Agenda Item No. 2, Part 2

2020 Census Redistricting Task Force

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Date: March 14, 2022
Date:

☒	☐	Mapping Procedures – From the Vice Chair - March 11, 2022
☒	☐	Map 1A from Q2 Data and Research – March 9, 2022
☒	☐	COI Listening Session Presentation v7– February 16, 2022
☒	☐	Maps submitted by the public through March 10, 2022
☐	☐	**All Maps and COI submissions are available on our Airtable Chart
☐	☐	https://airtable.com/shrSqWhuZRnaRrNnp
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Prepared by: John Carroll **Date:** March 11, 2022
Prepared by: John Carroll **Date:**
Prepared by: John Carroll **Date:**

Task Force (TF) Mapping Procedures

Principles:

- The TF will provide Q2 with specific instructions for a starting point for the first maps to be presented to the Task Force on 3-2-22 the first mapping meeting of the TF.
- Mapping requests and changes will be initiated by the TF and they will work with Q2 who will draw the next requested iterative map.
- Discussions will be focused on Communities of Interest, Neighborhoods, District Boundaries, Census Data and compliance with The Voting Rights Act.
- Allow Task Force to explore multiple paths or maps.
- Offer clear forward direction and clarity for the mapping process status at the end of each meeting.

Communication

Liaisons on process, clarification or info/questions between TF and Q2 for mapping will be Members Matt Castillon and Chasel Lee. Members Castillon and Chasel Lee will be in charge of coordinating the process and keeping a written log of what feedback or input is incorporated in each map. This feedback should be reflected in the public record and in the Final Report.

Task-Force Centralized Mapping for Follow Up Maps

TF members will initiate all requests for maps or mapping changes.

After the members have shared their comments there will be a recommendation to advance one of the prior maps with specific changes.

Where possible the TF will attempt to advance the next stage of the mapping process off a chosen specific and hopefully single map. If needed multiple map will be advanced but the goal will be to always advance off of one specific map.

As the new map is selected the TF will ask Q2 to come back with that map as the basis with 2 or 3 new/different versions on the next iteration.

After the TF has provided their direction to Q2 there will be public comment.

The members may again discuss the maps and any changes they would like to see if any.

The map may then be advanced without further changes or with changes recommended and approved by the TF. If consensus has been reached then the mapping request will be advanced to Q2. If there is no consensus, a formal vote may be taken.

This will be the process the TF will follow at each mapping meeting until the final map is selected on or before April 14th.

Groups and the public may submit their maps to the TF through the public website, and TF members may pick parts or all of a map to incorporate into their mapping requests. In order to maintain fairness, all outside feedback will be evaluated independently and no outside individual will be given preferential treatment over any other member of the public.

- Specifically, non-TF generated maps are a form of public comment, and no publicly generated maps will be directly presented to a member of the TF by an interest group or non-task force member.

Sample Mapping Advancement and Naming Sequence:

-**Mapping Day 1** (3-2-22): TF provides parameters to Q2 to create Map 1 A

-3-9-22 Q2 provides Map 1 A to the TF for discussion on 3-14-22

-**Mapping Day 2**(3-14-22): TF provides new mapping instructions of boundary changes to Map 1 A

Q2 will return next mapping day with the changes to Map 1 A which will be returned named: Maps 2 A & 2 B

-**Mapping Day 3**(3-23-22): Q2 will return on next mapping day with the changes requested by TF on Maps 2 A & 2 B

- TF motions through consensus or vote to move Map 2 B forward
- TF provides new mapping instructions of boundary changes to Map 2 B which will then be returned named: Maps 3 A, 3 B and perhaps a 3 C.

*From here on in mapping days will be numbered but not dated as dates may be added as we go along.

-**Mapping Day 4**: Q2 will return on next mapping day with the changes requested by TF on Maps 3 A, 3 B, & 3 C

- TF motions through consensus or vote to move Map 3 C forward
- TF provides new mapping instructions of boundary changes to Map 3 C which will then be returned named: Maps 4 A & 4 B.

-**Mapping Day 5**: Q2 will return on next mapping day with the changes requested by TF on Maps 4 A & 4 B

- TF motions through consensus or vote to move map 4 A forward
- TF provides new mapping instructions of boundary changes to Map 4 A which will then be returned named: Maps 5 A & 5 B

The mapping continues as noted above until a final map is voted on.

Live Line Drawing

Line drawing is conducted during public sessions at officially agendized task force meetings. Line drawing may also occur at any other designated mapping meetings if the TF decided to do so. Combination of mapping and line drawing meetings may occur at the discretion of the TF.

Two specific dates, because of Q2 turn around requirements have been designated as line drawing days. They are 3-26-22 and 4-9-22.

Consultants (Q2) will be present with a mapper and digital maps at the ready.

The Task Force can start with existing lines, or with someone's proposed new lines, or with a blank map. In some cases the task force may work up "visualizations," which may be rough-sketch districts, and proceed from there.

The Chair or designee will focus on a particular area and then begin taking input from other Task Force members about particular lines.

TF members are free to give whatever reasons they think germane to their proposals, whether it were public input, or balancing populations, or known neighborhood boundaries.

1. Only one change could be considered at a time (though mappers could undo past changes as needed).

Line mapping will be done by consensus.

It's all iterative: after an area is finished (an area could be a district, multiple districts or any area of San Francisco) then public input would come in, and the TF might also do further research, and then revisit that area and make changes

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



District 6A detail

This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting

Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Board of Supervisors Redistricting
Map 1 A



This preliminary map is not the adopted final map of the Redistricting Task Force. It is a starting point on redrawing San Francisco's supervisorial districts in accordance with The Voting Rights Act. This map shows how the districts would look if they were drawn within 1% deviation of the average district population. The map aims to keep together Communities of Interest, recognized neighborhoods, Community Benefit Districts), and cultural districts while maintaining current district boundaries. **This is a preliminary visualization, not a final draft.**

SAN FRANCISCO 2022

REDISTRICTING

Public Input and Communities of Interest

Introduction: What is Redistricting?

1

San Francisco has 11 supervisorial districts, used to elect the Board of Supervisors.

Redistricting is the process of adjusting the existing supervisorial district boundaries.

Redistricting happens every 10 years, after the release of the decennial Census data used to balance the populations of the supervisorial districts.

Redistricting provides the opportunity to bring the existing districts into compliance with all redistricting criteria.

No draft maps have yet been created by the Redistricting Task Force.

Introduction: What is Redistricting?

Mean Population of a Supervisorial District: 79,545

District	Population	Percent Deviation
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%

0153

What are the criteria for redistricting?

- Compliance with US and CA Constitution (*equal population*)
- Compliance with Federal Voting Rights Act (FVRA) which addresses race and language minorities
- Preserve *recognized neighborhoods*
- Preserve *Communities of Interest* (COIs)
- Contiguity
- Compactness

Recognized Neighborhoods and Communities of Interest (COIs)

Recognized Neighborhoods are generally based on data and geography collected from official sources (like the Planning Department). Neighborhood data may be submitted by members of the public as well. Neighborhoods may vary in size and definition depending on who is defining them.

Communities of Interest are generally described as a population of residents that share common interests (such as social, cultural, and economic interests) that should be included within a single district for purposes of its effective and fair representation.

COIs are defined by those familiar with the community...

Law does not limit the kinds of interests that may bind a community.

It is up to those who live in or work in a community to identify and establish the interests that unite it.

Interests need not be limited to current situation but can also include common goals.

Communities of Interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents, or political candidates.

Examples of Common Interests

Economic interests:

- Current situation -- common employment or economic opportunities (or lack thereof).
- Goals -- expanding opportunities, development, job creation

Social interests:

- Current -- schools, transportation, parks, housing
- Goals -- improving recreational opportunities or public safety, preserving historic resources

Cultural interests:

- Current -- holidays, cultural businesses
- Goals – cultural-meeting centers, official recognition through cultural districts

Tell us about your Community of Interest

What is your Community of Interest? What ties you together? What common interests do you share?

Where is your Community of Interest? What are the boundaries of your community (streets, parks)? Where is it on the map? What is different or the same about the areas around your community?

Why should your community be kept together in one district? Why would it be a problem to split your community?

Other options to tell the Task Force about your COI:
https://sf.gov/information/community-interest-coi-public-input

District-Based Input

The San Francisco Redistricting Task Force additionally welcomes district-based input:

- Provide feedback about one district, multiple districts, or the whole map
- Let the Redistricting Task Force know how you would like the districts to be drawn
- What would you like to change about San Francisco's current supervisorial districts? What do you like about how they are currently drawn?

Redistricting Mapping Tool

The Redistricting Task Force has made a free-to-use online mapping tool available to the public .

The online mapping tool allows members of the public to draw their own district maps.

Proposals developed with the online mapping tool may be submitted to the Redistricting Task Force for consideration.

The mapping tool also allows members of the public to view census geography and data for any area within San Francisco.

https://redrawmysf.publicredistricting.com/

March 3, 2022

TO: The SF Redistricting Task Force (RDTF@SFGOV.ORG)

RE: **District 3 United Neighborhoods Proposed Plan & Map**

We, the undersigned neighborhood organizations, are writing to express our support for the redistricting plan shown below for District 3.[1] This plan adjusts District 3's boundaries by simply extending the existing western boundary of Van Ness northward all the way to the Bay. This approach incorporates the missing "notch" bounded by Van Ness, Union St, Jones-Columbus-Leavenworth, and the Bay into D3. The remaining boundaries of D3 are unchanged.

D3 United Neighborhoods Plan: Proposed Map & Boundaries:

Figure 1: Boundaries Van Ness (west), Bay (north & east), Mission, Steuart, Market to Cyril Magnin St, etc. (south, same as current D3)

This plan is similar to the one previously submitted by the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association, North Beach Neighbors, Russian Hill Neighbors and other signatory organizations. **It meets the Task Force's redistricting criteria while offering significant benefits, which include:**

- Uniting the Russian Hill neighborhood, which is currently split between D3 and D2. The Russian Hill Neighbors sent a letter to the Task Force on February 11 requesting a plan that unifies their neighborhood and combines it with their peer neighborhoods in District 3.
- Maintaining the integrity of existing neighborhoods (e.g., North Beach, Chinatown, Telegraph Hill, Russian Hill, Nob Hill, Polk Street, and Barbary Coast). This proposal does not create new splits in any neighborhood nor any new divisions in D3 racial/ethnic populations under the city charter.
- Meeting the district population requirement within 1% of "ideal." The population of D3 with the current boundaries is 72,474 or 8.9% below the ideal number of 79,545. By extending the northwestern boundary to Van Ness, D3's population would be 78,908 a mere 0.8% below the ideal.

[1] Other District 3 organizations have expressed agreement in-concept with the D3 United Neighborhoods Plan & Map but could not meet our submission deadline.

- Continuing a tradition of diverse people within communities of interest—primarily mixed Asian and non-Hispanic White population. District 3's demographics mirror San Francisco's mixed minority-majority ethnicity with fewer than half of the population non-Hispanic Whites (39.8%) and more than one-third Asians (34.9%) according to a 2022 population study. According to the 2019 ACS maps of SF, while the majority of D3 residents speak English, more than 90% also speak an Asian or Pacific Islander language in their home.
- Connecting Ghirardelli Square, the Cannery, and Aquatic Park with other D3 waterfront and tourist attractions (Fisherman's Wharf, Pier 39, Exploratorium, North Beach, Ferry Building, Alcatraz Tours, Coit Tower, Chinatown, and Union Square). At the same time, it maintains commercial corridors of small and neighborhood serving businesses (North Beach, Polk Street, Jackson Square, Chinatown).
- Featuring a high concentration of dense housing and a close working relationship with the Central Police Station.
- Reflecting communities of interest by maintaining solidarity among neighborhood groups having a long, storied history of collaboration, cooperation, and community with their fellow neighborhood and merchant organizations.

In summary, this proposed plan meets the redistricting requirements of population equity, racial/ethnic diversity, and the integrity of existing communities of interest. It is simple and logical, taking advantage of the natural boundary provided by Van Ness Avenue. Most Importantly, it aligns with wishes of various neighborhood associations having a long history in District 3.

Respectfully submitted (alphabetical by organization),

Diana Taylor, President
Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
(BCNA LETTER & MAP to RTF 1/28/22)

Betty Louie, Board Advisor
Chinatown Merchants Association

Justin Charles Hoover, Executive Director
Chinese Historical Society of America

Robbie Silver, Executive Director
Downtown San Francisco

Madeleine Trembley, President
Gateway Tenants Association

Pietro Bonanno
Italian Community Services

Michael Velzo, President
Jackson Square Merchants Association

Janet Crane, Board Chair
Next Village

Stan Landfair, President
Nob Hill Association
(NHA LETTER submitted to RTF 2/16/22)

Bruno Kanter, President
North Beach Neighbors
(NBN LETTER submitted to RTF 1/29/22)

Robyn Tucker & Betsy Brill, Co-Chairs
Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association
(PANA LETTER submitted to RTF 2/14/22)

Kathleen Courtney, President
Russian Hill Community Association

Carol Ann Rogers, President
Russian Hill Neighbors
(RHN LETTER submitted to RTF 2/11/22)

cc: Supervisor Peskin (Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org)

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_030720222045_D3 Neighborhoods United Plan

Plan name: D3 Neighborhoods United Plan

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: current_draft

General comments: This plan and map for D3 are supported by 14 neighborhood organizations in D3. See attached letter. The map adjusts District 3's boundaries by simply extending the existing western boundary of Van Ness northward all the way to the Bay. The remaining boundaries remain the same as the current D3.

Submitted by: D3 United Neighborhoods (by Bob Harrer, BCNA)

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
10	8.36	
7	-5.46	
1	-8.42	
6	30.03	
4	-8.5	
2	-12.09	
3	-0.8	
9	-4.6	
8	4.05	
5	1.49	
11	-4.05	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 10

% Deviation : 8.36

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 7

% Deviation : -5.46

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 1

% Deviation : -8.42

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 2

% Deviation : -12.09

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 6

% Deviation : 30.03

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 4

% Deviation : -8.5

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 3

% Deviation : -0.8

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 9

% Deviation : -4.6

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 8

% Deviation : 4.05

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 5

% Deviation : 1.49

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 11

% Deviation : -4.05

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_030720222039_District 6 v4

Plan name: District 6 v4

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: Please keep the East Cut, Mission Bay, South Beach, Yerba Buena, Central and Western SoMa and Treasure Island together. Common Interests: Communities that are still in redevelopment mode and need a Supervisor who will work to build the infrastructure needed to build these areas into neighborhoods. We lack the schools, affordable retail (particularly grocery stores), adequate parking to address the 30%+ of the residents who are in affordable housing. We also share issues with traffic (physical and environmental safety).

Submitted by: Katina Johnson

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
New District 6	-25.62	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Map tiles by Stamen Design, CC BY 3.0 -- Map data (C) OpenStreetMap contributors

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : New District 6

% Deviation : -25.62

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_030720221824_Watershed Districts

Plan name: Watershed Districts

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This is a supervisorial district map based off of the watersheds of San Francisco. The idea is that each district should be grouped by water as a common resource that all residents share, and that the grouping should be entirely non-partisan, without any one group being able to gain advantage through Gerrymandering.

Submitted by: Christopher Pond

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
6	0.75	
2	0.32	
9	-0.39	
3	-0.18	
5	0.01	
7	0.68	
1	-0.29	
4	-0.96	
11	-0.38	
10	0.26	
8	0.2	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 1

% Deviation : -0.29

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 11

% Deviation : -0.38

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 10

% Deviation : 0.26

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 7

% Deviation : 0.68

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 4

% Deviation : -0.96

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 2

% Deviation : 0.32

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 5

% Deviation : 0.01

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 8

% Deviation : 0.2

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 9

% Deviation : -0.39

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 6

% Deviation : 0.75

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 3

% Deviation : -0.18

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_030620222030_SoMa Waterfront

Plan name: SoMa Waterfront

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: Embarcadero, Rincon Hill, South Beach, South Park, Mission Bay, and Dogpatch are all impacted significantly by Bay Bridge/280 traffic (pedestrian and bicyclists especially), waterfront (Port of SF) considerations/state laws, Oracle Park/Chase Center surges, dearth of recreational/publicly owned open spaces, and lack of resources for our thousands of below market rate housing residents moving into our redeveloped high-density residential neighborhoods replacing formerly industrials areas of San Francisco. Please keep us together!

