

From: [Dennis Williams](#)
To: [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#)
Subject: Build Black Power In SF: 2022 Redistricting Ask
Date: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 1:16:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Member Redistricting Task Force,

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Redistricting Task Force,

The time is now to protect and preserve the Black/African American community in the 2022 San Francisco Redistricting process. We understand the hard task you have at hand, but the future of Black San Francisco is in your hands. It's time to think of the greater good.

We want the following from the SF Redistricting Task Force:

- Unify Black tracts and neighborhoods from the new 2020 Census.
- Keep the highest percentage possible of Black population in Supervisorial Districts with currently largest % of Black people - Districts 5, 6, 10, and 11. Do not dilute us.
- Keep pathways open for Black leadership and representation CITYWIDE, not just in 1-2 Districts.
- Preserve existing Black businesses, institutions, community organizations, places of worship, housing, recreation/parks, and arts/culture/media.
- Repair the harm of years of segregation, redlining, redevelopment and gentrification.
- Prevent our Black community from a steady population decline over the next 10 years.

Without Black people, you can't have Black votes or representation. Without Black resources and funding, you lose jobs, businesses, homes, art/culture, media, recreation, institutions and places of worship. PLEASE PROTECT OUR COMMUNITY AND SAVE BLACK SAN FRANCISCO.

We respectfully ask that the SF Redistricting Taskforce consider the Black community principles and the Solidarity Maps found here: <https://sf-redistrict-proposal.webflow.io/>

Thank you for consideration.

30+ years NO BLACK Real Estate Development Companies have LED a Affordable Housing, Homeless Housing Project in San Francisco. This is systematic RACISM and DISCRIMINATORY Practices. Support D. C. Williams Development Company in being a part of the CHANGE.

Dennis Williams
biggdenn27@gmail.com
626 Larch Way
San Francisco, California 94115

From: [Pankaj Agarwal](#)
To: [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#)
Subject: I advocate for Map 4B, again!
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 3:02:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Redistricting Task Force,

I'm a Resident of Potrero Hill and am extremely unhappy with the present "Final Map."

I advocate for Map 4B.

Potrero Hill, Dogpatch and Showplace Square are a single community. South Beach also has similar concerns to ours.

Your draft map splits us and harms us. Please keep us with Mission Bay which is a similar community.

This was done best in Map 4B.

Pankaj Agarwal
Potrero Hill

From: [Lea McGeever](#)
To: [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#)
Subject: Lea McGeever's final public comment for SF RDTF
Date: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 5:32:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

During the final course of redistricting meetings I provided several public comments pleading (and finally screaming and crying) for the Tenderloin and SoMa to remain together in D6. This was important to myself, my trans wife and the trans community because the newly established and only transgender cultural district in the world crossed from the Tenderloin into SoMa. The final map split this community in half via Market St. serving as the new demarcation between D5 and D6. Splitting the Tenderloin and SoMa dilutes the voting power for the trans community when voting for a district supervisor, making representation ever harder for an already severely marginalized community.

However it's not just the trans community whose voting power was diluted with the new district map. The Black community, Filipino community, immigrant community, labor and working class community, Indigenous, Mexican and Latin American community, all of these marginalized, vulnerable communities had their voting power diluted. There are probably more I'm unaware of.

Also D10 should have gotten the Chase Center in their District. It was promised to them and would have been an economic boost to the severely marginalized, oppressed Black community. SF has a horrible history when it comes to tearing down & oppressing the Black community. This is just one more example of SF doing it again.

This is an unjust, racist, homophobic, transphobic, classist map.

Seeya in 10 years,
Lea McGeever

From: [Mary S](#)
To: [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#)
Subject: Reject the Map
Date: Thursday, May 19, 2022 12:46:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To whom it may concern:

As a resident who has participated in the redistricting process, I am disgusted with the way the city has rejected the people's continual pleas to create a just and equitable map and instead has chosen to gerrymander our city.

The current map is deeply flawed:

- Splitting the Tenderloin and SoMa dilutes the voting power for the trans community
- D10 should have gotten the Chase Center in their District.
- D11 should not be going to the Inner Sunset, a completely different neighborhood
- This is an unjust, racist, homophobic, transphobic, classist map and is a direct result of ignoring the will of the people.

Thank you.
Marynoel Strobe

From: [Kathleen Courtney](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Bernholz, Lucy \(REG\)](#); [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#); [Jamie Cherry](#); [John Borruso](#); [Betsy Brill](#); [carolannrogers@prodigy.net](#); [Diana Taylor](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RHCA-PANA: With thanks to Assistant Clerk John Carroll for his RDTF work
Date: Thursday, May 12, 2022 9:00:57 AM
Attachments: [RHCA-PANA John Carroll 5-12-22.pdf](#)
Importance: High

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Attached and pasted below are RHCA-PANA words of appreciation.

Russian Hill Community Association Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association

May 12, 2022

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City Hall Room 244

Greetings Madame Clerk:

It is impossible to overestimate the contribution Assistant Clerk of the Board John Carroll provided to the Redistricting Task Force (RDTF) and the community during the Redistricting effort.

Mr. Carroll's professionalism, patience, and profound understanding of protocol provided a much needed balance during a difficult and highly charged process. He was able to provide direction, diffuse situations and keep track of motions and timetables in an admirable manner.

You are to be commended, Madame Clerk, for selecting such a remarkable member of your staff for this most challenging of assignments.

With our thanks for Mr. Carroll's efforts,

Kathleen Courtney
Kathleen Courtney
Chair, Housing & Zoning
Russian Hill Community Association

Robyn Tucker
Robyn Tucker
Co-Chair
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association

Cc: Mayor London Breed, BOS President Shamann Walton, Elections Commission President Lucy Bernholz, RDTF Chair Rev. Arnold Townsend, RHCA: Jamie Cherry, John Borruso, PANA: Betsy Brill, RHN: Carol Ann Rogers, BCNA Diana Taylor, District 3 Supervisor Aaron Peskin, Assistant Clerk John Carroll.

Kathleen Courtney
Chair, Housing & Zoning Committee
Russian Hill Community Association
kcourtney@rhcasf.com and kcourtney@xdm.com
(c) 510-928-8243

Russian Hill Community Association Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association

May 12, 2022

Ms. Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City Hall Room 244

Greetings Madame Clerk:

It is impossible to overestimate the contribution Assistant Clerk of the Board John Carroll provided to the Redistricting Task Force (RDTF) and the community during the Redistricting effort.

Mr. Carroll's professionalism, patience, and profound understanding of protocol provided a much needed balance during a difficult and highly charged process. He was able to provide direction, diffuse situations and keep track of motions and timetables in an admirable manner.

You are to be commended, Madame Clerk, for selecting such a remarkable member of your staff for this most challenging of assignments.

With our thanks for Mr. Carroll's efforts,

Kathleen Courtney
Kathleen Courtney
Chair, Housing & Zoning
Russian Hill Community Association

Robyn Tucker
Robyn Tucker
Co-Chair
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association

Cc: Mayor London Breed, BOS President Shamann Walton, Elections Commission President Lucy Bernholz, RDTF Chair Rev. Arnold Townsend, RHCA: Jamie Cherry, John Borruso, PANA: Betsy Brill, RHN: Carol Ann Rogers, BCNA Diana Taylor, District 3 Supervisor Aaron Peskin, Assistant Clerk John Carroll.

From: [Marvis Phillips](#)
To: [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#)
Subject: Splitting the poor sections of District, instead of the Wealthy,
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 9:19:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear REDISTRICTING Committee,

Why when more than likely the biggest parts of District 6 population increase was either Mission Bay Housing and Treasure Island Housing, which did not even exist 10 years ago! So the biggest increase of our population is not from the Tenderloin or South of Market, yet we have to pay the price for the Mission Bay Housing Development, and the Treasure Island Developments! Does that sound fair, you split the poorest neighborhoods and not the wealthier ones!

Also when the census was taken 10 years ago 90%+ of the New Condos built in Rincon Hill hadn't been built, the "Eastern Neighborhood Plan" hadn't been approved yet, and the thousands of housing units on Folsom South to the Train yards hadn't happened yet! Yet here again the poor low-income people pay the price!

And this is called "**FAIR HOUSING**" not to mention 950 Market Condo's, 1028 Market Housing, 1050 (Shorestein Housing) Market Street, adding nearly 1000+ units to the Tenderloin, and all the new high rise condo's on Van Ness north of Market or the new 55 story building at South Van Ness and Market (west side of Van Ness)!

The city has done a bang up job of eliminating small businesses, auto repair, gas stations, and other auto related business from South of Market putting hundreds out of work, and building thousands of higher end housing, putting an even tighter strangled hold on the poor!

Now we have split our voter base so we cannot stop the destruction of the poor/lower income residential population and our businesses, and homes!

This is my view on **RE-DISTRICTING** my Neighborhood!

Sincerely,

Marvis J. Phillips
43 year resident of the core Tenderloin
(200/300 blocks Eddy)

--

Marvis J. Phillips
Board Chair
District 6 Community Planners

From: [Julie Paul](#)
To: [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#)
Subject: THANK YOU!
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 12:49:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Redistricting Taskforce,

I want to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude for all of your efforts. I know it was an incredibly challenging task and am sorry that you were subjected to so much public abuse. Please know there are **many** residents who are grateful for your service. I hope we can all move forward together in earnest to make San Francisco a better city for everyone!

Many thanks,
Julie Paul

Julie Paul

Founder

hearditfromafriend.com

From: [Laurance Lee](#)
To: [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#)
Subject: Video link for 4/28 meeting appears broken
Date: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 2:57:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi!

Thanks again for all the hard work on the Redistricting Task Force. I was recently on the granicus page with the video and caption notes. It looks like the link for the video for the 4/28/2022 meeting is broken. The caption notes are working so maybe a simple fix linking to the video is the only thing needed.

https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/41145?view_id=155&redirect=true

Thanks for addressing this item!

