



COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
2021 INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
FINAL REPORT

December 15, 2021

Draft as of 12/1/21



Table of Contents

Introduction	6
Establishment of the IRC	6
Composition of the IRC	7
Priorities of the IRC and Preparation for the Redistricting Process	7
Other Considerations	8
Outreach Plan and Efforts	8
Redistricting Outreach and Communication Ad Hoc Committee	9
Public Outreach and Engagement Services Contractor	10
Meetings.....	11
Public Hearings	11
Pre-Mapping Public Hearings	11
Draft Map Public Hearings	11
Additional Outreach	12
Public Input	12
Community of Interest Testimony	12
Publicly Submitted Maps.....	13
Commission Mapping Activities.....	13
Demographer Services	13
Expert Subcontractors	14
Federal Voting Rights Act Statistical Expert Team	14
Special Voting Rights Act Counsel	15
Legal Considerations.....	15
Federal Voting Rights Act.	16
The Final Plan	17
Overview	17
The Commission achieved compliance with the criteria described in subdivisions (a) & (b) of Section 21552 as follows: District 1	17
Cities and Unincorporated Neighborhoods	17
Reasonably Equal Population and Demographics.....	17

Compliance with Voting Rights Act	17
Geographic Contiguity	17
Community of Interest Integrity	17
Geographical Compactness	18
Place of Residence of Incumbents	18
Purposeful Discrimination for or Against an Incumbent, Political Candidate, or Political Party	18
Unincorporated Area.....	18
The Commission achieved compliance with the criteria described in subdivisions (a) & (b) of Section 21552 as follows: District 2	18
Cities and Unincorporated Neighborhoods	18
Reasonably Equal Population and Demographics.....	18
Compliance with Voting Rights Act	18
Geographic Contiguity	18
Community of Interest Integrity.....	18
Geographical Compactness	19
Place of Residence of Incumbents	19
Purposeful Discrimination for or Against an Incumbent, Political Candidate, or Political Party.....	19
Unincorporated Area.....	19
The Commission achieved compliance with the criteria described in subdivisions (a) & (b) of Section 21552 as follows: District 3	19
Cities and Unincorporated Neighborhoods	19
Reasonably Equal Population and Demographics.....	19
Compliance with Voting Rights Act	20
Geographic Contiguity	20
Community of Interest Integrity.....	20
Geographical Compactness	20
Place of Residence of Incumbents	20
Purposeful Discrimination for or Against an Incumbent, Political Candidate, or Political Party.....	20
Unincorporated Area.....	20

The Commission achieved compliance with the criteria described in subdivisions (a) & (b) of Section 21552 as follows: District 4	20
Cities and Unincorporated Neighborhoods	20
Reasonably Equal Population and Demographics	21
Compliance with Voting Rights Act	21
Geographic Contiguity	21
Community of Interest Integrity	21
Geographical Compactness	21
Place of Residence of Incumbents	21
Purposeful Discrimination for or Against an Incumbent, Political Candidate, or Political Party	21
Unincorporated Area	21
The Commission achieved compliance with the criteria described in subdivisions (a) & (b) of Section 21552 as follows: District 5	22
Cities and Unincorporated Neighborhoods	22
Reasonably Equal Population and Demographics	22
Compliance with Voting Rights Act	22
Geographic Contiguity	22
Community of Interest Integrity	22
Geographical Compactness	22
Place of Residence of Incumbents	22
Purposeful Discrimination for or Against an Incumbent, Political Candidate, or Political Party	23
Unincorporated Area	23
Conclusion	23
Effective Date of Final Plan	23
Closing Remarks	24
Appendices	25



COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

Independent Redistricting Commission

COMMISSIONERS

David Bame, Chair
Amy Caterina, Co-Vice Chair
Rosette Garcia, Co-Vice Chair
Colleen Brown
Chris Chen
Sonia Diaz
Elidia Dostal
Barbara Hansen
Kenneth Inman
Kristina Kruglyak
Arvid Larson
Fernandez Ponds
John Russ
Ramesses Surban

Introduction

Every ten years, after the federal Census, district boundaries for federal, state, and local elected offices are redrawn to reflect new population data and shifting populations to ensure substantially equal representation. This process is called redistricting. The 2021 County of San Diego Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) adopted the following redistricting map for San Diego County supervisorial districts:



Approved Map of San Diego County Supervisorial Districts

Establishment of the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC)

