

2022

BART Redistricting: Public  
Meeting 2/16/2022



GEOinovo Solutions Inc.

BART Redistricting

2/16/2022

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. Meeting Documents..... 1
- 2. Meeting Notes / Questions ..... 1
  - 2.1. From the Public ..... 1
  - 2.2. From the Board of Directors ..... 3
  - 2.3. From the Public ..... 13
  - 2.4. General Information ..... 13

# 1. MEETING DOCUMENTS

Documents presented by Alex Sainz and Jesus Garcia:

- Webmap: BART Districts and Demographic Data
- Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Pop Data by District
- After meeting with a member of the public, GEOinovo is working on another map option that takes into consideration their comments and suggestions. GEOinovo will provide the map and data tables once this feedback is fully processed.
- GEOinovo will be creating maps for Public Plan 101 and Public Plan 102 to be posted on BART's redistricting website.

# 2. MEETING NOTES / QUESTIONS

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

## 2.1. FROM THE PUBLIC

**Doug Blacksher:** I'm host of the Black Business Round Table, Chairman of the Labor and Economic East Bay Democratic Club, a Community Police Advisory Board Member, and a lifetime member of the NAACP. To that end, thank you BART directors. Plan A would marginalize Oakland among four largely suburban districts. District 4 is shifted South toward Hayward. Over 200,000 current residents of District 4 will be needlessly shifted to other districts. Black voters in East Oakland will not be able to unify with residents in Downtown Oakland. Equally bad of the nine BART districts, Plan A adds a fourth white majority district and that is of concern. With the City Council redistricting and in addition to that with the schools being closed there seems to be a plan to continuously put Blacks at a disadvantage. To the end, the bottom line is that Plan B or Plan C protect the urban core of the East Bay and that's Oakland. I humbly ask that you go with Plan B or C and scrap Plan A and I will be watching closely. Thank you for your time.

**Rebecca Saltzman:** Thank you and thank you for sticking around. I know you have been here for a while. Let's go to the next public speaker.

**David P.:** Good afternoon it's David Pilpel from San Francisco. I have attended several BART Redistricting outreach meetings, provided public comments, and a letter. I have worked with GEOinovo Solutions to prepare my own map submission which is incomplete. I would like to complete that work with them. I wasn't able to create a map with their online tool which is why I was working with them. I would like to do that to submit it for your consideration along with a final explanatory letter. I am wondering if there is a deadline to do so. Does the Board intend to act on February 24 to adopt a final map or is that just the next board meeting where you are going to consider progress in this area? Perhaps we'll talk about that in discussion and I can

describe my draft proposed map and the thinking behind it if the board has questions for me or I can briefly take a few second to share that.

Let me be very brief and if you have questions, you can follow up. My intention was to try to minimize the amount of overlap between counties, so I was trying to restructure Districts 3 and 7 so that they only overlap between Alameda and Contra Costa in District 3 and Alameda and San Francisco in District 7. That has the effect of shifting the population between District 3 and 7. There are clearly other ways to structure that. I was not intending to have any negative consequences in terms of CVAP or racial implications on the Districts. I was trying to straighten out some of the lines and have prettier, more compact districts. Going through the data from the counties has been extremely difficult and the consultant has done great work trying to straighten out some of that. I appreciate April and the DSO and everyone else behind the scenes trying to make this work. Thanks for listening.

**Mayor Cloven:** Good afternoon. Thank you, BART directors, for the hard work that you are doing. I appreciate your efforts. My name is Peter Cloven. I am the mayor of Clayton. I'm also the vice chair of TransPAC which is the Central Contra Costa Transportation RTPC. I am calling because we were made aware of the three maps that were proposed a few weeks ago. We noticed with alarm that Map Number C puts us, Clayton, in District 2 which is associated with East County. Our City Council reviewed all Maps during a City Council Meeting on February 1<sup>st</sup> and we considered them according to our residents needs and our historical location with Central Contra Costa County. It's very clear that when using BART, our residents specifically use Central Contra Costa County BART stations including Walnut Creek, Pleasant Hill, and Concord. There is a very large topographic divide between Clayton and the nearest BART station, Pittsburg, and it is counter intuitive to go to Pittsburg or Antioch because it is a counter commute if you are going into the City for a morning commute. All of our transportation planning through TransPAC is associated with using County Connection Routes that would go to Central Contra Costa County BART stations. In that discussion, we unanimously agreed to oppose any map that would put us in District 2 since our residents do not use those stations. I find it interesting in the conversations in the introduction, you wanted to make the district geographically compact and use BART stations where residents use them. We do that and we would very, very clearly like you to consider and request that you keep Clayton in District 1 with the BART stations our residents use.

