

2022

BART Redistricting: Public  
Meeting 2/24/2022



GEOinovo Solutions Inc.

BART Redistricting

2/24/2022

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Meeting Documents.....	1
2. Meeting Notes / Questions .....	1
2.1. From the Public .....	1
2.2. From the Board of Directors .....	2

# 1. MEETING DOCUMENTS

Documents presented by Alex Sainz and Jesus Garcia:

- Plan D
- Plan E
- Public 102
- Public 103
- Public 104

# 2. MEETING NOTES / QUESTIONS

The following presents summaries of the questions and comments raised during the meeting. These are not transcriptions; the wording has been changed in some cases. For exact wording, please see the meeting recording. Questions or comments that do not have a name attached to them are bolded in their entirety.

## 2.1. FROM THE PUBLIC

**Director Saltzman:** Before we get to public comments, I just want to thank the GEOinovo Team. I think we kind of gave you an impossible task last week. I don't know how you got it all together so quickly. We'll see what the Board and the public thinks about it but the fact you were able to take all of those comments, integrate them into maps, and make them have even less population variances than the maps you created over months is pretty incredible.

**Jon Spangler:** Thank you very much. First, I want to say thank you for the better maps in D and E. They look like they have incorporated many of our concerns. I'm not sure if we're there yet. I'm looking forward to hearing more about the 103 and 104 Plans. The process here is very complicated. I also appreciate the quotations early on about the California Constitution, but I do want to say that one of the concerns I have is the potential loss for institutional memory. If any BART Board member has been serving for a while is redistricted out of their current seat by his or her residential choices which of course they are free to make. I would like to hear more about the differences between D and E and to be able to see the maps at the same time. I have a great deal of difficulty unlike our consultants and some BART Board members who have degrees in cartography in following all of this. It would be nice to see all of that side by side. I do appreciate the progress and the less balkanization of this. It remains a mystery to me that district 7 needs to span the Bay and reach as far as it does. I will leave that as a question that may not require an answer.

**Call in User One:** It is David Pilpel. You have my letter. I have spent gobs of time on this project, I'm not sure why, but I do care about it. My proposed map and plan intentionally vary the population to address registration and turnout and also population shifts. In my view areas that have grown more in the past 10 years are likely to grow more than the district on average, so I'm trying to make those slightly smaller districts and conversely those areas that have not grown as much, I'm trying to make the reverse. The intention overall is to make the vote in Castro Valley be roughly the same value as the vote in the Castro District in San Francisco. That's hard

to achieve overall here but that is what I tried to do. I did try to maximize compactness and continuity while also respecting county and city boundaries. While it still needs some work it results in only five cities split overall. Oakland and San Francisco are larger than a single district and must be split and Concord, Berkeley, and Hayward get split in my plans simply because they are the focus points of the districts and there was no other way to do it. Further tweaks as I describe focus on those five cities and on the similarity with the other plans in particular there are some elements of D and E. I would like to complete my work on tweaking my proposal with the consultant team so you can see it. I also commented on the final report contents and thanked the BART team and the consultants. I wanted to comment briefly on 7, 8, and 9. I tried to increase the Asian CVAP in District 8, make 9 a little more rounded, and I increased the Black population in District 7 recognizing that it would span multiple counties. Thank you very much for taking the time on my plan.

**Aleta Dupree:** Thank you. This is my first time doing a redistricting speech. I don't know if I even have the standing to speak on this item. I will say as a practical matter that I am appreciative very much when I look in the population chart of your very inclusive demographic categories. I hope that can be a template for other demographic reports because at least in this report we are acknowledging the diversity in our Bay Area Community. I would hope as boundaries shift and some people find that their directors are changing, I hope that would not affect people's ability to engage with all nine of you because I am a constituent of all nine of you. I do believe in simple mapping that is easy on the eye because gerrymandering I is a problem in many other places. Gerrymandering came from a politician two centuries ago with the depiction of a salamander. I am learning more about this. I ask that you not allow this redistricting to narrow your constituency. This should uphold the idea the BART as indeed the people's system. Thank you.

**Director Saltzman:** Since it's come up in the comments, can the consultant explain why District 7 is split across the Bay?

**Alex Response:** The population of San Francisco is larger than two districts. The city of San Francisco due to its population size must be split with an ideal population for a district being 414,000. The City of San Francisco surpasses two districts alone so there does have to be one district that passes the Bay in order to meet population variance requirements.