Laurance Lee

From: [Lee, Chasel \(REG - Contractor\)](#)
To: [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [SHEN, ANDREW \(CAT\)](#); [FLORES, ANA \(CAT\)](#); [GUIBERT, GUS \(CAT\)](#)
Subject: 2021-2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force - Draft Final Report
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 4:56:17 PM
Attachments: [Draft Final Report.docx](#)
[Draft Final Report.pdf](#)

Dear Clerk Calvillo,

Please see the attached Draft Final Report of the 2021-2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force in both Word and PDF format. Please let me know if you have any questions or if I should submit other materials to you.

Sincerely,

Chasel Lee

Pronouns: he/him/his

Member | San Francisco Redistricting Task Force

chasel.lee@sfgov.org | <https://sfelections.org/rdtf>

**2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Draft Final Report**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Provisions of the City Charter.....	1
III.	Task Force and Staff.....	2
IV.	Redistricting Criteria.....	2
V.	2020 Census and Population Numbers	3
VI.	Work of the Task Force	4
VII.	Supervisory District Considerations	6
VIII.	Supervisory District Deviations in Excess of 1% of the Mean.....	9
IX.	Lessons Learned and Recommendations	11
X.	Closing Remarks.....	14

Appendices

Final Map and Supervisory District Statistics

Supervisory District Descriptions

Statements from Task Force Members

Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors – Report

Civic Edge Consulting – Outreach and Support Final Report

2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force Draft Final Report

I. Introduction

The San Francisco Redistricting Task Force (“Task Force”) is the governmental body empowered by the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco (“Charter”) to redraw the supervisorial district boundaries. The Task Force is convened every ten years after each decennial census and is responsible for redrawing district boundaries to be compliant with all redistricting criteria.

The Final Map containing the revised supervisorial district boundaries was adopted by the Task Force on April 28, 2022. This Final Report of the 2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force sets forth the Final Map and the work of the Task Force leading to its adoption.

II. Provisions of the City Charter

Section 13.110(d) of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco sets forth the powers of the Task Force and the requirements and procedures for redrawing the City’s eleven supervisorial districts.

The Charter requires that within 60 days following publication of the decennial federal census, the Director of Elections shall report to the Board of Supervisors on whether the existing districts continue to meet the relevant legal requirements. If it is determined that any of the districts is not in compliance, the Board of Supervisors by ordinance shall convene and fund a nine-person elections task force, with three members appointed by the Board of Supervisors, three members appointed by the Mayor, and three members appointed by the Elections Commission.

The Charter provides that population variations between the supervisorial districts should be limited to one percent from the statistical mean unless additional variations, limited to five percent of the statistical mean, are necessary to prevent dividing or diluting the voting power of minorities and/or to keep recognized neighborhoods intact. The Charter also requires the districts to conform to the rule of one person, one vote, and to reflect communities of interest in San Francisco.

The Charter requires that census data, at the census block level, as released by the United States Census Bureau be used in any analysis of population requirements and application of the rule of one person, one vote.

The Charter requires the Task Force to complete redrawing district lines before April 15 in the year in which the first election using the redrawn lines will be conducted. The Board of Supervisors may not revise the district boundaries established by the Task Force. The Charter provides that the City Attorney shall cause the description of the redrawn district lines to be published in an appendix to the Charter.

III. Task Force and Staff

Due to delays in the publication of 2020 Census redistricting data by the United States Census Bureau, the 2021–2022 Task Force was convened by Ordinance 94-21 in July 2021 before receiving the population data and in anticipation of the need to redistrict at least one of San Francisco’s eleven supervisorial districts following the 2020 census. Appointments to the Task Force were made in June and July of 2021 by the three appointing authorities set forth by the Charter: the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Elections Commission.

The members of the Task Force appointed by the Board of Supervisors were Jeremy Lee, Jose Maria (Chema) Hernández Gil, and J. Michelle Pierce. The members appointed by the Mayor were Matthew Castillon, Lily Ho, and the Rev. Arnold Townsend. The members appointed by the Elections Commission were Raynell Cooper, Chasel Lee, and Ditka Reiner. At its first meeting on September 17, 2021, the Redistricting Task Force elected the Rev. Arnold Townsend as its Chair and Ditka Reiner as its Vice Chair.

The Task Force was supported by Angela Calvillo, John Carroll, Wilson Ng, John Tse, Joe Adkins, Alicia Somera, Eileen McHugh and many more staff members from the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors (“Clerk’s Office”); Andrew Shen, Ana Flores, and Gus Guibert from the Office of the City Attorney; and Agnes Li, Arturo Castenza, and Raymond Borres from the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs. Staff from the Department of Elections and the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs supported their teams. The Task Force was also supported by the Sheriff’s Department and their officers. Q2 Data and Research LLC (“Q2”) was selected by the Department of Elections to assist with mapping, and Civic Edge Consulting were selected to do outreach by the Clerk’s Office prior to the seating and the first meeting of the Task Force.

IV. Redistricting Criteria

In accordance with federal, state, and local legal requirements and with the advice from the Office of the City Attorney, the Task Force performed its work with the following criteria:

- **Equal population:** The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, United States Supreme Court rulings in *Avery v. Midland County*, 390 U.S. 474 (1968) and subsequent cases, and Section 13.110(d) of the San Francisco City Charter require supervisorial districts to substantially comply with the rule of one person, one vote.
- **Federal Voting Rights Act (VRA):** The VRA protects the voting power of racial and language minorities. A violation of the VRA can occur if there is dilution of the voting power of a racial or language minority by cracking the minority group into several districts to prevent them from concentrating their strength or by packing the minority group into as few districts as possible.

- **Contiguity:** Districts should be contiguous, with all parts of a district being adjacent to another part of the district. Areas separated by water and not connected by a bridge, tunnel, or regular ferry service are not considered contiguous.
- **Recognized neighborhoods:** Recognized neighborhoods are based on data and geography collected from official sources, such as those defined by the Mayor’s Office of Neighborhood Services. The Charter permits deviations beyond one percent of the statistical mean to keep recognized neighborhoods intact.
- **Communities of interest:** Communities of interest are a population of residents that share common social, cultural, and economic interests. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.
- **Compactness:** Districts should be compact. Article XXI, Section 2 of the California Constitution defines compactness as “nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant population.”

V. 2020 Census and Population Numbers

According to the 2020 United States Census, San Francisco’s population was 873,965 as of April 1, 2020, an increase of 68,730 people (8.53%) from the 2010 Census count of 805,235 people. In compliance with the Fair And Inclusive Redistricting for Municipalities And Political Subdivisions Act (FAIR MAPS Act) and California Elections Code Section 21500, the adjusted 2020 total population for redistricting is 874,933 people, or 79,545 people per supervisorial district.

Population growth in the past ten years was unevenly distributed, with the greatest growth occurring in the eastern parts of the city. This led to population deviations in a majority of supervisorial districts that exceeded 5% of the statistical mean of 79,545 people.

District (2012–2022)	Population (2020)	Population Deviation from the Mean
1	72,848	–8.31%
2	76,363	–3.89%
3	72,474	–8.78%
4	72,784	–8.39%
5	80,667	+1.53%
6	103,564	+30.35%
7	75,436	–5.05%
8	82,418	+3.73%
9	75,829	–4.56%
10	86,323	+8.65%
11	76,287	–3.98%

District 6 saw the greatest amount of growth, adding 29,655 people over ten years and ending with a deviation of 30.35% above the mean. Growth in District 10 also outpaced many other

areas in the city, with its population growing to above 8% of the mean. Meanwhile, Districts 1, 3, 4, and 7 had population numbers that deviated to below 5% of the mean, and Districts 9 and 11 actually saw fewer people counted in 2020 than in 2010.

District (2012–2022)	Population (2010)	Population (2020)
1	69,703	72,848
2	69,544	76,363
3	70,394	72,474
4	72,498	72,784
5	74,600	80,667
6	73,909	103,564
7	72,737	75,436
8	75,746	82,418
9	76,720	75,829
10	72,566	86,323
11	76,818	76,287

VI. Work of the Task Force

The Task Force held its first meeting on September 17, 2021, one day after the delayed release of the 2020 Census data by the United States Census Bureau and using remote meeting software due to the global COVID-19 pandemic and the Mayor’s public health orders. During its initial meetings, the Task Force elected officers, adopted bylaws, and set a schedule for future meetings. The Task Force received briefings on its duties and powers from the Department of Elections, Office of the City Attorney, Clerk’s Office, Q2 Data and Research LLC (“Q2”), and Civic Edge Consulting. The Task Force also received various data sets including socioeconomic demographics, neighborhood maps, cultural district information, and community benefit district boundaries.

To accomplish the voluminous number of tasks needed to complete its work, the Task Force assigned individual members to lead on particular matters. Members were assigned to the following areas: community outreach and engagement, social media and website, data and mapping, budgeting, community input management, and messaging coordination. The Chair and Vice Chair assisted the members in their assignments alongside their duties to lead and represent the Task Force as a whole.

Outreach was a high priority for the Task Force. The Task Force relied on its outreach consultant Civic Edge Consulting to develop marketing materials, identifying community organizations for engagement, and digital outreach efforts such as email and social media. These efforts were supplemented by the Clerk’s Office, which included window signs, flyers, and other printed materials. Details of the tasks undertaken by Civic Edge Consulting and the Clerk’s Office are included in their respective reports in this Final Report’s appendices.

Individual Task Force members also participated in outreach activities: speaking with San Francisco residents, making presentations to community-based organizations, and attending

events to engage the public in the redistricting process. Interested organizations and members of the public also participated in informing their fellow neighbors and community members regarding the Task Force's work.

In addition to outreach, the Task Force also emphasized language access. Printed materials were available in English, Chinese, Spanish, Filipino, and other languages as needed, and translation services for district-specific Task Force meetings were provided for Cantonese Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino speakers. Several district-specific meetings also had translation services for Mandarin Chinese, Taishanese Chinese, Vietnamese, and Russian speakers. In April 2022, funding was secured for simultaneous interpretation of the Task Force meetings into Cantonese Chinese and Spanish.