**Rebecca Saltzman:** Thank you Mayor Cloven. Do we have any other members of the public that would like to speak?

**District Secretary's Office Representative:** I do no see so at this time.

**Rebecca Saltzman:** Before moving on, I just want to address some comments from the public. We had initially planned to have the vote on redistricting at our Board Meeting next week. But it looks like based on the conversation today, if we feel like we need more time, we could postpone that to the first meeting of March. We can't really postpone it later than that because we have to get our maps into the counties and make sure they have all the information for the elections this year. But we do have a little bit of space, so I just wanted to make sure everyone had seen that

email and knows that. We're not trying to rush to a decision today. The earliest we could make it is next week but if coming out of today we feel like we need to have another information discussion we can decide to do that. That's one of the things I want to get from the Board today so we can figure out how to schedule it for next week with a follow up vote in early March.

## 2.2. FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**Director Allen:** Thank you President Saltzman. I want to give you a little history of the work I've done on this. Back when Map C was put forth, it was really the first time I jumped in and looked hard at these maps at all three A, B, and C. I did recognize that the City of Clayton had been written out of District 1 and into District 2 in East Contra Costa as Mayor Cloven explained. I believed initially when I saw that that we can't do that, so Plan C is really not a viable plan as it's written now. Certainly, I think we will need to make adjustments in more than just that area. At that time, I had a conversation with the consultants and told them I'd really like to draw my own map. I was told that there was a mapping tool and as one of the other callers had mentioned, I had attempted to do that. The Consultants and I got on a Teams call and the tool was not working. The result of that after a long discussion and looking at the topographical maps, they asked for all the comments of what I thought should change in an email and we will work on a map for you. I did that. I sent a lengthy email. It had seven points of general changes that I thought we could look at. Most of these comments were prefaced with "if possible" knowing that in the end we have to balance these maps by District and population. At the end of the email, I asked for them to reach out to me and that I would like to work with the above changes to see how we can balance the Districts with these changes. Balancing was always in the forefront for me. I'm not sure what happened. Map 101 was published and away we went. Unfortunately, I did not look at the chart with balancing numbers until Friday and realized this map isn't even balanced. We had another long session on Friday, the consultants and I, and the demographer, and I asked them to go back to Map A. Map A did achieve something that the City of Orinda did comment on which was trying to incorporate more of the Moraga, Lafayette, and Orinda area into District 1. There were a couple of things I didn't like about Map A but they were much more minor, so I asked the consultant and demographers to start with Map A and incorporate these changes. One of the requested changes was to keep the unincorporated areas outside of the City of Clayton whole with Clayton – that was a very minor change and only added a few hundred people to District 1. Another change was that Map A took the downtown Concord station and surrounding area and moved it to District 2. I asked them to keep Downtown Concord with the rest of Concord. The final comment was that these changes really only have to balance between District 1 and 2 and they don't have to impact the rest of the Districts. There is a new map the hasn't been presented that makes these changes to Map A, keeps Clayton in District 1, moves District 1 further into Martinez, and reassigns some of the Downtown Concord population back to District 1. The Southern part of San Ramon ends up being moved into District 5. I think the map in development is really close to being balanced and that map could be combined with some of the changes Director Ames has requested down in District 5 and 6 which are also very minor. I think the directors on the call could come to some agreement on that pending what the other directors want to do with the other districts. I heard some of the comments to Map A and I'm interested in working on how we can balance some of

the numbers regarding racial balance but right now all the maps we are looking at today still have District 1 as a majority white district. I am happy to keep working on that however we can to find the equity that we're looking for there. I don't think we're ready to vote on a map at the next Board meeting, but I think we're making really good progress

**Rebecca Saltzman:** Thank you for providing more details. I understand that some of the work has to happen offline but the more we can bring the information into the open session the more the public can hear the better.