Submitted by: Jamie Whitaker

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

t name	% Deviation	Comments
front Redeveloped and Rising	-48.44	Embarcadero, Rincon Hill, South Beach, South Park, Mission Bay, and Dogpatch neighborh

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Waterfront Redeveloped and Rising

% Deviation : -48.44

Comments : Embarcadero, Rincon Hill, South Beach, South Park, Mission Bay, and Dogpatch neighborhoods.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_030320221987_option 231978

Plan name: option 231978

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: current_draft

General comments: split treasure island. half district 3 half district 6.

Submitted by: zach close

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
3	-9.76	
6	20.9	
1	-2.19	
10	0.66	
5	0.24	
2	-4.25	
7	6.21	
8	-7.19	
9	0.23	
4	1.94	
11	-6.79	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 10

% Deviation : 0.66

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 7

% Deviation : 6.21

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 1

% Deviation : -2.19

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 2

% Deviation : -4.25

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 6

% Deviation : 20.9

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 4

% Deviation : 1.94

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 3

% Deviation : -9.76

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 9

% Deviation : 0.23

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 8

% Deviation : -7.19

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 5

% Deviation : 0.24

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 11

% Deviation : -6.79

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_030320221920_D2 First

Plan name: D2 First

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: current_draft

General comments: Suggested plan for District 2, submitted by Pacific Heights Residents Association (PHRA). Plan incorporates PHRA stated boundaries* entirely within District 2. * Van Ness to Presidio, Union to Bush (This may be a duplicate submission -- plan was submitted once, but account shows "No Submissions," so submitting plan again.)

Submitted by: Carla Hashagen, Vice President -- Pacific Heights Residents Association

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
10	8.36	
7	-5.46	
1	-7.59	
6	30.03	
4	-8.5	
3	-0.81	
2	-5.34	
9	-4.6	
8	4.05	
11	-4.05	
5	-6.07	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 10

% Deviation : 8.36

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 7

% Deviation : -5.46

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 1

% Deviation : -7.59

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 2

% Deviation : -5.34

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 6

% Deviation : 30.03

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 4

% Deviation : -8.5

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 3

% Deviation : -0.81

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 9

% Deviation : -4.6

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 8

% Deviation : 4.05

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 5

% Deviation : -6.07

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 11

% Deviation : -4.05

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_030120221962_CADC's D10 Map

Plan name: CADC's D10 Map

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: CADC's D10 is composed of Portola, Visitacion Valley, Bayview and Hunters Point, bound by HW280/McLaren Park & existing D9 Boundary on the West, Caesar Chavez/Islais Creek on the North, the Bay on the East, and Geneva/County Line on the South District 10 under this map represents uniformed similarities in social economic status and demographics and is mostly composed of lower-moderate income residents and People of Color: Asian Americans (45.83%), Latino Americans (24.49%) and African Americans (16.36%). It has a laser focus on equity that could result in dramatically more resource allocation. It avoids the pitfall of the current District 10 map that includes neighborhoods with large income disparity. This disparity results in the disadvantaged neighborhoods in the southern part of the district being named the "Forgotten Valley" (Visitacion Valley), the "Forgotten Neighborhood" (Portola), and the "Forgotten Corner" (Bayview / Hunters Point). It also fits right below Potrero Boosters' proposed COI map with a shared border on Caesar Chavez. In contrast to the more affluent neighborhoods in the north that have almost no schools, the proposed D10 map encompasses almost all schools in the Southeast part of the City. These schools are among the lowest performing schools in San Francisco as well as in California State. A district supervisor can advocate for the allocation of the City Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF) to support this most disadvantaged district on its most demanding public education needs and make changes for betterment. SFUSD is currently undergoing School Assignment Redesign for neighborhood zoning. Students living in a neighborhood assignment zone will be going to schools in that zone. Having a supervisor district to form with a focus on elevating the needs of public education of the most disadvantaged groups, it could allow changes to be coordinated with SFMTA and other infrastructure. Thus, students can go to schools within the same district with ease, and resources can be prioritized by the district supervisors for this important need.

Submitted by: Chinese American Democratic Club

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
CADC's D10 Map	1.0	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : CADCâ□□s D10 Map

% Deviation : 1.0

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_022820221021_Small Changes 2

Plan name: Small Changes 2

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This map is intended to balance three features: (1) keeping neighborhoods together; (2) reflecting the statements about communities of interest submitted to date; and (3) producing districts within 1% of the target population. This does change the representation of some neighborhoods, but an effort was made to not split neighborhoods when redrawing lines. This map is not intended to be a "final" map, but a base map from which lines may be refined and created final districts within the 5% allowed to keep communities together.

Submitted by: Concerned Citizen

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D6

% Deviation : 0.97

Comments : Includes Treasure Island, Rincon Hill, SOMA, and the Tenderloin.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D10

% Deviation : -0.84

Comments : Adds Mission Bay to Showplace Square, Potrero Hill, Dogpatch, Bayview, Hunters Point, Silver Terrace and Little Hollywood.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D3

% Deviation : 0.18

Comments : Consolidates Russian Hill with Nob Hill, Fisherman's Wharf, Telegraph Hill, North Beach, the Financial District and Union Square.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D5

% Deviation : 0.83

Comments : Includes Market/Octavia and Hub Areas, Civic Center, Hayes Valley, Western Addition, Fillmore, Japan Town, Alamo Square, Lower Haight, Duboce Triangle, Corona Heights, Cole Valley, and Parnassus.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D9

% Deviation : 0.2

Comments : The Mission extended to Dolores, Bernal Heights and St. Mary's Park.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D1

% Deviation : 0.89

Comments : Includes Richmond south of California, USF, Upper Haight, and North of Panhandle.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D2

% Deviation : -0.07

Comments : Includes Sea Cliff, Lake Street, Jordan Park/Laurel Heights, Anza Village, Cathedral Hill, Presidio and Pacific Heights, Cow Hollow and the Marina.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D8

% Deviation : 0.99

Comments : The Casto/Eureka Valley, Noe Valley, Glen Park, Mission Terrace, Sunnyside, Miraloma Park, Diamond Heights, Mount Davidson, Laguna Honda, Midtown Terrace, Twin Peaks and Mount Sutro.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D7

% Deviation : 0.79

Comments : Brings together Outer Mission, Ocean View, Ingleside, Westwood Park, St. Francis Wood, Lake Shore, Stonestown, West Portal, Forest Hill, Inner Parkside and Golden Gate Heights.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D4

% Deviation : 0.65

Comments : Parkside, Sunset and the Inner Sunset.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D11

% Deviation : 0.48

Comments : Brings Visitacion Valley back together with Portola, Excelsior, and Crocker Amazon.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_022720221933_D10.Tomorrow

Plan name: D10.Tomorrow

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This map will not please everyone. No map will. This map however does leave the vast majority of D10 unchanged. This proposal moves the area west of 101/San Bruno Ave out of D10 into D9. About 3,700 D10 residents will be redrawn into D9. D10 new population would be approximately 82,500. This is still slightly over the ideal population (80,000) but it is within the 5% +/- allowable deviation which would be 3.75%. D9 can absorbs 3,700 D10 residents without exceeding the ideal 80,000 (5%+/-) population target. This change keeps the vast majority of D10 unchanged. This change keeps the vast majority of D9 unchanged. D10 population reduction is kept at a minimum in order to keep Communities of Interests and neighborhoods intact as much as possible. 101 is a hard physical barrier that already effectively separates this area of D10 from other areas of current D10. 101 was selected as the new line between D9 and D10 because it is a hard physical barrier within the built environment. This map does acknowledge that D9's population is slightly below the ideal 80,000 figure, thus with the addition of these selected blocks, both D9 and D10 are within the acceptable population target. The removal of these block from D10 has little demographic impact. Demographically, D10 remains essentially the same. None of broadly defined ethnic groups change more or less then 1%. This is only part of D10 that will be redistricted. General Hospital will no longer be within 10. Although this would have a conceptual impact, General Hospitals should not be viewed a just a D10 asset. It is a Citywide asset.

Submitted by: Russel Morine

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D10.Tomorrow	4.01	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D10.Tomorrow

% Deviation : 4.01

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_022720221931_D10 Tomorrow 2.0

Plan name: D10 Tomorrow 2.0

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: D10 Tomorrow - Area of D10 redrawn into D9

Submitted by: Russel Morine

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D10 Redrawn into D9	-95.57	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D10 Redrawn into D9

% Deviation : -95.57

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_022720221928_Solution to dysfunction

Plan name: Solution to dysfunction

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: In the spirit of President Obama's post-presidency initiative to merge congressional districts as a way to curb radicalism, San Francisco can go further than Seattle by not just having a handful of city-wide officials but by making the whole city's interests to be accounted for in every conversation.

Submitted by: Eric Daimler

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
City-wide District 1-10	1000.0	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : City-wide District 1-10

% Deviation : 1000.0

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: None

Plan name: D4-SPEAK PLAN

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments:

Submitted by:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : N

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
New District 4	1.74	Sunset Parkside Education- Action Committee (SPEAK) D4 - 1. Lake Merced Park-Water area & SFPUC Pump station to D4. Remainder in D7. 2. Fort Funston North of John Muir Dr. to D4. Remainder in 7. 3. Farallons to remain in D4.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : New District 4

% Deviation : 1.74

Comments : Sunset Parkside Education- Action Committee (SPEAK) D4 - 1. Lake Merced Park-Water area & SFPUC Pump station to D4. Remainder in D7. 2. Fort Funston North of John Muir Dr. to D4. Remainder in 7. 3. Farallons to remain in D4.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

SUNSET- PARKSIDE EDUCATION AND ACTION COMMITTEE (SPEAK)
HAND DRAWN MAP SUBMISSION DISTRICT 4



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: None

Plan name: D4-SPEAK PLAN

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments:

Submitted by:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : N

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
New District 4	1.74	Sunset Parkside Education- Action Committee (SPEAK) D4 - 1. Lake Merced Park-Water area & SFPUC Pump station to D4. Remainder in D7. 2. Fort Funston North of John Muir Dr. to D4. Remainder in 7. 3. Farallons to remain in D4.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : New District 4

% Deviation : 1.74

Comments : Sunset Parkside Education- Action Committee (SPEAK) D4 - 1. Lake Merced Park-Water area & SFPUC Pump station to D4. Remainder in D7. 2. Fort Funston North of John Muir Dr. to D4. Remainder in 7. 3. Farallons to remain in D4.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_022520221912_Mid-Market COI

Plan name: Mid-Market COI

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This map shows the boundaries of the Mid-Market community of interest.

Submitted by: Chuck Obermeyer

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
Mid-Market COI	-69.64	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Mid-Market COI

% Deviation : -69.64

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_022420221864_New D10 submission

Plan name: New D10 submission

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: current_draft

General comments: This is my 1st version of a suggested map of making district line changes to D10 in an effort to maintain as much of our neighborhood interests as possible

Submitted by: Naj Daniels

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
6	30.03	
4	-8.5	
3	-8.89	
10	2.93	
7	-5.46	
9	-4.6	
1	-8.42	
2	-4.0	
8	4.05	
5	1.49	
11	-4.05	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 10

% Deviation : 2.93

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 7

% Deviation : -5.46

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 1

% Deviation : -8.42

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 2

% Deviation : -4.0

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 6

% Deviation : 30.03

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 4

% Deviation : -8.5

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 3

% Deviation : -8.89

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 9

% Deviation : -4.6

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 8

% Deviation : 4.05

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 5

% Deviation : 1.49

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 11

% Deviation : -4.05

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

www.csfn.net • PO Box 320098 • San Francisco CA 94132-0098 • Est 1972

18 February, 2022

SUBJECT: Submission of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods "Incremental/Minimal Change Redistricting Plan."

Reverend Arnold Townsend, Chair and Members
San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
c/o John Carroll, Redistricting Task Force Clerk
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Rm. 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Chair Townsend and Members,

The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, CSFN, is pleased to submit this City-wide map and important relevant information to the Task Force for its consideration. This map has been developed in collaboration with Christopher Bowman, a long-time expert in matters related to elections and redistricting in San Francisco. It is the result of extensive research and the thoughtful application of fairness, equity, and recognition of Community of Interest. The maps were submitted to the RDTF on 18 Feb. 2022 via the RDTF Mapping Tool website.

CSFN is the largest neighborhood coalition in the San Francisco, representing a diverse mix of 24 member neighborhoods spread across the spectrum of San Francisco. CSFN is also the oldest major neighborhood coalition in San Francisco having been active continuously since 1972 (celebrating our 50th anniversary!). We take great pride in our diversity, longevity and commitment to the betterment of all San Franciscans.

The City-wide map submitted was approved by the CSFN General Assembly on 15 February, 2022 and CSFN believes it represents the best solution to the complex issues affecting fair and equitable redistricting.

It is worth noting that not all our members are in agreement with CSFN's map as it relates to their neighborhood/district and have been encouraged to submit specific alternatives for the RDTF's consideration.

We request that our entire submission be posted on the RDTF website as a viewer can only then fully appreciate the detailed analysis that went into creating the map.

We look forward to your considerations.

Respectfully,



Charles Head

President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

SAN FRANCISCO INCREMENTAL/MINIMUM CHANGE REDISTRICTING PLAN

Drafted by Christopher L. Bowman in Collaboration with the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods (CSFN)

Table of Contents

Overview

- Overview of the Incremental/Minimum Change Redistricting Plan
- Summary of Maps

Appendix 1

- Summary of Benefits of the CSFN Proposed Plan
- Adjusted 2020 Census Population and Demographics
- Inventory of 25 Population Transfers
- Metes and Bounds

Appendix 2

- Minority Report

OVERVIEW

History, Discussion and Rationale

Supporting Maps

Overview of the CSFN's Incremental/Minimal Change Redistricting Plan
Drafted by Christopher L. Bowman, January 22, 2022
Adopted by the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, February 15, 2022
Submitted to the Redistricting Task Force, February 18, 2022

Dear Chair Townsend and Members of the Redistricting Task Force:

On February 15, 2022, by a super-majority, the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods adopted the third draft of the Incremental/Minimum Change Redistricting Plan drafted at our request by Christopher L. Bowman on January 22, 2022.

Chris, a long-time friend of CSFN, was a member of the nine-member 1995 Elections Task Force which drew the district elections plan approved by the voters in 1996, and was used to elect eleven members of the Board of Supervisors in 2000, and has since submitted redistricting plans in 2011 and 2021 to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission, a plan to the 2012 SFRTF, and two plans to the San Mateo Board of Supervisors in 2013 and 2021.

Today, the Coalition is submitting our adopted redistricting plan to the San Francisco Redistricting Task Force, including our proposed citywide map, this overview with two appendices, population and racial profiles comparing our proposed districts to the current (2012) districts, an inventory of the 25 changes we propose to the current plan including the population and racial CVAP for each change, and the metes and bounds for our plan.

Our plan accommodates the population growth in Districts 6 and 10 in an equitable fashion throughout the City, balancing for population +/- 5% of the mean population for a district, and limiting the size of the transfers from Districts 6 and 10 to Districts 3, 5, and 9 to the absolute minimum allowable under the law, to reduce the ripple effects on the remaining districts.

By so doing, we minimize the number of San Franciscans who will find themselves in a new district after April 15th (when the Task Force adopts its final plan), to just 74,327 residents or 8.49% of the City's population, and through incremental change balancing for population maintain the social-economic, racial, cultural, and political character of all the current districts. To the maximum extent possible, we have kept or made neighborhoods and districts whole and in the case of the Inner Sunset which is already divided into three districts we reduce that division to two districts, with the western portion west of 12th Avenue which is heavily Asian going to District 4 and the eastern portion between 12th and 5th Avenue which has an economic Community of Interest with the residents of Sunset Heights of District 7 who shop, dine, and receive personal services and care in the commercial district centered at 9th and Irving going to District 7

We have also made the UCSF – Parnassus campus whole, restored some of the 1995 boundaries of the original plan, and adjusted districts based on topography or freeways,

Finally, we've incrementally increased Asian CVAP in Districts 2, 3, 5, 10, and 11 and through surgically precise transfers between District 5 and Districts 2 and 8, between District 10 and Districts 6 and 9, and between District 8 and 9, increased the Black CVAP in Districts 5, 6, and 10, and the Hispanic CVAP in District 9.