The Task Force directed its mapping consultant Q2 Data and Research LLC to provide mapping and community of interest submission tools for the public to create district maps and submit their proposals to the Task Force. In accordance with this direction, Q2 released the San Francisco Redistricting Tool, a free-to-use online mapping tool that allowed the public to work with the same geographies and data available to the Task Force to create their district maps, and a Community of Interest Public Input Form using Airtable. There was also a training video created to assist users in map drawing. Using these tools, members of the public submitted 99 district maps and 162 community of interest entries to the Task Force for consideration.

The Task Force also received public testimony in other ways. Members of the public were able to give oral public comment at Task Force meetings, submit handwritten letters and hand-drawn maps by mail and or in person, and send emails to a dedicated email inbox for the Task Force. Unlike previous iterations of the Task Force, this Task Force declined to set a deadline for map and community of interest submissions and continued to receive public comments, maps, and communities of interest until the end of the redistricting process. By the end of April 2022, the Task Force received over 2,500 written and oral public comments.

The Task Force sought to hear from each district and their residents first before creating draft maps, emphasizing the importance of the public's ability to testify regarding their neighborhoods and communities of interest. The Task Force also decided to have two district-specific meetings for every supervisorial district, the first time a Task Force has done so.

As the mapping process got underway in February 2022, the Task Force agreed to an iterative process to create draft maps. The Task Force would give specific directions regarding the district boundaries to Q2, who would create multiple draft maps based on the directions for the next mapping meeting. The Task Force would advance one or more maps, give additional directions regarding the district boundaries, and request Q2 to create a next set of maps for the next mapping meeting. This process would repeat itself until the Task Force adopted a map as the Draft Final Map. In addition to these directions, the Task Force held multiple live line-drawing sessions, including all meetings during the final few weeks, allowing the public to watch the work, understand the movement of district boundaries, and witness their impact on other districts in real time. Throughout this process, the Task Force continued to receive public testimony.

Using this process, several working maps were advanced and adjusted by the Task Force. A Draft Final Map was advanced on April 10, 2022, but was not adopted as the Final Map. The Task Force therefore continued its work and advanced a new Draft Final Map on April 21, 2022, which was adopted as the Final Map of the 2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force on April 28, 2022.

VII. Supervisorial District Considerations

For each supervisorial district, the Redistricting Task Force considered the geographic issues listed below.

• District 1

- Anza Vista: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Golden Gate Park: whether to include the Park in one district or split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
- Jordan Park: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Lone Mountain: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- North of Lake Street: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Panhandle: whether to include the area west of Masonic in D1 or D5
- Presidio Terrace: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Seacliff: whether to include in D1 or D2

• District 2

- Anza Vista: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Aquatic Park: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- Cathedral Hill / Jefferson Square Park / Margaret Haywood Playground: whether to include in D2 or D5 or to split between districts
- Fishermans Wharf: whether to include the area west of Leavenworth and Columbus in D2 or D3
- Japantown / Western Addition: where to establish the border between D2 and D5, especially with respect to the Booker T. Washington Community Service Center, the Hamilton Recreation Center, Housing Authority projects, Japantown's culturally significant sites, Rosa Parks Elementary School, the Sequoias senior living facility, the Western Addition Branch Library, and Westside Courts
- Jordan Park: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Lone Mountain: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- North of Lake Street: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Panhandle: whether to include the area east of Masonic in D2 or D5
- Polk Gulch: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- Presidio Terrace: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Russian Hill: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- Seacliff: whether to include in D1 or D2

• District 3

- Aquatic Park: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- East Cut / Rincon Hill: whether to include in D3 or D6

- Financial District: whether to include in D3 or D6 or to split between districts
 - Fishermans Wharf: whether to include the area west of Leavenworth and Columbus in D2 or D3
 - Lower Nob Hill: whether to establish the border between D3 and D6 on Post, Geary, or O'Farrell
 - Polk Gulch: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
 - Lower Polk Street Corridor: whether to include in D3 or D6
 - Russian Hill: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
 - South of Market: whether to include the area northeast of 2nd Street in D3 or D6
 - Tenderloin: whether to include in D3, D5, or D6 or to split between districts
 - Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island: whether to include in D3 or D6
- **District 4**
 - Golden Gate Park: whether to include the Park in one district or split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
 - Inner Sunset: whether to include in D4, D5, or D7 or to split between districts
 - Lakeshore / Merced Manor: whether to include in D4 or D7
- **District 5**
 - Ashbury Heights / Cole Valley: whether to include in D5 or D8
 - Cathedral Hill / Jefferson Square Park / Margaret Haywood Playground: whether to include in D2 or D5 or to split between districts
 - Central SoMa: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
 - Civic Center: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
 - Golden Gate Park / Kezar Stadium: whether to include the Park in one district or split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
 - Haight-Ashbury: whether to include in D5 or D8
 - Hayes Valley / The Hub: whether to include in D5, D6, or D8 or to split between districts
 - Japantown / Western Addition: where to establish the border between D2 and D5, especially with respect to the Booker T. Washington Community Service Center, the Hamilton Recreation Center, Housing Authority projects, Japantown's culturally significant sites, Rosa Parks Elementary School, the Sequoias senior living facility, the Western Addition Branch Library, and Westside Courts
 - Lower Haight: whether to include in D5 or D8 or to split between districts
 - Mid-Market: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
 - Mint Hill: whether to include in D5 or D8 or split between districts
 - Panhandle: whether to include in D1, D2, or D5 or to split between districts
 - Parnassus Heights: whether to include in D5, D7, or D8 or to split between districts
 - Tenderloin: whether to include in D3, D5, or D6 or to split between districts
- **District 6**
 - Chase Center: whether to include in D6 or D10
 - Civic Center: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
 - Dogpatch / Central Waterfront: whether to include in D6 or D10

- East Cut / Rincon Hill: whether to include in D3 or D6
- Financial District: whether to include in D3 or D6 or to split between districts
- Hayes Valley / The Hub: whether to include in D5, D6, or D8 or to split between districts
- Mission Bay: whether to include various areas in D6 or D10
- Potrero Hill: whether to include in D6, D9, or D10 or to split between districts
- Showplace Square: whether to include in D6 or D10 or to split between districts
- South of Market: whether to include various parts in D3, D5, or D6
- Tenderloin / Transgender Cultural District: whether to include in D3, D5, or D6 or to split between districts
- Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island: whether to include in D3 or D6
- **District 7**
 - Golden Gate Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
 - Inner Sunset: whether to include in D4, D5, or D7 or to split between districts
 - Lakeshore / Merced Manor: whether to include in D4 or D7
 - Ocean Avenue corridor: whether to include entirely in D7 or split between D7 and D11
 - Parnassus Heights: whether to include in D5, D7, or D8 or to split between districts
 - Upper Market: whether to include in D7 or D8
- **District 8**
 - Ashbury Heights / Cole Valley: whether to include in D5 or D8
 - Hayes Valley / The Hub: whether to include in D5, D6, or D8 or to split between districts
 - Kezar Stadium: whether to include in D5 or D8
 - Guerrero / Valencia: where to establish the border between D8 and D9
 - Mint Hill: whether to include in D5 or D8 or to split between districts
 - Mission Dolores: whether to include in D8 or D9 or to split between districts
 - Parnassus Heights: whether to include in D5, D7, or D8 or to split between districts
 - Upper Market: whether to include in D7 or D8
- **District 9**
 - Guerrero / Valencia: where to establish the border between D8 and D9
 - Mission Dolores: whether to include in D8 or D9 or to split between districts
 - McLaren Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D9, D10, D11)
 - Ocean Avenue corridor: whether to include entirely in D7 or to split between D7 and D11
 - Portola: whether to include in D9 or D10
 - Potrero Hill: whether to include in D6, D9, or D10 or to split between districts
 - University Mound: whether to include in D9, D10, or D11 or to split between districts

- **District 10**

- Chase Center: whether to include in D6 or D10
- Dogpatch / Central Waterfront: whether to include in D6 or D10
- McLaren Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D9, D10, D11)
- Mission Bay: whether to include various areas in D6 or D10
- Portola: whether to include in D9 or D10
- Potrero Hill: whether to include in D6, D9, or D10 or to split between districts
- Showplace Square: whether to include in D6 or D10 or to split between districts
- University Mound: whether to include in D9, D10, or D11 or to split between districts

- **District 11**

- Ocean Avenue corridor: whether to include entirely in D7 or split between D7 and D11
- McLaren Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D9, D10, D11)
- University Mound: whether to include in D9, D10, or D11 or to split between districts

VIII. Supervisorial District Deviations in Excess of 1% of the Mean

Ten supervisorial districts (all except District 3*) have population deviations between one percent and five percent of the statistical mean of 79,545 people. The deviations were necessary to keep recognized neighborhoods intact. The recognized neighborhoods are listed below.

- **District 1 (–4.80%)**

- Inner Richmond
- Lake Street
- Lincoln Park / Fort Miley
- Presidio Terrace
- Outer Richmond
- Seacliff
- Sutro Heights

- **District 2 (–4.52%)**

- Aquatic Park / Fort Mason
- Cow Hollow
- Laurel Heights / Jordan Park
- Marina
- Presidio Heights
- Presidio National Park
- Union Street

* District 3 has a population deviation of –0.31%. The recognized neighborhoods wholly in District 3 are Chinatown, Lower Nob Hill, Nob Hill, Northern Waterfront, Polk Gulch, and Telegraph Hill.