In January 2012, the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors voted to seek legislative changes in the California Elections Code and the County Charter. SB 1331 (Kehoe), Chapter 508, Statutes of 2012, provided for the creation of a redistricting commission in San Diego County, made up of retired state and federal judges, and charged it with adjusting the boundaries of supervisorial districts after each decennial federal census. In 2017, AB 801 (Weber) repealed provisions of SB 1331 and instead established an Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) in the county made up of county citizens and charged it with adjusting the boundaries of supervisorial districts. AB 801 also changed the criteria to be used when the boundaries of supervisorial districts in San Diego County are adjusted. California Elections Code Sections 21550-21553 and the County Charter, Sections 400 and 400.1 now set forth the rules and procedures for redrawing the supervisorial district boundaries of the County of San Diego.

Composition of the IRC

The 2020 Census marks the inception of the first IRC, selected to complete the 2021 redistricting of the five County supervisorial districts. The 2021 IRC is comprised of fourteen San Diego County residents who met the qualifications as set forth in Elections Code § 21550. They were selected in a two-part process¹ intended to insure independence from the influence of the Board of Supervisors. As required by the California Elections Code, the political party preference of the Commission members is reasonably proportional to the political party breakdown of the registered voters in the County of San Diego (Republican, Democrat, and No Party Preference), as determined by the then-most recent statewide election. At least one Commissioner resides in each of the supervisorial districts. The 2021 IRC reflects the County's diversity with respect to race, ethnicity, geography, and gender, with an equal number of men and women serving on the IRC. See [Appendix ##](#) for a list of the 2021 Commissioners and their biographies.

Priorities of the IRC and Preparation for the Redistricting Process

The Elections Code § 21551(a) requires the Commission to apply its provisions in a manner that is impartial and that reinforces public confidence in the integrity of the redistricting process. In carrying out its duty of drawing boundaries for the five supervisorial districts, the IRC committed to ensuring that the final map would fairly represent the residents of San Diego County in accordance with applicable laws, and to ensuring as broad and diverse participation as possible in the redistricting process. The IRC adopted bylaws that emphasized its duty to be fair and impartial and to operate openly and transparently to reinforce public confidence in the integrity of the redistricting process.

The Commissioners undertook a thorough training program to prepare to execute their duties. The program included directed training and self-study on a variety of topics. The IRC established an Ad Hoc Committee on Commissioner Training with a mission to develop a tailored, flexible, and focused Training Continuum and resource repository (database) to enable the Commission to execute its mission, roles, and responsibilities effectively and efficiently.

On March 25, 2021, the IRC approved the implementation of the Training Continuum proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee. Training topics completed by Commissioners, included, among others: the Brown Act; Redistricting 101; the "2020 Census Complete Count" in San Diego County; Census data; language access and outreach to African, Arab, Middle Eastern, Muslim, and South Asian communities; the Voting Rights Act; and

¹ The first eight Commissioners were selected by random drawing, at least one from each of the 5 districts; the first eight Commissioners then selected the six additional Commissioners, from the remaining pool of qualified applicants to ensure a commission that reflected the county's diversity, including racial, ethnic, geographic, and gender diversity, along with the requirement that the political party preferences of the commissioners be generally proportional to the political party breakdown of the County's registered voters.

demonstrations of the line drawing software and practical exercises in line drawing. These trainings supplied the IRC with background, context, and information required to fulfill their duties as Commissioners and to draw fair and accurate maps.

Additional details on the full Training Continuum, including the dates on which trainings were conducted, are available on the IRC website, as are the training materials, and in [Appendix ##](#). Members of the public are welcome to view the database of resources to review the training received by the IRC.

Other Considerations

The 2020 Census year and the redistricting time period (November 2020-December 2021) were marked by significant disruption and upheaval, primarily due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Release of Census data was delayed initially by four months, which prompted the Legislature to extend the deadline for adopting a redistricting map from August 15, 2021, to December 15, 2021. See AB 1276 (Bonta), Chapter 90, Statutes of 2020. Further delays led to the IRC appointing an Ad Hoc Committee to develop legislative and other recommendations to deal with the loss of time for the redistricting process. The IRC requested an amendment to Senate Bill 594 (Glazer) that would have extended the IRC's deadline to January 14, 2021, to account for the additional delays in receiving Census data and protect the time for robust public input, but the amendment was not incorporated. However, while its efforts to extend the deadline were ongoing, the IRC had continued to plan and establish timelines that protected, to the extent possible, time for public input, consistent with its stated goal to preserve time for public participation, with the understanding that the map adoption deadline would remain December 15, 2021.

