

AGENDA ITEM REQUEST FORM

Department: City Attorney's/City Clerk's Office

Department Head: Bruce Reed Goodmiller/Pamela Christian

Phone: 620-6509/620-6513

Meeting Date: 1/14/2020

Final Decision Date Deadline: _____

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE: On September 11, 2019, the City received a demand letter from attorney Scott J. Rafferty (Rafferty) which threatens legal action against the City under the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA) if the City does not transition from at-large to district-based elections of City Councilmembers.

INDICATE APPROPRIATE BODY

- | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City Council | <input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Authority | <input type="checkbox"/> Surplus Property Authority | <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Powers Financing Authority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Finance Standing Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Safety Public Services Standing Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> Rules and Procedures Standing Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> Local Reuse Authority | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

ITEM _____

- | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation/Proclamation/Commendation (3-Minute Time Limit) | <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing | <input type="checkbox"/> Council As Whole | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contract/Agreement | <input type="checkbox"/> Claims Filed Against City of Richmond | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grant Application/Acceptance | <input type="checkbox"/> Video/PowerPoint Presentation (contact KCRT @ 620.6759) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Resolution | | |

RECOMMENDED ACTION: HOLD the fifth public hearing to receive public input on draft maps of voting district boundaries and election sequencing as part of the City's transition from an "at-large" election system of electing City Councilmembers to a "by-district" election system; SELECT a map to establish district boundaries; and: (1) INTRODUCE and ADOPT an Urgency Ordinance adopting sections 2.16.050 (City Council Election Districts and Sequencing) and 2.16.060 (City Council Residency) of the Richmond Municipal Code to transition from at-large to by-district elections of City Councilmembers; and (2) INTRODUCE an ordinance (first reading) adopting sections 2.16.050 (City Council Election Districts and Sequencing) and 2.16.060 (City Council Residency) of the Richmond Municipal Code to transition from at-large to by-district elections of City Councilmembers - City Attorney's Office/City Clerk's Office (Bruce Reed Goodmiller 620-6509/Pamela Christian 620-6513).

REVIEWS/APPROVALS **DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE**

Only items submitted by City Staff have been reviewed and approved by the **FINANCE DIRECTOR, CITY ATTORNEY, and CITY MANAGER.**

AGENDA ITEM NO:
<ITEM_OUTLINE>



AGENDA REPORT

CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

DATE: January 14, 2020

TO: Mayor Tom Butt and Members of the City Council

FROM: Bruce Reed Goodmiller, City Attorney
Pamela Christian, City Clerk

SUBJECT: Fifth Public Hearing Regarding Composition of City Council Districts

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE:

On September 11, 2019, the City received a demand letter from attorney Scott J. Rafferty ("Rafferty") which threatens legal action against the City under the California Voting Rights Act ("CVRA") if the City does not transition from at-large to district-based elections of City Councilmembers.

Recent efforts to protect jurisdictions from costs related to CVRA litigation (which include plaintiffs' attorneys' fees and litigation expenses) led to an amendment of the Elections Code section 10010 to include a "safe-harbor" provision that gives jurisdictions the opportunity to change their election system once they receive a demand letter and caps legal fees recoverable by a plaintiff at \$30,000 if a jurisdiction:

- Adopts a resolution of intention to transition to district-based elections that outlines specific steps and estimates a time frame, within forty-five (45) days of receiving the demand letter; and
- Holds at least four (4) public hearings and adopts an ordinance within ninety (90) days of adopting the resolution of intention.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

HOLD the fifth public hearing to receive public input on draft maps of voting district boundaries and election sequencing as part of the City's transition from an "at-large" election system of electing City Councilmembers to a "by-district" election system; SELECT a map to establish district boundaries; and: (1) INTRODUCE and ADOPT an

Urgency Ordinance adopting sections 2.16.050 (City Council Election Districts and Sequencing) and 2.16.060 (City Council Residency) of the Richmond Municipal Code to transition from at-large to by-district elections of City Councilmembers; and (2) INTRODUCE Ordinance (first reading) adopting sections 2.16.050 (City Council Election Districts and Sequencing) and 2.16.060 (City Council Residency) of the Richmond Municipal Code to transition from at-large to by-district elections of City Councilmembers.

FINANCIAL IMPACT OF RECOMMENDATION:

There is no specific financial impact from tonight's public hearing, although the consideration of transitioning to a district-based election system involves retaining demographers and counsel. There will also be a small increase in the cost of future elections to account for multiple races rather than one, at-large race for Council.