**Director Li:** Thank you April. San Francisco residents were heavily involved in the redistricting process but have since burned out a bit as BART districts are in their own category. I can't help but note that District 8 which I represent now has the lowest population of all of the districts. The only map I have really strong feelings about is Map A and the negative impact it has on District 8. Communities of Color have been really outspoken about some early drafts of the State Assembly Districts 80-17 and 80-19 in San Francisco and I am very sensitive to those concerns especially the concerns around dividing the AAPI community. Many AAPI community leaders have spoken out about this from the AAPI council to political clubs. I strongly oppose Plan A. The North/South line at Stockton, which is a major commercial area for Chinatown shops – it's the exit coming out of Stockton Tunnel, it's one of the main gates into Chinatown. The current boundary in Plan A needlessly splits Chinatown in a way that just doesn't make sense.

Maps B and C are okay. The current map isn't great in regard to the boundaries either, but Plan A literally cuts into the main thoroughfare / main commercial corridor in Chinatown.

There are also a lot of other boarder changes that I am opposed to. For example, splitting the Marina District, putting Pac Heights into District 9, those are very similar districts and are the same supervisorial district in San Francisco. The other boundary I just don't agree with at all is splitting the Black Community in the Bay View along 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. It basically takes out about a third of the Bay View and uses 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, which is the main corridor and the home of so many Black owned businesses. Those boundaries are problematic, but it also creates a District 8 that is further and further away from actual BART stations. It's a long standing issue that I have to explain to residents what my District looks like because people say there are no BART Stations in District 8. Map A makes that problem worse and it's not fair to the constituents and it doesn't make sense with where the BART line goes.

**Rebecca Saltzman:** Thank you! Just to ask, what will be the process moving forward with the consultants? Can you take the feedback you get today and make new or edited potential maps? Do directors need to contact you offline or are you going to take the information from this meeting?

**Alex Response:** Yes, we are noting feedback from today's meeting. I am making notes as the comments are being made. In order to meet the deadline of March 4<sup>th</sup> to get that information ready for the March 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, we would need to have some type of direction sometime soon to compile that report and get it out for public consumption.

**Rebecca Saltzman:** I understand but can you take the comments from today and create new plans or edited plan and have them for the meeting next week?

**Alex Response:** Yes, we can take the feedback from today's meeting and create a new public map. We can meet with people individually as we have met with a number of Directors.

**Rebecca Saltzman:** I really think the best way is for you to consider information from this meeting in your next maps and to keep everything transparent. The more we can take care in public the better.

**Jesus Response:** I am taking notes as best as I can. But I don't have the same understanding of all the individual neighborhoods/communities as the directors as I've been there mainly as a tourist. If we can get some kind of written description of the communities that would be very helpful.

**Director Li:** I just ask the consultants to really listen to what the Directors here today have to say because we are most familiar with our Districts. I am deferential to the directors here regarding the specific knowledge of their neighborhoods and districts.

**Director McPartland:** Thank you very much. First of all, Alex and Jesus, I have to start off by saying the work you have done is absolutely amazing. I took a look at the tools of when this thing was first given to us and taking a look at the multi-dimensional / multi-layered ethnic population centers and quantities in order to try to even these things out. I got overwhelmed by the complexity of it and for that I am astounded and grateful that we have guys like you that can do that.

I am in favor of A on 4. One question, why do you have District 8 out there in the Farallone Islands? We have three seagulls out there.

**Alex Response:** I can answer that question. That was based on the GIS boundary data that was originally provided to us from BART. It may be legacy data. We have since updated maps without the Farallone Islands.

**Director McPartland:** Geographically or geologically, the Farallone Islands were part of Pacifica a long time ago. Moving on, I have to end on getting my most refreshing information from Mayor Cloven from Clayton. Looking at the maps as a director and trying to look at it through the eyes of other directors, in general we are responsible not only for geographical locations as far as where Cities are concerned but also of populations, traveling, and public transportation populations. I really have heartburn with both B and C. When District 3 goes all the way from El Cerrito to Castro Valley and they have to figure out how they are going to be responsible for those kinds of populations – that gets complex. The L line which extends from the A line out in the direction of Livermore out towards Pleasanton has a lot of issues associated with that population. Quite frankly it would be a distraction to anybody who would be responsible for the A line going all the way up to El Cerrito. I wouldn't want to be the director for that. I would like to be able to be a representative for the wants, needs, safety, and accommodation of the population that I can effectively take care of. El Cerrito to Castro Valley is way too far of a stretch. When you put the line right down the rail line, I at first had heartburn

with that and then I rethought it and quite frankly it kind of make sense. When you end up doing it that way that means I would have to end up getting together with Director Allen or Director Ames or whomever else in order to be able to have a consensus and get two votes out of nine as opposed to only having one vote.