Safety protocols enacted in response to the pandemic prohibited in-person meetings for the first eight months of the IRC's activity. All IRC meetings, from the full 14-member IRC public meetings to Ad Hoc Committee meetings, to public educational presentations, to Industry Days (for potential IRC contractors), were held virtually over the Zoom platform. Only when safety protocols were relaxed, in August 2021, did Commissioners have the option to meet in person. The IRC held public hearings using a hybrid model, offering in-person or virtual participation for Commissioners and members of the public. Throughout the redistricting process, regular and special meetings continued to allow virtual participation, an option that some members of the public and some Commissioners preferred.

Outreach Plan and Efforts

In the early stages of the IRC's activities, the Commission was focused on increasing public awareness of the IRC and mounting efforts to engage with the public, consistent with its commitment to obtain as broad and diverse participation as possible in the redistricting process. Integral to this mission was adherence to the legal requirement to offer translation in eight key languages: Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, Tagalog, Arabic, Japanese, Korean, and Laotian for each of the following activities:

- Live translation of hearings if a request was received at least 24 hours in advance
- Agendas for each Commission meeting and public hearing notices
- General explanation of the redistricting process on the website

The Commission exceeded legal requirements by providing translation upon request in additional languages and live translation on fewer than 24 hours notice. The IRC took two important steps to realize its aim of ensuring maximal public input: formation of a Redistricting Outreach and Communication Ad Hoc Committee to develop outreach plans during the interim period before hiring an outreach consultant; and appointing a Public Outreach and Engagement Services RFP Ad Hoc Committee to draft qualification criteria for retention of an outreach contractor, as described below.

Redistricting Outreach and Communication Ad Hoc Committee

The IRC formed a Redistricting Outreach and Communication Ad Hoc Committee, on February 11, 2021, tasked with proposing steps the IRC could take to increase awareness of the IRC and county redistricting prior to hiring an outreach contractor. The Ad Hoc Committee created an interim communications plan, approved by the IRC, that included a recommendation for conducting educational presentations while the IRC was waiting for the delayed Census data. The Ad Hoc Committee also produced a variety of ancillary deliverables such as FAQs, a Fact Sheet, and developed procedures for handling public requests for Commissioner presentations and media requests for comments or interviews.

The IRC approved the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation to embark on an "educational tour" to educate the public about the IRC, the importance of redistricting, and the process that would be followed. The Ad Hoc Committee developed a presentation, and the IRC scheduled and delivered seven educational presentations, all held virtually, due to pandemic restrictions. Five of the presentations were tailored toward one of the five districts, with Commissioners from that district serving as presenters. Two presentations were designated as county-wide presentations, but all presentations, regardless of the focus, were open to residents throughout the county. Simultaneous Spanish translation was also offered for the District 1 presentation.

The Ad Hoc Committee developed a list of stakeholders and audiences intended to be reached during this period, including community groups located in the 18 incorporated cities within the county and the unincorporated areas.

IRC staff employed all the tools available to advertise the educational tour, including announcements via County News Center, press releases, email announcements, social media posts, and non-traditional means, such as school marquees and pop-up events at farmer's markets. Commissioners were encouraged to reach out to their networks to elicit requests for presentations. Attendance at these educational presentations totaled 108 individuals. Specific details about the educational presentations, dates, and attendance can be found in **Appendix ##**.

Public Outreach and Engagement Services Contractor

On February 11, 2021, the IRC approved the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee to draft the Statement of Work, Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Criteria to be used in selecting an outreach contractor for IRC Public Outreach and Engagement. The IRC approved the ad hoc committee's proposals, and subsequently, the County of San Diego released Request for Proposals 10926. Following the source selection committee evaluation, on June 24, 2021, the IRC approved Asian Business Association San Diego (ABASD) to provide the services.

ABASD's goal was to raise awareness of the redistricting process and promote participation during the pre-mapping and draft maps public hearings in each of the five supervisorial districts by working with its outreach partners throughout the county to reach various communities of interest and maximize public participation. The IRC emphasized to ABASD that a priority was to aim efforts at the hard-to reach communities of the County, including those in rural, unincorporated areas and those historically under-represented in civic engagement. ABASD's report of its activities and the success of those efforts is included with this report in [Appendix ##](#)

Meetings

The IRC held ### regular and special meetings, 10 of which were public hearings: 8 took place before the Commission drafted maps and 2 took place after draft maps were developed. At every meeting of the IRC, the Commission took public comment on communities of interest, draft maps, the process, and many other topics.

