

El Cajon District Mapping Community Workshop Meeting Summary

Tuesday April 18, 2017

7:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

El Cajon Police Station Community Room: 100 Civic Center Way, El Cajon Way

46 Community Members in Attendance

Welcome and Introductions

The Institute for Local Government (ILG) opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. The agenda, workshop purpose and meeting logistics were then reviewed.

Overview of District Elections and Review of Draft Maps

National Demographics Corporation (NDC) explained the district mapping process that has occurred since measure S passed in November 2016 and reviewed the fifteen draft maps submitted by El Cajon residents and the three maps created by NDC. Each of the eighteen draft maps were briefly discussed, NDC noted how many submissions each map had and the noticeable map features. The map comparison table was reviewed and terms such as pop dev defined. PopDev stands for population deviation. Courts have said the absolute population deviation limit is 10%. NDC stated that they try to stay under that threshold to leave room to adjust later when the next census population numbers are released in 2021.

Gallery Walk

Meeting attendees were encouraged to walk around the room to take a closer look at each of the eighteen draft maps printed on large poster papers. They were asked to write down things they liked and/or did not like about the draft maps in each specific box on the worksheet provided or write general comments on the back of the worksheet. Worksheets were collected at the end of the workshop and comments are listed in the table below.

Group Discussion

Workshop attendees reassembled after the gallery walk and asked the following questions / comments:

- Question: What are the population numbers based on?
 - Answer: The numbers are from the 2010 census. After the 2020 census is done the district boundary lines can be adjusted if there has been a significant population change that has resulted in a population deviation of more than 10%.
- Comment: Suppose somebody wants to do a project in a single district (like an airport). Who gets to decide if it happens?
 - Answer: The city council will still make decisions with a majority vote. Projects would be decided by more than just a single district's council member.
- Question: What does the term compact mean?
 - Answer: Compact refers to how regular the district shape is? How much does it resemble a recognizable shape versus how much does it meander along different roads creating a scattered boundary line.
- Comment: Noticed that the population deviation is large on some of the draft maps. For example: Ebriggs2 is 6.49. How much of a chance is there that the city will have to redo the map in 2020?

- Answer: Whether or not the map districts need to be redrawn depends on how much growth there has been and where it has been distributed. Most of these maps have parts of town in them that are growing faster than others.
- Question: Is income variance a factor?
 - Answer: There is information about household income included in the table online for each draft map. Issues related to income come up in some cities more than others. El Cajon residents have stated that the flat land area in the central part of town is economically different than the areas up in the hills. However, residents have also said that the hill areas and adjacent flat areas are similar and could be kept together as a community of interest.
- Question: I understand that legislation rules out politics as being a consideration. But how do you leave it out as members of the public?
 - Answer: Politics may be going on behind the scenes. However, it is not factored into these maps, only the number of voter age residents is included.

Comments Specific to Each Draft Map

Map	Pro	Con
ADarr1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good division. ● I prefer this one because people around the downtown are divided in two districts and they share a lot of common interests. ● Don't like N/S orientation; needs / interests are different. ● Likes the low pop dev. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Includes too many higher end households. ● I do not like this map. Districts 1 & 3 do not access downtown. The area around the airport is not unified. There are many neighborhoods around schools that are divided. ● Doesn't take population of interest into account. ● Dislike because only 2 united neighborhoods.
EBriggs1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Looks equitable. ● 2nd favorite; keeps neighborhoods intact (mostly) while keeping pop dev low. ● I like that the four districts all touch downtown. I like that the area around the airport is in one district. I like that the pop dev is low. This would be my first choice. ● Like the districts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dislike. ● Dislikes the deviation of population and we don't know which district has more or less. ● Dislike because only 1 united neighborhood (fully).
EBriggs2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Looks fair. ● Looks like the best given. endorsements & layout (1st choice). ● Preserves the districts currently represented by council members and includes different areas in downtown. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dislike. ● Seems to permit continuance of existing representatives who have healthy electoral support. ● Okay, but pop dev is too high. ● Dislike only 1 united neighborhood.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets all requirements, keeps current council representation without pitting council members against each other. Fair. • Encompasses 3 districts in downtown, meets all the legal requirements, keeps the council members in their own districts, the lines to delineate is a better picture of sections. • This map meets all the requirements and does not create a conflict for future council member elections. It is well endorsed. • This meets all the legal requirements. Current council members live in their districts, downtown is represented by three districts. • This map is good. 	
ECook1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes mixed income areas. • Looks good given endorsements & layout (4th choice). • Likes handling of Fletcher Hills and that all four are representing downtown. All seem to have some higher income and lower income areas. • Preserves the districts currently represented by council members and includes different areas in downtown. • Meets all requirements. All four districts meet downtown. Keeps current council representation without pitting council members against each other. • Encompasses 3 districts in downtown, meets all the legal requirements, keeps the council members in their own districts, the lines to delineate is a better picture of sections. • This map is very good. It is compact, allows all districts to touch downtown, meets all requirements, and maintains the current boundaries for council seats. It is well endorsed. This is my top choice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seems to permit continuance of existing representatives who have healthy electoral support.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This meets all the legal requirements. Current council members live in their districts, downtown is represented by four districts. • This map is good. 	
FKalinoski1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't like this one, my district is too small. • Dislike – only 1 united neighborhood.
GGlover1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good Division. • I believe that this map captures the majority of the middle eastern community. • Best at representing Fletcher Hills and South Slope of Mt. Hills. • Okay – three united neighborhoods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't like this one.
MHagan1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seems fair (similar to EBriggs2) • I see the map is well divided as far as the election is concerned. • Good – two united neighborhoods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't like this one because my district is too small.
PCirco1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good Division • I prefer this one because downtown area is divided into 2 districts which will allow the middle eastern to have a better chance to representation. • This map seems to be more efficiently divided than the others (notwithstanding the population change that might have occurred since 2011). I like how the downtown area is divided between two districts, which creates less issues for the representatives of that area (it reduces the chance of contention over certain local claims). The population variance seems to be better or in line with the other map presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes too many higher end households from the west. • The division is Magnolia Ave – very bad. Last time they divided congressional district my neighbor across the street have different representatives and ended up with someone farther away and not as available to us. • Dislike – only two united neighborhoods.
RBecker1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good as it preserves neighborhoods. • This plan also gives all districts a part of the downtown area. This also unifies the area around the airport. It also preserves the important neighborhoods around schools. • This is acceptable (3rd choice). • Like the handling of Fletcher Hills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with high pop dev. • Dislike high pop dev. • Dislike – only one united neighborhood.

