

101 Scott Rafferty

Please post this map, which was developed based on the excel template before I had access to the Maptitude files. It is based on the map provided with the original petition, but conforms to your "population units." I am determining whether there are any other combinations of "population units" that satisfy the requirement of a majority-Latino district.

I think this map makes sense because it complies with federal law, it links low-density, high-white neighborhoods in Pt Richmond, Marina Bay and the Annex, which all send kids to EC High; it provides districts centered around El Sobrante and Hilltop, and it divided the remaining area into two districts both controlled by the African American voters, but differentiated by income and education levels. Each area is contiguous and as compact as possible, follows neighborhoods, and the residences of incumbents were not considered.

102 Scott Rafferty

Note from NDC: Original proposed settlement map (as close as NDC could get to matching it based on the image included in Mr. Rafferty's letter to the City).

103 Michael Parker

Give shoreline access / responsibility to multiple districts.

Note from NDC: NDC cleaned up a number of non-contiguous pieces in this map, which also brought the map closer to population balance, but it is still not population balanced.

104 Michael Parker

Includes single S Shoreline district

105 Jan Mignone (**NDC Note: not contiguous**)

I think this map makes sense because I have tried to keep neighborhoods together but to diversify the areas so that each district has a balanced demographic. I believe that it is very important that we remember why we have neighborhood councils and what they do to make this City better. They will do the same with who runs in their district.

106 Jim Hanson

This plan makes sense because it organizes districts with functioning communities of interest (ie. common issues and concerns), with balanced proportions of protected classes, and that also follows human-made and natural features, as follows: 1. The North and East is a compact, established neighborhood within the greater city geography 2. the Carlson follows the Carlson corridor and what appear to be communities of interest (from walking these neighborhoods at election time) 3. the Iron Triangle is an established, compact neighborhood community of interest 4. the distinctly shoreline-facing neighborhoods along Richmond Parkway that share similar future development, including open space shoreline connections through the Regional Parks, 5. the outlying, suburban enclave of Carriage Hills, and 6. the San Pablo Ave. corridor with common concerns with upcoming building and traffic and transportation planning issues along San Pablo Ave. This is a natural grouping of

communities of interest and could become more compact as boundaries adjust with future growth (especially for District 4 with planned growth in the Hilltop area and the South Shoreline).

Note: This District Election requirement did not arise democratically out of the Richmond populace with sufficient time for citizens to know it's happening or how to participate effectively given it's complexity (that also extends to doing the mapping, especially the online software). Thus, it's design is forcing square peg in a round hole. Because of past cherry-picking for city land expansion, some neighborhoods are isolated and therefore using 6 districts will result in inevitable problems of non-compact districts with dissimilar communities of interest, some greater than others. Some maps, such as Attorney Rafferty and their client, are more egregious in this regard than others. This means that 8 districts may be more appropriate. Regardless, the map that Attorney Rafferty and their client is attempting to impose on Richmond in their September letter to the City would split and divide established communities of concern. It would split representation within established neighborhoods and also stitch together remote and unrelated neighborhoods, thus it does not comply with the compact rule, also (such as represented in the suburban Carriage Hills and east Hilltop District showing the cherry-picking of East Richmond. (East Richmond is connected by a community of interest and friendships to central Richmond and the San Pablo Ave. Corridor).

Given the imposed rules, organizing Districts by natural, established, and connected neighborhood communities of interest and retaining diversity with the district, as done in the rough outline in this spreadsheet using the outlined blocks we were given, retains some sense of community by neighborhoods and overall in the city. In addition meeting the rules, a district election plan has to support the ongoing social, cultural, and political health of a city.

107 John Anderson

It is grouped by geography and general communities. District 1 is primarily to the east of I80/San Pablo Avenue. A good part of this area is connected to Richmond proper by a thin strip through parkland and is surrounded by unincorporated El Sobrante. District 2 is in the north in the Hilltop area. Like District 1 it is connected to Richmond proper by thin strips of land. These two District represent areas that were added to Richmond over 30 years ago. District 3 is Point Richmond to the Richmond Annex (area along the Bay). The other three Districts are in Central Richmond.

108 Joshua Lerman (single-district map)

I think this map makes sense because I consider the "North and East" my neighborhood and a distinct part of Richmond. It's contiguous, mostly residential neighborhood with single family houses. I included districts 79 and 80 which aren't usually "North and East".. but they have commercial areas that we in the North and East frequent. I only drew this one district, but the population is roughly 1/6th, which is perfect. That was another reason to add 79 and 80.

