural significance to the Asian community, the Commission decided to keep the Convoy District in District 6.
 - There was significant testimony from students attending the University of California – San Diego (UCSD) and other community members seeking to move UCSD and University City to this district; there was also testimony that University City should be kept whole and has a connection with UCSD and La

Jolla. The Commission determined that the portion of University City east of Interstate 5 should move to District 6.

- A common area of interest to many of the communities in this district is MCAS Miramar, referred to as Military Facilities. These communities include enlisted personnel and their families as well as social, business, and commercial interests surrounding MCAS Miramar.
- The Commission determined that because of its large population, it was impractical to include all of University City in this district. Torrey Hills was added to this district to balance population.
- 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 (partial – southeast portion)
 - Kearny Mesa (partial – portion east of State Route 163)
 - Linda Vista
 - Mission Valley (partial – Birdland and Civita neighborhoods and portion of East Mission Valley east of Interstate 15 and north of Friars Road)
 - Navajo
 - Serra Mesa
 - Tierrasanta
- Neighborhoods
 - Allied Gardens
 - Birdland
 - Del Cerro
 - Grantville (partial – portion east of Mission Gorge Road and portion north of Friars Road)
 - Lake Murray (East San Carlos)
 - Linda Vista
 - Mission Valley East (partial – portion east of Interstate 15 and north of Friars Road)
 - Morena
 - San Carlos
 - Serra Mesa (partial – excluding northwest corner west of State Route 163)
 - Tierrasanta (partial – excludes the portion north of State Route 52)
- Demographics
 - Total population: 157,253
 - Deviation: +1.83% (+2,820 people)
 - Historical: Approximately 90.4% of the population to be included in the new District 7 is included in the current District 7.

- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Kearny Mesa, Tierrasanta, Serra Mesa, and Grantville are connected north and south by Interstate 15. Morena, Linda Vista, and Grantville are connected east and west by Friars Road. Grantville, Allied Gardens, San Carlos, and Lake Murray are connected east and west by Friars Road/Mission Gorge Road. Navajo Road connects Allied Gardens, Del Cerro, and San Carlos. Tierrasanta, and Mission Trails Regional Park are connected east and west by State Route 52.
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - Per the 2020 census data, District 7 started out having a population of 159,500 and was over the ideal district size with a deviation of +3.28%.
 - The Commission determined that Mission Trails Regional Park and the communities that surround it, including Tierrasanta, Lake Murray, and San Carlos, form a community of interest based on their close connection to the park and should be kept together.
 - Linda Vista, Birdland, and Serra Mesa are located to the north of Mission Valley and share common issues related to the traffic feeding south to the developing areas of Mission Valley.
 - Tierrasanta and Navajo residents testified that they are also a community of interest, along with Allied Gardens, Del Cerro, San Carlos, and Grantville.
 - The inclusion of Kearny Mesa east of State Route 163 was included in part due to testimony concerning keeping areas around the Montgomery-Gibbs Executive Airport in one district. It also recognizes the interface between commercial and industrial development.
 - 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 redistricting criteria.

DISTRICT 8

- Community Plan Areas
 - Barrio Logan
 - Downtown (portion south of Commercial Street and Park Boulevard)
 - Military Facilities
 - Otay Mesa
 - Otay Mesa-Nestor
 - San Ysidro
 - Southeastern San Diego (portion west of Interstate 15, south of National Avenue and west of S. 43rd Street)
 - Tijuana River Valley
- Neighborhoods
 - Barrio Logan
 - Border

- Egger Highlands
- Grant Hill
- Logan Heights
- Nestor
- Ocean Crest
- Otay Mesa
- Otay Mesa West
- Palm City
- San Ysidro
- Shelltown
- Sherman Heights
- Southcrest
- Stockton
- Tijuana River Valley
- Demographics
 - Total population: 155,397
 - Deviation: +0.62% (+964 people)
 - Historical: 96.0% of the population to be included in the new District 8 is presently included in the current 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
 - Per the 2020 census data, District 8 started out having a population of 149,314 and was under the ideal district size with a deviation of -3.32%.
 - 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 75.9% Latino, 9.2% White, 4.6% Black, and 7.3% Asian. The CVAP of the district is 67.3% Latino.

