

Summary of Redistricting Reform Recommendations (June to November 2022)

This document was prepared by Commissioners Cynthia Dai and Renita LiVolsi and attempts to synthesize recommendations provided by Redistricting Initiative speakers and commenters to date. It may not be entirely comprehensive or capture every nuance. Refer to detailed recommendations from Asian Americans Advancing Justice – Asian Law Caucus (ALC); CA Common Cause (CA CC); League of Women Voters SF (LWVSF), written reports from past RDTFs and the Clerk of the Board (Clerk), and past recordings for more detail. We also raise additional questions for consideration or additional research.

Element	SF RDTF	Recommendation	by	Questions/Comments
Type	Independent citizens commission, supported by Clerk of the Board and Department of Elections, and City Attorney staff.	Independent citizens commission, with (some of) its own staff, a transparent budget with minimum funding, and influence in selecting key consultants and their scope of work.	ALC, CA CC, LWVSF, CA Citizens Redistricting Commission (CA CRC), MI ICRC (MI), Clerk (need at least 2 clerks + 5 temp staff); past RDTFs, Unity Map Coalition (UMC)	How much independent budget? What specified categories, e.g. outreach, language support, stipends, etc.? Should supporting departments get automatic augmentation for years 20X1-2?
Outreach and representative candidate pool	Limited to standard City channels. No requirement for diverse candidate pool.	Open, competitive application process. Required outreach beyond City channels to build (large) candidate pool representative of SF demographics.	ALC, CA CC, LWVSF; CA CRC, MI, Long Beach IRC (LB), UMC, Clerk (recommends working with Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA), for advice on outreach to communities, but could work for candidates too)	Can the City piggyback off Census outreach efforts and resources? Other timely City outreach campaigns?

Element	SF RDTF	Recommendation	by	Questions/Comments
<i>Selection criteria and process to reduce political influence</i>	Appointed by Mayor, BOS, and SFEC by different processes without standard qualification criteria or ban on conflicts of interest	Standard (but not overly restrictive) selection criteria w/ban on conflicts of interest, financial disclosures, during/post-service restrictions. Vetting/selection (of finalists) by neutral body/agency. Some (not all) random and self-selection.	ALC, CA CC (sign ethics pledge), LWVSF, CA Citizens Redistricting Commission (CA CRC), MI, past RDTFs (restrict candidates affiliated with orgs who receive direct City funding), UMC (Elections Commission should vet, randomized but include underrepresented communities)	What standard criteria? What neutral body is trusted and has the resources to run a good selection process? What additional requirements to reduce conflicts of interest during and post-service?
<i>Composition and diversity</i>	9 members: 3 selected by each appointing authority. No diversity or representation requirements	More members, minimally with representation from each district, potentially with at-large and/or alternates chosen from finalists. Consideration of diversity reflecting SF's demographics. Modest stipend or other compensation to enable broad representation.	ALC, CA CC, LWVSF, CA CRC, MI, LB (alternates sit as non-voting members; stipend should recognize uneven work outside of meetings), past RDTFs (should have alternates), UMC (should have alternates)	How many members (affects voting threshold)? If at-large, how many? If alternates, how many and should they sit as non-voting members? What diversity factors should be considered? (CA considers gender, race/ethnicity, location, socioeconomic status.) What kind of compensation and how is it adjusted over time?
<i>Training and preparation</i>	City Attorney wrote several legal memos to the RDTF. Both the City Attorney & mapping consultant offered to train the RDTF.	Extensive required legal and practical training, including from former local and State Commissioners.	ALC, CA CC, LWVSF, CA CRC, MI, LB, Clerk (train on neighborhoods, benefit and cultural districts, mapping tool), past RDTFs (mapping tool)	What specific training, e.g. Charter, FAIR Maps Act, Brown Act, Sunshine Ordinance, Robert's Rules, Census data, mapping, former members, etc.? Budget for training?

Element	SF RDTF	Recommendation	by	Questions/Comments
<i>Redistricting criteria</i>	Population equality within 5%, VRA (assumed), communities of interest (not defined)--no ranking	Explicit ranked criteria inclu. Federal and state (FAIR MAPS Act).	ALC, CA CC, LWVSF, CA CRC, MI, LB, UMC (Cultural Districts)	Where might SF deviate from FAIR MAPS Act to accommodate unique characteristics, e.g. cultural districts, definition of Communities of Interest, 5% population equality?
<i>Transparency</i>	Public meetings governed by Sunshine ordinance & Brown Act, but no ban on discussing redistricting matters outside a public meeting	Bias toward transparency. Ban on ex-parte communication and required disclosure. Longer public notice period for draft/final maps. Required written rationale for final districts against ranked criteria.	ALC, CA CC, LWVSF, CA CRC, MI, LB (release emails, live line drawing), UMC	How long is necessary to allow for meaningful comment and collaboration with the public?
<i>Draft Maps and timeline</i>	None required. Only final deadline stipulated	Draft map required 2-3 months before final map. Required minimum public hearings before mapping and again after mapping, as well as an extended public comment period before map adoption. Start at least 12 months before final map deadline.	ALC, CA CC, LWVSF, CA CRC, MI, LB, Clerk (start 6-12 mos before Census data released), past RDTFs, UMC	When must the RDTF be seated? What should the draft map deadline be? (Draft map deadline should consider adequate time for public input and collaboration.) Should the final map deadline be the same? (Final deadline should consider state/local deadlines for final maps).
<i>Voting to approve maps</i>	Simple majority: 5 (of 9) votes	Special majority or supermajority	CA CRC, MI, LB, UMC (consensus)	Is there any reason for a special supermajority?

Element	SF RDTF	Recommendation	by	Questions/Comments
<i>Recourse if no agreement on final map</i>	Unclear	No specific recommendations, but most local bodies punt to Superior Court.		What is a realistic backup plan that provides a motivating failsafe with the right incentives?
<i>Replacement/removal of members</i>	RDTF members serve at the pleasure of their appointing authority	Removal only due to neglect of duty or gross misconduct or disqualifying information. Must be replaced with an alternate from the finalist pool.	CA CRC, MI, past RDTFs	(This recommendation presumes a vetting process against standard criteria.) What should be the processes for removal and replacement?