Public Hearings

Pre-Mapping Public Hearings

ABASD created an outreach plan for the Pre-Mapping Public Hearings and coordinated all eight Pre-Mapping Public Hearings held between August 12th and September 25th at eight different locations throughout the five different districts. Three of the meetings were General Meetings and five were district-specific meetings, one in each district:

1. August 12, Mira Mesa Senior Center, General Meeting
2. August 18, Bonita Sunnyside Library, District 1
3. August 26, Ronald Reagan Community Center, District 2
4. September 2, Escondido Chamber of Commerce, District 3
5. September 9, Valencia Park/Malcolm X Library, District 4
6. September 18, Green Dragon Tavern & Museum, General Meeting
7. September 23, Vista Civic Center, District 5
8. September 25, Spring Valley Community Center, General Meeting

Because state and local health orders prohibited large gatherings, as specified in AB 1276, the hearings were conducted in a hybrid in-person/virtual format, using technology that permitted remote viewing and participation with the ability to view and listen to proceedings by video, to listen to proceedings by phone, to provide public comment by phone and in writing, with no limitation on the number of commenters, as well as an opportunity for in-person participation.

Total attendance for the Pre-Mapping Public Hearings from August 12th to September 25th was 356 individuals. Of the 356 attendees, 107 [30%] attended in person and 249 [70%] attended virtually. Additional details on attendees may be found in Appendix ##.

Draft Map Public Hearings

ABASD created a Draft Map Public Hearing Outreach Plan to engage the maximum number of participants for the two Draft Map Public Hearings:

1. November 1, City of Chula Vista City Hall Chambers
2. December 2, San Diego County Office of Education

As with the Pre-Mapping Public Hearings, the Draft Map Public Hearings were also offered in a hybrid virtual/in-person format, pursuant to the requirements of AB 1276. Total attendance, virtual and in-person, for the Draft Map Public Hearings was ### and the total number of comments received from the public was ###. Additional details on attendance may be found in Appendix ##.

Additional Outreach

During this period, the IRC also engaged in additional outreach, facilitated by ABASD, to community planning groups and civic organizations in response to heightened attention as the mapping proceeded. The presentations were focused on educating attendees on the redistricting process and the opportunities available for them to participate. Commissioners presented to the following groups:

1. November 9, Jamul Dulzura Community Planning Group
2. November 9, Campo Lake Morena Community Planning Group
3. November 9, Pine Valley Community Planning Group
4. November 11, San Dieguito Planning Group
5. November 15, Fallbrook Planning Group
6. November 15, Chollas Valley Community Planning Group
7. November 15, Borrego Springs Community Sponsor Group
8. November 19, San Diego Law Library

Public Input

The results of the IRC's outreach efforts are reflected not only in attendance at the public hearings, but also in the number of communications received from members of the public and groups through the multiple modes provided to receive public input. The Commission received the following public comment:

- ## eComments
- ## Emailed comments
- ## Letters
- ## Telephone calls

A comprehensive collection of public input is provided in the Public Comment and community of interest (COI) Tracker which can be found in Appendix ## and at www.drawyourcommunity.com.

Community of Interest Testimony

The Commission actively invited the submission of COI testimony and provided a dedicated mapping tool at the IRC website (Community Builder Tool) that members of the

public could use to map their COI as well as describe it in writing. The Commission also received COI testimony at the pre-mapping public hearings and in writing. Community of interest testimony continued to be solicited and submitted throughout the mapping process.

Publicly Submitted Maps

The Commission also encouraged the submission of proposed redistricting maps and individual districts by members of the public, and, to facilitate submission, provided to the public ready access to redistricting data and computer software equivalent to what was available to the commission members. The Commission also encouraged, received, and processed hand-drawn maps, as well as those drawn in various computerized mapping programs. The Commission received a total of ## whole and partial maps created by members of the public and groups. Maps submitted by the public can be found in Appendix ##.

Commission Mapping Activities

The Commission prepared for mapping by undertaking training activities, actively engaging the public, as described above, and retaining the services of a qualified demographic firm and other expert consultants, as described below. Mapping commenced after receipt of the adjusted Census data.