- **District 4 (–4.46%)**
 - Outer Sunset
 - Parkside

- **District 5 (+4.98%)**
 - Alamo Square
 - Haight-Ashbury
 - Hayes Valley
 - Lower Haight
 - Panhandle

- **District 6 (–4.45%)**
 - Mission Bay
 - Rincon Hill
 - Showplace Square
 - South Beach
 - Treasure Island
 - Yerba Buena Island

- **District 7 (–1.08%)**
 - Balboa Terrace
 - Forest Hill
 - Forest Knolls
 - Golden Gate Heights
 - Laguna Honda
 - Ingleside Terraces
 - Inner Sunset
 - Miraloma Park
 - Monterey Heights
 - Mt. Davidson Manor
 - Parkmerced
 - Sherwood Forest
 - St. Francis Wood
 - West Portal
 - Westwood Highlands
 - Westwood Park

- **District 8 (+4.87%)**
 - Ashbury Heights
 - Castro
 - Cole Valley
 - Corona Heights
 - Diamond Heights
 - Eureka Valley
 - Fairmount
 - Glen Park

- Upper Market
- **District 9 (+2.54%)**
 - Bernal Heights
 - Peralta Heights
- **District 10 (+3.27%)**
 - Apparel City
 - Bayview
 - Bret Harte
 - Candlestick Point SRA
 - Central Waterfront
 - Dogpatch
 - Hunters Point
 - India Basin
 - Produce Market
 - Silver Terrace
 - Sunnydale
 - Visitacion Valley
- **District 11 (+3.95%)**
 - Cayuga
 - Crocker Amazon
 - Excelsior
 - Ingleside
 - Mission Terrace
 - Oceanview
 - Outer Mission

IX. Lessons Learned and Recommendations

The Task Force was heavily impacted by the global COVID-19 pandemic, which forced it to work in unprecedented ways that may not affect future iterations of the Task Force. For example, the delay of the census data also delayed the ability for the Task Force to convene for several months compared to previous iterations, only holding its first meeting in September 2021. All Task Force meetings before March 7, 2022, were held remotely due to the Mayor's public health orders. This, along with successive pandemic waves, hindered the ability for Task Force members to hold meetings in San Francisco's diverse districts and communities, many of which were already struggling with the pandemic.

Despite the pandemic, the Task Force exerted its best efforts to perform its duties under trying circumstances. Through the benefit of experience and hindsight, the Task Force makes the following recommendations for future iterations of the Task Force.

- **Starting early:** The Task Force should start as early as the calendar and Charter allows, and definitely before receiving Census data. There are many tasks such as adopting

bylaws; finalizing district meetings and the schedule; getting trained in mapping; being apprised on legal duties and requirements; formulating outreach strategies; and setting in district meetings that are not dependent on census data. Importantly, starting early gives the Task Force the ability to begin working on its substantive duties earlier, such as holding community meetings and discussing draft maps.

- **Early planning:** The Task Force's early meetings saw protracted discussions regarding the creation of bylaws and the meeting schedule. Each new iteration of the Task Force benefits from the institutional knowledge of the Clerk's Office, the City Attorney's Office, and other City agencies and departments that have supported previous Task Forces. Rather than having newly empaneled Task Force members grapple with issues such as bylaws and the schedule without the important context, draft bylaws, tentative schedules, and proposed timelines should be presented to the next iteration of the Task Force for consideration in the first meeting.

As previously mentioned, the Task Force should also receive training in mapping early in the redistricting process rather than waiting until mapping meetings begin. San Francisco is a diverse city with many neighborhoods, communities of interest, and viewpoints, and Task Force members will benefit from experience with working on mapping tools, reviewing district iterations, and understanding the line-drawing process by the time mapping meetings are fully underway.

- **Direct support:** While the Task Force is immensely grateful for the support it received from the Clerk's Office and other City agencies, staffing availability and resources were constant concerns. Vice Chair Ditka Reiner spent endless hours handling the Task Force's many operational needs and coordinating with the Clerk's Office. The Clerk's Office also spent much of its own resources supporting the work of the Task Force, which increased greatly as the redistricting process progressed, and all involved found themselves stretched thin. With ever-increasing public access to government proceedings, the next Task Force should be able to work with all sufficient resources to accomplish its duties to the public.

The Task Force echoes the recommendation of the Clerk's office that, upon convening the next iteration of the Task Force, the City should establish a temporary department or division to support the Task Force and its needs. Such a department or division will require a paid chief of staff, dedicated administrative support, a media coordinator, and a Sunshine Ordinance expert to manage the myriad requests that may be directed at the Task Force at their busiest time. The Board of Supervisors should also allocate more funding from the outset rather than having the Task Force draw on limited funds from the Clerk's Office and the Department of Elections to meet public participation needs, as has occurred in this and previous iterations of the Task Force.

- **Clerks:** The Task Force thanks its clerk John Carroll for his efforts and dedication to help the Task Force fulfill its duties. However, the time and energy needed to support the Task Force is too much for one person and calls for the need of more staffing and support. The 2011–2012 Task Force was supported by two clerks. If the City does not accept the establish a more robust support framework for future iterations of the Task

Force (see above), then the Task Force should be staffed by at least two clerks to sufficiently assist in its work, with one person assigned to document issues, agreements, and the Meeting Minutes.

- **Meetings:** Most meetings were held in the evening. While starting meetings later in the day allows Task Force members to attend meetings and for more members of the public to participate, starting late in the day also means ending late into the night. Future iterations of the Task Force should strongly consider beginning their meetings in the morning, as starting earlier allows everyone involved to be better engaged in the process.

The length of meetings should also be managed. Several meetings exceeded ten hours, with the longest one being almost twenty hours long, which is inappropriate under any measure. Future iterations of the Task Force should consider various methods of running meetings more efficiently while allowing for robust participation, including more focused public comment, better facilitation of discussion and action, and even recessing until the next day if necessary.

- **Outreach:** The COVID-19 pandemic adversely impacted the abilities for the Task Force, its consultant Civic Edge Consulting, and interested parties to conduct important community outreach. However, engagement with the public is a fundamental component of the redistricting process and is important to perform regardless of the challenges. The next iteration of the Task Force should engage in vigorous outreach with the diverse communities of San Francisco, including participating as many events, meetings, and presentations as possible.

The 2021–2022 Task Force was the first Task Force to retain an outreach consultant. This was done in light of advice from the 2011–2012 Task Force, which recommended having an outreach consultant for the purposes of community engagement. However, several Task Force meetings were spent understanding the role of this outreach consultant and to resolve differences between the contracted scope of work for the consultant and the expectations of Task Force members. With the benefit of experience, the Task Force recommends that for future iterations of the Task Force, relevant City bodies should set forth clearer expectations for outreach that more closely align with the needs of the redistricting process.

- **Independence of the Task Force:** As a governmental body, the Task Force makes considerations and decisions that generate passionate discussion and fervent debate. The Task Force welcomes the extraordinary amount of public interest and scrutiny of its work. However, it also witnessed unprecedented assaults on its independence by political actors invested in a specific outcome. These actions, including an effort to remove the three appointees of the Elections Commission, highlight the need for mechanisms to shield the Task Force from undue and inappropriate influence. Stronger measures should be considered to protect future iterations of the Task Force from experiencing these attacks ever again.

Likewise, future iterations of the Task Force should not have to endure racist, prejudiced, vitriolic, and other personal attacks and threats as this Task Force did for performing its

duties for the people of San Francisco. These inappropriate attempts to intimidate the Task Force have no place in public discourse. Better methods should be developed to cut off inappropriate comments and to protect all public servants who volunteer for this difficult job.

- **Composition of the Task Force:** To affirm and protect the independence of the Task Force from inappropriate political influence, a review should be conducted regarding the composition of the Task Force, including the member selection process and ways to reduce potential conflicts of interest. The review should examine whether implementing appointment procedures like that used for the California Citizens Redistricting Commission, but without any involvement of elected officials, are appropriate and will reinforce the independence of the Task Force.

There are currently no guidelines on who may be a member of the Task Force, leaving the Task Force vulnerable to potential conflicts of interest. Therefore, minimum qualifications and restrictions such as those imposed on the California Citizens Redistricting Commission should be considered. To further reduce potential conflicts of interest, such a review should consider restrictions on persons directly receiving or connected to for-profit or nonprofit entities receiving discretionary grants or funding from the City.

- **Alternate members:** Future iterations of the Task Force should consider including alternate members that can take the place of a voting Task Force member who can no longer continue serving. These alternate members should meet the same requirements as that of voting members and should be selected before the first meeting of the Task Force.

X. Closing Remarks

The Task Force was convened to perform a civic duty set forth in the Charter. Amidst a global pandemic and through unprecedented circumstances, the Task Force fulfilled its responsibility to the people of San Francisco by considering the data, engaging communities, and adopting the Final Map setting forth the supervisorial district boundaries for the next ten years. The Task Force thanks the people of the City and County of San Francisco for the great honor of serving them in this capacity and for their participation in this important process.

**2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Draft Final Report**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Provisions of the City Charter.....	1
III.	Task Force and Staff	2
IV.	Redistricting Criteria.....	2
V.	2020 Census and Population Numbers	3
VI.	Work of the Task Force	4
VII.	Supervisory District Considerations	6
VIII.	Supervisory District Deviations in Excess of 1% of the Mean.....	9
IX.	Lessons Learned and Recommendations	11
X.	Closing Remarks.....	14

Appendices

Final Map and Supervisory District Statistics

Supervisory District Descriptions

Statements from Task Force Members

Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors – Report

Civic Edge Consulting – Outreach and Support Final Report

2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force Draft Final Report

I. Introduction

The San Francisco Redistricting Task Force (“Task Force”) is the governmental body empowered by the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco (“Charter”) to redraw the supervisorial district boundaries. The Task Force is convened every ten years after each decennial census and is responsible for redrawing district boundaries to be compliant with all redistricting criteria.

The Final Map containing the revised supervisorial district boundaries was adopted by the Task Force on April 28, 2022. This Final Report of the 2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force sets forth the Final Map and the work of the Task Force leading to its adoption.

II. Provisions of the City Charter

Section 13.110(d) of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco sets forth the powers of the Task Force and the requirements and procedures for redrawing the City’s eleven supervisorial districts.

The Charter requires that within 60 days following publication of the decennial federal census, the Director of Elections shall report to the Board of Supervisors on whether the existing districts continue to meet the relevant legal requirements. If it is determined that any of the districts is not in compliance, the Board of Supervisors by ordinance shall convene and fund a nine-person elections task force, with three members appointed by the Board of Supervisors, three members appointed by the Mayor, and three members appointed by the Elections Commission.