## 2.2. FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**Director Simon:** What stations in Plan D in District 7 would be taken away? I understand plan E, but can you explain what the shift is in Plan D? What's being taken? What's being added? Can you just go over that with me?

**Alex Response:** In Plan D specifically, District 7 keeps the Bay View District but once it moves over to the East Bay rather than going into West Oakland, as it does in the current districts, it goes into East Oakland. The stations represented in Plan D include Coliseum, Coliseum Airport Connector, Oakland International Airport, San Leandro, Bay Fare, and it has shared representation (within half a mile of District 5) with Castro Valley and the Hayward Station which will be shared with District 5.

**Director Simon:** It leaves out MacArthur Station and the Stations in Berkeley, is that right?

**Alex Response:** Yes. Because the district moves Southeast when crossing the Bay those stations would be removed.

**Director Simon:** In terms of Plan D, it has the most disparate impact in terms of District 7?

**Alex Response:** Yes, District 7 and followed very closely by District 4.

**Director Simon:** In Plan D, I'm curious about the population metrics in Potrero Hill and conjoining Hunters Point in terms of the demographics there is a huge demographic difference between those communities. I'm just curious what the rationale was to move Potrero Hill into District 7 in Plan D. Potrero Hill is a majority white community and as you all know District 7 has historically been a district that is very much represented by people of color and adding a white district within the City. I'm curious why?

**Jesus Response:** The goal there was to deal with the population changes that were occurring based on the other suggestions to shift some of the boundaries.

**Director Simon:** I don't want to go too far into it because I know there are other Directors that need to talk. It's just an extreme concern of mine to shift the racialized demographics of District 7 within San Francisco. I also understand with D that it also loses sort of the Tenderloin and Embarcadero. Essentially it becomes more white rather than uplift the voices of people of color.

**Jesus Response:** The quick answer to this is the movement of the Pacific Heights neighborhoods that were originally in District 8 into District 9 and by doing that it caused a shift of the population between District 9 and 7. That is why Potrero Hill was given up. There had to be a shift. We moved all of the geography that was originally around 3<sup>rd</sup> street and moved that population to align with plan 101. It gives us a very definite geography feature, it's a clean line moving out past Cesar Chavez because we moved Potrero Hill, and we moved more of Chinatown into District 8 that allowed us to then shift the boundary from 3<sup>rd</sup> street to highway 101 to the left.

**Director Simon:** I won't belabor this much more. Again, losing West Oakland and historically Black communities within San Francisco and in this districting and then gaining white communities, I think it's worth more conversation. At this point Plan D makes me more uncomfortable than Plan E. I haven't spoken much during these presentations, and I've been listening to more deeply understand the impacts. I appreciate all the input the Directors have put in and the consultants have put in. I'm just expressing mine now. Thank you so much and we can move to other Directors. Thank you.

**Director Li:** To respond to Director Simon's comments, in looking at the maps, noting that maps D and E are identical in San Francisco, just to clarify, Director Simon, Potrero actually moves into Director Dufty's District 9 and that the only portion of San Francisco that remains in your District 7 is the Bay View District.

**Director Simon:** My understanding is that he put Potrero Hill in my District, so if that's my mistake, I'm happy about that mistake.

**Director Li:** Yes, Potrero is now in both the new maps D and E, Potrero and Dogpatch, and Mission Bay, and also Soma all become part of Director Dufty's District 9.

**Director Simon:** You would agree then that part of San Francisco would be taken away that has been historically part of the line in District 7, the Tenderloin and the South of Market.