Demographer Services

On February 11, 2021, the IRC approved the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee to draft the Statement of Work, Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Tool and Submittal Items for the RFP for demographer services. On April 26, 2021, the County of San Diego released Request for Proposals 10673 to acquire a contractor for IRC mapping activities, and following a successful source selection committee evaluation, the IRC approved FLO Analytics (FLO) to provide the services. Specifically, FLO was contracted to:

1. Provide ongoing and special consultation, analysis, and support to the IRC;
2. Analyze Census and other data, statistics, demographics, and maps for the current and proposed revisions of the supervisorial districts;
3. Prepare, draw, and revise draft redistricting maps and prepare recommendations for final revised supervisorial districts based on the IRC and public input;
4. In coordination with the IRC's public outreach and engagement contractor and County staff, develop and implement a process to allow for public comment and suggestions in the drawing of supervisorial district maps, including the submittal of full and partial maps;
5. Provide the IRC with access to appropriate software systems for use in the evaluation of the redistricting map alternatives;

6. Develop and execute a training plan serving to instruct the IRC and the public participants in use of mapping software and related products;
7. Provide hands-on, live training sessions in use of mapping software and related products (virtually or in-person, as possible); and
8. Provide mapping software available for the public to draw and submit draft supervisorial districts and identify communities of interest, which should include standard demographic profile reports as well as the ability to create customized reports².

FLO also hosted an internet-based viewer where all maps – public, consultant, and commission-made – were collected, along with relevant data and geospatial COI polygons and other COI information. All these materials were available to the public to facilitate studying draft maps and comparing and contrasting features and approaches. FLO also compiled a database of public input and developed a tool to search the database for themes and geographies, as well as words. Every public comment and submission was also collected and preserved by the Commission in an Excel document available for public review.

FLO's report of its activities is included in **Appendix ##**.

In the course of its mapping activities, the Commission ordered development and modification of a total of **##** maps and iterations of maps. Included in **Appendix ##** is FLO's report describing the evolution of the Commission's final map including all Commission motions resulting in changes from the initial base map to the final map.

Expert Subcontractors

Upon recommendation of the demographer contractor and legal counsel, the Commission directed and approved retention of two subcontractors with specialized expertise in critical topics, to guide the IRC in their mapping process, as described below.

Federal Voting Rights Act Statistical Expert Team

The IRC directed FLO to retain a subcontractor to analyze racially polarized voting in the county. FLO selected a team of political scientists, Dr. Christian Grose, Dr. Natalie Matsuoka and Dr. Jordan Carr Peterson, statistical experts in racially polarized voting, a key element in determining Voting Rights Act compliance. They reviewed the past ten years of elections in San Diego County, including all supervisorial elections and relevant statewide elections, and produced an extensive report, showing that racially polarized voting occurred in the County during this period. They also assessed the incidents of coalitional voting among racial groups and cross-over voting by white voters, and also provided information to the Commission about the ability of racial minorities in each existing supervisorial district to elect candidates of choice. This report by Drs. Grose,

² The mapping program was made available in the eight key languages: Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, Tagalog, Arabic, Japanese, Korean, and Laotian.

Masouka, and Peterson, and the presentations they made to the Commission about these topics, as well as the credentials of these experts, are contained in **Appendix ##** to this report.

Special Voting Rights Act Counsel

The IRC approved a subcontractor for expert counsel in the Federal Voting Rights Act. The IRC established an Ad Hoc Committee to issue a request for qualifications and recommend selection of Special Voting Rights Act Counsel to guide the Commission on legal issues arising under Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. At the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee, the IRC retained Bruce Adelson to provide legal guidance in the application of the Act.

As the Commission's Special Voting Rights Act counsel, Mr. Adelson, provided the Commission with an interpretation of the statistical evidence developed by the racially polarized voting expert team and guidance on the consideration of race in the development of the districts in the Commission's final plan. Mr. Adelson's opinion and the presentations he made to the Commission are included in **Appendix ##**.

Legal Considerations

The IRC adhered to Section 21552 of the Elections Code in making mapping decisions that yielded the final adopted map. These statutory requirements are detailed below. The Commission was required to establish single-member supervisorial districts for the board pursuant to a mapping process using the following Elections Code criteria as set forth in the following order of priority:

- Districts shall comply with the United States Constitution and each district shall have a reasonably equal population with other districts for the board, except where deviation is required to comply with the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. Sec. 10101 et seq.) or is allowable by law.³
- Districts shall comply with the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.).
- Districts shall be geographically contiguous.
- The geographic integrity of any city, local neighborhood, or local COI shall be respected in a manner that minimizes its division to the extent possible without violating the requirements of paragraphs (1) to (3) inclusive. A COI is a contiguous population that shares common social and economic interests that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation. Communities of interest shall not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.