The Charter provides that population variations between the supervisorial districts should be limited to one percent from the statistical mean unless additional variations, limited to five percent of the statistical mean, are necessary to prevent dividing or diluting the voting power of minorities and/or to keep recognized neighborhoods intact. The Charter also requires the districts to conform to the rule of one person, one vote, and to reflect communities of interest in San Francisco.

The Charter requires that census data, at the census block level, as released by the United States Census Bureau be used in any analysis of population requirements and application of the rule of one person, one vote.

The Charter requires the Task Force to complete redrawing district lines before April 15 in the year in which the first election using the redrawn lines will be conducted. The Board of Supervisors may not revise the district boundaries established by the Task Force. The Charter provides that the City Attorney shall cause the description of the redrawn district lines to be published in an appendix to the Charter.

III. Task Force and Staff

Due to delays in the publication of 2020 Census redistricting data by the United States Census Bureau, the 2021–2022 Task Force was convened by Ordinance 94-21 in July 2021 before receiving the population data and in anticipation of the need to redistrict at least one of San Francisco’s eleven supervisorial districts following the 2020 census. Appointments to the Task Force were made in June and July of 2021 by the three appointing authorities set forth by the Charter: the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Elections Commission.

The members of the Task Force appointed by the Board of Supervisors were Jeremy Lee, Jose Maria (Chema) Hernández Gil, and J. Michelle Pierce. The members appointed by the Mayor were Matthew Castillon, Lily Ho, and the Rev. Arnold Townsend. The members appointed by the Elections Commission were Raynell Cooper, Chasel Lee, and Ditka Reiner. At its first meeting on September 17, 2021, the Redistricting Task Force elected the Rev. Arnold Townsend as its Chair and Ditka Reiner as its Vice Chair.

The Task Force was supported by Angela Calvillo, John Carroll, Wilson Ng, John Tse, Joe Adkins, Alicia Somera, Eileen McHugh and many more staff members from the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors (“Clerk’s Office”); Andrew Shen, Ana Flores, and Gus Guibert from the Office of the City Attorney; and Agnes Li, Arturo Castenza, and Raymond Borres from the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs. Staff from the Department of Elections and the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs supported their teams. The Task Force was also supported by the Sheriff’s Department and their officers. Q2 Data and Research LLC (“Q2”) was selected by the Department of Elections to assist with mapping, and Civic Edge Consulting were selected to do outreach by the Clerk’s Office prior to the seating and the first meeting of the Task Force.

IV. Redistricting Criteria

In accordance with federal, state, and local legal requirements and with the advice from the Office of the City Attorney, the Task Force performed its work with the following criteria:

- **Equal population:** The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, United States Supreme Court rulings in *Avery v. Midland County*, 390 U.S. 474 (1968) and subsequent cases, and Section 13.110(d) of the San Francisco City Charter require supervisorial districts to substantially comply with the rule of one person, one vote.
- **Federal Voting Rights Act (VRA):** The VRA protects the voting power of racial and language minorities. A violation of the VRA can occur if there is dilution of the voting power of a racial or language minority by cracking the minority group into several districts to prevent them from concentrating their strength or by packing the minority group into as few districts as possible.

- **Contiguity:** Districts should be contiguous, with all parts of a district being adjacent to another part of the district. Areas separated by water and not connected by a bridge, tunnel, or regular ferry service are not considered contiguous.
- **Recognized neighborhoods:** Recognized neighborhoods are based on data and geography collected from official sources, such as those defined by the Mayor’s Office of Neighborhood Services. The Charter permits deviations beyond one percent of the statistical mean to keep recognized neighborhoods intact.
- **Communities of interest:** Communities of interest are a population of residents that share common social, cultural, and economic interests. Communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.
- **Compactness:** Districts should be compact. Article XXI, Section 2 of the California Constitution defines compactness as “nearby areas of population are not bypassed for more distant population.”

V. 2020 Census and Population Numbers

According to the 2020 United States Census, San Francisco’s population was 873,965 as of April 1, 2020, an increase of 68,730 people (8.53%) from the 2010 Census count of 805,235 people. In compliance with the Fair And Inclusive Redistricting for Municipalities And Political Subdivisions Act (FAIR MAPS Act) and California Elections Code Section 21500, the adjusted 2020 total population for redistricting is 874,933 people, or 79,545 people per supervisorial district.

Population growth in the past ten years was unevenly distributed, with the greatest growth occurring in the eastern parts of the city. This led to population deviations in a majority of supervisorial districts that exceeded 5% of the statistical mean of 79,545 people.

District (2012–2022)	Population (2020)	Population Deviation from the Mean
1	72,848	–8.31%
2	76,363	–3.89%
3	72,474	–8.78%
4	72,784	–8.39%
5	80,667	+1.53%
6	103,564	+30.35%
7	75,436	–5.05%
8	82,418	+3.73%
9	75,829	–4.56%
10	86,323	+8.65%
11	76,287	–3.98%

District 6 saw the greatest amount of growth, adding 29,655 people over ten years and ending with a deviation of 30.35% above the mean. Growth in District 10 also outpaced many other

areas in the city, with its population growing to above 8% of the mean. Meanwhile, Districts 1, 3, 4, and 7 had population numbers that deviated to below 5% of the mean, and Districts 9 and 11 actually saw fewer people counted in 2020 than in 2010.

District (2012–2022)	Population (2010)	Population (2020)
1	69,703	72,848
2	69,544	76,363
3	70,394	72,474
4	72,498	72,784
5	74,600	80,667
6	73,909	103,564
7	72,737	75,436
8	75,746	82,418
9	76,720	75,829
10	72,566	86,323
11	76,818	76,287

VI. Work of the Task Force

The Task Force held its first meeting on September 17, 2021, one day after the delayed release of the 2020 Census data by the United States Census Bureau and using remote meeting software due to the global COVID-19 pandemic and the Mayor’s public health orders. During its initial meetings, the Task Force elected officers, adopted bylaws, and set a schedule for future meetings. The Task Force received briefings on its duties and powers from the Department of Elections, Office of the City Attorney, Clerk’s Office, Q2 Data and Research LLC (“Q2”), and Civic Edge Consulting. The Task Force also received various data sets including socioeconomic demographics, neighborhood maps, cultural district information, and community benefit district boundaries.

To accomplish the voluminous number of tasks needed to complete its work, the Task Force assigned individual members to lead on particular matters. Members were assigned to the following areas: community outreach and engagement, social media and website, data and mapping, budgeting, community input management, and messaging coordination. The Chair and Vice Chair assisted the members in their assignments alongside their duties to lead and represent the Task Force as a whole.

Outreach was a high priority for the Task Force. The Task Force relied on its outreach consultant Civic Edge Consulting to develop marketing materials, identifying community organizations for engagement, and digital outreach efforts such as email and social media. These efforts were supplemented by the Clerk’s Office, which included window signs, flyers, and other printed materials. Details of the tasks undertaken by Civic Edge Consulting and the Clerk’s Office are included in their respective reports in this Final Report’s appendices.

Individual Task Force members also participated in outreach activities: speaking with San Francisco residents, making presentations to community-based organizations, and attending

events to engage the public in the redistricting process. Interested organizations and members of the public also participated in informing their fellow neighbors and community members regarding the Task Force's work.

In addition to outreach, the Task Force also emphasized language access. Printed materials were available in English, Chinese, Spanish, Filipino, and other languages as needed, and translation services for district-specific Task Force meetings were provided for Cantonese Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino speakers. Several district-specific meetings also had translation services for Mandarin Chinese, Taishanese Chinese, Vietnamese, and Russian speakers. In April 2022, funding was secured for simultaneous interpretation of the Task Force meetings into Cantonese Chinese and Spanish.

The Task Force directed its mapping consultant Q2 Data and Research LLC to provide mapping and community of interest submission tools for the public to create district maps and submit their proposals to the Task Force. In accordance with this direction, Q2 released the San Francisco Redistricting Tool, a free-to-use online mapping tool that allowed the public to work with the same geographies and data available to the Task Force to create their district maps, and a Community of Interest Public Input Form using Airtable. There was also a training video created to assist users in map drawing. Using these tools, members of the public submitted 99 district maps and 162 community of interest entries to the Task Force for consideration.

The Task Force also received public testimony in other ways. Members of the public were able to give oral public comment at Task Force meetings, submit handwritten letters and hand-drawn maps by mail and or in person, and send emails to a dedicated email inbox for the Task Force. Unlike previous iterations of the Task Force, this Task Force declined to set a deadline for map and community of interest submissions and continued to receive public comments, maps, and communities of interest until the end of the redistricting process. By the end of April 2022, the Task Force received over 2,500 written and oral public comments.

The Task Force sought to hear from each district and their residents first before creating draft maps, emphasizing the importance of the public's ability to testify regarding their neighborhoods and communities of interest. The Task Force also decided to have two district-specific meetings for every supervisorial district, the first time a Task Force has done so.

As the mapping process got underway in February 2022, the Task Force agreed to an iterative process to create draft maps. The Task Force would give specific directions regarding the district boundaries to Q2, who would create multiple draft maps based on the directions for the next mapping meeting. The Task Force would advance one or more maps, give additional directions regarding the district boundaries, and request Q2 to create a next set of maps for the next mapping meeting. This process would repeat itself until the Task Force adopted a map as the Draft Final Map. In addition to these directions, the Task Force held multiple live line-drawing sessions, including all meetings during the final few weeks, allowing the public to watch the work, understand the movement of district boundaries, and witness their impact on other districts in real time. Throughout this process, the Task Force continued to receive public testimony.

Using this process, several working maps were advanced and adjusted by the Task Force. A Draft Final Map was advanced on April 10, 2022, but was not adopted as the Final Map. The Task Force therefore continued its work and advanced a new Draft Final Map on April 21, 2022, which was adopted as the Final Map of the 2021–2022 San Francisco Redistricting Task Force on April 28, 2022.

VII. Supervisorial District Considerations

For each supervisorial district, the Redistricting Task Force considered the geographic issues listed below.