109 Marilyn Saarni, E., Reza Yazdi, Soheila Bana (each submitted the same map separately)

Marilyn Saarni comments:

I think this map for East Richmond, District 1, makes sense because this represents a contiguous area of East Richmond that faces several common public safety issues relating to natural disasters, wildfires in particular. Much of its housing stock was built in the 1950s-1960s, which means specific earthquake-deficiencies are widespread in housing, with many residents unaware that their homes with no shear wall strength could kill them (ranch style homes with stucco sprayed onto studs, tar paper and chicken wire, with no plywood sheathing). Meanwhile the Hayward Fault passes through this area. While these public safety issues stretch throughout the city, they are focused in East Richmond, and yet little attention has been paid to these issues. (Compare neighboring cities' disaster planning and prevention to see what City of Richmond could be doing.) The area of Richmond in zip 94803 is the "forgotten Richmond." Its ethnic/racial/culture diversity is rich, and much appreciated by its residents. People in this area prize their local wildlife, surrounding wildlands, and urban farming (though the farms close at hand are usually on unincorporated land). Which brings up another unifying factor: these residents desperately need their own Richmond Council member that listens, and supports citizen coordination efforts with neighboring residents and governments (unincorporated El Sobrante, Pinole, San Pablo, unincorporated East Richmond Heights, EBRPD, EBMUD) to provide disaster response that ensures public safety for everyone. East Richmond shares more linear borders with other governments than any other portion of Richmond.

E comments:

Pulls together a majority of area east of I-80; as contiguous as possible to reach population goal; Makes the most sense – I could not figure out another way, logically, to get to the population balance; also includes areas with common concerns such as fire response, high fire hazard unique to our area; allows remaining Hilltop area to reach a balanced population of 16,642 (areas 13-30).

110 Nancy Reichert, Irene Kuhn & Andrea Bennett (each submitted the same map separately)

No comments submitted

111

No comments submitted

112

No comments submitted

113 NDC

Map focused on minimizing neighborhood splits (in addition to the statutory requirements). Divides only one neighborhood association in the entire city (North & East).

District 1: Hilltop – Country Club;

District 2: Richmond Heights / El Sobrante;

District 3: Shoreline (Point Richmond and the Marina) / Richmond Annex;

District 4: uses railroad for western border, uniting Belding-Woods neighborhood with much of North & East neighborhood.

District 5: Iron Triangle / Santa Fe / Coronado;

District 6: Compact group of neighborhoods in South Richmond from Roosevelt Ave (in North & East) down to I-580 and the East Shore and Laurel Park neighborhoods.

114 NDC

A “Hilltop United west of I-80” map that balances neighborhoods with major roads and compactness.

District 1 is Richmond Heights and El Sobrante; District 2 is Hilltop / Country Club (with no population from the southern region of the City);

District 3 is Point Richmond, Marina, and the Annex neighborhoods, along with Atchison Village and Santa Fe;

District 4 is Shields-Reid, Belding/Woods, and much of North & East;

District 5 is Iron Triangle, Coronado, Cortez / Stege and the part of Richmore Village / Metro Square neighborhood east of Carlson Blvd and the railroad; District 6 runs from most of North & East neighborhood south to Parkview.

115 NDC

A highly compact map that keeps each of the Hilltop neighborhood associations whole, but has two districts covering Hilltop as a whole. Divides the shoreline between two districts. Follows railroads and major roads with a focus on united neighborhoods.

District 1 is Iron Triangle north of Macdonald Ave, Belding/Woods, and North & East above Garvin Ave and west of 26th St.

District 2 has part of the shoreline, as it starts in the south with Point Richmond then goes north to include the Country Club, Hilltop Bayview, Hilltop Village and Hilltop Green (this is the only map that puts all of the Hilltop Green neighborhood with Hilltop neighborhoods west of I-80).

District 3 runs east-west between Macdonald Ave and I-580, from Atchison Village in the west to Pullman in the east; its southern border follows the neighborhood borders rather than the freeway;

District 4 starts with Fairmede/Hilltop in the north, includes El Sobrante, and the part of Richmond Heights east of I-80 and north of Sierra Ave;

District 5 in the southeast covers the Marina (this is the 2nd Shoreline District), the Annex neighborhoods, then north to Cutting Blvd and Wall Ave.

103B NDC (in progress)

A revised version of 103 that addresses the voting rights act concerns (creating a 2nd district that does not include any shoreline); includes a district very similar to the map 110 “San Pablo Corridor” district; and has four districts touching the shoreline.