With the caveats that have already been brought out by the other Directors, I am going to have to go with A because District 3 is an absolute nightmare from the standpoint of one director trying to take care of that kind of geographical footprint. Thank you.

**Director Foley:** Thank you Madam President. Thank you to the staff and thank you to April for helping to guide us through this process and I appreciate everyone getting together today to talk about an important process of redistricting. In a nutshell I oppose A, B, and C. I think that each one of them has merit but certainly doesn't meet our needs. I think we can take all of the feedback, find a basemap, and work through this and find what we are looking for. I support Director Allen's comments. I think separating Clayton from the District and Concord Station makes not sense based on transit patterns so I fully support making those corrections if you will to that. One of the things I noticed in the District I represent, District 2, is that I have the Concord and Martinez BART Stations yet I have zero Martinez voters that are at the Martinez station. Certainly, a map that would incorporate Martinez or a portion of it, would be a map I would like to see so that there is more of an equal representation around the actual station. I have a general question around balancing the counties, how is that taken into consideration when you are splitting the stations? Are you trying to balance by the nine districts an equal number of stations within a county? Are you balancing three directors per county? How is that math working out?

**Alex Response:** While we are creating these districts, because of the distinct differences in population density going from West Bay all the way out to East Contra Costa and Alameda Counties there is a pretty wide difference with San Francisco being pretty densely populated and rural areas being much less so. We did try to balance the number of stations with the adjacent district where possible. As you know San Francisco has that string of four stations coming right off the Bay that are very close together. I believe the distance between the four stations is just over a mile, so they are in very close proximity to one another. In District 5 you are seeing stations that are much more widely dispersed. We did try to balance the stations out with adjacent districts. The result is not a perfect balance of stations among the districts, but we did the best we can given the adjacent areas and the data we had available.

**Jesus Response:** Our goal was to try to do our best to balance the stations among directors. We see the BART area as a whole. Our goal was to use transportation corridors and half mile radii and if areas were over half a mile away to put them in separate districts but if they were within half a mile, we tried to make them shared stations. Our attempt was to both keep population balanced but to extend the opportunity to represent a station as a whole or as shared. Again, we are very open to the discussion here. As Director Allen stated, we are already working on another map for her and we can do that for the rest of the suggestions we are having here.



**Director Foley:** Thank you and I just want to conclude by saying that I truly appreciate the work GEOinovo is doing. In my day job I work with GIS, so I get the challenges you are facing here but I appreciate you coming to us with five different flavors to choose from. I imagine we will need a 6<sup>th</sup> and a 7<sup>th</sup> and an 8<sup>th</sup> but I know we will get there. Thank you for your hard work to really get us something to look at and start the process. Thank you.

**Jesus Response to David:** I just want to say we are working on a map with David. I just want to let David know that we rounded out a few of the geographies but we are ready for your input on the finalized last map. I didn't want to make decisions on my own without your review. I would say its 70% done and hopefully you will like what we've started. Again, we are very happy to interact with you or any other member of the public that would like to generate your own map.

**Director Saltzman:** Just as a follow up to Director Foley's questions. I think when you present this next week, it would be helpful to have a rundown of what stations are in each district. I am assuming that the stations that are on the lines between the districts are represented by both directors but that's just an assumption so that might be helpful for us to look at.

**Alex Response:** Director Saltzman that is a great point. Director Foley did request that information and we were able to provide that to him. The only reason why we did not provide that to the entire board is that it was just in an email. We have that information ready, and we will present that at the next meeting.

**Director Ames:** I did hear a public comment that said to scrap A. Could we get some comments from the consultant on that, but it sounded like it was a question about the African American Community was being moved to South Hayward. Maybe I heard that wrong? Can I get clarification on that public speaker? I think it was Mr. Blacksher? I think he said to scrap Plan A and I just wanted to understand that comment.