• District 1

- Anza Vista: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Golden Gate Park: whether to include the Park in one district or split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
- Jordan Park: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Lone Mountain: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- North of Lake Street: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Panhandle: whether to include the area west of Masonic in D1 or D5
- Presidio Terrace: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Seacliff: whether to include in D1 or D2

• District 2

- Anza Vista: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Aquatic Park: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- Cathedral Hill / Jefferson Square Park / Margaret Haywood Playground: whether to include in D2 or D5 or to split between districts
- Fishermans Wharf: whether to include the area west of Leavenworth and Columbus in D2 or D3
- Japantown / Western Addition: where to establish the border between D2 and D5, especially with respect to the Booker T. Washington Community Service Center, the Hamilton Recreation Center, Housing Authority projects, Japantown's culturally significant sites, Rosa Parks Elementary School, the Sequoias senior living facility, the Western Addition Branch Library, and Westside Courts
- Jordan Park: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Lone Mountain: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- North of Lake Street: whether to include in D1 or D2
- Panhandle: whether to include the area east of Masonic in D2 or D5
- Polk Gulch: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- Presidio Terrace: whether to include in D1 or D2 or to split between districts
- Russian Hill: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- Seacliff: whether to include in D1 or D2

• District 3

- Aquatic Park: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
- East Cut / Rincon Hill: whether to include in D3 or D6

- Financial District: whether to include in D3 or D6 or to split between districts
 - Fishermans Wharf: whether to include the area west of Leavenworth and Columbus in D2 or D3
 - Lower Nob Hill: whether to establish the border between D3 and D6 on Post, Geary, or O'Farrell
 - Polk Gulch: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
 - Lower Polk Street Corridor: whether to include in D3 or D6
 - Russian Hill: whether to include in D2 or D3 or to split between districts
 - South of Market: whether to include the area northeast of 2nd Street in D3 or D6
 - Tenderloin: whether to include in D3, D5, or D6 or to split between districts
 - Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island: whether to include in D3 or D6
- **District 4**
 - Golden Gate Park: whether to include the Park in one district or split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
 - Inner Sunset: whether to include in D4, D5, or D7 or to split between districts
 - Lakeshore / Merced Manor: whether to include in D4 or D7
- **District 5**
 - Ashbury Heights / Cole Valley: whether to include in D5 or D8
 - Cathedral Hill / Jefferson Square Park / Margaret Haywood Playground: whether to include in D2 or D5 or to split between districts
 - Central SoMa: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
 - Civic Center: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
 - Golden Gate Park / Kezar Stadium: whether to include the Park in one district or split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
 - Haight-Ashbury: whether to include in D5 or D8
 - Hayes Valley / The Hub: whether to include in D5, D6, or D8 or to split between districts
 - Japantown / Western Addition: where to establish the border between D2 and D5, especially with respect to the Booker T. Washington Community Service Center, the Hamilton Recreation Center, Housing Authority projects, Japantown's culturally significant sites, Rosa Parks Elementary School, the Sequoias senior living facility, the Western Addition Branch Library, and Westside Courts
 - Lower Haight: whether to include in D5 or D8 or to split between districts
 - Mid-Market: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
 - Mint Hill: whether to include in D5 or D8 or split between districts
 - Panhandle: whether to include in D1, D2, or D5 or to split between districts
 - Parnassus Heights: whether to include in D5, D7, or D8 or to split between districts
 - Tenderloin: whether to include in D3, D5, or D6 or to split between districts
- **District 6**
 - Chase Center: whether to include in D6 or D10
 - Civic Center: whether to include in D5 or D6 or to split between districts
 - Dogpatch / Central Waterfront: whether to include in D6 or D10

- East Cut / Rincon Hill: whether to include in D3 or D6
- Financial District: whether to include in D3 or D6 or to split between districts
- Hayes Valley / The Hub: whether to include in D5, D6, or D8 or to split between districts
- Mission Bay: whether to include various areas in D6 or D10
- Potrero Hill: whether to include in D6, D9, or D10 or to split between districts
- Showplace Square: whether to include in D6 or D10 or to split between districts
- South of Market: whether to include various parts in D3, D5, or D6
- Tenderloin / Transgender Cultural District: whether to include in D3, D5, or D6 or to split between districts
- Treasure Island / Yerba Buena Island: whether to include in D3 or D6
- **District 7**
 - Golden Gate Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D1, D4, D5, D7, D8)
 - Inner Sunset: whether to include in D4, D5, or D7 or to split between districts
 - Lakeshore / Merced Manor: whether to include in D4 or D7
 - Ocean Avenue corridor: whether to include entirely in D7 or split between D7 and D11
 - Parnassus Heights: whether to include in D5, D7, or D8 or to split between districts
 - Upper Market: whether to include in D7 or D8
- **District 8**
 - Ashbury Heights / Cole Valley: whether to include in D5 or D8
 - Hayes Valley / The Hub: whether to include in D5, D6, or D8 or to split between districts
 - Kezar Stadium: whether to include in D5 or D8
 - Guerrero / Valencia: where to establish the border between D8 and D9
 - Mint Hill: whether to include in D5 or D8 or to split between districts
 - Mission Dolores: whether to include in D8 or D9 or to split between districts
 - Parnassus Heights: whether to include in D5, D7, or D8 or to split between districts
 - Upper Market: whether to include in D7 or D8
- **District 9**
 - Guerrero / Valencia: where to establish the border between D8 and D9
 - Mission Dolores: whether to include in D8 or D9 or to split between districts
 - McLaren Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D9, D10, D11)
 - Ocean Avenue corridor: whether to include entirely in D7 or to split between D7 and D11
 - Portola: whether to include in D9 or D10
 - Potrero Hill: whether to include in D6, D9, or D10 or to split between districts
 - University Mound: whether to include in D9, D10, or D11 or to split between districts

- **District 10**

- Chase Center: whether to include in D6 or D10
- Dogpatch / Central Waterfront: whether to include in D6 or D10
- McLaren Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D9, D10, D11)
- Mission Bay: whether to include various areas in D6 or D10
- Portola: whether to include in D9 or D10
- Potrero Hill: whether to include in D6, D9, or D10 or to split between districts
- Showplace Square: whether to include in D6 or D10 or to split between districts
- University Mound: whether to include in D9, D10, or D11 or to split between districts

- **District 11**

- Ocean Avenue corridor: whether to include entirely in D7 or split between D7 and D11
- McLaren Park: whether to include the Park in one district or to split among multiple districts adjacent to the Park (D9, D10, D11)
- University Mound: whether to include in D9, D10, or D11 or to split between districts

VIII. Supervisorial District Deviations in Excess of 1% of the Mean

Ten supervisorial districts (all except District 3^{*}) have population deviations between one percent and five percent of the statistical mean of 79,545 people. The deviations were necessary to keep recognized neighborhoods intact. The recognized neighborhoods are listed below.

- **District 1 (–4.80%)**

- Inner Richmond
- Lake Street
- Lincoln Park / Fort Miley
- Presidio Terrace
- Outer Richmond
- Seacliff
- Sutro Heights

- **District 2 (–4.52%)**

- Aquatic Park / Fort Mason
- Cow Hollow
- Laurel Heights / Jordan Park
- Marina
- Presidio Heights
- Presidio National Park
- Union Street

^{*} District 3 has a population deviation of –0.31%. The recognized neighborhoods wholly in District 3 are Chinatown, Lower Nob Hill, Nob Hill, Northern Waterfront, Polk Gulch, and Telegraph Hill.

- **District 4 (–4.46%)**
 - Outer Sunset
 - Parkside
- **District 5 (+4.98%)**
 - Alamo Square
 - Haight-Ashbury
 - Hayes Valley
 - Lower Haight
 - Panhandle
- **District 6 (–4.45%)**
 - Mission Bay
 - Rincon Hill
 - Showplace Square
 - South Beach
 - Treasure Island
 - Yerba Buena Island
- **District 7 (–1.08%)**
 - Balboa Terrace
 - Forest Hill
 - Forest Knolls
 - Golden Gate Heights
 - Laguna Honda
 - Ingleside Terraces
 - Inner Sunset
 - Miraloma Park
 - Monterey Heights
 - Mt. Davidson Manor
 - Parkmerced
 - Sherwood Forest
 - St. Francis Wood
 - West Portal
 - Westwood Highlands
 - Westwood Park
- **District 8 (+4.87%)**
 - Ashbury Heights
 - Castro
 - Cole Valley
 - Corona Heights
 - Diamond Heights
 - Eureka Valley
 - Fairmount
 - Glen Park

- Upper Market
- **District 9 (+2.54%)**
 - Bernal Heights
 - Peralta Heights
- **District 10 (+3.27%)**
 - Apparel City
 - Bayview
 - Bret Harte
 - Candlestick Point SRA
 - Central Waterfront
 - Dogpatch
 - Hunters Point
 - India Basin
 - Produce Market
 - Silver Terrace
 - Sunnydale
 - Visitacion Valley
- **District 11 (+3.95%)**
 - Cayuga
 - Crocker Amazon
 - Excelsior
 - Ingleside
 - Mission Terrace
 - Oceanview
 - Outer Mission

IX. Lessons Learned and Recommendations

The Task Force was heavily impacted by the global COVID-19 pandemic, which forced it to work in unprecedented ways that may not affect future iterations of the Task Force. For example, the delay of the census data also delayed the ability for the Task Force to convene for several months compared to previous iterations, only holding its first meeting in September 2021. All Task Force meetings before March 7, 2022, were held remotely due to the Mayor's public health orders. This, along with successive pandemic waves, hindered the ability for Task Force members to hold meetings in San Francisco's diverse districts and communities, many of which were already struggling with the pandemic.

Despite the pandemic, the Task Force exerted its best efforts to perform its duties under trying circumstances. Through the benefit of experience and hindsight, the Task Force makes the following recommendations for future iterations of the Task Force.

- **Starting early:** The Task Force should start as early as the calendar and Charter allows, and definitely before receiving Census data. There are many tasks such as adopting

bylaws; finalizing district meetings and the schedule; getting trained in mapping; being apprised on legal duties and requirements; formulating outreach strategies; and setting in district meetings that are not dependent on census data. Importantly, starting early gives the Task Force the ability to begin working on its substantive duties earlier, such as holding community meetings and discussing draft maps.