³ Notwithstanding this requirement, an incarcerated person, as that term is used in Section 21003 of the Elections Code, was not counted towards the county's population, except for an incarcerated person whose last known place of residence may be assigned to a census block in the county in the adjusted database provided by the California Statewide Database and used by the Commission for the redistricting.

- To the extent practicable, and where it does not conflict with paragraphs (1) to (4) inclusive, districts shall be drawn to encourage geographical compactness such that nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant areas of population.
- The place of residence of any incumbent or political candidate shall not be considered in the creation of a map.
- Districts shall not be drawn for purposes of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.

In addition, per the Charter of the County of San Diego section 400.1, the supervisorial district boundaries shall be drawn in such a way that the area of at least three districts shall include unincorporated territory with two of the districts having geographic area that is predominantly outside of the incorporated cities as population will permit.

Federal Voting Rights Act.

Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act prohibits electoral practices or procedures, including redistricting plans, that have the intent or effect of denying or abridging the right of any citizen to vote on account of race or color, or membership in a language minority group, 52 U.S.C. § 10301(a). Compliance supersedes all other state-law redistricting criteria.

Because of the importance of complying with the Federal Voting Rights Act the IRC retained two subcontractors as described in the Expert Subcontractors section above, to provide analyses and guidance on racially polarized voting; minority coalition voting; crossover voting by Whites; the ability of minorities to elect a representative of choice; and the federal VRA and its application. The Commission received several reports during the draft mapping process. Prior to the Commission adopting its final redistricting plan for the County, the racially polarized voting expert team provided an analysis of the ability of minority voters to elect chosen candidates in each of the new supervisorial districts and Mr. Adelson provided his legal opinion that each of the districts in the Commission's final plan complied with the federal Voting Rights Act. All reports and presentations made by these expert subcontractors can be found in **Appendix ##** attached to this report.

The Final Plan

Overview

The Commission adopted its final map on December 9, 2021.

<<Final Plan introduction/overview could include an overview of the final map submitted, the total Countywide population and deviation, an overview of the process for analyzing statistics, and demographics for the final districts.>>

The Commission achieved compliance with the criteria described in subdivisions (a) & (b) of Section 21552 as follows: District 1

Cities and Unincorporated Neighborhoods

District 1 contains the following whole cities:

District 1 contains the following parts of cities:

[Describe rationale for division of a city: e.g. The City of San Diego was divided because its population is too large to be included in a single district. The division of the City was guided by COI testimony as described below.]

Reasonably Equal Population and Demographics

[Add FLO charts here from its standard data sheet]

Compliance with Voting Rights Act

Geographic Contiguity

District 1 is contiguous as specified in California law.

Community of Interest Integrity

The following communities of interest identified in the Commission's proceedings are wholly included in District 1:

[List]

The following communities of interest identified in the Commission's proceedings are divided between District 1 and another district:

[List and describe rationale for division]

Geographical Compactness

Where it does not conflict with other mandatory criteria, District 1 is compact such that nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant areas of population.

Place of Residence of Incumbents

The Commission did not take into consideration the place of residence of any incumbent, or political candidate when drawing District 1.

Purposeful Discrimination for or Against an Incumbent, Political Candidate, or Political Party

The Commission did not draw District 1 for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.

Unincorporated Area

[Report of the percent of the district that is unincorporated area]

The Commission achieved compliance with the criteria described in subdivisions (a) & (b) of Section 21552 as follows: District 2

Cities and Unincorporated Neighborhoods

District 2 contains the following whole cities:

District 2 contains the following parts of cities:

[Describe rationale for division of a city: e.g. The City of San Diego was divided because its population is too large to be included in a single district. The division of the City was guided by COI testimony as described below.]

Reasonably Equal Population and Demographics

[Add FLO charts here from its standard data sheet]

Compliance with Voting Rights Act

Geographic Contiguity

District 2 is contiguous as specified in California law.

Community of Interest Integrity

The following communities of interest identified in the Commission's proceedings are wholly included in District 2:

[List]

The following communities of interest identified in the Commission's proceedings are divided between District 2 and another district:

[List and describe rationale for division]

Geographical Compactness

Where it does not conflict with other mandatory criteria, District 2 is compact such that nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant areas of population.