RWeaver1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dislike – only two united neighborhoods.
Sadler1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too many higher income households from the west. Dislike – only one united neighborhood.
SDavidson1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dislike – only two united neighborhoods.
SSaffer1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dislike – only two united neighborhoods.
TBrumfield1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Okay; neighborhoods preserved and pop deviation lowest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dislike – only two united neighborhoods.
TTopping1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All four are in downtown districts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dislike my own map as only one united neighborhood.
Yellow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not bad. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dislike – only two united neighborhoods.
Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not bad. Acceptable. Like low dev in pop, that it divides fletcher hills and that there are multiple districts in downtown. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This map is possible if redrawn to have all districts touch downtown. Dislike – only one united neighborhood.
Orange	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good Mixed income variance. 1st favorite; preserves neighborhoods and best keeping pop dev low. Preserves fletcher hills areas around the airport and SE with granite hills. Like that downtown is covered by three districts. NDC Orange is the only map that keeps all of the major neighborhoods (as identified in the workshops) intact. Has very good compression and scores well on the population deviation. Really like as it has four unified neighborhoods and three downtown district representation. 	

General Comments

- Dislike any maps that separate our (middle eastern) community into many districts.
- I understand that relevant legislation excludes your institute from using considerations of political party based voting outcomes in drawing districts; but that doesn't prevent maps from being drawn up or supported by Council Members or committees on that political party basis. Shouldn't an institute

like yours at least be concerned not to rule out the possibility of some change to party political governance?

- Make sure that within the districts the incomes are varied. That is the only way a representative can support his or her districts issues.
- The map of the people with college degrees is not accurate considering the number of middle eastern people who have a degree.
- Middle eastern people share many aspects that includes but not limited to culture, languages, economic status and common everyday life issues that they care about or are trying to solve. It is important to have downtown area to be in one or two districts to allow the middle eastern people to be represented in a good way considering the fact that downtown area population has a high percentage of middle easterners. Please take in consideration that those people lack the knowledge and the desire to participate in this democratic process do to the history of persecution they have been through in their mother counties.
- Any map that keeps Fletcher Hills as one district instead of two.
- Having the data sheet in corresponding maps would have been helpful.
- The best maps include different areas in the downtown and do not redraw boundaries so as to set council members against each other.
- What I dislike about all of these districts is that they all divide the city into districts when comes to voting for city council. People from El Cajon should have the jurisdiction to all across the map.
- If the airport is not in my district, and the district that it is in wants to do something to the airport or with the airport, do we all have a say in what's going to happen?
- The problem is what if we would like to vote for another city council? I'm a US citizen and I would like to exercise my rights but if so I would not vote.
- I authored one of the proposed maps, however, after careful review of all 18 maps on display, I believe the only map that should be the final map of all four districts is the orange map as it keeps intact all four neighborhoods of Fletcher Hills, East, Center-South and Southeast thus achieving the wishes of citizens who attended the meeting and expressed their concept of neighborhood identity. The mayor and city council members should put the citizens and residents of the city of el Cajon first and foremost instead of considering themselves when drawing districts to save their time in office.