**Director Li:** I want to echo Director Saltzman's Thanks to the GEOinovo Team. Also, I would like to thank District Secretary April Quintanilla for fielding so many comments from the public and Board of Directors to produce these maps in an incredibly short amount of time. I had actually put together a video to share my comments so I could screen share and I have to say you did a really amazing job to really trying to respond to as many of my comments that I had made. Second, I want to particularly thank David Pilpel for developing public map 104 and for this engagement and attention on this. I have to say I am very familiar with Mr. Pilpel's engagement in San Francisco. I admit we haven't often been on the same side of issues but on this I really feel that his boundaries in San Francisco are very thoughtful, make a lot of sense, and preserve a lot more of the original boundaries that I think all of us are familiar with. I definitely think there is a lot of merit to what he's developed. I just want to point out a few things just so it's in the public here. I really appreciate that the Chinatown boundary, that's where the line is drawn between Districts 8 and 9, are expanded. Honestly, looking back I was really surprised at what had happened after the 2010 census and that the line really cut into the Chinatown community, so I really appreciate that all of these boundaries, public map 104 and maps D and E, that the boundary is changed to make sure the Chinatown community is more coherent. I also really appreciate the changes of the Bay View line and not drawing the line down 3<sup>rd</sup> street which would split up the Bay View community. It preserves highway 101 as more of that boundary; I really appreciate that. I think the one comment, this is something I can live with, the Northern Boundary between Districts 8 and 9 is now pushed up to be at the Marina and that would mean that 7, your District, District 9 would have much more of Pac Heights and this sort of Lone Mountain area, like where USF is. It's fine but again it does really keep pushing District 8 further and further away from the BART line, although I recognize that Glen Park would be a shared Station between 8 and 9. I think there will always be tradeoffs with these decisions. Ultimately, I feel far more comfortable and would feel okay saying yes to where the lines are for maps D and E and perhaps even public map 104 for what now is showing in San Francisco. All that to say, thank you so much for your work on this.

**Director Dufty:** I want to join Director Li in acknowledging GEOinovo. I thank you for your work and the public input. Thank you David and thank you to our acting District Secretary and your team and DSO for working hard to incorporate everybody's new points. I would like to weigh in with Director Simon that I think that it is important to me that West Oakland would be part of District 7. I don't know what the options are there, but I do think from both a contemporary and a historical perspective that West Oakland be part of District 7 is important. There definitely are changes with the impact of moving District 8 so far north. It does take it away from some of the Geography that has been part of District 9 for some time. I am grateful that there is greater integrity in terms of Chinatown, that's very important in terms of the future

of that district. As I said I appreciate the work, but I am interested in seeing what the possibilities might be if West Oakland were part of District 7. Thank you.

**Director Allen:** First, I think we made substantial progress with maps D and E. I want to echo the comments that Director Saltzman made about the amazing work you've done in such a short period of time since our last meeting. I want to thank April as well; I know she's been an integral to this process. With maps D and E, you've incorporated all of the things that Director Ames, and I had set forth as goals for the districts. I'm happy. I could actually vote today on D or E if other directors were satisfied with what has been moved and changed in the Western front in terms of San Francisco, Oakland, and along the Bay. I understand there are still some questions there and I'm looking forward to seeing how that works out. With respect to map 103, as we're seeing for the first time today, Director Ames and I put it together fully understanding that the other Directors would need to address the Districts they are in. Certainly, that is not an option for adoption but again those changes have been incorporated into D and E. I'm satisfied with that. With respect to the new map, 104, that has been submitted, I did not look at that map other than the through the perspective of my district and the borders that have been changed in District 1. That could be a very good map for other Districts but I'm not happy with the shift between District 3 and District 1, shifting all the way East into the Cities of Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, and Lafayette. I know that Mr. Pilpel stated that the intent there was a focus on voter registration and also on keeping County and City boundaries together in a District. That shift of the line between Districts 3 and 1 actually splits out part of Pleasant Hill, part of Walnut Creek, and part of Lafayette and moves certain communities in those cities into District 3. District 3 is primarily an 80 corridor district except, a little bit of Martinez, except for those cities that I mentioned. It does not make sense to me to move portions of those cities that use the Walnut Creek, Pleasant Hill, and Lafayette BART stations into a District where the Director represents the West Contra Costa County Stations. I couldn't accept that change. I'm curious from Alex, or either of you from GEOinovo, you said on the slide when you presented map 104 that the goal here was to maintain political geography between cities and places. I think that the submitter of this map stated that he had a focus on voting and how people vote in a political geography. I'm wondering if either of you could comment on that, is that a goal that is within the guidelines of what we are doing here? That we would submit a map based on how people politically vote.

**Alex Response:** Not exclusively, it is a consideration but not the main consideration. It is a consideration to maintain the boundaries of cities and places, which Mr. Pilpel attempted to accomplish in his map 104. It's a good map. It provides good population variance, just under 5% with room for the faster growing BART areas to grow and those areas anticipated to have slower growth in the next 5 years, a higher population, so those balance in the next ten or so years. Hopefully, that answers your question. Political boundaries are something that can be taken into consideration, but it is not the primary consideration.