On the westside of the City, we recognize that the Asian CVAP in Districts 1 and 4 must decline, so the transfers we have proposed to bring those districts over 95% of the mean population were designed to minimize that decline, while other proposals that have been made to the Task Force to put all of NOPA and Anza Vista into District 1 and all of the Inner Sunset into District 4 would cause two to three times the decline in Asian CVAP in those districts than under our plan.

We acknowledge that some of our member organizations disagreed with our proposal as it affected Districts 3 and 4, and we have included their minority report in Appendix 2, but we would suggest that while their plans taken in isolation for their respective districts may make perfect sense, they have not explored the ramifications and adverse ripple effects of their plans on neighboring districts or in the rest of the City, and unless they can submit a city-wide map or maps centered on their home districts that works for all eleven districts, their dissent carries less weight with us, and hopefully also with the Task Force.

In conclusion, it is important that redistricting not become a zero-sum game. That's one reason Supervisor Hallinan in 1994 proposed creating the Elections Task Force which had three members appointed by the Mayor, three by the Board of Supervisors, and three by the Registrar of Voters, whose members represented the diversity of the City. They drafted a plan in which every major stakeholder of the City felt it had a decent chance to elect one of their own to the Board or influence what candidate outside their community was elected who would represent their interesz.

In redistricting the key is to give people what they need versus what they want (which normally is at other people's expense). We believe that our plan provides a "win/win" for all major stakeholders of the City including our dozens of diverse and unique neighborhoods and communities.

Historical Background

To put the current (2012) Redistricting plan and CSFN's plan in their proper context, we need to go back 28 years, when Supervisor Terence Hallinan and the majority of his colleagues on the Board of Supervisors placed Proposition L on the November 1994 ballot calling for the creation of the nine-member 1995 Elections Task Force which would present to the Board of Supervisors a plan or plans to provide a different method for electing the Board of Supervisors, taking into account the number of Supervisors San Francisco should have, the pay for Supervisors, the costs

of running for Supervisor, and representation of the diversity of the City's neighborhoods and communities.

The measure won at the polls and Supervisor Hallinan lobbied the three appointing authorities (the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and Germaine Wong -- the Director of Elections) to appoint members to the Task Force who represented the political, social, economic, and racial diversity that was San Francisco at the time.

In response, the appointing authorities appointed to the Task Force three Asians (Samson Wong, Dale Shimasaki, and Eric Mar), one Hispanic (Ramon Arias), one African American (Gwenn Craig, who Chaired the Task Force), and four Whites (Chris Bowman, Dale Butler, Nancy Lenvin, and Carmen White). Most of its members were registered Democrats, but Chris Bowman was active with the Republican Party and Log Cabin and Carmen White was with the Green Party. There were three women, including a Lesbian -- Gwenn Craig who was the former Co-Chair of the Harvey Milk Democratic Club and a former Police Commissioner, and four attorneys (Rmon Arias who was with Bay Area Legal Aid, Dale Butler who represented the SF Labor Council, Nancy Lenvin -- a real estate attorney, and Eric Mar who was the Assistant Dean of the New College School of Law.

The Task Force convened in January 1995, and on May 1, 1995 submitted a 600 page report to the Board, and recommended four different methods to elect Supervisors – including a return to District Elections.

The Task Force reconvened at the War Memorial Building (as City Hall was closed for retrofitting) on September 7, 1995.to draft and approve a district elections plan. Task Force members Nancy Lenvin, Carmen White, and Samson Wong served through May 1st, and were replaced by their appointers by Susan Horsfall, Betty Traynor, and Henry Louie.

Supervisor Terence Hallinan stressed to the Task Force members the importance of ensuring that each major stakeholder of the City -- Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, union households, LGBTs, homeowners, renters, and Republicans (who at the time were 17% of the registered voters of the City) had a critical mass of voters in one district (or more) so they could elect at least one of their own to the Board or influence who outside their community would best represent them on the Board.

By so doing, neighborhoods and communities would become invested in the line-drawing process and the final map and would approve the plan at polls. (The previous three progressive district elections plans authored by Calvin Welch, Sue Hestor and their allies, had failed three times at the polls from 1980 to 1987, and Hallinan didn't want to see another defeat at the polls.)

The Task Force held a number of citywide and neighborhood meetings to get community input and feedback to multiple draft maps prepared by the Task Force's redistricting consultant, Professor Rich DeLeon of San Francisco State and his graduate assistant, Lisel Blash. Neighborhood hearings were held at the Laurel Heights Campus of UCSF, the Chinese Cultural Center, New College on Valencia, the Southeast Community Facility, and the County Fair Building at 9th and Lincoln.

After reviewing public comments to the draft maps the Task Force narrowed down to the selection to two maps. After being deadlocked, the Task Force decided to merge the two maps and adjusted boundaries to balance for population, make or keep neighborhoods and communities whole whenever possible, to combine neighborhoods and communities with common interests and demographics, and propensity to vote into the same district.

The final map was approved in late November, and the plan including the map, statistics, metes and bounds, and language of the proposed Charter Amendment which would be placed on the ballot to usher in the return of District Elections was submitted to the Board at the end of the month.

The Task Force largely followed Supervisor Hallinan's guidance that every major stakeholder had a critical mass to win in one or more districts, and the Task Force believed that they created a plan in which Asians would have a good shot of being elected in Districts 1, 3, and 4, Blacks in Districts 5 and 10, Hispanics in District 9, LGBTs in District 8, Union Households in District 11, and Republicans or moderate Democrats in Districts 2 and 7, and District 6 was what was left over albeit one could argue its Community of Interest was that, at the time the plan was approved, 94% of its residents were renters.

In December of 1995, the Board was deadlocked 5 to 5 on placing the Charter Amendment on the ballot – four of the five opponents didn't want to see a return of District Elections, and the fifth Supervisor, Jose Medina, didn't like how the lines of District 11 were drawn. So it wasn't until the following Summer that enough pressure had mounted on Supervisors who were on the fence the and some backroom deals took place to delay the return of District Elections until 2000 to allow Supervisors elected to a second term in 1994 and 1996 the ability finish their service on the Board without having to run in a district, that seven Supervisors placed the Charter Amendment (Prop G) on the November 6, 1996 Presidential General Election ballot.

The Task Force members thought they had gotten it right and the voters seemed to confirm that opinion when they passed Prop. G with 56.7% of the vote and Prop. G won in 24 of 25 of the City's neighborhoods as defined by the Department of Elections.

Four years later district voters elected 11 District Supervisors to the Board, including two Hispanics, one African American, one Asian, and two Gay men. The new Board included 3 Liberals, 7 Progressives, and Tony Hall who caucused with the Progressives.

The 2002 Redistricting.

The political landscape in 2001 was highly polarized between the Liberal Machine Democrats led by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr. and the Progressive majority on the Board led by Aaron Peskin. The progressives and the machine Democrats also split the rest of the elected officials of the City, with a slight edge to the Progressives.

The Progressives believed that if the Redistricting Task Force were seated before the Elections Commission (which would be empowered to make the three appointments to the Redistricting Task Force instead of the Director of Elections) took office in January 2002, the Mayor would have six votes on the Task Force and his majority would use the redistricting process to exact revenge on his political opponents on the Board. (In reality, the Director of Elections was appointed by the City Administrator and was largely insulated from political pressure.) Supervisor Chris Daly placed on the November 2001 ballot Prop. G (which would delay the seating of the Task Force until 2002), and the voters believing that his measure represented reform rather than a naked power grab, approved the measure.

So the Elections Commission met and appointed two progressives and Claudine Cheng to the Task Force. The Board appointed two Progressives to the Task Force and a Tony Hall supporter who ultimately caucused with the Progressives to form a 5-4 majority on the Task Force.

In 95% of the changes made to the districts, the Task Force voted unanimously as they were pro-forma transfers from one district to another to balance for population. The major non-controversial changes in 2002 included:

* The USF campus was mad whole in District 1 and District 1 moved east to Masonic between Geary and Fulton to include all of Lone Mountain;

*District 3 picked up five blocks of Russian Hill and expanded south to Post and Geary to include Union Square;

*the northern and southern boundaries of District 5 were compressed and the district moved east from Laguna to parts of Gough;

*District 8 moved east from Guerrero to parts of Valencia and south and west of Bosworth to pick up the eastern part of Sunnyside;

*the northern border of District 10 was extended from 17th Street to Townsend; and

*Merced Extension Triangle (METNA) was transferred from District 11 to District 7.

The Task Force messed up by dividing Parnassus Heights between Districts 5 and 7, because the consultant was unwilling to split a census block that overlapped the boundary of Parnassus Heights and the UCSF – Parnassus campus.

The major controversy which divided the Task Force by a 5 to 4 vote was what to do with the Portola District, which under the 1995 Pan was divided with 28% in District 11 and 72% in District 10, and secondarily whether Potrero Hill and Dog Patch were good fits for District 10, or better fits for District 6.

District 11 was over-populated so it needed to jettison its portion of the Portola.

The Liberals on the Task Force wanted to unite the Portola and assign it to District 10, and transfer Potrero Hill and Dog Patch to District 6 on the grounds that the Portola was demographically similar to the rest of District 10 south of Cesar Chavez, and that Potrero Hill and Dog Patch were more affluent and far less diverse than the rest of District 10 and had a high propensity to vote, whereas Bayview Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley had two of the four lowest propensities to vote in the City.

The Progressives argued that there was a historic link between the two neighborhoods and Bayview Hunters Point on environmental, health, and other issues, but the key issue not mentioned in the public debate was that Supervisor Sophie Maxwell's base was in Potrero Hill and even though she no longer lived in the neighborhood, where her mom, Enola, was a powerhouse. She was elected in 2000 over Linda Richardson (who was backed by the Mayor and won in the rest of the district south of Cesar Chavez) because of the votes she received from the two neighborhoods.

The "solution" proposed by the Progressives and passed on a 5 to 4 vote was to move the northern half of the Portola across I-280 into District 9, which had few working class Asian homeowners (who constituted a majority of the Portola's population), and the portion of the Portola in District 10 dropped from 72% to 50%. To accommodate such a large transfer of half of the Portola into District 9 required that part of the northern border of the Distict 9 be moved south to 20th – thus, not only was the Portola split 50/50 but so too was the Inner Mission.

The 2012 Redistricting.

The Director of Elections, John Arntz, reported to the Board that new Redistricting Task Force needed to be impaneled because Districts 6, 10, and 11 were over-populated beyond the 105% limit allowable under "One Person/One Vote'.

The 2012 Task Force was more racially diverse than the 1995 ETF and 2002 RTF with two African Americans, two Hispanics, three Asians including an Filipina, a white resident of District 7, and David Pilpel, also White, who had been appointed by the Elections Commission. As Ed Lee was Mayor, he didn't appoint members with a political agenda but rather appointed current and former commissioners or bureaucrats. The Task Force leaned left but there were few 5 to 4 votes during its tenure.

Again, most of the changes revolved around Districts 6, 10, and 11, and the incremental changes between districts to balance for population were largely non-controversial, including:

*District 3 continued to move south to include most of the tourist hotels and the theater district and its southern boundary with District 6 (the northern border of the Tenderloin) was determined by homelesses, tenant, and non-profit affordable housing activists.

*District 4 which was spared adjustments to its boundaries in 2002 was under-populated and crossed 19th Avenue to pick up 4 blocks of the Inner Sunset. District 7 already had 10 blocks of the Inner Sunset, from 19th Avenue to 9th Avenue between Judah and Kirkham.

*By using a service road on the UCSF Parnassus campus, Parnassus Heights was made whole again, and District 5 was again its home.

*The western boundary of District 6 continued to move eastward out of the Western Addition and its new western boundary was Van Ness from just north of Geary to Market.

*District 8's eastern boundary again moved east to the entire length of Valencia.

*District 11 again had to make painful cuts, this time between Ocean and Holloway from Ashton to Harold – thus losing to District 7 the southern side of the Ocean Avenue Commercial Strip which had served residents of the OMI for decades, and the triangle north of Mission Terrace from Tingsley to I-280 and Alemany which was transferred to District 8. Minor changes were made to the border of the Excelsior and Portola Districts east of Madison.

On the controversial side, but ultimately eight Task Force members opposed all aspects of his plan, David Pilpel submitted his redistricting plan before any member of the public did and his colleagues and members of the public spent nearly two months trying to shelve his proposal for

each district, including splitting District 5 along Geary, which divided Japantown and the Asian enclave of District 5. To assuage leaders of the Japanese Community who were alarmed and offended by his proposal, the Task Force listened carefully to the Japanese non-profit leaders to embrace a northern boundary of District 5 which included all major cultural, religious, and social services institutions in Greater Japantown. The resulting northern boundary for District 5 looked like a jagged jigsaw puzzle. Counter intuitively, the expansion actually lowered the Asian CVAP for the district because the northern parts of Greater Japantown had become predominantly White.

The major controversy was what to do with the Portola and the Inner Mission. Both had been split 50/50 in 2002.

The Liberals, neighborhood activists, and a coalition led by San Francisco Association of Realtors called for both the Inner Mission and the Portola to be made whole, with the Inner Mission in District 9 all the way to Duboce and Division and Hwy. 101, and that the Portola be solely in District 10.

The Progressives prevailed by making the Portola intact, but placing it in its entirety into District 9, and the Inner Mission was nearly made whole from Valencia to Bryant, but with District 10 extending west to Bryant between Division and 20th.

In conclusion, even though there was discord on the 2002 and 2011-2012 Task Forces over the Portola, there was broad agreement on the rest of the incremental changes to the 1995 lines. Significantly, the current districts boundaries are over 90% the same as the 1995 districts boundaries, and as such it would appear that the diverse members of the two Redistricting Task Forces largely agreed with how the 1995 district lines were drawn.

This would suggest that were the 2021-2022 Redistricting Task Force to follow the precedence set by the 2002 and 2012 Redistricting Task Forces to make incremental changes to existing districts, that CSFN's Incremental/Minimum Change Redistricting Plan CSFN is submitting would be in keeping with that approach. We would also argue they should be loathe to make radical changes to existing districts including, but not limited to, moving Potrero Hill and Dog Patch into District 6 as it would create major disruptive ripple effects across the City including Districts 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and possibly Districts 9 and 11 leading to far more San Franciscans than the 74,327 residents under our plan who would find themselves in a new district after April 15th.



(1) OVERALL WITH BOUNDARIES

San Francisco Redistricting Tool

Languages Help



(2) D1

Statistics

ap contributors.

San Francisco Redistricting Tool

Languages Help



(3) D2

Statistics

ap contributors.

San Francisco Redistricting Tool

Languages Help



(4) D 3

Statistics

ap contributors.

San Francisco Redistricting Tool

Languages Help



(5) D4

Statistics

ap contributors.

San Francisco Redistricting Tool

Languages Help



(6) D5

Statistics

ap contributors.

San Francisco Redistricting Tool

Languages

Help



(7) D6

Statistics

ap contributors.

San Francisco Redistricting Tool

Languages Help



(8) D 7-8-9-10-11

Statistics

ap contributors.

APPENDIX 1

Summary of Benefits of Proposed Plan

Adjusted 2020 Census Population and Demographics

Inventory of 25 Population Transfer

Metes and Bounds

SUMMARY OF WHAT THE CSFN'S INCREMENTAL/MINIMAL CHANGE REDISTRICTING PLAN WOULD ACCOMPLISH IF ADOPTED BY THE SFRTF

Minimize the impact of transferring excess population from Districts 10 and 6 on the neighboring Districts 3, 5, 9 and contain the ripple effects on the rest of the City.

Under the CSFN plan, District 10 would transfer 2,368 residents between 16th and Townsend (to include Showplace Square) to District 6 and another 3,424 residents to District 9 west of Hwy. 101 to Potrero between 20th and Cesar Chavez and from Division to 20th between Hwy. 101/San Bruno and Bryant, making the Inner Mission whole.

The minimal number of residents allowable under "One Person/One Vote" would be transferred from District 6 to Districts 3 and 5, e.g., 16,089 residents neighboring Moscone Center (mostly s Chinese and Filipino seniors living in affordable housing) and on Rincon Hill from 5th Street to the Embarcadero, between Market and Harrison; and 6,228 residents from 9th Street and Folsom west to where the Central Freeway meets Market Street to District 5. (After all the transfers into and out of District 6 were made, District 6's population would be 104.95% of the mean population for a district, just 0.05% below the legal limit.)