**Director Saltzman:** I don't want any of us to speak for him so I will turn it over to him. I just wanted to say that I did participate in the last Redistricting meeting and there were a few public commenters that had concerns about Plan A in regard to how it splits Oakland into even more districts. There are some concerns about that both from Oakland's point of view as a City but also about specific communities. I will let Mr. Blacksher address the board if he wants to explain a little more of his point of view.

**Mr. Blacksher:** Thank you Director Saltzman. Once again since I have already stated my opposition to specifically Plan A for the two directors who think it is a good idea, I want to be sure that you're clear that gentrification is happening all over the Bay area specifically in Oakland. We don't need to further that by implementing a map that will breakup more of the Black folk as it would be as a block. Be careful on how you do this and once again my name is Doug Blacksher, I am the host of the Black Business Round Table and I feel very comfortable letting anyone listening know what is going on. Really, really think about how it will impact the constituents and the Black Businesses. Thank you.

**Director Ames:** I just wanted to clarify with the consultant with the creation of Map 102. I wasn't married or wedded to Plan C, but I did admire the effort that it was more destination

based and looked at government facilities and where people are moving and how that shaped the districts. We talked about Niles Canyon, Vargas Plateau and those areas are actually part of Fremont. Also, that some of Union City is in Niles Canyon so that was the original district that I have right now and I was trying to reinstitute that component as part of a Plan. It doesn't matter if it's A, B, or C, it was more focused on this geographical alignment of the Canyon and the Cities in my district. It was a very minor change and I appreciate that it turned out so I would like to push that forward on any plan that we adopt. Unfortunately, we're not getting a lot of comments on the plans. I did hear from a Hayward resident that they liked 101 but 101 is more tailored towards Plan A and the Hayward perspective. I'm open to any of the changes the Directors feel is imperative for their districts. We know our districts very well, but I am open to the boundary changes that were proposed. I don't have a huge preference on any plan right now.

**Director Rayburn:** I appreciate the efforts by the Redistricting Committee – I would like to hear comments about what the committee did. I'll just state that I'm very afraid of Plan A that it has serious repercussions for the City of Oakland and future. The ability to elect somebody that would represent an urban core area and not have lots of divisions. Plan A creates four directors who would represent Oakland and not one of those directors would really be centered in Oakland. They would really be suburban districts and we all know on this Board that a lot of issues come down to urban/suburban, it's just not fair. I believe it is possible that we take either plan A, B, or C and amend them appropriately to meet everyone's needs here. I urge each of you to make your own suggestions as I have made to Alex and Jesus about minor tweaks that I asked for. I think that's the way to move forward. Right now, Plan A isn't only unfair to the voters who like to turn to the Black Chamber of Commerce or the Latino Chamber of Commerce in Oakland or City wide groups. Number one in those public comments, in the summaries we saw was protect Cities and census designated places. I can sense where director McPartland's sentiments lay because Castro Valley is cut right down Redwood Road in one plan and is cut right out of another so I think we should be cognizant of places. Plans 101 and A I feel are not viable for different reasons one of course for the extreme variation of population and everything about redistricting is to reapportion the population after each census. Our next goal should be to do whatever possible to maintain and augment the voting strength of the protected classes including the Black populations and where you have a community of interest which is defined by the Cities themselves. I would like to start with the Cities and Census Designated places. I can see in Plan C that Clayton shouldn't be tied in with East of the hills, it should be part of the area that feeds into the stations in the northern part of the valley on the yellow line. I think we can get to a solution that meets everybody's needs but there were changes made that I feel were very unnecessary and radical given that District 4 started off with less than 1% variation using the current boundaries. It's unwarranted to make this carve up of Oakland as the center piece of plan A. Regarding District 3, District 3 is an oddity, and it does represent the suburban edges of the City core as well as Berkeley. There are things that happen at BART because one district has to transcend the Bay. Some way, somehow we have to connect the Bay. I think how it's been done in the existing plan to create solid representation among Black voters as well as make for a reasonable change representation of even West Oakland. The real fatal flaw with Plan A is the creation of four majority white districts. Currently, we have six combined minority majority districts at BART and to take away one of those minority majority districts and leave us with

five, I think is a dangerous precedent that's not going to pass muster with the voting rights act as it dilutes minority voting strength. Thank you.