**Director Allen:** Again, because I'm not seeing where the City boundaries in my District were actually attempted to be kept whole. In fact, four of the cities, small cities actually, have been split up. Certainly, the larger cities like Concord, it has always been split and it's something people have always complained about in Concord, in all of the redistricting that they didn't want

Concord split up. It is such a large city it is hard to avoid that, similar to Oakland and the other larger Cities, I can understand that. I think I also have some heartache with the balancing of map 104 in that Districts 3 and 4 have over 5,000 more people in each district than our average target of 414,000. Suburban stations (Districts) 1, 2, 5 are less than that 414,000. I know that mine own is under by a couple thousand and I know that some are further under than that. My current District 1 really did not change much in population over the last 10 years. I'm just wondering how we could project to go under the balance. I would prefer to see us stick to that 414,000 per District. That would be my preference as a starting point. Especially, District 5 was more under populated. As well in 104, the District 1 director goes to representing five stations and two of them [shared] which is less than some of the other districts. District 3 ends up representing 7 stations, District 2 represents 6 sharing only 1 station with District 1. In respect to some of the population shifts, this map places Southern San Ramon back in District 1, which in all of the other District maps we have, or I have asked, that the Southern San Ramon area be moved into District 5 because those people in that community typically utilize the BART stations represented in District 5. My preference in picking goals is to keep communities together with the BART stations that they use and keeping them in the District with the Director who is representing that BART station is of importance to me. I'm not going to be a big fan of 104 for all of those reasons. I think D and E from the perspective of myself, or the people in District 1, that either of those could work. One quick question about the San Francisco conversation. I agree with Director Simon that probably the map that keeps District 7 representing Oakland is the better of the two, but that's all I'm going to say about that. I do have a question about why in changing District 7's representation of San Francisco, and I do understand why that's happening because the population has decreased in comparison to the other populations. I'm curious as to why we would take the Southernmost part of that district, the Bay View District, and keep that in District 7 with really no BART Stations in San Francisco being represented by the District 7 Director. All of the rest of what was in District 7, that was closer to Embarcadero, the first station as you cross the Bay, all of those populations have been taken out of District 7. I didn't look at the racial demographics and I know that's a goal and a concern, just the map doesn't look right to me to take the Southernmost portion of San Francisco and then attached that to District 7 where that Director has to go over the Bay Bridget and all the way down South to get to the people that the Director represents. Those are my comments. Thanks.

**Jesus Response:** I would like to address a couple points of Director Allen. First of all, the criteria number 1 when creating District is to achieve population balance as much as possible. We don't know what's going to happen tomorrow or the next day. The Census is a snapshot of 2020 and the goal traditionally with redistricting processes is to adhere to lines as of that date. That's part of the reason we try to keep Districts that are as close to parity as possible. We do have the leeway of 10% but again our goal is to be as close as possible and then to work from there.

In response to David's question in keeping geographies whole, I don't think that it has to do with voters, it's not about voting, it's about voters. By voters, I mean the registrar of voters at every county will be happy to the extent that we can keep folks together within a jurisdiction. When we have some cities that are split and there are little neighborhoods that is with a different Director,



the county election people have to create a whole new ballot for those folks that are outside of a particular city boundary. I think trying to make that does help government in general because it does eliminate the creation of different ballots for folks that may live across the street. It's a notable goal and again in our maps D and E we try to achieve this as much as possible to keep the political geography so that the voters can have the same ballots. It's not about voting it's about the ballots that are received in a particular area.

**Director Allen:** Thank you for clarifying that term, political geography. I understand now. Thank you.

**Alex Response:** If I could just address that point you made about District 7, and this might speak to Director Simon's concerns as well. In the current District 7, the African American population stands at about 17.9%. In plans D and E, we were actually able to increase that slightly to 18.4% for plan D and 19.2% for plan E, so despite the changes in geography were actually able to slightly increase the proportion of African American population for District 7 in both plans.

**Director Simon:** Just quickly, I know I'm speaking out of turn, West Oakland is still in District 7 in plan E, is that correct?

**Alex Response:** That is correct Director Simon.

**Director Ames:** I really appreciate the consultants and the staff for cobbling up all of these comments and such creative mapping. I do like what I see in plans D and E from my point of view, in my District, and also District 5 which is close to me. I just wanted to get some clarification on this comment that was made by the consultants. I guess it was maximizing coalition districts, if someone could comment on what that means I would appreciate it.