District 3, in turn, would transfer the rest of Russian Hill (9,136 residents) to District 2 so that Russian Hill would be made basically whole (three blocks on the southwest corner of the official boundaries of Russian Hill with 1,159 residents would remain in District 3, as they are adjacent to Chinatown and together have an Asian CVAP of 65.96%); and District 2 in turn, would transfer Sea Cliff and the Lake Street corridor (4,783 residents) to District 1.

District 5, which was already somewhat over-populated at 101.49% of the mean population for a district before taking in part of the excess population from District 6, would transfer 5,558 residents from the Inner Sunset to District 7 and another 2,387 residents of the Inner Sunset to District 4. Currently 29.62%% of the Inner Sunset Neighborhood Commercial District whose boundaries of 19th to 5th Avenues between Lincoln and Kirkham are set by SEC. 730 of the City's Planning Code is in Districts 7 (20.10%) and 4 (9.52%). The dividing line between District 4 and District 7 would be 12th Avenue between Lincoln and Kirkham and if these transfers took place, District 4 would have 47.34% and District 7 would have 53.66% of the Inner Sunset Neighborhood Commercial District.

Districts 8 and 11 would be unaffected by the ripple effects.

Limit to a Minimum the Number of San Franciscans who will find themselves in a new district should the CSFN redistricting plan be adopted by the Redistricting Task Force.

Under the CSFN Plan only 74,327 San Franciscans or 8.49% of all 874,993 San Franciscans would be transferred from their current district to a new district. If you look at the itemizations of the 25 changes this plan proposes for the current districts, 53,647 San Franciscans would be transferred from one district to another to balance for population; 4,661 would be transferred

from Districts 7, 8, and 10 to make District 11 whole again, 2,038 would be transferred to conform district lines to topographical or man-made features or commercial district boundaries; and 13,981 would be transferred by adjusting the borders of District 5 with Districts 2 and 8, and between Districts 8 and 9, to increase the Black CVAP in District 5 from 9.14% to 10.34%. and marginally increase the Hispanic CVAP in District 9 from 26.75% to 26.89%.

Restore most of the 1995 boundaries of the OMI and District 11.

After extensive consultation with community leaders from the OMI, Mission Terrace, the Excelsior, and Crocker Amazon. three portions of District 11 which were transferred to Districts 7, 8, and 10 by the 2002 and 2012 Redistricting Task Forces because District 11 was significantly over-populated at the time would be restored to District 11 under the CSFN plan. They would include Ocean Avenue to Holloway between Ashton and Harold and the triangle bordered by Ocean and Geneva, and I-280, from District 7; the triangle bordered by Tingsley, I-280, and Alemany from District 8; and south on Geneva to Carter from District 10. And this is all accomplished by District 11 growing from 94.70% to just 100.31% of the mean population for a district.

Restore additional parts of the 1995 map.

Beyond restoring most of the OMI and District 11, the CSFN Plan calls for the following restorations:

* Returning the eastern portion of Sunnyside to District 7 by moving the boundary with District 8 from Congo and Joost east to Bosworth and the BART station;

* Along Hwy. 101 from Mariposa to Cesar Chavez between Districts 9 and 10, transferring to District 9 the rest of the Inner Mission, including General Hospital;

* Along 16th Street from Hwy. 101 to Pennsylvania defining the northern border of Potrero Hill and District 10.[3]

* Along Lake Street from 5th to Arguello between Districts 1 and 2 separating the Inner Richmond from Presidio Terrace;

* Along California Street from Baker to Steiner between Districts 2 and 5, restoring several blocks of the Western Addition to District 5;

* Along St. Joseph's between Geary and Turk between Districts 2 and 5, restoring three blocks of the Western Addition to District 5; and

* Along the eastern border of the UCSF – Parnassus campus between UCSF and Parnassus Heights between Districts 7 and 5 so that the entire campus south of Parnassus is in District 7;

Make the UCSF – Parnassus Campus whole.

One of the few areas that the 1995 ETF failed to research before approving its lines is that it divided USF into three (not just two) districts, with the Koret Health and Recreation Center, soccer fields, and faculty parking garage in District 1, the main campus in District 2, and the USF Law School and Library, and its nursing school and St. Mary's Hospital in District 5. All of USF and St. Mary's Hospital were made whole in District 1 by the 2002 Task Force.

The Parnassus campus of UCSF has continued to be divided at Parnassus with 80% of the campus and 100% of its student housing in District 7, and the rest of the campus which includes its multi-story parking garage, Student Union, bookstore, library, Ambulatory Care Center, and Department of Neurological Surgery in District 5. The CSFN plan would include the entire Parnassus campus in District 7, by moving District 7 north of Parnassus.

Set District boundaries along topographical divides and Commercial District Boundaries.

By and large, the Election Task Force in 1995 set district boundaries along geographic divides and man-made barriers. Thus, portions or all of Van Ness, Market, Hwy. 101, I-280. Bosworth and O'Shaughnessy, Twin Peaks Blvd., Golden Gate Park, 19th Avenue, Sloat, Ocean, and the western border of McLaren Park served as district boundaries in the 1995 plan.

The major geographic divide for San Francisco east/west generally runs from Buena Vista Park, along Twin Peaks Blvd., and along O'Shaughnessy with District 8 largely on the east side of the divide.

There are two exceptions which the CSFN plan addresses.

The first is that Ashbury Heights, Clifford Terrace, and Mt. Olympus are west of the east/west topographic divide and are part of the Community of Interest that includes all of Cole Valey from Frederick to Clarendon, but they have been in District 8 since 1995. The CSFN Plan transfers these neighborhoods to Distict 5.

The second is that south of Twin Peaks, the topographic divide is not Twin Peaks Blvd. to Portola, but from Twin Peaks Blvd to the southern end of Crestline and along Burnett to Portola. The residences to the west of that divide are also in District 8, but they are zoned RH-1, while almost all of the housing to the east are apartment buildings. Google Maps shows the area as part of Midtown Terrace. The CSFN plan transfers this neighborhood to District 7.

CSFN also recognizes that wherever possible the core of commercial zones should be made or kept whole. To wit there are three blocks bordered by Columbus, Leavenworth, Beach, Hyde, and the Bay. They are currently in District 2, but are the western-most block of Fisherman's Wharf along Jefferson which is primarily in District 3. The CSNF plan unites Fisherman's Wharf and assigns the entire commercial district to District 3.

Consistent with using good redistricting principles create an Asian, Hispanic, or Black CVAP majority district where there was previously an Asian, Hispanic, or Black CVAP plurality district, or create an Asian, Hispanic. or Black plurality district where there was previously a White CVAP plurality district. By happenstance, the transfer of 16,089 majority Asian CVAP residents from District 6 to District 3 would turn District 3 under the CSFN plan from a White CVAP plurality district to an Asian CVAP plurality district, e.g., from a 47.51% to 40.23% district to a 43.69% to 44.20% district. Additionally, by restoring most of the 2002 boundaries of District 11, the Asian CVAP would increase from 55.98% to 56.46%.

As a positive side-effect of following good redistricting principles there would be an enhancement of the electoral power of racial groups in several districts. Under the CSFN plan, this would be accomplished by shrinking Districts 6 and 10 so that the Hispanic CVAP and Black CVAP in District 6 would increase, respectively, from 12.42% to 13.91% and from 10.53% to 11.51% in District 6, and the Black CVAP would increase from 18.87% to 19.80% in District 10

Adjusted 2020 Census Populations and Demographics for the Proposed Revised Incremental/Minimum Change Redistricting Plan
Drafted by Christopher L. Bowman on January 22, 2022 versus the Current (2012) Redistricting Plan
Source: redrawmysf.publicredistricting.com, San Francisco Redistricting Tool
Data Compiled and Organized by Christopher L. Bowman

Proposed Revised Incremental/Minimum Change Redistricting Plan

District	Population	% of Mean Population	% Total Population by Race				% Voting Age Population by Race				% of CVAP by Race			
			WH	AS	HI	BL	WH	AS	HI	BL	WH	AS	HI	BL
1	77,478	97.40%	43.53%	41.51%	9.04%	2.56%	44.12%	41.42%	8.70%	2.61%	47.08%	41.57%	7.05%	2.92%
2	78,305	98.44%	**68.25%**	19.07%	7.82%	1.98%	**69.23%**	18.75%	7.45%	1.92%	**73.75%**	17.37%	6.42%	1.69%
3	79,439	99.87%	37.70%	47.38%	8.65%	3.65%	39.12%	46.62%	8.25%	3.55%	43.69%	44.20%	6.65%	3.87%
4	76,548	96.23%	32.66%	**55.02%**	7.90%	1.76%	33.34%	**54.95%**	7.54%	1.76%	35.73%	**53.44%**	7.29%	1.79%
5	80,744	101.51%	50.50%	24.26%	11.38%	9.90%	**51.84%**	24.26%	10.71%	9.39%	**59.12%**	20.35%	8.17%	10.34%
6	83,480	104.95%	32.10%	35.08%	18.09%	10.12%	33.53%	35.07%	17.14%	10.28%	39.91%	31.67%	13.91%	11.51%
7	78,316	98.45%	43.24%	38.05%	11.49%	3.88%	44.33%	37.50%	11.07%	4.06%	47.71%	35.73%	11.08%	4.08%
8	82,246	103.40%	**58.82%**	19.27%	14.75%	3.55%	**60.26%**	18.78%	14.15%	3.44%	**66.74%**	16.95%	11.25%	3.84%
9	78,244	98.36%	32.54%	26.65%	32.51%	4.20%	34.09%	27.86%	30.82%	4.24%	40.64%	26.44%	26.89%	4.79%
10	80,402	101.08%	17.00%	38.49%	22.43%	17.04%	18.90%	39.84%	20.10%	16.61%	20.03%	42.82%	14.47%	19.80%
11	79,791	100.03%	13.02%	**53.25%**	27.06%	4.44%	13.79%	**53.81%**	25.62%	4.67%	15.53%	**56.46%**	21.48%	5.40%
Total	874,993		39.01%	36.16%	15.65%	5.80%	40.53%	36.01%	14.60%	5.71%	45.41%	36.92%	12.04%	6.01%

Current (2012) Redistricting Plan

District	Population	% of Mean Population	% Total Population by Race				% Voting Age Population by Race				% of CVAP by Race			
			WH	AS	HI	BL	WH	AS	HI	BL	WH	AS	HI	BL
1	72,848	91.58%	42.14%	42.74%	9.17%	2.64%	42.74%	42.57%	8.86%	2.68%	45.59%	42.62%	9.17%	3.10%
2	76,363	96.00%	**68.62%**	18.25%	7.93%	2.10%	**69.66%**	17.87%	7.56%	2.05%	**74.60%**	16.56%	6.26%	1.79%
3	72,474	91.11%	40.80%	44.77%	8.63%	3.19%	42.22%	43.95%	8.26%	3.13%	47.51%	40.23%	6.86%	3.76%
4	72,784	91.50%	31.74%	**56.02%**	7.87%	1.74%	32.37%	**56.03%**	7.50%	1.73%	34.97%	**54.25%**	7.29%	1.76%
5	80,728	101.49%	**51.79%**	24.40%	10.95%	9.35%	**53.07%**	24.09%	10.38%	8.92%	**60.42%**	20.17%	8.53%	9.14%
6	103,429	130.03%	32.91%	36.75%	17.06%	9.36%	34.30%	36.73%	15.68%	9.43%	39.49%	34.82%	12.42%	10.53%
7	75,198	94.54%	41.61%	39.45%	11.71%	3.95%	42.63%	38.94%	11.30%	4.15%	45.89%	37.70%	10.91%	4.03%
8	82,768	104.05%	**59.13%**	19.65%	14.05%	3.50%	**60.63%**	19.07%	13.48%	3.40%	**66.16%**	17.14%	11.40%	3.95%
9	75,886	95.40%	31.70%	27.91%	33.32%	4.07%	33.24%	28.15%	31.60%	4.10%	40.20%	27.17%	26.75%	4.75%
10	86,194*	108.36%	18.29%	38.26%	22.22%	16.27%	20.31%	39.44%	19.92%	16.27%	21.66%	42.17%	14.55%	18.90%
11	76,321*	95.95%	12.81%	**53.18%**	27.37%	4.44%	13.61%	**53.74%**	25.90%	4.66%	15.25%	**55.98%**	22.06%	5.54%
Total	874,993		39.01%	36.16%	15.65%	5.80%	40.53%	36.01%	14.60%	5.71%	45.41%	36.92%	12.04%	6.01%

NOTES: *The U.S. Census Bureau between the 2010 and 2020 Decennial Censuses redew the boundaries of at least four census blocks in San Francisco that were on the border of six of San Francisco's Supervisorial districts. They now overlap districts rather than separate them. Rather than attempt to estimate the population of each portions of a split census block, the redistricting consultant, Q^2 for Redistricting Task Force arbitrarily assigned the whole census block to one or the other district. We agree with their choices in the cases of the Districts 6 and 9 boundary along Division, the Districts 5 ad 7 boundary in the area of Clarendon west of Stanyan, and between Districts 7 and 11 between Ocean and Geneva, but disagree with the allocation of a split census block and a whole census block which it borders being assigned to District 11 instead of District 10 east of 1600 Geneva to Carter. Having said that we have incorporated the consultant's lines for Districts 10 and 11, replicated the two districts using the SF Mapping tool, matched the consultant's estimated population for each district and used the mapping tools calculation of the racial profiles of both district based on Toral Population, Voting Age Population, and Citizen Voting Age Population. The current districts' populations listed above which match the latest calculation by Q^2 of the districts' populations vary slightly with the district populations reported by Director Arntz to the Board of Supervisors when the adjusted population data were released in late September.

Districts which are a majority of a particular racial group are highlighted in **bold yellow,** Those where a racial group represents a plurality are highlighted in yellow.

FINDINGS: On the basis of total adjusted population, Districts 2, 5, and 8 are White Majority districts and Districts 4 and 11 are Asian Majority districts. Additionally, District 7 is a White Plurality district while Districts 1, 3, 6, and 10 are Asian Plurality districts, and Distict 9 is a Hispanic Plurality district. Blacks were the 4th largest racial group in each of the 11 districts.

A better gauge of estimating the actual voting strength by race, is to use the district's Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP), given that a large percentage of first-generation Hispanics and Asians who are of voting age have not yet been naturalized. Using that yardstick, Whites continue to be a majority in Districts 2, 5, and 8 (with significantly larger majorities than reflected in their percentage of the total population) and Districts 1, 3, 6, 7. and 9 are White Plurality districts. Districts 4 and 11 remain Asian Majority districts while District 10 remains an Asian Plurality district. Hispanics are outnumbered by Asians in District 11 by a ratio of 2.5 to 1 for a distant second place and in District 9, they are in third place just behind Asians, and in third place ahead of Blacks in District 6. Blacks are in third place in District 10 with 18.90% compared with 21.66% for Whites and 42.17% for Asians as well as in District 5 where they are outnumbered by Asians by a larger than 2 to 1 ratio. The only district other than District 10 where Blacks constitute more than 10% is in District 6 with 10.53% of the total.

CSFN's proposed Incremental/Minimal Change Redistricting plan beyond ensuring that Districts 10 and 6 which had become significantly over-populated since the 2010 Census would now be in compliance with the "One Person/One Vote" constitutional requirement, with the transfer of over 16,000 residents (the majority of whom were Asian CVAP) from District 6 to District 3, the plan would change District 3 from being a White CVAP Plurality district to a Asian CVAP Plurality district. Additionally, by carefully adjusting the boundaries between Districts 3 and 2. Districts 5 with Districts 2 and 8, and between Districts 8 and 9, the plan marginally increases Black, Asian, and Hispanic CVAPs. By restoring many of its 2002 boundaries Asian CVAP in District 11 would increase from 55.98% to 56.46%. Asian CVAP would also increase in District 2 from 16.56% to 17.37%, in District 10 from 42.17% to 42.82%, and in District 5 from 20.17% to 20.35%. Black CVAP would increase from 9.14% to 10.34% in District 5, from 10.53% to 11.51% in District 6, and in District 10 from 18.90% to 19.80%. Hispanic CVAP would increase from 12.42% to 13.91% in District 6 and from 26.75% to 26.89% in District 9 (with Hispanics becoming the second largest racial group ahead of Asians in that district).