Place of Residence of Incumbents

The Commission did not take into consideration the place of residence of any incumbent, or political candidate when drawing District 2.

Purposeful Discrimination for or Against an Incumbent, Political Candidate, or Political Party

The Commission did not draw District 2 for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.

Unincorporated Area

[Report of the percent of the district that is unincorporated area]

The Commission achieved compliance with the criteria described in subdivisions (a) & (b) of Section 21552 as follows: District 3

Cities and Unincorporated Neighborhoods

District 3 contains the following whole cities:

District 3 contains the following parts of cities:

[Describe rationale for division of a city: e.g. The City of San Diego was divided because its population is too large to be included in a single district. The division of the City was guided by COI testimony as described below.]

Reasonably Equal Population and Demographics

[Add FLO charts here from its standard data sheet]

Compliance with Voting Rights Act

Geographic Contiguity

District 3 is contiguous as specified in California law.

Community of Interest Integrity

The following communities of interest identified in the Commission's proceedings are wholly included in District 3:

[List]

The following communities of interest identified in the Commission's proceedings are divided between District 3 and another district:

[List and describe rationale for division]

Geographical Compactness

Where it does not conflict with other mandatory criteria, District 3 is compact such that nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant areas of population.

Place of Residence of Incumbents

The Commission did not take into consideration the place of residence of any incumbent, or political candidate when drawing District 3.

Purposeful Discrimination for or Against an Incumbent, Political Candidate, or Political Party

The Commission did not draw District 3 for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.

Unincorporated Area

[Report of the percent of the district that is unincorporated area]

The Commission achieved compliance with the criteria described in subdivisions (a) & (b) of Section 21552 as follows: District 4

Cities and Unincorporated Neighborhoods

District 4 contains the following whole cities:

District 4 contains the following parts of cities:

[Describe rationale for division of a city: e.g. The City of San Diego was divided because its population is too large to be included in a single district. The division of the City was guided by COI testimony as described below.]

Reasonably Equal Population and Demographics

[Add FLO charts here from its standard data sheet]

Compliance with Voting Rights Act

Geographic Contiguity

District 4 is contiguous as specified in California law.

Community of Interest Integrity

The following communities of interest identified in the Commission's proceedings are wholly included in District 4:

[List]

The following communities of interest identified in the Commission's proceedings are divided between District 4 and another district:

[List and describe rationale for division]

Geographical Compactness

Where it does not conflict with other mandatory criteria, District 4 is compact such that nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant areas of population.

Place of Residence of Incumbents

The Commission did not take into consideration the place of residence of any incumbent, or political candidate when drawing District 4.

Purposeful Discrimination for or Against an Incumbent, Political Candidate, or Political Party

The Commission did not draw District 4 for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.

Unincorporated Area

[Report of the percent of the district that is unincorporated area]

The Commission achieved compliance with the criteria described in subdivisions (a) & (b) of Section 21552 as follows: District 5

Cities and Unincorporated Neighborhoods

District 5 contains the following whole cities:

District 5 contains the following parts of cities:

[Describe rationale for division of a city: e.g. The City of San Diego was divided because its population is too large to be included in a single district. The division of the City was guided by COI testimony as described below.]

Reasonably Equal Population and Demographics

[Add FLO charts here from its standard data sheet]

Compliance with Voting Rights Act

Geographic Contiguity

District 5 is contiguous as specified in California law.

Community of Interest Integrity

The following communities of interest identified in the Commission's proceedings are wholly included in District 5:

[List]

The following communities of interest identified in the Commission's proceedings are divided between District 5 and another district:

[List and describe rationale for division]

Geographical Compactness

Where it does not conflict with other mandatory criteria, District 5 is compact such that nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant areas of population.

Place of Residence of Incumbents

The Commission did not take into consideration the place of residence of any incumbent, or political candidate when drawing District 5.

Purposeful Discrimination for or Against an Incumbent, Political Candidate, or Political Party

The Commission did not draw District 5 for the purpose of favoring or discriminating against an incumbent, political candidate, or political party.

