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**Traditional Redistricting Principles**

*Creating Maps that Make Sense for Communities*

There are a number of criteria that have been used nationally and upheld by courts.

- Relatively equal size - people, not citizens
- *Contiguous* – districts should not hop/jump
- Maintain *communities of interest*
- Follow city/county/local government lines
- Keep districts *compact* – appearance/function
- Stability – reduce deferrals
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Looking at Existing Districts
2001 Commission created districts that kept groups whole

**LATINO DISTRICT**
This is the only true Section 2 district within the city.

1) Council District 8 is a natural district to re-create even under the nine-member configuration.
2) Due to population changes the impact on the district is negligible
3) Important to maintain or exceed the Latino population as a function of Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP)
Looking at Existing Districts
2001 Commission created districts that kept groups whole.

African American
The 4th District has been a historically African American district with several neighborhoods maintaining a rich history.

1) These voters are a community of interest, and using traditional redistricting practices this community should maintain or increase their African American CVAP.

2) It is hard to draw a district that does not empower African Americans in this community.

LGBT district
This district is a model for the nation.

1) The LGBT community of interest exists and has been respected by the Commission.

2) Recent rulings on Proposition 8 have given additional equal protection arguments for the LGBT community within redistricting.

3) Equality California is releasing data showing LGBT and supporters communities of interest – and that map speaks to these lines.
Additional Community
Asian Community Seeks Greater Influence

The Asian Community seeks to create a greater voting power for their ethnic population. But certain questions need to be answered.

1) Is the group geographically centered and dense enough to create a district using current commission rules?

2) Would the predominant factor be race, or could others come into play to substantiate the plan under any critical review?

3) Does the Asian Community map provide for a better potential electoral outcome that justifies it like the African American, Latino and LGBT districts do?

Additional Community
Asian Community Seeks Greater Influence

The final determination is the job of this commission, but these points of analysis should be considered.

1) The Old District lines had one district with Asian plurality at 25%

2) The APAC Plan provides for one district with 31% Asian CVAP.

3) The Empower San Diego map provides for an Asian Plurality seat with

4) The maps I will present to you provide for two districts that have 25%+ Asian and XX% Asian voter participation in each.
San Diego Neighborhoods
People in San Diego identify by their neighborhoods

In Washington DC, people ask “who do you work for?”

In Los Angeles they ask “who’s your agent?”

In San Diego they ask “what neighborhood are you from?”
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Pacific Beach
Scripps Ranch
Rancho Penasquitos
Rancho Bernardo
Ocean Beach
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Pacific Beach = PB
Scripps Ranch = Scripps
Rancho Penasquitos = PQ
Rancho Bernardo = RB
Ocean Beach = OB
San Diego Neighborhoods
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Applying These Redistricting Principles
Creating Maps that Make Sense for Communities

Our goal at the city or school district / community college level is to create maps that respect communities and create the greatest alignment with the law and local rules for redistricting. The priorities are as follows:

1) Population Equality – don’t start with the idea of having 10% differential

2) Follow the current Voting Rights Act and recent rulings.

3) Follow the intent of the VRA, empowering minority communities even where the VRA is unenforceable or silent
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Creating Maps that Make Sense for Communities

Our goal at the city or school district / community college level is to create maps that respect communities and create the greatest alignment with the law and local rules for redistricting. The priorities are as follows:

4) Keep neighborhoods whole -- There are 124 Neighborhoods. A book with maps of each neighborhood, including ethnic population breakdown and changes over the past decades, is being provided to the Commission and Executive Director.

5) Pair neighborhoods with similar partners – The pairing of neighborhoods can be an impassioned plea, but comes after VRA, other ethnic, community of interest and whole neighborhood concerns.

Neighborhood Plan 1.0

This plan is built by combining neighborhoods and attempting to get near population equality.

Beyond Equality, districts are built around Empowerment goal for ethnic groups and LGBT.
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District 1

Begins along the coast with La Jolla then comes up and moves inland to keep entirely whole communities of Black Mountain Ranch and Rancho Penasquitos.
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District 2

This is a Southern Coast progressive seat.

Neighborhood Plan 1.0

District 3

This is the traditional LGBT Community of Interest seat.
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District 3

The seat contains several census block groups that are in the 99th percentile of LGBT Community of Interest based on the database that Redistricting Partners created for Equality California.
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District 4

This is the traditional African American council district. In this plan it is 27% African American CVAP.
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District 5

This district has an odd shape due to the inherent shape of the city boundaries.

Instead of the traditional measures of compactness, commissioners should judge this district based on drive time and distance from the spine of the 15.

Neighborhood Plan 1.0

District 6

Maintains communities within the area between the 5 and 805.
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**District 7**

This district is bordered by the freeways on two sides, city boundary to the East, and maintains the neighborhoods to the north.

---

Neighborhood Plan 1.0

**District 8**

This district is the traditional Latino seat. In this configuration it increases from 2001 lines to 59% CVAP Latino.
District 9

Calling this the “new” district is a misnomer. This is a progressive seat that includes a mix of Latinos and some of the growing LGBT population just south of the 8.

Improving Neighborhood Plan

Population Equality is the goal, so the next step is to use this plan and make small alterations where communities can be divided using physical, geographic, transportation or other communities of interest.