On the westside of the City, Districts 1 and 4 are significantly under-populated, and given that the adjacent neighborhoods from which the districts would pick up population are less and sometimes much less Asian, the plan carefully added only those neighborhoods which would not significantly dilute the voting power of Asians in those districts. In the case of D4, the district would pick up just ten blocks from District 5 which are 32.56% Asian CVAP but also 7 blocks from District 7 which are 47.26% Asian CVAP. For District 1, the options were between adding Sea Cliff and the Lake Street corridor to the district or transferring the equivalent number of residents from NOPA. Sea Cliff is over 28% Asian CVAP and the Lake Street corridor is over 16% Asian CVAP while NOPA is barely 12% Asian CVAP. As a result, Asian CVAP in the districts under CSFN's plan would decline slightly from 54.25% to 53.44% in District 4 and from 42.62% to 41.57% in District 1. Alternative proposals would have made the loss of Asian CVAP far worse. Based on testimony before the Task Force at its Districts 1, 4, and 5 hearings, if the Task Force followed some of the suggestions, all of NOPA and Anza Vista would be added to District 1, resulting in Asian CVAP dropping from 42.62% to 39.11%, and in D4, if all of the Inner Sunset (as defined by the Inner Sunset Merchants, running from Arguello to 19th) were added to District 4, it would result in a drop of Asian CVAP from 54.25% to 51.75%

Inventory of the 25 Transfers District to District in the Proposed Revised Incremental/Minimum Change Redistricting Plan
Drafted by Christopher L Bowman, January 22, 2022
Adopted by the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, February 15, 2002

	Population	Percentage CVAP			
		White	Asian	Hispanic	Black
From District 1:					
Census block immediately south of the USF Law School and north of Grove between Cole and Shrader From D1 to D5	153	55.19%	22.38%	7.14%	9.74%
From District 2:					
Sea Cliff; the Lake Street Corridor; the former Public Health Hospital; and California to Lake, 5th to Arguello From D2 to D1	4,783	73.02%	22.64%	3.96%	0.175
Fisherman's Wharf between Hyde and Leavenworth, and the Bay to Beach and Columbus From D2 to D3	12	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
St. Joseph's to Broderick between O'Farrell and Turk From D2 to D5	289	54.29%	14.76%	3.81%	9.52%
Parts of Lower Pacific Heights between Presidio and Steiner, and California and Geary From D2 to D5	2,955	66.97%	16.47%	6.95%	7.65%
Parts of Cathedral Hill between Gough and Van Ness, and Bush and Geary/Post From D2 to D5	1,467	42.20%	44.16%	5.51%	4.86%
From District 3:					
Rest of Russian Hill not in D2 generally from Van Ness to Mason and Columbus, and Union to Pacific, Broadway & Vallejo From D3 to D2	9,136	63.65%	28.16%	5.61%	2.16%
From District 4:					
No transfer from district					
From District 5:					
Parts of Lower Pacific Heights from Steiner to Gough, and California to Sutter and Bush From D5 to D2	2.312	67.01%	18.22%	10.15%	3.55%

Inventory of the 25 Transfers District to District in the Revised Incremental/Minimum Change Redistricting Plan Drafted by Christopher L Bowman, January 22, 2022, Adopted by the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, February 15, 2022. Page 2

	Population	Percentage CVAP			
		White	Asian	Hispanic	Black
Part of the Inner Sunset between 17th and 12th, and Lincoln and Judah From D2 to D4	2,387	53.70%	32.56%	9.21%	3.42%
Part of Inner Sunset between 12th and 5th, and Lincoln and Kirkham including UCSF north of Parnassus From D5 to D7	5,588	55.11%	31.85%	9.91%	2.53%
Most of District 5 south of Haight between Baker and Market From D5 to D8	2,357	74.03%	11.60%	12.99%	1.16%
From District 6:					
Moscone Convention Center, Transbay Terminal, and most of Rincon Hill from 5th to the Embarcadero, and Market Street to Harrison From D6 to D3	16,089	38.57%	52.73%	4.52%	3.06%
Central Freeway to 9th St. and Mid-Market to Division and Folsom From D6 to D5	6,228	34.81%	35.50%	12.26%	14.53%
From District 7:					
19th to 12th between Judah and Kirkham From D7 to D4	1,377	44.39%	47.26%	4.06%	1.51%
Ocean and Holloway between Ashton to Harold; the triangle bordered by Ocean, Geneva, and I-280 From D7 to D11	Approx. 2,862*	20.08%	69.85%	5.64%	4.35%
From District 8:					
Ashbury & Clayton to Roosevelt, Between Frederick & 17th From D8 to D5	1,619	80.62%	13.08%	1.85%	1.62%
Twin Peaks Blvd. to Burnett Between Crestline to Portola From D8 to D7	407	5640%	24.39%	10.98%	3.05%
Congo to I-280 between Bosworth and Joost Fron D8 to D7	1,115	64.97%	20.64%	5.86%	9.81%

Inventory of the 25 Transfers District to District in the Revised Incremental/Minimum Change Redistricting Plan Drafted by Christopher L Bowman, January 22, 2022, Adopted by the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, February 15, 2022. Page 3

	Population	Percentage CVAP			
		White	Asian	Hispanic	Black
Dolores to San Jose & Guerrero south of 26th; Poplar between, 25th and 26th; & San Jose to Tiffany From D8 to D9	2,267	58.80%	9.92%	27.05%	2.80%
East of Tingsley between I-280 and Alemany From D8 to D11	804	20.59%	56.89%	20.59%	4.25%
From District 9:					
Valencia to Mission between 17th and 19th; Valencia to San Carlos between 19th and 21st. From D9 to D8	2,664	59.40%	24.20%	15.53%	3.60%
Valencia to Mission between The Central Freeway and 14th From D9 to D8	669	56.78%	21.61%	18.34%	4.02%
From District 10:					
San Bruno to 7th, between Division and Townsend to 16th From D10 to D6	2,368	33.96%	56.07%	8.49%	0.89%
Potrero to Hwy. 101 and San Bruno between Division and Cesar Chavez; Bryant and Potrero between Division and 20th From D10 to D9	3,424	53.24%	20.87%	19.08%	6.71%
1600 Geneva to Carter, Geneva to the San Mateo County Line From D10 to D11	995	11.92%	56.10%	11.92%	16.86%
From District 11:					
No transfer from district.					

74,327 San Franciso residents or 8.49% of San Francisco's total adjusted 2020 Census population of 874,993 would find themselves in a new Supervisorial District were the districts in this plan adopted by the San Francisco Redistricting Task Force on April 15, 2022.

* The census block sandwiched between Howth and I-280 and Ocean and Geneva represented part of the boundary between Districts 7 and 11 in the current 2012 plan. Subsequently, the Census Bureau revised the boundary of that census block so that it now straddles Geneva which is the current boundary between the two districts Since census blocks are the smallest unit of population in determining the population of current and proposed districts, since this proposal calls for the restoration of the 2002 borders of the OMI and District 11, it is impossible in this one case to know the precise number of residents thar would be transferred between Districts 7 and 11 if this plan were adopted.

Metes and Bounds for the Incremental/Minimum Change Redistricting Plan
Drafted by Christopher L. Bowman, January 22, 2022
Adopted by the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, February 15, 2022

District 1. The Pacific Ocean and the southern border of the Presidio of San Francisco, easterly along the southern border of the Presidio of San Francisco to 15th Avenue, north on 15th Avenue to include the former Public Health Hospital (CBs 1028. 1030, 1032, & 1036, CT 601), south on 14th Avenue to the southern border of the Presidio of San Francisco, easterly on the southern border of the Presidio of San Francisco to 5th Avenue, south on 5th Avenue to Lake, east on Lake to Arguello, south on Arguello to Geary, east on Geary to Masonic, south on Masonic to Fulton, west on Fulton to Cole, south on Cole to Grove (including CB 4000, CT 165, but excluding CB 4005, CT 165 north of Grove), west on Grove to Shrader, south on Shrader to Hayes, west on Hayes to Stanyan, south on Stanyan to Fell, southwest on Fell to John F. Kennedy, westerly on John F. Kennedy to Nancy Pelosi, southwesterly on Nancy Pelosi to Martin Luther King, Jr., northwesterly and southwesterly on Martin Luther King, Jr. to 19th Avenue, south on 19th Avenue to Lincoln, west on Lincoln to the Pacific Ocean, and north and northeasterly along the Pacific Ocean to the southern border of the Presidio of San Francisco.

District 2. The Pacific Ocean and the southern border of the Presidio of San Francisco, northerly along the Pacific Coast through the Golden Gate to the San Francisco Bay waterfront, easterly along the waterfront to Hyde, south on Hyde to Beach, east on Beach to Columbus, southeast on Columbus to Mason, south on Mason to Vallejo, west on Vallejo to Taylor, south on Taylor to Broadway, west on Broadway to Jones, south on Jones to Pacific (including CB 2003, CT 108 east of Jones), west on Pacific to Van Ness, south on Van Ness to Bush, west on Bush to Webster, south on Webster to Sutter, west on Sutter to Steiner, north on Steiner to California, west on California to Baker, south on Baker to Pine, west on Pine to Lyon, south on Lyon to Bush, west on Bush to Presidio, south on Presidio to Post, east on Post to Baker, south on Baker to St. Joseph's, southeast and south on St. Joseph's to Turk, west on Turk to Masonic, north on Masonic to Geary, west on Geary to Arguello, north on Arguello to Lake, west on Lake to 5th Avenue, north on 5th Avenue to the southern border of the Presidio of San Francisco, westerly on the southern border of the Presidio of San Francisco to 14th Avenue, north on 14th Avenue to exclude the former Public Health Hospital (CBs 1028. 1030, 1032, & 1036, CT 601), south on 15th Avenue to the southern border of the Presidio of San Francisco, and westerly along the southern border of the Presidio of San Francisco to the Pacific Ocean.

District 3. Hyde and the waterfront, easterly and southeasterly along the waterfront to Harrison, southwest on Harrison to 5th Street, northwest on 5th Street crossing Market to Eddy, west on Eddy to Mason, north on Mason to Ellis, east on Elis to Cyril Magnin Place, north on Cyril Magnin Place to O'Farrell, west on O'Farrell to Taylor, north on Taylor to Geary, west on Geary to Leavenworth, north on Leavenworth to Post, west on Post to Polk, south on Polk to Cedar, west on Cedar to Van Ness, north on Van Ness to Pacific, east on Pacific to Jones, north on Jones to Broadway (excluding CB 2003, CT 108 east of Jones), east on Broadway to Taylor, north on Taylor to Vallejo, east on Vallejo to Mason, north on Mason to Columbus, northwest on Columbus to Beach, west on Beach to Hyde, north on Hyde to the waterfront.

District 4. The Pacific Ocean and Lincoln, east on Lincoln to 12th Avenue, south on 12th Avenue to Kirkham, west on Kirkham to 19th Avenue, south on 19th to Sloat, west on Sloat to the Pacific Ocean, and north along the Pacific Ocean to Lincoln.

District 5. St. Joseph's and Geary, north on Baker to Post, west on Post to Presidio, north on Presidio to Bush, east on Bush to Lyon, north on Lyon to Pine, east on Pine to Baker, north on Baker to California, east on California to Steiner, south on Steiner to Sutter, east on Sutter to Webster, north on Webster to Bush, east on Bush to Van Ness, south on Van Ness to Market, northeast on Market to 9th, southeast on 9th to Folsom, southwest on Folsom to the Central Freeway, westerly and northwesterly on the Central Freeway crossing Market to Octavia, north on Octavia to Haight, west on Haight to Buchanan, south on Buchanan to Hermann, west on Hermann to Webster, north on Webster to Haight, west on Haight to Pierce, south on Pierce to Waller. west on Waller to Scott, north on Scott to Haight, west on Haight to Buena Vista Avenue West, southerly on Buena Vista Avenue West to Upper Terrace, southwest on Upper Terrace to Loma Vista Terrace, south on Loma Vista Terrace to Roosevelt, southwesterly on Roosevelt to 17th Street, west on 17th Street to the Clayton, south on Clayton to Twin Peaks Blvd., southwesterly on Twin Peaks Blvd. to Clarendon, westerly on Clarendon to the eastern boundary of UCSF – Parnassus Campus, northerly along the eastern boundary of UCSF – Parnassus Campus (to include all of Parnassus Heights) to Parnassus, west on Parnassus to Hillway, north on Hillway to Carl, west on Carl and Irving to 5th Avenue, north on 5th Avenue to Lincoln, east on Lincoln to Kezar Drive, northeasterly on Kezar Drive to Fell, northeast on Fell to Stanyan, north on Stanyan to Hayes, east on Hayes to Shrader. north on Shrader to Grove (including CB 4005, CT 165, north of Grove, but excluding CB 4000, CT 165), east on Grove to Cole, north on Cole to Fulton, east on Fulton to Masonic, north on Masonic to Turk, east on Turk to St. Joseph's, north and northwest on St. Joseph's to Geary.

District 6. Cedar and Van Ness, east on Cedar to Polk, north on Polk to Post, east on Post to Leavenworth, south on Leavenworth to Geary, east on Geary to Taylor, south on Taylor to O'Farrell, east on O'Farrell to Cyril Magnin Place, south on Cyril Magnin Place to Ellis, west on Ellis to Taylor, south on Taylor to Eddy, east on Eddy to 5th Street, southeast on 5th Street to Harrison, northeast on Harrison to the waterfront (to include Yerba Buena Island and Treasure Island), southerly on the waterfront (beyond McCovey Cove) to an imaginary extension of 16th Street running west connecting the waterfront to Terry A. Francois Blvd., southwesterly on Terry A. Francois Blvd. to Mariposa, west on Mariposa to I-280, northwest on I-280 to 16th Street, west on 16th Street to San Bruno, north on San Bruno to Division, west on Division to 11th Street, northwest on 11th Street to Harrison, southwest on Harrison to the Central Freeway, west on the Central Freeway to Folsom, northeast on Folsom to 9th, northwest on 9th to Market, southwest on Market to Van Ness, and north on Van Ness to Cedar.

District 7. 19th Avenue and Lincoln, north on 19th Avenue to Martin Luther King, Jr., northeasterly and southeasterly on Martin Luther King, Jr. to Nancy Pelosi, northeast on Nancy Pelosi to John F. Kennedy, east on John F. Kennedy to Kezar Drive, southwesterly on Kezar Drive to Lincoln, west on Lincoln to 5th Avenue. south on 5th Avenue to Irving, east on Irving and Carl to Hillway, south on Hillway to Parnassus, east on Parnassus to the eastern boundary of UCSF – Parnassus Campus, southerly along the eastern boundary of UCSF – Parnassus Campus to Clarendon (excluding Parnassus Heights) to Clarendon, easterly on Clarendon to Twin Peaks Blvd., southerly on Twin Peaks Blvd. to an imaginary line running east connecting Twin Peaks Blvd. to Crestline, south on Crestline to Burnett, south on Burnett to Portola (including CBs 1001, 1002, and 1003, CT 204.02), west on Portola to O'Shaughnessy, southeasterly on O'Shaughnessy to Bosworth, southeast on Bosworth to Lyell, south on Lyell to I-280, southwesterly on I-280 to Ocean, northwest on Ocean to Ashton, south on Ashton to Holloway, west on Holloway to Junipero Serra. south on Junipero Serra to Brotherhood Way, east on Brotherhood Way to Alemany, east on Alemany to I-280, southwest on I-280 to the San Mateo County line, west on the San

Mateo County line to the Pacific Ocean, north along the Pacific Ocean to Sloat, east on Sloat to 19th, north on 19th to Kirkham, east on Kirkham to 12th, north on 12th to Lincoln. And west on Lincoln to 19th.