- 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. In response to community testimony, the neighborhood of Southcrest was added to District 8 from its current location in District 9.
- 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. The community also requested that part of the Downtown Community Planning Area around the 10th Avenue terminal be included in District 8, due to the traffic, pollution, and related environmental impacts on Barrio Logan.
- 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 (partial – excludes Ridgeview neighborhood)
 - College Area
 - Eastern Area (partial – neighborhoods of Rolando, Rolando Park, Redwood Village, and El Cerrito)
 - Kensington-Talmadge
 - Mission Valley (partial – portion east of Interstate 805 and south of Friars Road)
 - Normal Heights
- Neighborhoods
 - Adams North
 - Azalea/Hollywood Park
 - Castle
 - Cherokee Point
 - Chollas Creek
 - Colina del Sol
 - College East
 - College West
 - Corridor
 - El Cerrito
 - Fairmont Park
 - Fairmont Village
 - Fox Canyon
 - Grantville (partial – western and southwestern portion)
 - Islenair
 - Kensington

- Mission Valley East (partial – portion east of Interstate 805 and south of Friars Road)
- Normal Heights
- Qualcomm
- Redwood Village
- Rolando
- Rolando Park
- Swan Canyon
- Talmadge
- Teralta East
- Teralta West
- Demographics
 - Total population: 151,713
 - Deviation: -1.76% (-2,720 people)
 - Historical: 79.0% of the population to be included in the new District 9 is presently included in City Council District 9.
- Contiguity

The district is geographically contiguous. There is reasonable access between population centers in the district. Adams North, Normal Heights, Kensington, Corridor, Teralta West, Cherokee Point, Castle, Azalea/Hollywood Park and Fairmount Park are connected north and south by Interstate 15. Normal Heights, Corridor, Kensington, Talmadge, Colina del Sol, College East, College West, Teralta East, Teralta West, El Cerrito, Rolando, Rolando Park and Redwood Village are connected east and west by El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue
- Findings and Reasons for Adoption
 - Per the 2020 census data, District 9 started out having a population of 146,204 and was under the ideal district size with a deviation of -5.33%.
 - The Commission heard testimony concerning keeping neighborhoods along University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard east of Interstate 805 together as far as possible, with these neighborhoods stating they formed a Community of Interest along those corridors.
 - The Commission moved the Normal Heights Community Planning Area from District 3 to District 9. Testimony from residents of this area requested that the Community Planning Area be kept intact, either in District 3 or District 9. Because District 3 was the only district out of Districts 3, 4, 8, and 9 south of Interstate 8 that was above the target district size population, the move helped to balance populations among the four districts and reduce the total deviation of the Preliminary Map. This area is also wholly east of Interstate 805, creating a discrete boundary between District 3 and District 9, using the Interstate as the demarcation line.
 - The district has a large population of immigrants, from many parts of the world, including Latin America, East Africa, and Southeast Asia, presenting 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. Accordingly, the Qualcomm neighborhood north of Interstate 8 was added to District 9 from District 7, as it is the location of a new SDSU development that will include sports facilities, businesses, and student and faculty housing.
 - This new district moves Rolando Park and Redwood Village to District 9 at the request of those residents.
 - Natural boundaries include Interstate 8 partially, Interstate 805, the City limits and part of Highway 94.
 - The district includes a majority-minority Latino population, representing 40.25% of the total population. The district remains diverse in ethnicity, with a large Latino population as well as significant Black and Asian populations. The new district's population is 40.25% Latino; 30.3% White; 10.22% Black; and 13.5% Asian, compared with its current population of 48.2% Latino, 23.7 White, 10.4% Black, and 12.8% Asian. The Latino CVAP for this new district is 28.63% compared with the current Latino CVAP of 35.0%.
 - The reduction in the proportion of the Latino population was in part due to the need to add population to the district, which currently has the smallest population of the nine City Council districts. As has already been stated, Districts 9, 4, and 8 were all significantly below the target district size of 154,433. District 4 is bounded by District 9 to its north and District 8 to its west, so in order to increase its population, it needed to add neighborhoods from District 9, which in turn needed to further increase its now reduced population by extending west to Normal Heights and North to Mission Valley. These moves changed the population composition of District 9, although it remains a majority-minority district.
 - The district is geographically compact to the extent possible while balancing the other criteria and community of interest boundaries.

VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY PLAN AND UPCOMING HEARINGS

The vote of the Commissioners on the Preliminary Plan on November 13, 2021 was as follows:

- Voting "yes" for the Preliminary Plan as submitted: Commissioners Val Hoy, Fred Kosmo, Roy MacPhail, Ken Malbrough, Alan Nevin, Tom Hebrank and Kristen Roberts
- Voting "no" for the Preliminary Plan as submitted: Commissioners Justine Nielsen and Monica Hernandez

In accordance with the requirements of the Charter, the Redistricting Commission will now convene five public hearings in the 30 days after the filing of this Plan 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 Charter.

The members of the City of San Diego 2020 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.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Thomas C. Hebrank". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal dashed line.

Thomas Hebrank

Chair of the City of San Diego 2020 Redistricting Commission

On 2020 Redistricting Commission:

Val Hoy

Frederick W. Kosmo, Jr.

Roy MacPhail

Ken Malbrough

Alan Nevin

Justine Nielsen

Monica Hernandez

Thomas Hebrank

Kristen Roberts

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

—DISTRICT 1—

<u>Community Planning Areas</u>	<u>Neighborhoods</u>
Carmel Valley	Carmel Valley
Fairbanks Ranch Country Club	Del Mar Heights
La Jolla	La Jolla
NCCUA Subarea II	North City
Pacific Beach	Pacific Beach (partial – portion north of Grand Avenue, Crown Point Drive, and Riviera Drive)
Pacific Highlands Ranch	Rancho Peñasquitos (partial – eastern portion)
Torrey Highlands	Torrey Highlands
Torrey Hills (partial – portion north of Carmel Mountain Road)	Torrey Pines
Torrey Pines (partial – excluding southern portion east of Interstate 5)	Torrey Preserve
University City (partial – portion east of Interstate 5)	
Via de la Valle	

—DISTRICT 2—

<u>Community Planning Areas</u>	<u>Neighborhoods</u>
Clairemont Mesa	Bay Ho
Midway-Pacific Highway	Bay Park
Mission Bay Park	Clairemont Mesa East
Mission Beach	Clairemont Mesa West
Ocean Beach	La Playa
Peninsula	Loma Portal
	Midtown (partial – portion west of Interstate 5)
	Midway District
	Mission Beach
	Mission Hills (partial – portion west of Interstate 5)
	Ocean Beach
	North Clairemont
	Pacific Beach (partial – southern portion adjacent to Mission Bay)
	Point Loma Heights
	Roseville/Fleet Ridge
	Sunset Cliffs
	Wooded Area

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

—DISTRICT 3—

<u>Community Planning Areas</u>		<u>Neighborhoods</u>
Balboa Park	Balboa Park	Midtown (partial – portion east of Interstate 5)
Centre City/Downtown (excluding 10th Avenue terminal)	Bankers Hill	Mission Hills (partial – portion east of Interstate 5)
Greater Golden Hill	Burlingame	Mission Valley East (partial – southern portion)
North Park	Core-Columbia	Mission Valley West
Mission Valley (partial- southern portion)	Cortez Hill	North Park
Old Town San Diego	East Village	Old Town
Uptown	Gaslamp Quarter	Park West
	Golden Hill	Petco Park
	Grant Hill (partial – portion north of State Route 94)	Sherman Heights (partial – portion north of State Route 94)
	Harbor View	South Park
	Hillcrest	Stockton (partial – portion north of State Route 94)
	Horton Plaza	University Heights
	Little Italy	
	Marina	

—DISTRICT 4—

<u>Community Planning Areas</u>		<u>Neighborhoods</u>
City Heights (partial – Ridgeview neighborhood)	Alta Vista	Mount Hope
Eastern Area (partial – neighborhoods of Oak Park and Webster)	Bay Terraces	Mountain View
Encanto Neighborhoods	Broadway Heights	Oak Park
Skyline-Paradise Hills	Chollas View	Paradise Hills
Southeastern San Diego (partial – portion east of Interstate 15, north of National Avenue and east of South 43 rd Street)	Emerald Hills	Ridgeview
	Encanto	Skyline
	Jamacha	Valencia Park
	Lincoln Park	
	Lomita	