**Director Saltzman:** Do either of the consultants have a response? I know you're very concerned with keeping to the Voting Rights Act, so can you respond.

**Alex Response:** Specifically, to Director Raeburn's concerns with Plan A. You are seeing the changes because even if you were to take Oakland on its own, we would not be able to fit the City into one district due to the size of Oakland's population. To clarify, a perfectly balanced district for BART would be approximately 414,000. The City of Oakland alone is over 440,000 which that takes us almost over the 10% variance. In terms of the ethnic groups, the thinking behind Plan A was to take the two largest ethnic groups, in this case, the Asian and the Latino populations, those that would have the greatest opportunity to influence elections. We had no intention of inadvertently splitting up any African American communities or anything of that nature, but we did what we could with the largest protected class groups and that is why you are seeing the largest concentrations in Plan A. At the same time if we were to use one of the other plans B, C, 101, or 102 you are seeing a slight dispersal of those protected class groups as they are being spread more evenly across the four districts.

**Jesus Response:** In plan A the goal was to maximize the two largest groups, Latino and Asian. In Plan A it has above 47% of the protected class groups which is the largest of any of the districts. The next closest count of the Latino population is 30% which is a significant drop. Now the demographics of the Bay Area are evolving, there are lots of different types of communities that are coming in. Specifically, to the Fair Maps Act and to the Voting Rights Act African American, Latino, and Asian are the protected classes but in this case under Plan A the Asian population had the most potential of having a near Voting Rights Act District. Now, you do not have a Voting Rights Act District. In this case it's not even an issue so we can begin to look at coalition districts of Latino, Black, and Asian districts. Again, the goal here was to maximize the opportunity for a protected class group, in this case Asian, voting participation. As you can see with other districts the Latino population drops to 4%, so is it better to have districts with a higher percent? And I believe in some of the districts the African American population is close to 20%. We have a lot of competing interests here. Plan A was one vision, B and C are others. I do appreciate the comments of "let's begin with selecting one of the Plans as a base" and then we can apply the Directors' comments into a plan. Otherwise, we can have all of the plans and all of the iterations, but if we can agree on the base that's a good place to start. We're here to take guidance from the Board on how to proceed.

**Director Rayburn:** Jesus, you mentioned coalition districts and that's exactly what is lost in Plan A is one of the minority majority districts that exists today and exists in Plans B and C. I feel that it's very clear in section II of the Voting Rights Act and also in other cases, you have to get that 50%, that is the first test, and we have that in the combined majority minority districts. We have six of those throughout BART and to create whole new white census voting age population districts, four of them, in existence under Plan A, that is unconscionable. Again, I want to see us come back around to something around B or C that reflects the input of the other directors that have concerns. I believe those concerns are legitimate as they step on that top goal

that other commenters have made to preserve these cities and other census designated places. As well I do want to comment that there were a number of commenters at the most recent workshop that were concerned. African Americans from East Oakland concerned about not being part of the Central Oakland business district. There were concerns from the Unity Council at an earlier meeting about separation from the downtown and carving up Oakland just does not make sense. Yes, you're right Alex that we have to carve up Oakland to balance the population of the districts because the population of Oakland is larger than the District 4 population. We have to try to reflect and minimize that and it has been done in a reasonable matter in the past so that the suburbs in the hill areas are separated from the flat lands and foothills. I think we can get to a point of agreement. It will take a lot of work over the next week. I've looked at the lines carefully and I see that it is possible.

**Alex Response:** If I could just make a suggestion. I know it would be helpful for us as the consultant to collect all of these comments, but if there could be some kind of agreement as to which Plan to use as a base that would be helpful.

**Director Saltzman:** I don't think there is agreement from what you are hearing so let's continue to hear out and I think you'll have to come back with a couple of different options.