District 1 starts at Rosie the Riveter Park and the Port, then heads north picking up largely industrial areas of the Marina neighborhood, Santa Fe / Coronado and part of Cortez /

Steger; and all of the Iron Triangle neighborhood [only about 60 voters are in the district from south of I-580, and they are part of the Santa Fe neighborhood association]; District 2 consists of all of Richmore Village / Metro Square neighborhood and all of Belding/Woods neighborhood, then a large part of North & East (this is one of two districts that do not include shoreline territory); District 3 has most of North & East neighborhood, all of Pullman, Cortez/Steger south of Cutting Blvd and east of South 28th St, and most of the population of the Marina neighborhood [1,180 residents, about 1,130 registered voters, and about 900 voters in a Presidential election are south of I-580: about 7% of the district's population, 12% of the registered voters, and 14% of active voters]; District 4 has El Sobrante and Hilltop's Fairmede / Hilltop neighborhood (with no Richmond Heights population); District 5 is the San Pablo corridor, from Richmond Heights down to the Annex, plus the Southwest Annex part of the shoreline, which is zero-population and includes Point Isabel and McLaughlin Eastshore State Park; except for at the shoreline and in Park Plaza, the entire west border of District 5 follows neighborhood boundaries, so the in and out jogs are where different neighborhoods jog in and out, other than population balancing in Park Plaza [2,074 residents, 1,400 registered voters, and 1,000 active voters are west of I-580 in this district, representing 12% of District population, 13% of registered voters, and 13% of active voters]; District 6 is Point Richmond, the Country Club, and the northern two Hilltop neighborhoods (Hilltop Bayview and Hilltop Village).

103b NDC

Keep as many neighborhood associations undivided as possible, while:
Keep the "multiple districts touching the shoreline goal of Map 103 (though this map has four, rather than five, districts on the shoreline);
Ensure the wealthier shoreline voters do not outvote the South Richmond bulk of population of the two South Richmond / Shoreline districts;
Incorporate the "San Pablo Corridor" of Map 110;
Ensure compliance with the Federal Voting Rights Act.

103c Michael Parker

Give shoreline access/responsibility to multiple districts.

115b Jim Hanson

Attached is a map revision submittal for map #115. This map makes sense because it makes District 6 more compact and consistent with communities of interest by bringing in Richmond Heights, by connecting the area east of I-80 at Hilltop to District 4, by incorporating a 580/Richmond parkway/Cutting Blvd. confluence area in from District 3 to District 2, and by adding an east area to section 3 to extend the District along the Cutting Blvd. neighborhood area travel corridor. These modifications are consistent with the rules of the CVRA and continue to balance out population size by district. Thank you for the

opportunity to hear more comments from your staff and residents at last night's workshop and reflect this new information and insights in a revised map #115 recommendation.

[Follow up comments from Mr. Hanson]

The main concern of our neighborhood is to align the Richmond Hts. neighborhood to the central Richmond proper by making it contiguous with the Richmond proper. I am following up with my individual input by asking for connection: a) with the North and East neighborhood (District 6 on my #115 map revision) and b) by making it contiguous with the San Pablo Ave. corridor neighborhoods to the south (District 5 on a #103 map revision). At the Dec. 3 workshop, Ms. Tilton said - given comments by Council and our the public hearing where I spoke as RHNC President - that NDC would revise #103 to be more population-balanced and would incorporate Richmond Hts. into Richmond proper. I am writing to support that revision to #103 and any other map revisions where Richmond Hts. is attached to the distant residential areas of Sobrante Ridge and Hilltop.

Connection of Richmond Hts. with Richmond proper is a better representation of the rules for communities of interest, contiguous, and compactness.

101b Scott Rafferty

In response to the community forums, I have tried to modify Map 101 to accommodate a desire expressed to maintain both sides of 23rd street and San Pablo avenue each within one district. As is sometimes the case, the housing styles and demographics in census blocks on both sides of these commercial corridors are similar. The demographics within the Barretts (PUs 40 and 41) vary; I had hoped that a community forum would help define this part of the district more precisely, but the city has determined that there will be no timely forum in Belding Woods or Shields Reid.

I had previously asked to discuss how blocks were aggregated into "population units." As Dr. Johnson is aware, I was concerned that these units resulted in a candidate-focused gerrymander in Monterey Park that split a very distinctive and well defined Latino neighborhood. Some PU's in this case appear to create large bottlenecks (e.g. 75). The area between 28th and 29th street has large inconsistencies in the synthesized CVAP ratio. This is a rather dense area, so it was not possible to follow either street unless population was adjusted elsewhere. It was not clear why the PU chose 28th St as a boundary when 28th St defined block groups, which avoid the need to synthesize data, which create an unmeasurable measure of error. An earlier map alternated between these streets, in anticipation of community input in designing the ultimate remedial district. It was unfortunate that Dr Johnson described this as a "jigsaw," and tried to link it to his theory that any consideration of race in demonstrating a majority district is improper, a view that Justice Alito dismissed last year. The alternation between 28th and 29th was an effort to deal with very uncertain data at the block group level, pending community input that the city has opted not to solicit. Lack of compactness may defeat a majority demonstration district; erosivity does not.