Unincorporated Area

[Report of the percent of the district that is unincorporated area]

Conclusion

<<This section could include the results of the IRC vote to adopt the final redistricting plan>>

Effective Date of Final Plan

<<Legal description of when the plan shall take effect>>

Closing Remarks

<<Brief paragraph summarizing the report and possibly thanking the public for their participation and involvement.>>

Appendices

1. IRC Website Link

- www.drawyourcommunity.com

2. Legal Statutes and Considerations

- [Elections Code Sections 21550-21553](#)
- [County of San Diego Charter](#)
- [Bylaws and Operating Procedures of the County of San Diego Independent Redistricting Commission](#)

3. Board Letters pertaining to creation of the IRC:

- October 13, 2020: [Notice of Public Hearing: Selection of The First Eight Members of The County of San Diego Independent Redistricting Commission by Random Drawing and Establish Appropriations for Support of the Independent Redistricting Commission](#)
- June 8, 2021: [Establish Appropriations of \\$467,500 to Support the County of San Diego Independent Redistricting Commission](#)

4. Commissioner Biographies

As noted above in the Commissioner Selection Process, 14 individuals were selected to serve on the IRC. In order to assist the public in understanding the qualifications of the members, each member provided a short biography for website publication:

[Commissioner Biographies](#)

(<https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/redistricting/commissioner-bios.html>).

5. Link to recordings of meetings

All recordings can be found on the “[Past Meetings Agendas/Minutes](#)” page of the IRC website (<https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/redistricting/IRCmeetings1.html>).

6. Presentations delivered at the meetings

All presentations delivered at IRC Meetings can be found on the “[Past Meetings Agendas/Minutes](#)” page of the IRC website

(<https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/redistricting/IRCmeetings1.html>).

7. Training Continuum

[Training Continuum Website](#)

[Training Continuum PDF](#)

8. Education Tour Schedule

Title of Event / Date	Location	Format	Attendance	Attendees Residing Within District	Attendees Residing Outside District
District 5 Education Tour Thursday, June 3, 2021, at 12:00 pm	Virtual	Virtual	29	66%	34%
District 4 Education Tour Tuesday, June 8, 2021, at 6:00 pm	Virtual	Virtual	20	70%	30%
District 1 Education Tour Wednesday, June 16, 2021, at 4:00 pm	Virtual	Virtual	19	37%	63%
District 3 Education Tour Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 12:00 pm	Virtual	Virtual	17	59%	41%
District 2 Education Tour Wednesday, June 30, 2021, at 12:00 pm	Virtual	Virtual	23	78%	22%

9. Pre-Mapping Public Hearings

Date	Location	District	eComments received	Public Speakers	Attendees (Includes virtual and in-person)
August 12	Mira Mesa Senior Center	General Meeting	31	10	30
August 18	Bonita Sunnyside Library	District 1	11	7	14
August 26	Ronald Reagan Community Center	District 2	27	12	35

Date	Location	District	eComments received	Public Speakers	Attendees (Includes virtual and in-person)
September 2	Escondido Chamber of Commerce	District 3	39	17	40
September 9	Valencia Park/Malcolm X Library	District 4	28	15	37
September 18	Green Dragon Tavern & Museum	General Meeting	33	27	65
September 23	Vista Civic Center	District 5	106	43	92
September 25	Spring Valley Community Center	General Meeting	31	24	49

10. Draft Map Public Hearings

Date	Location	eComments received	Public Speakers	Attendees (Includes virtual and in-person)
November 1	City of Chula Vista City Hall Chambers	86	92	215
December 2	San Diego County Office of Education			

11. Map of final adopted plan (all County and each district)

12. IRC resolution for adoption of Final Map

13. IRC resolution for adoption of Final Report

14. Population and demographics report (all County and each district)

15. ABASD Final Report – Pre-Mapping

[ABASD PMPH Final Report - PPT](#)

[ABASD PMPH Final Report - Document](#)

16. ABASD Final Report – Draft Mapping

17. FLO Analytics Final Report

18. Racially Polarized Voting Analysis of San Diego County

Presented to the IRC on October 14, 2021:

- 10/14: [RPV Analysis of San Diego County - Presentation](#)

- 10/14: [San Diego County RPV Report](#)

Presented to the IRC on November 10, 2021:

- 11/10: [San Diego County RPV Report](#)
- 11/10: [Presentation on Ability to Elect](#)

Special VRA Counsel Materials

Presented to the IRC on October 7, 2021:

- 10/7: [SD Redistricting Overview VRA Training - Presentation](#)

Presented to the IRC on October 14, 2021:

- 10/14: [The Law of Redistricting](#)

Presented to the IRC on November 10, 2021:

- 11/10: [Legal Opinion by IRC Counsel Bruce Adelson](#)

19. Publicly Submitted Maps