- **Early planning:** The Task Force's early meetings saw protracted discussions regarding the creation of bylaws and the meeting schedule. Each new iteration of the Task Force benefits from the institutional knowledge of the Clerk's Office, the City Attorney's Office, and other City agencies and departments that have supported previous Task Forces. Rather than having newly empaneled Task Force members grapple with issues such as bylaws and the schedule without the important context, draft bylaws, tentative schedules, and proposed timelines should be presented to the next iteration of the Task Force for consideration in the first meeting.

As previously mentioned, the Task Force should also receive training in mapping early in the redistricting process rather than waiting until mapping meetings begin. San Francisco is a diverse city with many neighborhoods, communities of interest, and viewpoints, and Task Force members will benefit from experience with working on mapping tools, reviewing district iterations, and understanding the line-drawing process by the time mapping meetings are fully underway.

- **Direct support:** While the Task Force is immensely grateful for the support it received from the Clerk's Office and other City agencies, staffing availability and resources were constant concerns. Vice Chair Ditka Reiner spent endless hours handling the Task Force's many operational needs and coordinating with the Clerk's Office. The Clerk's Office also spent much of its own resources supporting the work of the Task Force, which increased greatly as the redistricting process progressed, and all involved found themselves stretched thin. With ever-increasing public access to government proceedings, the next Task Force should be able to work with all sufficient resources to accomplish its duties to the public.

The Task Force echoes the recommendation of the Clerk's office that, upon convening the next iteration of the Task Force, the City should establish a temporary department or division to support the Task Force and its needs. Such a department or division will require a paid chief of staff, dedicated administrative support, a media coordinator, and a Sunshine Ordinance expert to manage the myriad requests that may be directed at the Task Force at their busiest time. The Board of Supervisors should also allocate more funding from the outset rather than having the Task Force draw on limited funds from the Clerk's Office and the Department of Elections to meet public participation needs, as has occurred in this and previous iterations of the Task Force.

- **Clerks:** The Task Force thanks its clerk John Carroll for his efforts and dedication to help the Task Force fulfill its duties. However, the time and energy needed to support the Task Force is too much for one person and calls for the need of more staffing and support. The 2011–2012 Task Force was supported by two clerks. If the City does not accept the establish a more robust support framework for future iterations of the Task

Force (see above), then the Task Force should be staffed by at least two clerks to sufficiently assist in its work, with one person assigned to document issues, agreements, and the Meeting Minutes.

- **Meetings:** Most meetings were held in the evening. While starting meetings later in the day allows Task Force members to attend meetings and for more members of the public to participate, starting late in the day also means ending late into the night. Future iterations of the Task Force should strongly consider beginning their meetings in the morning, as starting earlier allows everyone involved to be better engaged in the process.

The length of meetings should also be managed. Several meetings exceeded ten hours, with the longest one being almost twenty hours long, which is inappropriate under any measure. Future iterations of the Task Force should consider various methods of running meetings more efficiently while allowing for robust participation, including more focused public comment, better facilitation of discussion and action, and even recessing until the next day if necessary.

- **Outreach:** The COVID-19 pandemic adversely impacted the abilities for the Task Force, its consultant Civic Edge Consulting, and interested parties to conduct important community outreach. However, engagement with the public is a fundamental component of the redistricting process and is important to perform regardless of the challenges. The next iteration of the Task Force should engage in vigorous outreach with the diverse communities of San Francisco, including participating as many events, meetings, and presentations as possible.

The 2021–2022 Task Force was the first Task Force to retain an outreach consultant. This was done in light of advice from the 2011–2012 Task Force, which recommended having an outreach consultant for the purposes of community engagement. However, several Task Force meetings were spent understanding the role of this outreach consultant and to resolve differences between the contracted scope of work for the consultant and the expectations of Task Force members. With the benefit of experience, the Task Force recommends that for future iterations of the Task Force, relevant City bodies should set forth clearer expectations for outreach that more closely align with the needs of the redistricting process.

- **Independence of the Task Force:** As a governmental body, the Task Force makes considerations and decisions that generate passionate discussion and fervent debate. The Task Force welcomes the extraordinary amount of public interest and scrutiny of its work. However, it also witnessed unprecedented assaults on its independence by political actors invested in a specific outcome. These actions, including an effort to remove the three appointees of the Elections Commission, highlight the need for mechanisms to shield the Task Force from undue and inappropriate influence. Stronger measures should be considered to protect future iterations of the Task Force from experiencing these attacks ever again.

Likewise, future iterations of the Task Force should not have to endure racist, prejudiced, vitriolic, and other personal attacks and threats as this Task Force did for performing its

duties for the people of San Francisco. These inappropriate attempts to intimidate the Task Force have no place in public discourse. Better methods should be developed to cut off inappropriate comments and to protect all public servants who volunteer for this difficult job.

- **Composition of the Task Force:** To affirm and protect the independence of the Task Force from inappropriate political influence, a review should be conducted regarding the composition of the Task Force, including the member selection process and ways to reduce potential conflicts of interest. The review should examine whether implementing appointment procedures like that used for the California Citizens Redistricting Commission, but without any involvement of elected officials, are appropriate and will reinforce the independence of the Task Force.

There are currently no guidelines on who may be a member of the Task Force, leaving the Task Force vulnerable to potential conflicts of interest. Therefore, minimum qualifications and restrictions such as those imposed on the California Citizens Redistricting Commission should be considered. To further reduce potential conflicts of interest, such a review should consider restrictions on persons directly receiving or connected to for-profit or nonprofit entities receiving discretionary grants or funding from the City.

- **Alternate members:** Future iterations of the Task Force should consider including alternate members that can take the place of a voting Task Force member who can no longer continue serving. These alternate members should meet the same requirements as that of voting members and should be selected before the first meeting of the Task Force.

X. Closing Remarks

The Task Force was convened to perform a civic duty set forth in the Charter. Amidst a global pandemic and through unprecedented circumstances, the Task Force fulfilled its responsibility to the people of San Francisco by considering the data, engaging communities, and adopting the Final Map setting forth the supervisorial district boundaries for the next ten years. The Task Force thanks the people of the City and County of San Francisco for the great honor of serving them in this capacity and for their participation in this important process.

From: [Ho, Lily \(REG - Contractor\)](#)
To: [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#)
Cc: [Castillon, Matthew \(REG - Contractor\)](#); [Lee, Chasel \(REG - Contractor\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Final Statement
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 11:59:26 PM
Attachments: [RTDF Final Statement.docx](#)

RTDF Clerks -

Please see attached the final statement to be included in the final report signed jointly by myself and Member Matt Castillon. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Lily

The Task Force accounted for the diversity of community input shared with the Task Force through emails, COI map submissions, signed letters, and public comment. There were thousands of emails that described various community relationships from every corner of the City. In addition to keeping communities of interests intact, the Task Force, as much as possible, kept to the intent of keeping districts contingent and compact. Some areas of the city had neighborhoods with contested boundaries and competing communities of interests. In those situations, decisions had to be weighed with the intent to keep districts contingent and compact, with keeping the most number of communities of interest whole – all while balancing population numbers. Two districts in particular voiced uncontested unity in their communities of interests – D11 and D3 – and the Task Force was able to keep those communities whole and intact, as there were no contested boundaries or competing communities of interests. The majority of the map appeased the majority of neighborhoods, while being population compliant, contiguous, and compact.

There is only one place where the Task Force failed at being contiguous. The most gerrymandered place in this city is Portola. It is separated from the rest of its district, D9, by the 280 Freeway. One cannot get from Portola to other parts of D9 without needing to enter other districts. Portola is entirely non-contingent within its district.

The community input expressed to unite Portola with Visitation Valley and Bayview is the most consistent and persistent public input out of any community the Task Force heard from. In every meeting since February, residents from Portola, Visitation Valley, and Bayview, showed up by the dozens asking to have their community of interest – low income, monolingual, Chinese Americans – united. The socioeconomic status of Portola (median household income \$79K) is far more similar to Visitation Valley (\$56K) and Bayview/Hunters Point (\$58K and \$32K) than that of Potrero Hill (\$157K).

When they first called into public comment, it was clear they were unfamiliar with the process. They didn't understand the prompt, "You have been unmuted," and as a result, we had a lot of blank lines. The Task Force and Clerks helped to resolve this issue by having translators give instructions regularly. When the Task Force started holding meetings at City Hall, this community showed up. On most days, over 20 residents of Portola and Visitation Valley would be there in person, and some of them would stay with us till the end of the meetings – 3:30am – as long as it took.

They didn't come on behalf of a well-funded CBO, or a multi-million-dollar non-profit. They came as themselves, self-organized. They are the monolingual, marginalized, low-income, communities that this Task Force supposedly upholds. Yet, the voices of the Portola were not

heard. The community of the Portola has been historically, systematically, disenfranchised, and marginalized – by the system of Redistricting. It is a moral and legal issue. We are deeply disappointed this issue was not resolved.

From: [Cooper, Raynell \(REG\)](#)
To: [REG - Redistricting Taskforce](#)
Cc: [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Lee, Chasel \(REG - Contractor\)](#)
Subject: Member statement - Raynell Cooper
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 10:35:44 PM
Attachments: [RTF Final Report Statement Raynell Cooper.pdf](#)

Hello Clerk's Office,

I have attached my member statement for inclusion in the appendix of the final version of the RTF final report.

Thanks,

Raynell

Raynell Cooper
San Francisco, CA 94117

May 11th, 2022

Re: Redistricting Task Force Final Report Member Statement

Dear San Francisco,

When contemplating this opportunity to immortalize my thoughts regarding my service on the San Francisco Redistricting Task Force, I was reminded of another Task Force: The Human Interference Task Force. This was an interdisciplinary group of Cold War scientists, linguists, and philosophers tasked with finding a way to communicate the presence of nuclear waste to humans ten millennia from now who would still be negatively affected by the radiation but will likely not be able to understand any of our written languages. Proposals ranged from glowing cats to giant spikes in the ground to Thomas Sebeok's proposal of an "atomic priesthood," a pseudo-religious order that would be able to carry information across hundreds of generations.