In total, the following slides show just five community divisions that take this plan from 16% deviation to 1%.

The end result is a plan that keeps 119 of San Diego’s 124 communities completely whole, and maintains a population equality that will absolutely meet legal guidelines.
Improving Neighborhood Plan
Creating Version 2.0 by making smart splits of few neighborhoods

Population Equality is the goal, so the next step is to use this plan and make small alterations where communities can be divided using physical, geographic, transportation or other communities of interest.

In total, the following slides show just five community divisions that take this plan from 16% deviation to 1%.

The end result is a plan that keeps 119 of San Diego’s 124 communities completely whole, and maintains a population equality that will absolutely meet legal guidelines.
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A resident could know what district they are in based on what side of the hill they live.
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Division of Oak Park, preserving greatest African American Density for District 4
Division of Oak Park, preserving greatest African American Density for District 4

Neighborhood Plan 2.0

After these splits our deviations are minuscule:

1 0.2% Under
2 0.0% Over
3 0.0% Over
4 0.9% Over
5 0.2% Under
6 0.6% Over
7 1.2% Over
8 0.1% Under
9 1.1% Over
Neighborhood Plan 2.0

District 1

Maintains much of the current shape.

Begins at the south with the northern half of La Jolla and moves up to include the complete neighborhood of Rancho Penasquitos.

Only one neighborhood split. Deviation of 0%.

Neighborhood Plan 2.0

District 2

Southern Coastal progressive district. Moves more to the shore in order to allow a stronger LGBT community map which includes both sides of Balboa Park.

Only split is La Jolla along ridge line. Deviation of only seven people, for 0%.
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District 3
Historic LGBT district.
Has two split neighborhoods, one to the north along the San Diego river, and one to the south with a split of grant hill. Deviation is 54 people, for 0%

This district maintains its extremely strong LGBT community of interest.

Red census block groups are in the 99th percentile statewide for membership in LGBT organizations, No vote on Props 8 and 22, and same sex households.
Neighborhood Plan 2.0

District 4

Historic African American district.

Only has one division with some of the less dense African American populations removed in order to get closer population equality.

Deviation is 1%.

Neighborhood Plan 2.0

District 4

African American population is dense, and this was clearly a goal.

However this plan is also very compact, and keeps neighborhoods together.
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District 5

Maintains much of the current shape – increasing stability and reducing deferrals & accelerations.

Has one small community split and deviation of 0%

Neighborhood Plan 2.0

District 5

This community has strong API numbers – five points below Asian population based on UPAC plan, only three points below Asian turnout in 2010.
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District 6

This district follows transportation corridors between the 5 and 580.

Asians are the strongest ethnic group with 21%.

No community splits and deviation of 1%.

Neighborhood Plan 2.0

District 7

Two small community splits and deviation of 1%.
Neighborhood Plan 2.0

District 8
Maintains historic Latino seat by increasing its CVAP figure to 59%.
Deviation is 96 people or 0%.

Neighborhood Plan 2.0

District 9
This “New” district includes progressives below the 8.
Significant Latino to the south and LGBT population to the north.
Comparing Plans
How does the Neighborhood Plan stack up?

Our goal was to create a neighborhood-based plan that keeps San Diegans with their natural communities of interest – but focusing on that as a way to

1) Population Equality – don’t start with the idea of having 10% differential

2) Follow the current Voting Rights Act and recent rulings.

3) Follow the intent of the VRA, empowering minority communities even where the VRA is unenforceable or silent. (ie: maintaining cohesive and dense minority groups that are not at 50% of a district)

4) Keep neighborhoods whole

5) Pair neighborhoods with similar partners.

Comparing Plans
Empower SD Plan

The Empower SD Plan was designed to achieve a more progressive outcome, but does so at the expense of some of the communities it serves.

The plan:

1) Splits more than 20 neighborhoods

2) Provides slightly higher Asian CVAP in CD 4 and CD 6.

3) Appears to have lower Latino CVAP in CD 8 – the only Majority Minority seat in San Diego.

4) Appears to retrogress African Americans in CD 4
Comparing Plans
APAC United for Fair Redistricting

The APAC plan undeniably increases Asian concentration in the northern central portion of San Diego. However it does this at a price.

The plan:
1) Splits at least 18 neighborhoods.
2) Provides 5-points higher API CVAP than Neighborhood or Empower plan.
3) However, voter turnout for Asians in this plan is only 14% in CD 9, and 11-12% in comparable district from Neighborhood or Empower plan.

Comparing Plans
Republican Party Plan

The Republican Party redistricting plan attempts to create conservative districts in the north and disrupts the natural balance of districts below the 8.

The plan:
1) Splits more than 20 neighborhoods
2) Divides the LGBT community of interest
3) Does not maximize minority Latino vote in 8 or African American vote in 4.
Conclusion

This year’s redistricting process will continue to be extremely challenging. What we have provided should give the commission some tools for the job ahead.

The San Diego Neighborhood plan:

1) Begins with VRA goals and clear direction to keep neighborhoods together.

2) Splits neighborhoods only when necessary for population equality - and does so fairly based on geographic and other traditional redistricting principals.

3) Increases electoral opportunities for Latinos and African Americans, retains LGBT and Asian community of interest decisions from 2001 plan.

4) Maintains maximum stability for voters even with the change from 8 to 9 districts.