

From: [Diane Leeds](#)
To: [CMO BoardFeedback](#)
Subject: Public Comment for December 7 Board of Supervisors Meeting
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 6:56:21 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Honorable Supervisors Canepa, Groom, Horsley, Pine and Slocum,

At the November 16 Board of Supervisors meeting and later quoted in a December 3 article in the Daily Journal, Supervisor Canepa stated that the Unity Map substantially reduces the number of minority voters in the multiple districts while increasing the number of white voters, potentially creating challenges for a person of color to be elected.

Supervisor Canepa has either misread or misunderstood the numbers because this assertion is not backed up by the demographic tables created by NDC that accompany each of the maps under consideration.

There are two measures of demographic breakdown - Total Population and Citizen Voting Age Population or CVAP. This second statistic is the best reflection of the voting power of each group as it only includes people eligible to vote - those over 18 and US citizens.

The Unity Map (using the one NDC labeled Unity with Millbrae United dated 11/8/21), when looking at CVAP there are only 2 majority NH white districts - District 2 (63%) and District 3 (63%). District 4 is evenly split white/non-white and District 5 is majority AA/PI (57%)

The Minimal Change (titled Communities Together by NDC dated 11/12/21) similar to the Unity map, has District 4 evenly split white/non-white and District 5 has the same 57% AA/PI majority. In addition, this map also has the same 2 majority NH white districts - District 2 (52%) and District 3 (72%). So it is in the Minimal Change map where there is a supermajority of white voters, not the Unity Map.

So does the Unity Map "substantially" reduce the voice of communities of color? No, it does not.

An article from KQED published on 8/5/2013 stated "In the past 60 years only 1 Latino and 1 African/American has been on the Board of Supervisors". This lack of diversity and dilution of voting power was the basis for a lawsuit filed in April 2011 to change at-large to district elections of Supervisors after a recommendation to place district elections on the ballot was rejected in 2010. Not long after that, Measure B, which changed the county charter to move to district elections, was placed on the November 2012 ballot and passed by voters. San Mateo County was the last county in California to move to district elections.

So where has been the diversity in the composition of the Board of Supervisors in the 8 years since the move to district elections? Concerns were raised back in October 2013 about the decision of the Board of Supervisors to select a map that members of the District Lines Advisory Commission, city officials and members of the public along with the Asian Law Caucus spoke out against for not going far enough to ensure a stronger voice for minority residents due in part to its similarity to the existing district boundaries. The map that this Board is set to approve is in turn similar to current district boundaries as well as to the boundaries that were in existence prior to the move to district elections, so little change has been made in close to 10 years.

The County has only increased in diversity since 2013 with the growth of the Asian-American/Pacific Islander and Latino communities. How does staying with the status quo make it more likely that we will see diversity on the Board of Supervisors?

Regards,

Diane Leeds

Resident of Emerald Hills