**Alex Response:** Coalition Districts simply mean we are taking the sum total of all of the protected class groups and combining those to the extent possible. Therefore, keeping the majority white population equal that or less to the number of Districts where there is a majority in the current districts. Basically, coalition districts we are grouping as many protected class groups as possible rather than what you saw in plan A, where we attempted to take the two largest protected class groups and try and elevate those. These new plans D and E, look at the whole view of those protected class groups and distributing them more evenly across the districts.

**Director Ames:** That explains why we have District 9 that has 7 stations and I think District 3 and that's due to, I think, this coalition district concept. I don't understand how you meander through all of those stations. Can you explain how you got to that conclusion with those directors that have more stations?

**Alex Response:** That's a great question. The coalition districts apply specifically to the demographic composition of each district whereas the number of stations represented by each district is more related to the area or geography that that district represents. You will see some variance between the areas and the demographic makeup of those districts, but the two are separate categories in particular for redistricting.

**Director Ames:** I look forward to hearing more comments about maps D and E. Personally, in my district, I have very few comments for my area. There's environmental justice to me having the Niles Canyon part of District 6, a lot of our water is being supplied through that Canyon, 40%, I think, of our ground water comes from Niles Canyon, Alameda Creek, and also the downstream Fremont and city go into the Canyon area, so I appreciate what you've done. Sharing the South Hayward Station with Director McPartland or whoever has that district in the future is a good compromise. I look forward to hearing more detail on D and E from the directors because I think we're getting close. I don't think it's perfect. It looks like we need to do some tweaking to the boundaries, possibly. I appreciate all of the comments so far.

**Jesus Response:** Director Ames maybe I can try and clarify the concept of coalition districts. The first pass of creating districts is the population parity or equal balance, so we achieved that. The second is the creation of voting rights act districts (VRAs). The VRA is part of section II of the Voting Rights Act, it requests, if a district can be created that is 50% or more of population and 50% or more of CVAP (Citizen Voting Age Population) of a protected class as defined by directive 15, such as Latino, African American, Asian, or minority language groups, it must be created. Our first plan, Plan A, attempted to create a VRA district, if possible, for Latino and Asian populations. As I stated before, we were not able to create a VRA district. The next step below that is to attempt to empower these particular groups into what's now termed in the industry coalition groups or districts that have a majority of protected class populations. If you go to the web mapping tool you will notice there are layers that are called population densities of Latino, African American, and Asian. If you turn those on and off you will see there are pockets, densities, and hotspots of different locations. For example, for the Latino population there are three or four different hotspots, with the African American community there's maybe two to three different hotspots that exist, the Asian community, I think, has two. These hotspots are not always in the same location, so the challenge is to create districts that create an opportunity for these coalition groups to have more influence on the Board. As Alex has shown we are trying to achieve that across the board, and I think D and E does the best bringing together opportunities for all of these protected groups as defined by the Federal Voting Rights Act to possibly come together and work to elect a board member to the BART Board of Directors. It's kind of complicated but I am more than happy to show you from the maps the thinking process. Related to the question of bringing Oakland and West Oakland together, I did try to do that as much as possible. I'd be very happy to work with one or two directors to show you the efforts I put into play and at this point discarded. We can bring that discussion back, but I did try to bring Oakland and West Oakland together as much as possible including Coliseum and the Airport. At some point the challenges become too great. At this point the decision was made to separate Oakland and West Oakland. The other player is Alameda, it sits there right in the middle, so we have to keep that place whole as a community of interest, so I can't see splitting that down the middle. We are very happy to meet with any one of you. Thank you very much.

**Director Ames:** Thank you, I really appreciate you explaining how we can find these hotspots on a map so that explains why the boundaries have changed so much on D and E. I look forward to maximizing these coalition districts as you have noted. I'll work with you to see how this

works. I didn't play around with the map. Thank you for trying to maximize those districts that have those minority groups. It sounds like it's not just two but three now. I appreciate your work.

**Director Rayburn:** Thank you President Saltzman and thank you Alex and Jesus for your responses. Plan D retains District 4, the district I currently represent, as an urban core based entirely in the East Bay, that's a good thing. It also reflects public comments that supported keeping the City of Alameda and the Fruitvale District united with Central Oakland as well. Oakland's Chinatown community is adamant that it be united with Alameda's AAPI community. That said, no lines are going to be perfect. The current districts, in regarding to District 4 in particular achieves closer to ideal minority representation by splitting Oakland between the flatlands and the hills rather than somewhere between East Oakland, Coliseum, and the downtown. My question is, have you in a discarded plan somewhere, show carving out the hill areas from District 4 in order to bolster the minority populations in District 4?