District 8. Buena Vista Avenue West and Haight, east on Haight to Scott, south on Scott to Waller, east on Waller to Pierce, north on Pierce to Haight, east on Haight to Webster, south on Webster to Hermann, east on Hermann to Buchanan, north on Buchanan to Haight, east on Haight to Octavia, south on Octavia crossing Market to the Central Freeway, southeasterly on the Central Freeway to Mission, south on Mission to 14th, west on 14th to Valencia, south on Valencia to 17th, east on 17th to Mission, south on Mission to 19th, west on 19th to San Carlos, south on San Carlos to 21st, west on 21st to Valencia, south on Valencia to 25th, west on 25th to Poplar, south on Poplar to 26th, west on 26th to Dolores, south on Dolores to Randall, east on Randall to Mission, southwesterly on Mission to I-280, southwesterly on I-280 to Lyell, north on Lyell and northwesterly on Bosworth to O'Shaughnessy, northwesterly on O'Shaughnessy to Portola, east on Portola to Burnett, north on Burnett to Crestline (excluding CBs 1001, 1002, and 1003, CT 204.02), north on Crestline to an imaginary line running west connecting Crestline with Twin Peaks Blvd., northerly along Twin Peaks Blvd. to Clayton, north on Clayton to 17th, east on 17th Street to Roosevelt, northeasterly on Roosevelt to Loma Vista Terrace, north on Loma Vista Terrace to Upper Terrace, northeast on Upper Terrace to Buena Vista Avenue West, and northerly on Buena Vista Avenue West to Haight.

District 9. Mission and the Central Freeway, east on Central Freeway to Harrison, northeast on Harrison to 11th, southeast on 11th to Division, east on Division to San Bruno, south on San Bruno to Mariposa, east on Mariposa to Hwy. 101, southerly on Hwy. 101 to Cesar Chavez, east on Cesar Chavez to Bayshore Blvd., southerly on Bayshore Blvd. to Silver, west on Silver to Hwy. 101, south on Hwy. 101 to Paul, northwest on Paul to San Bruno, south on San Bruno to Mansell, west on Mansell to Brazil, westerly on Brazil to the western border of McLaren Park, northerly on the western border of McLaren Park to Burrows, east on Burrows to Peru, northwesterly on Peru to Valmar Terrace, northeast on Valmar Terrace to Madison, northwest on Madison to Silver, east on Silver to Sunglow Lane, northerly on Sunglow Lane to Gladstone, west on Gladstone to Stoneyford, north on Stoneyford to Cambridge, east two blocks on Cambridge to an imaginary line running north connecting Cambridge with I-280, west on I-280 to Mission, northeast on Mission to Randall, west on Randall to Dolores, north on Dolores to 26th, east on 26th to Poplar, north on Poplar to 25th, east on 25th to Valencia, north on Valencia to 21st, east on 21st to San Carlos, north on San Carlos to 19th, east on 19th to Mission, north on Mission to 17th, west on 17th to Valencia, north on Valencia to 14th, east on 14th to Mission, north on Mission to the Central Freeway.

District 10. San Bruno and 16th Street, east on 16th Street to I-280, southeast on I-280 to Mariposa, east on Mariposa to Terry A. Francois, northeast on Terry A. Francois to 16th Street, east on an imaginary linr (an extension of 16th Street) connecting Terry A. Francois Blvd. with the waterfront. southerly on the waterfront to the San Mateo County line, west on the San Mateo County line to Carter, northeast on Carter to Geneva, northwest on Geneva to the western boundary of McLaren Park, northerly along the western border of McLaren Park (excluding the Crocker Amazon Playgrounds and soccer fields and the City Arts and Tech High School and June Jordan School for Equity) to Persia, easterly on Persia to Mansell, east on Mansell to San Bruno, north on San Bruno to Paul, southeast on Paul to Hwy. 101, north on Hwy. 101 to Silver, east on Silver to Bayshore Blvd., northerly on Bayshore Blvd. to Cesar Chavez, west on Cesar Chavez to Hwy. 101, northerly on Hwy.101 to Mariposa, west on Mariposa to San Bruno, and north on San Bruno to 16th Street.

District 11. Junipero Serra and Holloway, east on Holloway to Ashton, north on Ashton to Ocean, southeast on Ocean to I-280, northeasterly on I-280 to an imaginary line running south connecting I-280 with Cambridge, west on two blocks Cambridge to Stoneyford, south on Stoneyford to Gladstone, east on Gladstone to Sunglow Lane, southerly on Sunglow Lane to Silver, west on Silver to Madison, southeast on Madison to Valmar Terrace, southwest on Valmar Terrace to Peru, southeasterly on Peru to Burrows, west on Burrows to the western border of McLaren Park, southerly along the western border of McLaren Park to Persia (including the City Arts and Tech High School and June Jordan School for Equity), easterly on Brazil to Persia, westerly on Persia to the western border of McLaren Park, southerly along the western border of McLaren Park to Geneva (including the Crocker Amazon Playgrounds and Soccer Fields), southeast on Geneva to Carter, southwest on Carter to the San Mateo County line, west on the San Mateo County line to I-280, northeasterly on I-280 to Alemany, west on Alemany to Brotherhood Way, west on Brotherhood Way to Junipero Serra, and north on Junipero Serra to Holloway.

APPENDIX 2

Minority Report

Date: February 16, 2022

To: Charles Head, CSFN President; Richard Frisbee, CSFN Board Member, George Wooding, CSFN GR/Elections Committee Chair; Coalition of SF Neighborhoods

From: Diana Taylor, BCNA President; Lee Robbins, CSFN Delegate, Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association
Eileen Boken, CSFN Delegate, Sunset-Parkside Education & Action Committee (SPEAK)

Re: **Minority Report to CSFN Redistricting Map/Report**

As CSFN developed its redistricting proposal, it was unable take into account the views of some members due to time constraints and other factors. Accordingly, several of its members voted "No" on CSFN proposed plan. Members who do not support the CSFN proposal include:

- Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA) in District 3
- Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD) in District 3
- Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee (SPEAK) in District 4

While District 3 (D3) is of particular interest, there are concerns with the CSFN map for other districts (e.g., D4 and western SF neighborhoods).

On behalf of D3, the Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA) has testified before the Redistricting Task Force and has submitted a letter and map recommending quite different boundaries from the CSFN map. In addition, Russian Hill Neighbors (RHN) has submitted a letter to the Redistricting Task Force conforming to the BCNA position. CSFN member SPEAK on the Westside is in solidarity with BCNA and RHN proposals. Furthermore, other District 3 neighborhood organizations (e.g., North Beach Neighbors) appear in general support of the RHN/BCNA position even though they have not issued a formal position.

<u>The BCNA proposal for D3 includes the following</u> (the full report was submitted to SF Redistricting Task Force, 1/28/22):

The best option for increasing District 3's area is to move the northern portion of D3's western boundary to Van Ness by incorporating the section bounded by Van Ness, Union St, Jones-Columbus- Leavenworth and the Bay into D3. See proposed Map below. This proposal offers several significant benefits:

- Unites the Russian Hill neighborhood, which is currently split between D3 and D2 (as proposed by RHN)
- Connects Ghirardelli Square and the Cannery with other D3 waterfront and tourist attractions (Fisherman's Wharf, North Beach, Coit Tower, Chinatown and Union Square).
- Includes a high concentration of dense housing and is served by police boundaries (SFPD Central Station) with similar tenant and safety concerns.
- Meets the district population requirement set by the Task Force (within 1% of the ideal number).

<u>A map of 2022 proposed district 3 boundaries (Included in BCNA report to Redistricting Task Force):</u>



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_022020221808_KL

Plan name: KL

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: current_draft

General comments: Please keep the St. Mary's Park neighborhood in Bernal Heights part of District 9 as it recently was.

Submitted by: Kimberly Lauer

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
10	8.36	
7	-5.46	
1	-8.42	
2	-4.0	
6	30.03	
4	-8.5	
3	-8.89	
9	-4.6	
8	4.05	
5	1.49	
11	-4.05	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 10

% Deviation : 8.36

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 7

% Deviation : -5.46

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 1

% Deviation : -8.42

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 2

% Deviation : -4.0

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 6

% Deviation : 30.03

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 4

% Deviation : -8.5

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 3

% Deviation : -8.89

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 9

% Deviation : -4.6

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 8

% Deviation : 4.05

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 5

% Deviation : 1.49

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 11

% Deviation : -4.05

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_021920221793_VVCU's Visitacion Valley COI

Plan name: VVCU's Visitacion Valley COI

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: Visitacion Valley Community Unity (VVCU) is a coalition to help Visitacion Valley's residents, groups and organizations come together, work together, and stand together in unity to change social policy, increase educational standards, improve financial opportunity and stabilize families - "We're Better Together" Visitacion Valley historically is composed of Sunnydale, Visitacion Valley and Little Hollywood. It is border by Mansell on the North, McLaren Park/Sunnydale/La Grande on the West, Geneva/County Line on the South, HW101 on the East. VVCU's Visitacion Valley COI has similar demographics and social-economic status on low income, People of Color and immigrants. It is one of the most marginalized communities in SF with two of the lowest performing schools in the City as well as the State. Naming this COI can help preserve the low income community for resource allocation and be vigilant on unreasonable gentrification.

Submitted by: Visitacion Valley Community Unity

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

historically is composed of Sunnydale, Visitacion Valley and Little Hollywood. It is a COI that has similar low income, People of Color, imm

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : VVCU's Visitacion Valley COI

% Deviation : -72.52

Comments : Visitacion Valley historically is composed of Sunnydale, Visitacion Valley and Little Hollywood. It is a COI that has similar low income, People of Color, immigrants and is one of the most marginalized communities in SF.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_021920221792_BHP's D10 Plan - Portola, Visitacion Valley, Bayview

Plan name: BHP's D10 Plan - Portola, Visitacion Valley, Bayview

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: BetterHousingPolicies.org (BHP) is a nonprofit 501(c)(4) organization advocating for better housing and quality of lives for the Chinese and general communities. BHP's D10 Plan is the boundary map for District 10. It is composed of Portola, Visitacion Valley, Portola Place, Bayveiw, and Hunters Point. This District 10 map is bound by HW280 on the West, Caesar Chavez/Islais Creek Channel on the North, the Bay on the East, Geneva/County Line on the South. District 10 under this map represents uniformed similarities in social economic status and demographics, and is mostly composed of lower-moderate income residents and People of Color of Asian Americans (45.65%), Latino Americans (24.52%) and African Americans (16.85%). It has a laser focus on equity that could result in dramatically more resource allocation. It avoids the pitfall of the current District 10 map that includes neighborhoods with large income disparity, which results in the disadvantaged neighborhoods being named the "forgotten valley", the "forgotten neighborhoods" and the "forgotten corner". It also fits nicely right below Potrero Boosters's proposed COI map with a shared border on Caesar Chavez.

Submitted by: BetterHousingPolicies.org

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
BHP's D10 Plan - Portola, Visitacion Valley, Bayview, Hunters Point	-2.69	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : BHP's D10 Plan - Portola, Visitacion Valley, Bayview, Hunters Point

% Deviation : -2.69

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_021920221791_BHP's D10 Chinese COI

Plan name: BHP's D10 Chinese COI

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: BetterHousingPolicies.org (BHP) is a nonprofit 501(c)(4) organization advocating for better housing and quality of lives for the Chinese and general communities. BHP's Chinese COI for District 10 has 57.34% Asian, and is composed of Portola, Visitacion Valley and East Bayveiw. This COI is bound by HW280/Industrial/Oakdale on the North, Cambridge/McLaren Park on the West, Geneva on the South, and 3rd St on the East. With a COI built this way, it can request for the Chinese Culture District, as well as working closely with SFMTA to adjust routes to serve this community. Currently we have proposed to SFMTA to make adjustments on bus routes (#8, 8AX, 8BX, 9, 9R, 29, 44, 54, 56, T) to have a shuttle loop in these 3 neighborhoods and connect to routes that go to Chinatown. It'll make a lot of sense if these neighborhoods become a COI.

Submitted by: BetterHousingPolicies.org

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

7.34% Asian, and is composed of Portola, Visitacion Valley and East Bayveiw. This COI is bound by HW280/Industrial/Oakdale on the Nort

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : BHP's D10 Chinese COI

% Deviation : -37.45

Comments : BHPâ□□s Chinese COI for District 10 has 57.34% Asian, and is composed of Portola, Visitacion Valley and East Bayveiw. This COI is bound by HW280/Industrial/Oakdale on the North, Cambridge/McLaren Park on the West, Geneva on the South, and 3rd St on the



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_021920221723_Visitacion Valley

Plan name: Visitacion Valley

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: BetterHousingPolicies.org (BHP) is a nonprofit 501(c)(4) organization advocating for better housing and quality of lives for the Chinese and general communities. BHP's Visitacion Valley COI for District 10 is composed of Sunnydale, Visitacion Valley and Little Hollywood. This COI is bound by Mansell on the North, McLaren Park/Sunnydale/La Grande/ on the West, Geneva on the South, and HW101 on the East. BHP's Visitacion Valley COI covers the neighborhoods where Visitacion Valley Community Unity (VVCU, VVCU.org) operates. It is historically an integral neighborhood.

Submitted by: BetterHousingPolicies.org

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

s

Valley historically is composed of Sunnydale, Visitacion Valley and Little Hollywood. It is a COI that has similar low income, People of Colo

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Visitacion Valley COI

% Deviation : -73.07

Comments : Visitacion Valley historically is composed of Sunnydale, Visitacion Valley and Little Hollywood. It is a COI that has similar low income, People of Color, immigrant and most marginalized communities.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_021620221699_D4 District Additions

Plan name: D4 District Additions

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: current_draft

General comments: There are some natural barriers like the ocean, Golden Gate Park, KFK Drive, 9th Ave, Kirkham, 19th Ave and Below Sloat to the border with San Mateo County and Daily City. Clean lines and envelope more folks who already identify as D4 residents and dine and shop there already.

Submitted by: Martin Rawlings-Fein

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
6	8.36	
1	-8.55	
4	19.27	
7	-28.02	
2	-8.42	
10	8.36	
3	-4.0	
11	8.36	
9	8.36	
8	-4.05	
5	-3.59	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 2

% Deviation : -8.42

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 10

% Deviation : 8.36

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 7

% Deviation : -28.02

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 6

% Deviation : 8.36

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 3

% Deviation : -4.0

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 1

% Deviation : -8.55

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 4

% Deviation : 19.27

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 11

% Deviation : 8.36

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 9

% Deviation : 8.36

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 8

% Deviation : -4.05

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : 5

% Deviation : -3.59

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_021620221320_D4 to 7th

Plan name: D4 to 7th

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: In order to meet population requirements this plan expands the section of District 4 east of 19th Avenue (Lincoln Way to Judah Street, 19th Ave to 17th Ave) eastward to 7th Avenue and southward to Kirkham St. The Inner Sunset is well known and understood as a key part of the Sunset District. The plan unites most of the Inner Sunset with Central and Outer Sunset (aka “The Avenues”). At 1% this plan adheres closely to the ideal population for the District and keeps the Chinese Cultural District intact.

Submitted by: Ken Rackow for D4ward

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D4	1.0	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D4

% Deviation : 1.0

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyBoardSupervisors_SD_021520221664_BHP's D4 Plan - Chinese + Lowell COI

Plan name: BHP's D4 Plan - Chinese + Lowell COI

District type: Supervisorial District

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This is the D4 Redistricting Submission by BetterHousingPolicies.org. It includes Chinese COI in Inner Sunset West of Funston, for the D4's Chinese Culture District. It also includes the area of Lowell High School, most student in Lowell are from D4

Submitted by: Christy Tam, BetterHousingPolicies.org

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Redistricting Task Force : Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D4 by BHP - Chinese + Lowell COI	0.39	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Map tiles by Stamen Design, CC BY 3.0 -- Map data (C) OpenStreetMap contributors

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D4 by BHP - Chinese + Lowell COI

% Deviation : 0.39

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_021220221597_Increasing District Coherence

Plan name: Increasing District Coherence

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: this district map would do a better job keeping neighborhoods whole. D 1 would retain the Richmond and Lone Mountain. D 2 would absorb polk gulch. D 3 would be focused on Chinatown and North Beach and would absorb Transbay, Rincon Hill, South Beach, and Treasure Island, D4 would remain primarily the Outer Sunset, D5 would lose the Inner Sunset and Cole Valley to D 8 but D 5 would gain lower Pac Heights and areas near Hayes Valley. D 6 would include Tenderloin, Western SoMa, Showplace Square, and Mission Bay, D 7 would lose parts of the Inner Sunset but add Glen Park, D8 would move west with its eastern edge at Dolores and would include Cole Valley and the Inner Sunset, D9 would center on the Mission and Bernal, D 10 would remain made up of Bayview Hunters Point, Potrero, Dog Patch, and Visitacion Valley while D 11 would remain largely the same while adding the Portola.