While the stakes are much lower and the time period is much shorter, the message of the Human Interference Task Force to far-future archaeologists and my message to like-minded potential Redistricting Task Force members is the same: Stay Away.

I applied to and was appointed to this Task Force at age 26, looking for a way to get more involved in making San Francisco better without getting too deep into the City's notoriously toxic political climate. I worked (and still work) as a planner for SFMTA, so I felt like my energy would be best spent on this nonpartisan and ostensibly nonpolitical body, where I could contribute my community engagement skills and lifelong passion for maps without having to ruffle too many feathers.

I approached this process the same way I approach everything in my career in the public sector: attempting to do what's best for the people while working within difficult and oftentimes frustrating constraints. My understanding of the task at hand was that we were to take in data and public feedback and discuss how to make the best possible map based on those inputs, without consideration for the desires of political interests unwilling to speak publicly about what their intentions are and why.

But it became clear to me in the final days of the process that I had brought a clipboard to a knife fight. The delays in the mapping, the back-and-forth votes we took as a body, and blatant attempts, some successful, by outside political actors to influence the map led to a pressure cooker of a week ahead of the original mapping deadline of April 9th. We had put off the difficult conversations around this map to the final week, and with those difficult conversations came voluminous public comment, which meant marathon meetings that drained all of us, physically and emotionally.

The primary illustrative example of what went wrong that week was the question of Potrero Hill and the Portola, two neighborhoods about which we heard overwhelming support for their inclusion in District 10. The cases to move Portola into the same district as Visitacion Valley and to keep Potrero Hill with Sunnydale, the Bayview, and Hunters Point were both quite strong, but unfortunately there was not a situation where both could fit in the district. This led to a series of honest but difficult conversations and far too many difficult votes.

On April 4th, we moved away from a Potrero-Hill-in-D10 map after reaching an impasse regarding South of Market and Tenderloin. We then on April 6th voted to move Potrero Hill into D10. Then on April 9th, what seemed like a settled matter resurfaced out of nowhere with a new motion to move Potrero Hill out of District 10 springing out of a convoluted series of edits as if it were just an organic set of edits necessary to balance the numbers. That motion would have put Potrero Hill in District 9, a new home for the neighborhood that to that point had not been contemplated. It failed, but after a hastily called recess the vote was reversed and Potrero Hill was off to District 9 and the Portola added back District 10.

Regardless of the merits of the move itself, blatant unfairness of the proceedings led to myself and three other members walking out of the meeting. It had become apparent to me earlier that day that not all members of the Task Force were voting based solely on how their own hearts or minds felt about the issues at hand and in that moment it became apparent to everyone else. The issue of Potrero Hill and the Portola was brought back to assuage outside political interests, not due to any genuine change of heart by a member of the Task Force. I was stunned by what I had just witnessed and knew that I would be compromising my morals by remaining in that meeting that evening. You can hear it in my voice during the recording of that meeting – I cease being able to form words to discuss the map and what I am even looking at. The move of Potrero Hill out of District 10 was once again undone in a meeting after the original mapping deadline, but not before the damage was done to the public's trust in the process and my own personal trust in the process.

The issue of whether to include the Portola or Potrero Hill into District 10 brought about vitriolic racist language on both sides, the likes of which I had never seen in-person and hope to never see again. While the conflict itself was largely unavoidable and will certainly be a central theme for this process next decade, the flames of hate were fanned by our poor behavior. The way the Task Force handled itself with the public regarding the Potrero Hill and Portola issue was an embarrassment.

During the recess immediately preceding the walkout, I thought about the events that had transpired thus far and the dark truths I had learned about the political system of San Francisco while pacing deliriously around the 4th floor of City Hall. I leaned on the stone barrier separating the hallway from the grand stairway below and the Baroque dome above. These early-morning recesses were among the only times I had seen the rotunda without happy brides and grooms celebrating weddings. People come to City Hall to get married not just

because it's cheaper than other options or because it's an exemplary specimen of Beaux-Arts architecture. It's because it stands for something. Weddings in City Hall are imbued with the strength of our democratic institutions and the power of the oaths its public officials make. As someone who is defined by my civic pride and faith in the sanctity of local government, there was always something beautiful about that to me. But in that moment, none of it felt right. In that moment, this building that should be a temple to the very best aspects of human society wasn't anything more than a Vegas drive-thru chapel.

My reasons for voting against the map were two-fold. For one, I resented that political influence clearly had a direct effect on the voting patterns of some of my colleagues. I won't pretend to know the full extent of what went on behind the scenes that led to the shape of the map we'll be living with for the next decade, but I know that the map was not as above the political fray as it should have been. But additionally, we did not, in my eyes, meet the City Charter's requirement to "make adjustments as appropriate based on public input at public hearings." This is a frustratingly vague turn of phrase within which just about any alteration to this map can be justified. As I interpret it though, the central decision of this map, removing Tenderloin from its cross-Market neighbors in Central SOMA and moving it to District 5, is not an appropriate adjustment based on public input.

We heard virtually unanimous opinion from the residents of Tenderloin, Central SOMA, and District 5 that the previous alignment of those neighborhoods made sense. The Tenderloin community in particular was consistent, persistent, and clear about their desire to remain in the same district as SOMA. But going against near-unanimous public comment is not in and of itself a sin. Thanks to the uneven growth in San Francisco that stems in part from its racist system of exclusionary zoning, the scale of change this redistricting process required was massive and meant that we were always going to have to make changes that some people did not like and maybe even changes that faced universal opposition. District 6 in particular was going to have to change massively, and moving the Tenderloin was certainly one way to exact that change. That is where the word "appropriate" comes in.

Keeping neighborhoods whole is an essential part of this process, but not every community can stay together. Hard choices needed to be made. So where to begin when trying to balance those tradeoffs? For me, the answer was obvious: start with the part of San Francisco that relied the most on City services and is the most in need of attention from its Board of Supervisors representation. That is the Tenderloin and its partner Central SOMA. Keeping those neighborhoods together made for some unpopular changes to other parts of the map, but moving the East Cut to District 3 and Russian Hill to District 2 were reasonable changes to make to accommodate that. Keeping the SROs together, ensuring affordable housing residents

were well-represented, allowing for public safety and public health issues in these central city neighborhoods to be handled holistically by one Supervisor – these are higher priorities than keeping the Transbay Terminal with Mission Bay or Russian Hill with Telegraph Hill. Government exists to serve everyone, but these underprivileged communities need a leg up and need to be centered in this process.

It was profoundly disappointing to see the majority of my colleagues make a decision that explicitly prioritized the desires of well-off communities over the needs of the most underprivileged. It speaks to a callous and uncompassionate way of seeing society and our role in it that I did not think could have permeated the membership of the Task Force. But more than that, it was just baffling for the map to head in the direction it did time and time again. It was a decision that was not at all in conversation with the community input we received and one that was not at all adequately justified to the public. Only in the final moments of the process were explanations offered up by anyone besides the Chair as to why they felt like the move of the Tenderloin into District 5 was the best solution to our problem. Those explanations may satisfy some members of the public but did not rise to the level I believe the public deserved.

In the weeks since the map's passing, I have already heard stories of the difficulties created by the separation of Tenderloin and Central SOMA are strong communities. It was a completely avoidable deep cut through the heart of a community that could handle it the least. I do hope that the divisions this map has sown in this City become a call to action for neighborhoods to reach across Supervisor district lines for their advocacy and community-building.

I learned a lot about the City & County, I learned a lot about myself, and I'm very proud of my service on the Redistricting Task Force. But I cannot deny that this was an immensely dispiriting process. As someone who wakes up every day trying to do right by the people of San Francisco, this peek behind the curtain made me question, at least for a moment, whether those in power were even thinking about that at all. Perhaps I was naïve to think that my colleagues and much of the public would be on the same page with regards to the sanctity of the process. Perhaps I should have been prepared for politicians to apply pressure and for Task Force members to vote in response to that pressure. But the truth is I shouldn't have needed to be prepared. We owed it to the City and County of San Francisco to run a process they could have faith in regardless of the outcome and we failed at doing that.

I want to take a moment to thank the staff of the Clerk's office, especially our main clerk, Mr. John Carroll. John Carroll could have – and likely should have – left us out to dry at any point in this process. From the difficulties of scheduling during an ever-changing pandemic to the

back-to-back marathon meetings to dealing with the motley crew that was the Task Force, he was a paragon of professionalism and represented the very best of what San Francisco government has to offer. Through unbelievably difficult circumstances he managed to set an incredibly high bar that those of us who work for the City & County. I also want to thank those from the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs who helped translate the bulk of our meetings, the City Hall and elections staff who supported our in-person meetings, and everyone else behind the scenes who did their best to try to make this process work.

After this month, I imagine this letter is going to go largely unread for nine years, like an entry in the world's least interesting time capsule. Should this process happen again in the early 2030s under the same rules, I know the staff will once again answer the call to serve by acting honestly and professionally. I also know the public will once again organize and fight for what they think is best for this community. I wish I could say with certainty that next decade's Task Force will be able to rise to the occasion.

While the recommendations contained within this report, if followed, are a starting point in rebuilding trust in the process and trust in the City, it is up to all nine members of the next Task Force to hold themselves accountable to the Charter and to the people and to not let outside forces who only have their political interest in mind influence what the districts look like. Unfortunately, there would need to be major changes to the Task Force selection process, Charter requirements, and the fundamental decorum of politics in this City for redistricting to ever occur in a manner where the deck is not stacked against the voices of the public and members who wish to faithfully listen to those voices and create a map that is best for the City. I wish I could in good faith advise civic-minded bureaucrats to get involved in redistricting. On paper, it should be exactly the thing someone like me would enjoy and excel at. But as it is, I have no choice but to do everything in my power to make sure they do not get caught up in this quagmire and leave it to people better-suited to dealing with the proverbial radioactive waste that I'm all but certain will continue to irradiate this process for decades to come.

Best,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Raynell Cooper". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "R" and a long, sweeping underline.

Raynell Cooper