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

—DISTRICT 5—

Community Planning Areas

Black Mountain Ranch
Carmel Mountain Ranch
Miramar Ranch North
Rancho Bernardo
Rancho Peñasquitos
San Pasqual
Scripps Miramar Ranch (partial – portion
north and east of Pomerado Road)
Torrey Highlands (partial – portion east of
Camino del Sur and north of Carmel Valley
Road)

Neighborhoods

Carmel Mountain Ranch
Miramar Ranch North
Rancho Bernardo
Rancho Peñasquitos (partial – excluding portion
that is in the Los Peñasquitos Canyon
Community Plan Area and the westernmost
portion that is in the Torrey Highlands
Community Plan Area)
Sabre Springs
San Pasqual
Scripps Ranch (partial – portion north and east
of Pomerado Road)
Torrey Highlands (partial – portion east of
Camino del Sur and north of Carmel Valley
Road)

—DISTRICT 6—

Community Planning Areas

East Elliott (partial – excluding southeast
portion)
Kearny Mesa (partial- portion west of State
Route 163)
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve
Military Facilities
Mira Mesa
Rancho Encantada
Scripps Miramar Ranch (partial – portion
south and east of Pomerado Road)
Torrey Hills (partial – excluding portion north
of Carmel Mountain Road)
Torrey Pines (partial – southern portion east
of Interstate 5)
University City (partial– portion east of
Interstate 5)

Neighborhoods

Carmel Valley (partial – portion in the Los
Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Community Plan
Area and portion in the Torrey Hills
Community Plan Area that is west of El
Camino Real and south of Carmel Mountain
Road)
East Elliott
Kearny Mesa (partial – portion to the west of
State Route 163)
Miramar
Mira Mesa
Rancho Encantada
Rancho Peñasquitos (partial – southeastern
portion)
Scripps Ranch (partial – portion south and east
of Pomerado Road)
Sorrento Valley
Torrey Hills
University City (partial – portion east of
Interstate 5)

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

—DISTRICT 7—

Community Planning Areas

East Elliott (partial – southeast portion)
Kearny Mesa (partial – portion east of State
Route 163
Linda Vista
Mission Valley (partial – Birdland and Civita
neighborhoods and portion of East Mission
Valley east of Interstate 15 and north of Friars
Road)
Navajo
Serra Mesa
Tierrasanta

Neighborhoods

Allied Gardens
Birdland
Del Cerro
Grantville (partial – portion east of Mission
Gorge Road and portion north of Friars Road
Lake Murray (East San Carlos)
Linda Vista
Mission Valley East (partial – portion east of
Interstate 15 and north of Friars Road)
Morena
San Carlos
Serra Mesa (partial – excluding northwest
corner west of State Route 163)
Tierrasanta (partial – excludes the portion
north of State Route 52)

—DISTRICT 8—

Community Planning Areas

Barrio Logan
Downtown (partial – portion south of
Commercial Street and Park Boulevard)
Otay Mesa
Otay Mesa-Nestor
San Ysidro
Southeastern San Diego (partial — portion
west of Interstate 15, south of National
Avenue and west of S. 43rd Street)
Tijuana River Valley

Neighborhoods

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

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

—DISTRICT 9—

Community Planning Areas

City Heights (partial – excludes the Ridgeview neighborhood)
College Area
Eastern Area
(partial – neighborhoods of Rolando, Rolando Park, Redwood Village, and El Cerrito)
Kensington-Talmadge
Mission Valley (partial – portion east of Interstate 805 and south of Friars Road)
Normal Heights

Neighborhoods

Adams North
Azalea
Castle
Cherokee Point
Chollas Creek
Colina del Sol
College East
College West
Corridor
El Cerrito
Fairmont Park
Fairmont Village
Fox Canyon
Grantville (partial – western and southwestern portion)
Hollywood Park
Islenair
Kensington
Mission Valley East
(partial – portion east of Interstate 805 and south of Friars Road)
Normal Heights
Qualcomm
Redwood Village
Rolando
Rolando Park
Swan Canyon
Talmadge
Teralta East
Teralta West