Compliance check:

Submitted by:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D 5	-3.06	
D 1	-2.0	
D 3	-1.09	
D 2	0.32	
D 7	0.74	
D 11	0.69	
D 4	0.75	
D 10	1.49	
D 6	-0.4	
D 8	1.97	
D 9	0.6	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 6

% Deviation : -0.4

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 5

% Deviation : -3.06

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 1

% Deviation : -2.0

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 3

% Deviation : -1.09

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 2

% Deviation : 0.32

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 7

% Deviation : 0.74

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 11

% Deviation : 0.69

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 4

% Deviation : 0.75

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 8

% Deviation : 1.97

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 9

% Deviation : 0.6

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 10

% Deviation : 1.49

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_021120221586_TL in D6

Plan name: TL in D6

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This district plan would ensure various racially diverse districts. It would keep the Tenderloin in D 6 along with Western SoMa and Mission Bay. Eastern SoMa and Treasure Island would Move to D3. Polk Gulch would move to D 2. D8 would absorb Cole Valley and part of the Inner Sunset. D 11 would take over Portola while D9 would expand west to Dolores street.

Compliance check:

Submitted by:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D 6	0.7	
D 1	-1.29	
D 9	-1.62	
D 10	0.57	
D 3	-1.09	
D 4	1.36	
D 7	2.97	
D 2	-0.67	
D 5	-2.78	
D 8	-0.88	
D 11	2.72	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 9

% Deviation : -1.62

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 10

% Deviation : 0.57

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 6

% Deviation : 0.7

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 3

% Deviation : -1.09

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 1

% Deviation : -1.29

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 4

% Deviation : 1.36

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 7

% Deviation : 2.97

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 2

% Deviation : -0.67

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 8

% Deviation : -0.88

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 5

% Deviation : -2.78

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 11

% Deviation : 2.72

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_020920221528_SOMA Pot Patch 94107

Plan name: SOMA Pot Patch 94107

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This new district, "SOMA Pot Patch 94107 (Rev)", is contiguous, diverse, comprises parts of current D10 & D6, and includes all of zip 94107. It keeps together historic Potrero Hill & Dogpatch and unites them with the vibrant tech/biotech hub of SOMA, where many Pot Patch residents work. It is bounded on the northwest by Mission St, on the west by Potrero Av, on the south by Napoleon and Islais Creek, and on the east by San Francisco Bay.

Compliance check:

Submitted by:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
SOMA Pot Patch 94107 (Rev)	-0.15	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : SOMA Pot Patch 94107 (Rev)

% Deviation : -0.15

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

BARBARY COAST
NEIGHBORHOOD
ASSOCIATION

BCNA
550 Davis Street, Box 6
San Francisco, CA 94111
www.bcnasf.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

David Albert
Bill Hannan
Karen Scarr
Diana Taylor

MEMBERS AT LARGE

Adam Bergman
Bob Harrer
Michele Hennessey
Lee Robbins
James Seff
Michael Velzo

January 28, 2022

To: SF Redistricting Task Force

From: Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association

Re: District 3 (D3) Redistricting Proposal

The current District 3 encompasses many of the sights and activities that people associate with San Francisco. Its identity is strongly linked to tourism. D3's entire eastern and northern perimeter along the waterfront features famous attractions such as the Ferry Building, the Exploratorium, Alcatraz Tours, Pier 39 and Fisherman's Wharf. Inland lie North Beach restaurants, Pioneer Park & Coit Tower views, Chinatown shops and Union Square's hotels & shopping.

If D3 boundaries need to be adjusted outward, its neighborhoods have vastly greater affinity with neighborhoods to the west, not south. The best option for increasing its area is to incorporate the section bounded by Van Ness, Union St, Jones-Columbus-Leavenworth and the Bay into D3. [Proposed Map submitted online to Task Force]. This would make Van Ness Avenue – a natural dividing line – the district's western boundary.

As presented in the SF Redistricting Task Force materials, the ideal redistricting population in one district is 79,545 people. The Task Force directions say proposed new districts should be within 5%, at most, of the ideal number. The population of D3 with the current boundaries is 72,474 or 8.9% below the ideal number. If we extend the northwestern boundary to Van Ness, D3's population would be 78,908 a mere 0.8% below the ideal.

Moving the northern portion of D3's western boundary to Van Ness offers several benefits. This plan would unite the Russian Hill neighborhood, which is currently split between D3 and D2. It would also connect Ghirardelli Square and the Cannery with other similar waterfront attractions. And this expanded D3 community includes a high concentration of dense housing and is served by police boundaries (SFPD Central Station) with similar tenant and safety concerns. Furthermore, this proposal would meet the district population requirement set by the Task Force (within 1% of the ideal number). Such an adjustment to D3's boundaries would bring together related communities that have profound interests in common. It would be a natural and logical re-arrangement; in short, a common-sense solution.

Diana Taylor, BCNA President on behalf of BCNA Board of Directors

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_012820221239_D3 draft 1

Plan name: D3 draft 1

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: Please see letter from Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA) dated January 28, 2022. This map moves the northern portion of D3's western boundary to Van Ness, thus incorporating a unified Russian Hill neighborhood and tourism activities like the Cannery/Ghirardelli along the northern waterfront.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_012820221239_D3 draft 1

Plan name: D3 draft 1

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: Please see letter from Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association (BCNA) dated January 28, 2022. This map moves the northern portion of D3's western boundary to Van Ness, thus incorporating a unified Russian Hill neighborhood and tourism activities like the Cannery/Ghirardelli along the northern waterfront.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D3 #2	-0.8	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D3 #2

% Deviation : -0.8

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_012720221299_TL in D 3

Plan name: TL in D 3

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: this map solves the problem of how to deal with the large growth in D 6 by moving the Tenderloin into D 3. This means that D 2 takes more of Russian Hill, Polk Gulch, Nob Hill, and Fisherman's Wharf. D 5 extends to lower Pacific heights while D 8 would lose part of the Mission and Glen Park and gain Cole Valley and the Inner Sunset. Glen Park would become part of D7. D 9 would los the Portola which would shift mostly to D 10.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: N

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D 6	-1.88	
D 4	0.39	
D 5	-1.3	
D 2	2.0	
D 1	-0.67	
D 10	-0.92	
D 7	-0.1	
D 3	3.94	
D 8	-1.04	
D 9	-0.77	
D 11	-0.98	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 3

% Deviation : 3.94

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 2

% Deviation : 2.0

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 1

% Deviation : -0.67

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 5

% Deviation : -1.3

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 6

% Deviation : -1.88

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 4

% Deviation : 0.39

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 8

% Deviation : -1.04

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 10

% Deviation : -0.92

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 7

% Deviation : -0.1

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 9

% Deviation : -0.77

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 11

% Deviation : -0.98

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_012620221295_District 3

Plan name: District 3

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
District 3	-2.28	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 3

% Deviation : -2.28

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_012620221077_Map 1

Plan name: Map 1

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
Downtown	0.08	
Richmond	5.18	
SE	3.89	
Soma East	-5.27	
Middle	1.51	
Sunset	-2.6	
Marina Pac Heights	-1.7	
Inner Sunset	0.69	
Mission Noe	3.47	
Bernal Sunnyside	-1.42	
Excell	8.05	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Soma East

% Deviation : -5.27

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Downtown

% Deviation : 0.08

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Mission Noe

% Deviation : 3.47

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Bernal Sunnyside

% Deviation : -1.42

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Middle

% Deviation : 1.51

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Inner Sunset

% Deviation : 0.69

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Marina Pac Heights

% Deviation : -1.7

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Richmond

% Deviation : 5.18

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : SE

% Deviation : 3.89

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Excell

% Deviation : 8.05

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : Sunset

% Deviation : -2.6

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_012220221127_Communities Map

Plan name: Communities Map

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This map tries to keep communities of interest together, while still reflecting SF's diverse population in each district. The new districts should be much more diverse than the current set, while BIPOC communities are largely kept whole.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: N

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D3	-4.49	
D6	-1.75	
D2	-5.42	
D5	-0.34	
D7	2.81	
D9	-1.98	
D4	4.47	
D10	0.61	
D1	1.68	
D11	-0.51	
D8	4.92	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D6

% Deviation : -1.75

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D2

% Deviation : -5.42

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D3

% Deviation : -4.49

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D5

% Deviation : -0.34

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D7

% Deviation : 2.81

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D11

% Deviation : -0.51

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D9

% Deviation : -1.98

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D8

% Deviation : 4.92

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D4

% Deviation : 4.47

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D10

% Deviation : 0.61

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D1

% Deviation : 1.68

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_012220221116_West Soma in D5

Plan name: West Soma in D5

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This plan resolves issues around D6 by D5 absorbing West Soma including Hub and Division corridor, Russian Hill and Portola are unified, Cathedral Hill goes to D2, D1 expands east, minor changes to D7, D8, D9, D11, D10 loses half of Portola. D4 gains Inner Sunset. This plan keeps many communities of interest together in their existing districts.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D6	1.93	
d8	-1.34	
District 1	-0.41	
D7	-4.15	
District 2	-1.83	
D11	0.24	
D10	1.15	
District 3	3.75	
D4	-2.05	
D9	0.9	
District 5	0.49	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D9

% Deviation : 0.9

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D10

% Deviation : 1.15

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 3

% Deviation : 3.75

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D6

% Deviation : 1.93

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : d8

% Deviation : -1.34

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 1

% Deviation : -0.41

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D7

% Deviation : -4.15

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 2

% Deviation : -1.83

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D11

% Deviation : 0.24

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 5

% Deviation : 0.49

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D4

% Deviation : -2.05

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_012120221060_Strengthening Communities of Color

Plan name: Strengthening Communities of Color

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This plan would particularly strengthen representation of the Black, Latino, and Asian population. by placing Tenderloin, Western Addition Fillmore, and Japantown together, D5 would have greater Black, Latino, and Asian representation. D10 would similarly have strong Black, Asian and Latino representation while D 11's strength with Asian and Latino voters would be strengthened. The Latino population in D 9 would be Strengthened while D 6, D 3, D7, D 1, and D 4 would all have significant white and asian populations while being majority people of color. only Districts 2 and 8 would be majority white.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: N

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D 5	-0.97	
D 7	1.74	
D 3	0.12	
D 10	3.41	
D 4	1.0	
D 1	-1.79	
D 2	-2.89	
D 6	-0.84	
D 9	-1.46	
D 11	0.21	
D 8	1.45	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 3

% Deviation : 0.12

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 6

% Deviation : -0.84

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 10

% Deviation : 3.41

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 9

% Deviation : -1.46

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 4

% Deviation : 1.0

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 7

% Deviation : 1.74

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 11

% Deviation : 0.21

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 1

% Deviation : -1.79

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 2

% Deviation : -2.89

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 5

% Deviation : -0.97

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 8

% Deviation : 1.45

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_012020221053_District 5 WRO

Plan name: District 5 WRO

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: Here is my secondary input on the district 5 based on consistent geography, character, etc. In my last one it looks like I missed a few internal blocks that should have been selected to make it contiguous. I think this reflect better the consistent values and culture of a ""new"" district 5. I did vet this with a few neighbors via the Cole Valley Facebook page and they agreed. Hopefully this input is considered in drawing more representative lines. The current district 5 proposal breaks up Cole Valley which is a core neighborhood in district 5."

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
District 5 WRO	3.24	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 5 WRO

% Deviation : 3.24

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_012020221020_Bills district 5

Plan name: Bills district 5

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: Here is my input on the district 5 based on consistent geography, character, etc. I think this reflect better the consistent values and culture of a "new" district 5. I did vet this with a few neighbors via the Cole Valley Facebook page and they agreed. Hopefully this input is considered in drawing more representative lines. The current district 5 proposal breaks up Cole Valley which is a core neighborhood in district 5.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
New district 5	-2.71	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : New district 5

% Deviation : -2.71

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_01172022961_JS1

Plan name: JS1

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
1	-202.35	Sea Cliff and adjacent Presidio voters should be included with the Richmond DIstrict

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_01142022875_TL in D6

Plan name: TL in D6

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This plan works to keep the core of each district intact. For example, D3, the historic northeast corner of the City remains intact rather than spilt. D6's large growth is resolved by moving Western Soma to D9 which took on most of the old D6 last redistricting. D10's growth is resolved by removing Lower Potrero Hill to D9 and Dogpatch to D6. Portola moves from D11 from D9 to compensate for these changes. Other flow through changes made to other districts including D7 gaining some of western D11. D4 adds some of the Inner Sunset. D8 and D5 borders move around and D2 takes on Lower Pacific Heights, Japantown and Cathedral Hill. D1 takes all of the Richmond District, Seacliff and Baker Beach in the Presidio.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
District 3	-0.06	Both sides of Market Street Downtown and filling out of Geary and O'farrell.
District 1	-1.57	
District 9	0.57	
District 11	-0.2	
District 2	-1.62	
District 7	2.5	
District 4	-0.25	
District 5	-4.32	
District 6	1.32	
District 10	-1.26	
District 8	-0.31	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 3

% Deviation : -0.06

Comments : Both sides of Market Street Downtown and filling out of Geary and O'farrell.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 6

% Deviation : 1.32

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 9

% Deviation : 0.57

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 10

% Deviation : -1.26

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 8

% Deviation : -0.31

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 5

% Deviation : -4.32

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 1

% Deviation : -1.57

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 7

% Deviation : 2.5

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 2

% Deviation : -1.62

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 4

% Deviation : -0.25

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 11

% Deviation : -0.2

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_01142022852_Test

Plan name: Test

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This plan reflects how I navigate the city as a transit rider and cyclist. I've tried to draw districts that reflect how transit lines draw communities together, while honoring topography, history, and residential patterns.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

arkside neighborhood to increase continuity among area served by L, K, M and T transit lines, converging around West Portal / St. Francis C
ast-west to increase continuity among neighborhoods that are close to downtown. Mission Bay is now connected to Dogpatch/Potrero rathe
ast-west to enhance continuity of neighborhoods served by the N line. Also enhances continuity of residential hills around UCSF.
e more compact, incorporating areas under the Octavia & Market Plan while retaining close neighborhoods connections. From Hayes & Div
district with better continuity among southeastern neighborhoods.
ly to account for population change, absorbing Anza Vista and other neighborhoods along the vital 38 bus route.
l Heights, which is tied to Noe Valley and the Castro by bus 24 and the J line, and by similar housing patterns.
change, District 3 absorbs parts of SoMa, including Yerba Buena, Financial District South, and waterfront areas north of the Bay Bridge. Ne
tly smaller to account for population change but retains continuity between Tenderloin, Mid-Market, and western SoMa.
istrict 3 better reflects the topography of Russian Hill.
yside with Mission Terrace (reflecting the "Outer Mission" as defined by SF Planning). Includes walksheds of important transit lines (14, J/M

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 6

% Deviation : -0.52

Comments : This district gets significantly smaller to account for population change but retains continuity between Tenderloin, Mid-Market, and western SoMa.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 4

% Deviation : -0.79

Comments : This district is reoriented east-west to enhance continuity of neighborhoods served by the N line. Also enhances continuity of residential hills around UCSF.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 7

% Deviation : -0.08

Comments : This district absorbs the Parkside neighborhood to increase continuity among area served by L, K, M and T transit lines, converging around West Portal / St. Francis Circle.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 11

% Deviation : -0.29

Comments : This district reunites Sunnyside with Mission Terrace (reflecting the "Outer Mission" as defined by SF Planning). Includes walksheds of important transit lines (14, J/M, Balboa Park Bart).



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 10

% Deviation : -0.79

Comments : A geographically compact district with better continuity among southeastern neighborhoods.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 9

% Deviation : -0.82

Comments : This district is reoriented east-west to increase continuity among neighborhoods that are close to downtown. Mission Bay is now connected to Dogpatch/Potrero rather than SoMa, and tied to the Mission via rerouted Bus 22.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 8

% Deviation : -0.93

Comments : This district absorbs Bernal Heights, which is tied to Noe Valley and the Castro by bus 24 and the J line, and by similar housing patterns.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 3

% Deviation : -0.91

Comments : Accounting for population change, District 3 absorbs parts of SoMa, including Yerba Buena, Financial District South, and waterfront areas north of the Bay Bridge. New Central Subway connects Chinatown and 4th Street.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 2

% Deviation : -0.96

Comments : New eastern border with District 3 better reflects the topography of Russian Hill.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 1

% Deviation : -0.95

Comments : This district expands slightly to account for population change, absorbing Anza Vista and other neighborhoods along the vital 38 bus route.