**Alex Response:** Thank you for clarifying, I appreciate that.

**Director Saltzman:** We haven't had a ton of public comment, but we have had some. No body wants their City split up. El Cerrito is a small City and it's cut up the least in Plan A. Albany which is an even smaller City is cut up in all of the plans. The current District 3 is a beast maybe not as much as District 7. It could be a challenge sometimes to represent the district well when you have to be in multiple locations in one day. It is possible to do. I have to disagree with Director Rayburn that District 3 is a suburban district because 2/3 of the district is in Oakland and Berkeley. If you look at the plans, District 3 remains primarily an urban district but that is changing over time as we plan dense development near our stations. I think some people would think of Union City as pretty suburban but the development they are planning around their station is more urban than some of the urban cities are planning. I think some of those distinctions are less of a consideration than they were a decade ago. Just looking at District 3 which is the District I know the best because it's the District I represent; I think the best version is in Plan A but I do think there are flaws with Plan A based on what Director Rayburn and lot of others from Oakland have brought up. I have mixed feelings with Oakland having three Directors as it does now. It actually increases the power of Oakland so I'm not sure that having four would decrease the influence of Oakland so I'm less worried about that part. I do think it's complicated and confusing for City officials and residents when Cities are broken into multiple pieces. Who do I call? Who is on this station? Do I need to talk to all four directors? I don't know if we've had a City broken into four districts and I think we should be thoughtful about whether we should do it. Maybe that is the thing that makes the most sense, but I do want everyone to think about it carefully and see if there is a way we can avoid it. Looking at the other two plans B and C. Looking at El Cerrito, both plans split El Cerrito along a main thoroughfare through El Cerrito but it's arbitrary and it splits communities. Less in the really core way that Director Li was talking about with District 8 but still it's totally arbitrary. I want to be really

thoughtful about that and who uses which BART station. I think Plan C is really flawed with where the BART riders are with each station. Plan C cuts out El Cerrito Plaza station from District 3 but the vast majority of people, I'm guessing like 75% of the people who use El Cerrito Plaza station will live in District 3 but their director will be from another district. That's really surprising as Plan C was supposed to be a station based plan. The other part of District 3 that really makes no sense with the Stations is the fact that the Oakland Airport station would be included in District 3 but then the Coliseum Station would be in District 4. We've got to figure out a way to keep the Airport station and the Coliseum Stations in the same District because there is no way to get to the Airport station without going through Coliseum Station. For me the most flawed proposal is Plan C. But again, that from a District 3 perspective and I'm hearing from other Directors how the other proposals are a problem for their Districts. I think this is where it gets complicated because we are all thinking about the Districts that we know best. I want to be fully transparent. All of the plans cut me out of District 3 and I'm actually okay with that. I will have served for 12 years on the BART board so I am okay with that but I did just want to make that transparent, so people don't think I'm arguing one way or another because of what it does for my opportunity to run for the seat again. My understanding is that all of the plans cut out at least one of the current directors for their current districts. We're not going to consider it based off of that, but I really do look forward to seeing some more variations on the maps. I know it's going to be very challenging to meet all the goals of all the different directors.

**Director Allen:** Thank you President Saltzman and Alex and Jesus. I really believe Liz and I have made progress and I think John is okay with some of the changes we have made. I'm really hoping with the map 103 that gets published Districts 1, 2, 5, and 6 are close to where we'd like to see them be. You're right Director Saltzman that District 3 is a beast, and it is a beast in all of these maps. I'm just wondering because 3, 7, and 4 has been vertical these past years, does it make sense? I started with map C for me because it was closest to the changes, I wanted for my District not because of how the other districts were drawn. I think that the changes that a couple of us directors asked for could be dropped on to any one of the maps, A, B, or C or anything that anybody comes up with. I'm perfectly happy to defer to what the other directors in San Francisco have suggested because they know their communities best. I'm not sure if starting from a base map is the best approach. The other four or five directors that want to see changes to their districts, they should have the one on one discussions with Alex and Jesus to really clarify what it is you like or don't like about A, B, or C so they can really zero in on Oakland. This vertical thing with Districts 3 and 7 perhaps you could consider a map that puts these districts more on top of each other instead of more vertical. The final thing I wanted to say, could we all agree that map 101 is not a viable map and never has been and viable map and could we just stop talking about it? And just take it off of the table because it was never supposed to be on the table to begin with.

**Director Saltzman:** Yes, I think we can. Feel free to have follow up conversations but the more we can get out in public and provide in a public process the better. I am concerned about having lots of new conversations behind closed doors. We had a robust public process, and we should keep this public. If there are clarifying questions, feel free to follow up offline.