**Jesus Response:** Director Rayburn, yes, I do. I actually created a plan that encompasses Alameda, wraps around San Leandro, and then comes back and takes as much of the hill as possible. It looks like a claw, so it violated a couple of the tenants of continuity and stuff like that. I did get close. I am very happy to show some of that preliminary work.

**Director Rayburn:** I can envision the lines, that's totally unacceptable. I'll leave it, maybe the current district lines are the best. We're under the highest variation with the current district lines being around 7% population variation, but I see Plan B as making significant progress on several fronts. I appreciate that.

**Director Foley:** Thank you Madam President. I wanted to simply say thank you to GEOinovo for your quick turn around and the District Secretary's Office for your support. Thank you to Alex and Jesus for your expertise and including Martinez in District 2. That certainly met my main concern in addition to the lines between Clayton and District 2 being adjusted, so thank you for that. I think we need to try to focus our energy on picking either D or E and trying to refine that and get us to map we can support. I think we're in a split vote right now if we were to look at one of those two maps. I think there are some areas that we could incorporate some additional refinement to get us there but with the clock ticking and being able to get our information to the folks at the county we need to move and make a decision. I would support us trying to refine D or E with a couple more variations and coming back to us quickly in hopes we can find one that does in fact allow us to move with a majority vote and move forward. Those are my comments for the moment.

**Director Saltzman:** I appreciate everyone's comments today, but I agree with Director Foley that there seems to be a split. We have to vote on this at the next meeting, we have to get 5 votes for some map. We don't have to figure it out today, but if there are further changes, we want to see in either of the maps, we have to figure that out today. We can't take an hour during that meeting to figure that out, we need to figure that out ahead of time. It would be good to go around quickly, after I've spoken, and Director McPartland has spoken to get a strong poll to where people are leaning and if you want specific changes to D or E.

I'll first start talking about public map 104. I agree with Director Allen about the lines between Districts 1 and 3, they would be really challenging not just for the directors but also for the people and the elected officials that are in those cities of who to contact for what because you would have one director representing you but then your station is represented by another person. Then just geographically, I mostly get around by transit so if I or another Director had to represent both of those areas, it's really far to go to all of these places from Richmond/El Cerrito and then to go all the way up to Pleasant Hill/Concord. It would be a challenge. For me that map is out because of the District 1 and 3 lines. It sounds like there are some other good things about it but it's just too challenging for those districts. For plans D and E, I think both of them make sense for District 3. I hadn't thought about the District being made like that but the more I thought about it, it makes sense. It would be a really big change from the current district, but I think it's okay. While I for the next couple of years may be sad not to represent San Leandro and Orinda and parts of Oakland, it's okay. It's a change and it is what it is. I actually think our current district lines don't make a lot of sense and because of the population variation I think we do need to change from the current district lines. In terms of the differences between D and E for district 3, I could live with either of them. I appreciate you tried to keep UC Berkeley whole but when I look very closely at the interactive map the parts of UC Berkeley that get split out from, I think E, I think it's okay because it's really mostly the University and some parks. There are very few people who actually live in that part that gets split out, so I think where the community is that uses UC Berkeley and goes to school there and teaches there. I think it keeps it whole-ish knowing that really UC Berkeley impacts the whole East Bay and Bay Area so you can't keep it totally whole any way. It does a good job in both. In terms of Districts D and E as a whole and District 3, I think it's challenging. I hear arguments from both sides about whether D is better or whether E is better. I think just in terms of keeping things compact and on a map of what makes sense, I think E is slightly better but I hear some of Director Rayburns concerns with E so I guess I could live with either map. I don't have any specific changes I want to see made before the meeting in March. I want to hear more from the other Directors that may be impacted, or if they think their Districts don't make as much sense.

**Director McPartland:** Thank you. I'd like to backup Director Li, Director Simon, and Director Dufty in terms of District 7. The redistricting goal is to have equal sized districts with balanced demographics and protected populations represented by each one of the directors. From a practical standpoint, Directors can most effectively represent adjacent transit population clusters. As I pointed out in our last meeting, we might not be able to, and I doubt if we can satisfy those completely. Alex and Jesus have done a very good job with the tools they've been trying to work with to be able to get that done. However, backing up Lateefah and Bevan, for the most part they have done as well as they can except for District 7, which ends up going all the way from San Francisco to Castro Valley. This kind of waters things down to the point where it really makes it almost impossible for the District 7 Director to be able to effectively represent that entire district, those clusters of populations, and be interactive with them on a continuous basis. I just wanted to align myself with both of those folks.