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : District 5

% Deviation : -1.0

Comments : This district is redrawn to be more compact, incorporating areas under the Octavia & Market Plan while retaining close neighborhoods connections. From Hayes & Divisadero, nothing is more than a 30-minute walk.

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_01112022800_Fair plan

Plan name: Fair plan

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D6	0.06	
D3	-3.36	
D9	0.28	
D4	-0.44	
D11	1.73	
D2	-1.04	
D1	0.43	
D7	1.73	
D10	0.96	
D8	-0.76	
D5	0.39	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D3

% Deviation : -3.36

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D9

% Deviation : 0.28

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D6

% Deviation : 0.06

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D4

% Deviation : -0.44

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D7

% Deviation : 1.73

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D5

% Deviation : 0.39

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D11

% Deviation : 1.73

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D2

% Deviation : -1.04

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D1

% Deviation : 0.43

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D8

% Deviation : -0.76

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D10

% Deviation : 0.96

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_01092022761_Equity Plan 2022

Plan name: Equity Plan 2022

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: My goal for this map was to improve racial equity across San Francisco. I approached this in two ways: 1. Maintaining existing majority-minority districts 2. Reducing the non-Hispanic white population in districts where it is currently 50% or higher I measured my work against the San Francisco Planning Department's report titled "San Francisco Neighborhoods Socio-Economic Profiles 2012-2016", which reports data at the level of individual supervisorial districts. In my view, I largely succeeded at this effort. The average non-Hispanic white population among today's 11 districts is 48.64% according to SF Planning. Under this set of maps, the redistricting tool shows a new average of 44.72%. Further, the number of districts with a non-Hispanic white population greater than 50% has been reduced from 4 to 2. The districts proposed in this submission are more equitable than the status quo and more accurately reflect San Francisco's diverse population.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D8	-1.3	
D9	3.21	
D3	-1.6	
D5	1.72	
D1	-4.17	
D2	4.22	
D10	-0.97	
D4	-3.18	
D7	-1.67	
D11	3.05	
D6	0.7	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D6

% Deviation : 0.7

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D3

% Deviation : -1.6

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D10

% Deviation : -0.97

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D4

% Deviation : -3.18

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D7

% Deviation : -1.67

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D11

% Deviation : 3.05

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D8

% Deviation : -1.3

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D5

% Deviation : 1.72

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D9

% Deviation : 3.21

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D1

% Deviation : -4.17

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D2

% Deviation : 4.22

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_12272021614_SF

Plan name: SF

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: N

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D2	-7.6	
D6	5.49	
D7	-0.37	
D10	6.63	
D4	-0.22	
D1	-1.77	
D5	-6.57	
D3	6.15	
D11	-0.6	
D9	0.47	
D8	-1.81	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D1

% Deviation : -1.77

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D5

% Deviation : -6.57

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D2

% Deviation : -7.6

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D3

% Deviation : 6.15

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D6

% Deviation : 5.49

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D7

% Deviation : -0.37

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D11

% Deviation : -0.6

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D10

% Deviation : 6.63

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D9

% Deviation : 0.47

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D4

% Deviation : -0.22

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D8

% Deviation : -1.81

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_12202021552_TL in D5

Plan name: TL in D5

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This plan puts the Tenderloin in D 5. As a result the Haight and Cole valley move out of D 5 into D 8. D 9 would extend west to Dolores. D6 would focus on SoMa, Mission Bay, Dog Patch, and most of Potrero Hill. Portola would shift from D 9 into D 10. The inner Sunset would be split between D7 and D 4. This plan resolves the problem of too much population in the current D 6 by focusing D 6 on the areas with more recent development and more population growth while focusing D 5 on the Western addition and Tenderloin, areas with diverse populations, a lot of affordable housing, and more historic, older neighborhoods.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D3	-2.13	
D7	3.3	
D1	-2.15	
D2	-2.06	
D3	-100.0	
D4	0.75	
D5	0.12	
D5	-1.21	
D10	-0.82	
D3	-3.72	
D1	-1.19	
D4	1.36	
D7	1.74	
D6	0.98	
D2	-5.14	
D10	1.9	
D6	-1.58	
D8	0.76	
D9	-1.12	
D11	2.29	
D8	2.98	
D11	0.59	
D9	0.51	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D5

% Deviation : -1.21

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D9

% Deviation : -1.12

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D6

% Deviation : 0.98

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D10

% Deviation : -0.82

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D3

% Deviation : -3.72

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D1

% Deviation : -1.19

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D4

% Deviation : 1.36

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D7

% Deviation : 1.74

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D11

% Deviation : 2.29

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D8

% Deviation : 2.98

Comments :


Fulton Street
Oak Street
Fell Street
Oak Street
Oak Street
Fell Street
Oak Street
Dutoma Avenue
Clayton Street
Cole Street
Parnassus Avenue
Carl Street
Stanyan Street
Arguello Boulevard
Funston Avenue
Crossover Drive
Kezar Drive
Transverse Drive
Conservatory Drive East
Conservatory Drive West
Conservatory Drive East
Conservatory Drive West
Conservatory Drive East
Conservatory Drive West

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D2

% Deviation : -5.14

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_12122021552_TL in D5

Plan name: TL in D5

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: The fundamental issue facing redistricting is that D6 has grown in population far faster than all other districts and D6 must change. This plan moves most of the Tenderloin into D5, which would also include Fillmore/ Western Addition, Hayes Valley, Japantown, NOPA, and Anza Vista. the Haight and Cole valley would move into D8. While the Eastern boundary of D8 would be come part of D9, adding blocks between Dolores and Valencia to D9. Glen Park would shift from D8 to D7. Portola would move to D10. Potrero Hill would be split with the northern part in D6 while the southern part would be in D10.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: N

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D6	0.98	
D2	-5.14	
D5	-1.21	
D10	-0.82	
D3	-3.72	
D1	-1.19	
D4	1.36	
D7	1.74	
D9	-1.12	
D11	2.29	
D8	2.98	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D5

% Deviation : -1.21

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D9

% Deviation : -1.12

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D6

% Deviation : 0.98

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D10

% Deviation : -0.82

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D3

% Deviation : -3.72

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D1

% Deviation : -1.19

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D4

% Deviation : 1.36

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D7

% Deviation : 1.74

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D11

% Deviation : 2.29

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D8

% Deviation : 2.98

Comments :


Fulton Street
Oak Street
Fell Street
Oak Street
Oak Street
Fell Street
Oak Street
Dutoma Avenue
Clayton Street
Cole Street
Parnassus Avenue
Carl Street
Stanyan Street
Arguello Boulevard
Funston Avenue
Crossover Drive
Kezar Drive
Transverse Drive
Conservatory Drive East
Conservatory Drive West
Conservatory Drive East
Conservatory Drive West
Conservatory Drive East
Conservatory Drive West

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D2

% Deviation : -5.14

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_12032021512_ TL in D 3

Plan name: TL in D 3

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: This plan resolves the challenge of how to shrink D 6, where there has been a lot of population growth, by moving the Tenderloin into D 3. This means that more of Polk Gulch, Russian Hill, and Nob Hill have to move into D 2. Other notable changes are that Cole Valley and UCSF would move into D 8, creating a continuous area around Buena Vista Park and served by the N Judah. D 6 would shrink to focus on SoMA and Mission Bay. Most other districts would see limited changes.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D 1	0.24	
D 7	-1.6	
D 3	4.68	
D 5	-3.93	
D 6	-0.27	
D 9	0.28	
D 10	1.86	
D 2	2.18	
D 4	0.59	
D 8	-2.93	
D 11	-1.5	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 6

% Deviation : -0.27

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 9

% Deviation : 0.28

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 10

% Deviation : 1.86

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 3

% Deviation : 4.68

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 2

% Deviation : 2.18

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 1

% Deviation : 0.24

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 4

% Deviation : 0.59

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 8

% Deviation : -2.93

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 5

% Deviation : -3.93

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 7

% Deviation : -1.6

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 11

% Deviation : -1.5

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_12022021501_TL in D1

Plan name: TL in D1

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: I made a mistake in Plan Name and and this should say Tenderloin in D 5 which the most significant part of this plan. Given the population growth in District 6, deciding how to shrink the district is the central challenge of redistricting. In this plan the Tenderloin would move into D 5 along with Western Addition/ Fillmore, Hayes Valley, Japantown, Alamo Square, and NOPA. D 5 would lose the Haight and Cole Valley, which would move into D8. D8's eastern edge would be Dolores street rather than Valencia and the portion of the Mission that used to be in D 8 would shift to D 9. Glen Park would shift out of D 8 into D 7 and Portola would shift from D 9 into D 10. Other than these changes, districts would be very similar to how they appear today.

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: Y

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
D 7	2.06	
D 11	3.38	
D 6	-4.84	
D 5	-1.13	
D 1	-2.25	
D 3	-1.47	
D 9	0.18	
D 10	0.73	
D 2	-1.96	
D 4	2.43	
D 8	-1.96	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 3

% Deviation : -1.47

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 5

% Deviation : -1.13

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 9

% Deviation : 0.18

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 6

% Deviation : -4.84

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 10

% Deviation : 0.73

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 1

% Deviation : -2.25

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 2

% Deviation : -1.96

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 4

% Deviation : 2.43

Comments :

Lincoln Way
Lincoln Way
Lincoln Way

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 8

% Deviation : -1.96

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 7

% Deviation : 2.06

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : D 11

% Deviation : 3.38

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_12022021500_New SF Districts

Plan name: New SF Districts

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments:

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: N

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
New District 5	11.47	Ensures the black community of interest of the western addition together

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : New District 5

% Deviation : 11.47

Comments : Ensures the black community of interest of the western addition together

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

David Pilpel
2151 27th Ave
San Francisco CA 94116-1730

Chair Rev. Arnold Townsend and Members
Redistricting Task Force
1 Carlton B Goodlett Pl Ste 244
San Francisco CA 94102-4689

November 29, 2021

Re: My San Francisco Redistricting Map for 2022 (DP1), First Draft

Dear Chair Rev. Townsend and Members,

I am excited to share my first draft of a San Francisco Redistricting Map for 2022 (DP1). To determine the ideal population for each district (DP Ideal), I considered the census population change from 2010 to 2020, registration, and turnout (using voter data from November 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020 elections). Starting with the existing districts, I adjusted boundaries to improve compactness, keep communities and neighborhoods together, include (or split) institutions and parks where appropriate, and use freeways, large streets, and other natural borders as much as possible.

The general boundaries are (clockwise from the county line, northwest corner, or water's edge):

DP1 District 1: 33rd, California, 26th, Lake, 21st, California, Presidio, Bush, Divisadero, Sutter, Presidio, Post, Divisadero, Fulton, Cole, Grove, Shrader, Hayes, Stanyan, JFK, Kezar, MLK, Lincoln

DP1 District 2: Leavenworth, Jefferson, Jones, Broadway, Van Ness, Bush, Presidio, California, 21st, Lake, 26th, California, 33rd

DP1 District 3: Bryant, Beale, Harrison, 3rd, Folsom, 4th, Stockton, Geary, Van Ness, Broadway, Jones, Jefferson, Leavenworth

DP1 District 4: Lincoln, MLK, 9th, Irving, 17th, Kirkham, 19th, Eucalyptus, Middlefield, Lake Merced

DP1 District 5: Bush, Van Ness, S Van Ness, 14th, Valencia, Duboce, Castro, 14th, Roosevelt, 17th, Stanyan, Carl, Arguello, Irving, 9th, MLK, Kezar, JFK, Stanyan, Hayes, Shrader, Grove, Cole, Fulton, Divisadero, Post, Presidio, Sutter, Divisadero

DP1 District 6: TI, YBI, 16th, Terry Francois, Mariposa, Pennsylvania, 17th, Mississippi, 7th, King, Division, 8th, Mission, 9th, Market, Van Ness, Geary, Stockton, 4th, Folsom, 3rd, Harrison, Beale, Bryant

DP1 District 7: Kirkham, 8th, Lawton, 7th, Laguna Honda, Portola, O'Shaughnessy, Malta, Stillings, Martha, Baden, I-280, Alemany, Brotherhood, Lake Merced, Middlefield, Eucalyptus, 19th

DP1 District 8: Irving, Arguello, Carl, Stanyan, 17th, Roosevelt, 14th, Castro, Duboce, Valencia, 15th, Dolores, Day, San Jose, I-280, Baden, Martha, Stillings, Malta, O'Shaughnessy, Portola, Laguna Honda, 7th, Lawton, 8th, Kirkham, 17th

DP1 District 9: Market, 9th, Mission, 8th, Division, Potrero, Mariposa, Hampshire, 25th, Potrero, Cesar Chavez, Bayshore, Industrial, US-101, I-280, Baden, San Jose, Day, Dolores, 15th, Valencia, 14th, S Van Ness

DP1 District 10: Geneva, La Grande, Mansell, Visitacion, Raymond, Delta, Teddy, San Bruno, Paul, Bayshore, Cesar Chavez, Potrero, 25th, Hampshire, Mariposa, Potrero, Division, King, 7th, Mississippi, 17th, Pennsylvania, Mariposa, Terry Francois, 16th

DP1 District 11: Lake Merced, Brotherhood, Alemany, I-280, US-101, Industrial, Bayshore, Paul, San Bruno, Teddy, Delta, Raymond, Visitacion, Mansell, La Grande, Geneva

To summarize (Change is DP1 from 2020 Census and % Deviation is DP1 from Average):

District	2010 Population	2020 Census	DP Ideal	DP1	Change	% Deviation
1	69,703	72,848	81,120	81,121	8,273	1.98%
2	69,544	76,363	77,418	77,466	1,103	-2.61%
3	70,394	72,474	82,845	82,765	10,291	4.05%
4	72,498	72,784	81,171	81,109	8,325	1.97%
5	74,600	80,667	75,847	75,892	-4,775	-4.59%
6	73,909	103,564	79,783	79,821	-23,743	0.35%
7	72,737	75,436	78,685	78,709	3,273	-1.05%
8	75,746	82,418	75,568	75,622	-6,796	-4.93%
9	76,720	75,829	80,281	80,197	4,368	0.82%
10	72,566	86,323	79,857	79,861	-6,462	0.40%
11	76,818	76,287	82,418	82,430	6,143	3.63%
Total	**805,235**	**874,993**	**874,993**	**874,993**	**0**	**0.00%**
Average	**73,203**	**79,545**	**79,545**	**79,545**		

Thank you, as always, for considering my thoughts on this matter. I can briefly describe this proposal at a future Task Force meeting if you would like. I am certain that your final plan will be different, but I do hope that the elements here are useful and spark some civic (and civil) debate and interest. I am also pretty sure that no one will like this proposal as it is and I understand that. While maintaining and strengthening each district were primary concerns, I also tried to move each district slightly toward the middle politically, hoping for more competitive election contests and good, strong elected representatives from each district in the next ten years. Thanks again for your consideration.

Sincerely,

/s/
David Pilpel

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submission ID: MyCityCouncil_SD_11292021463_DP1

Plan name: DP1

District type: Board of Supervisors

Starting Map: blank_map

General comments: See letter dated November 29, 2021. Thanks. DP

Compliance check:

- Contiguity: N

- Total population % deviation: N

- Assignment: N

I acknowledge that my District map and description will be sent to the Board of Supervisors: Y

I want to receive email updates from the Board of Supervisors: N

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name	% Deviation	Comments
DP1 District 6	0.35	
DP1 District 9	0.82	
DP1 District 11	3.63	
DP1 District 3	4.05	
DP1 District 10	0.4	
DP1 District 4	1.97	
DP1 District 2	-2.61	
DP1 District 1	1.98	
DP1 District 7	-1.05	
DP1 District 8	-4.93	
DP1 District 5	-4.59	

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 6

% Deviation : 0.35

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 9

% Deviation : 0.82

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 3

% Deviation : 4.05

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 10

% Deviation : 0.4

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 4

% Deviation : 1.97

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 2

% Deviation : -2.61

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 1

% Deviation : 1.98

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 7

% Deviation : -1.05

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 8

% Deviation : -4.93

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 5

% Deviation : -4.59

Comments :

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force

District name : DP1 District 11

% Deviation : 3.63

Comments :



Submitted by the Public to San Francisco Redistricting Task Force
Not Produced or Endorsed by the Redistricting Task Force