**Director McPartland:** Maybe I can clarify some of the ambiguity in this process and wish the public speaker was still there. What was his name? Doug Blacksher. I was assisting with one of the county supervisors, in the unincorporated areas there was a coalition of people who wanted to be able to encapsulate all of the unincorporated areas to a single county supervisor. The consensus of the population was “how dumb can you get? When there are three county supervisors that represent unincorporated areas. They get three out of five votes. As a lobbying group.” I grew up in Oakland and I live in Castro Valley now and I’m very familiar with Oakland and if I were a director for Oakland, I would be a great director but if I were to be set in the center of Oakland I would be the commander of my domain and I would have 1 vote out of 9. For those that think having different directors with responsibility in the City of Oakland as a bad thing, think again, because if everyone of the directors that has a district in that largest population area in the county has a responsibility to represent those folks. In a perfect world, it would be great, as Directors of public transportation, if we could have geographical clusters of communities we represent. In this board we end up having people because of the age of the system and the extensions and the deterioration of the core, we end up having fights on a continuous basis on the needs of the extensions vs the needs of the core. Wouldn’t it be great if everyone of us had to take responsibility for both? Then we would have a more global perspective and would have to take into consideration the needs of both. Jesus and Alex, we find ourselves in a position where we are trying to get as much equity for the ethnic groups we have in our district. It would be really great if we could answer all of these needs, but we can’t. I am most grateful that I don’t have your job. You have to figure this out based on listening to all of us. I hope I gave a little bit of enlightenment from a standpoint of the people wanting to just have one district in Oakland which is a really bad idea. I thank Nate Miley for giving me that insight.

**Director Saltzman:** Thank you and I don’t think anyone is arguing for one district for Oakland. I think we all know that’s not possible.

**Director Li:** Director Saltzman, can I ask you or someone to sum up what these next steps are? Because that still seems a bit unclear to me.

**Director Saltzman:** Our next steps are to have another informational meeting next Thursday and then we have to vote to adopt one of the maps at our first meeting in March. Jesus /Alex can you walk us through what your plan is for our meeting next Thursday?

**Alex Response:** For next Thursday’s meeting we plan to incorporate the feedback from today into one or two maps and the new public 103. We will bring those to the board next Thursday and hopefully we can make enough progress at that point to go far enough for a decision.

**Director Saltzman:** Can we update the information online to make it clear that you will not include map 101 in your discussion?

**Alex Response:** we will work with the District Secretary’s Office to make sure that map is marked as not viable on the website. And just to be clear the only reason why we had map 101 as part of the presentation today was just to get the information out there.

## 2.3. FROM THE PUBLIC

**Doug Blacksher:** Thank you to the Board and all the hard work you have done to make BART run better. To Director McPartland, my name is Doug Blacksher for the record. I appreciate the time and allowing me to speak today. As we all know many of our Black Community is asleep that's why I have a show called the Black Business Roundtable to inform them of when meetings like this happen that are designed to further put Black and Brown people into despair economically, home ownership, health, thank you.

**David Pilpel:** Thank you so much for the discussion, respect you have shown to each other, this is incredibly complicated and my history with BART redistricting goes way back. This was a really enlightening public policy discussion on how to solve the difficult puzzle. I look forward to working within the next few days with Alex, Jesus and others to finalize my map. I hope you will likely take bits and pieces of all the various plans. It's probably going to be a mix and match and probably everyone will be happy with somethings and will be willing to compromise on others. Hopefully, you or your successors will represent the districts well.

**Karla Guerra:** I am the policy and advocacy manager at the Unity Council, and I just wanted to say we are really thankful for the opportunity to speak and for your hard work in the redistricting process. Our goal is to ensure at a minimum all the East Oakland stations stay together and that the Latinx representation vote not to be diluted. Thank you very much.

## 2.4. GENERAL INFORMATION

BART has set up the following email address for members of the public to submit questions: [Redistricting@BART.gov](mailto:Redistricting@BART.gov). The following website shows all materials and documents prior to setting up the Redistricting Committee: <https://www.bart.gov/news/articles/2021/news20211105>.

Consultant will be glad to go over any questions and review any maps sent to the public email.

Send questions for the Consultant about the redistricting process to the BART email above. For additional information about GEOinovo use the following email address: [Info@Geoinovo.com](mailto:Info@Geoinovo.com).