**Director Li:** I'll just make two quick comments. I would also like to be aligned with the comments of Director Dufty, Simon, and McPartland made particularly regarding West Oakland.

I think it's really important that West Oakland remain in District 7. I'm not sure I totally understand why the Northern boundary in Districts 8 and 9 has been moved so far North. I think it's important to keep the Marina District and Pac Heights together but really more importantly acknowledging that District 8 has a high Asian population. I'm concerned truthfully that it makes District 9 more white and takes away from the large Latino community there. I would say if there's one small change to take a look at in San Francisco, it would be that northern boundary where that line is drawn between the Marina District and Pac Heights.

**Alex Response:** Really short reply to that. Director Li, there was a little bit of a tradeoff in terms of population so by bringing in all of Chinatown into District 8, as we did in plans D and E, we had to make up for the high population density in Chinatown. We can look for some ways to make adjustments in the Marina District, but we will have to find that population balance somewhere else.

**Director Li:** I would say the tradeoff would be to look at the more Southern part of the district especially since you have added Glen Park into District 8.

**Jesus Response:** Directly Li, yes that's exactly what I think we could do. Try to keep Chinatown whole, bring the Pacific Heights South. That would impact the Southern end and instead of having a District 8 and 9 connected it goes back to District 9 or the county line. We can explore that. Again, there's a lot of little blocks with lots of population so we can make adjustments here and there. We're very happy to make that effort and come back with a modified plan.

**Director Dufty:** I want to piggyback on Director Li's comments that I appreciate the response to it. Definitely District 9 has been kind of a Southeastern district and picking up areas such as USF and Lone Mountain and Pack Heights, those are not areas that have traditionally been engaged with the neighborhoods in the current District 9. I think very much, if we could bring the line at the Northern point South, Districts 9 and 8 have shared the Balboa Park station and I think that's something that has worked well. In some of the plans it looks like District 9 would be sharing a lot of stations which I think is fine. The San Francisco Directors have been able to work very together, and I would hope that any District 9 Directors would be able to do so. I would like to see a district that eventually would be very competitive for someone from the Latino community to consider it. I've always described by district as I am the Eastside of San Francisco and I think that has really been what D9 has been about. I do appreciate the effort to maybe take a look at moving these lines a little bit to keep communities that have been woven together in terms of interests and geography more connected. Thank you.

**Director Saltzman:** It sounds like we want GEOinovo to bring back both D and E with some changes in San Francisco that Director Li and Director Dufty were both asking about. I don't think I heard requests for any other changes. Is there anything else anyone would like to see at the next meeting with the new maps?

**Alex Response:** We're happy to answer any questions. Specific to feedback from the Directors, having actionable items related to specific changes. As you can see, whenever you make a change, there's always going to be a tradeoff. If we have that direction, that way we will know what's potentially the best compromise. We know that no map is going to be perfect, so if we

have that direction, we can make those big strides like we did going from the original plans to what we are seeing today with plans D and E. That would be greatly appreciated.

**Jesus Response:** In addition, we do have a near zero population variance. We have up to 10% to go. I don't recommend we go to 10% but maybe 2, 3, or 4. Again, our goal would be to achieve as many of the changes the directors are recommending while trying to keep the best practices. Right now, we're at zero so we do have wiggle room to make modifications throughout. We'll do our best.

**Director Saltzman:** Before we conclude, I would just ask that plans D and E as well as the public maps are included on the Redistricting web page. I was just looking, and it doesn't look like they are there so if you could add everything and as these new maps after D and E that those be added before our next meeting so we can get it out to the public. We haven't had a ton of public engagement but when you're at the decision point that's when people want to look at these documents. If you could put those all up on the redistricting web page and let us know when they're up there that would be great so we can share that out.

**Alex Response:** President Saltzman, if I could just point out plans D and E and 103 and 104 have been added to the webmap so those were live as of yesterday.

**Director Saltzman:** yes, just on the redistricting page these maps are not available.

**Director Rayburn:** Please include the demographic data including the CVAP and the current districts data in the posting on the BART website along with the maps. I know that in the most recent attachment for the demographic data it left out the current districts. I think a reference point is useful for anyone comparing the districts. Thank you.