DISCUSSION:

On September 11, 2019, the City received a demand letter from Mr. Rafferty asserting that the City's at-large council member electoral system violates the Federal Voting Rights Act (FVRA) and the CVRA by denying Latino voters an opportunity to elect candidates of their choice that is equal to the opportunity enjoyed by non-Latino voters and by diluting the electoral influence of Richmond's Asian and African-American communities. More recently Mr Rafferty has asked whether districts prepared by the City's consulting demographers have divided the City's Lao community.

The letter threatened litigation if the City declined to voluntarily change to a district-based election system.

Federal and California Voting Rights Acts

The FVRA was enacted in 1965 to overcome legal barriers at the state and local levels that prevented minority groups from exercising their right to vote as granted by the U.S. Constitution. Cities with at-large electoral systems have been challenged under Section 2 of the FVRA on the premise that the at-large system dilutes minority voting rights.

The CVRA was enacted in 2001 to implement the California constitutional guarantees of equal protection and the right to vote. The CVRA is broader than the FVRA and provides a private right of action to members of a protected class where, because of "dilution or the abridgment of the rights of voters," an at-large election system "impairs the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to include the outcome of an election." A violation of CVRA is established if racially polarized voting occurs in elections.

- "Racially polarized voting" means voting where there is a difference between candidates or other electoral choices preferred by voters in a protected class and those preferred by voters in the rest of the electorate." Intent to discriminate is not necessary to find evidence of racially polarized voting.

The essential difference between the federal and state statutes is that federal law applies only if a reasonably compactly and continuous "majority-minority district" (i.e., a district in

which a majority of residents are of a minority group) can be drawn while the state law applies whether or not this is so.

Attorney Fees

In many cases, the apparent motivation for a claim under the CVRA (as opposed to the FVRA) is the attorney fees often awarded to successful plaintiffs.¹ For example, Modesto settled a CVRA claim for \$3 million in attorney fees.² Notably, no attorney fees award is available to the defending jurisdiction, even if it wins — which none has yet done.³

Under the CVRA, a plaintiff need not obtain a court judgment to recoup attorney fees. Under the “catalyst theory,” a party may seek attorney fees if a matter is settled or the defendant agency accedes to the plaintiff’s demands before judgment. To obtain catalyst fees, a plaintiff must demonstrate his or her suit or demand was “a substantial factor contributing to” the agency’s decision to adopt districts.⁴

Safe-Harbor Under the CVRA

Recent efforts to protect jurisdictions from costs related to CVRA litigation led to an amendment of the Elections Code section 10010 to include a “safe-harbor” provision that gives jurisdictions the opportunity to change their election system once they receive a demand letter and caps legal fees recoverable by a plaintiff at \$30,000 if a jurisdiction:

- Adopts a resolution of intention to transition to district-based elections that outlines specific steps and estimates a time frame, within forty-five (45) days of receiving the demand letter; and
- Holds at least four (4) public hearings and adopts an ordinance within ninety (90) days of adopting the resolution of intention.

On October 22, 2019, the City adopted Resolution of Intention No. 99-19 to transition from at-large to district-based elections of City Councilmembers. Under the “safe-harbor” provision, the ordinance to transition to district elections must be adopted no later than January 20, 2020.

Public Hearings on District Formation

Following adoption of the Resolution of Intention, a minimum of four public hearings must be held in 90 days. The first two public hearings are held prior to drawing maps to consider communities of interest and other interests which should influence map design. The third and fourth public hearings are held to receive public input on the draft maps provided by the City’s contract demographer, those submitted by Mr. Rafferty, and other map proposals submitted by others.

¹ FVRA cases have been brought by non-profit impact litigation groups, while CVRA cases have been brought by private, for-profit attorneys, sometimes suing for such groups.

² Ashton, “Settlement in Latino voting case will set Modesto back \$3 million,” *The Modesto Bee* (June 6, 2008).

³ Elec. Code, § 14030.

⁴ *Hogar Dulce Hogar v. Community Development Comm.* (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 1358, 1365.

The City Council held public hearings on November 5, November 19, 2019 and December 3, 2019, and December 17, 2019. In addition to the four public hearings, staff also held City Council Voting District Community Workshops on November 14 and November 18, 2019, at the Council Chamber; December 5, 2019, at Hilltop Community Church (Activity Room), 3118 Shane Drive, Richmond; December 10, 2019, at Booker T. Anderson Community Center, 960 S. 47th Street, Richmond, and January 6, 2020, at Veteran's Hall, 968 23rd Street.

Analysis of Richmond's Laotian-American Community

Analysis of the impacts of districts on the City's African-American and Latinx communities has infused all discussions to date. It seems plain that districts that meet the Federal Voting Rights Act can be drawn for both Latinx and African-American voters.

In the last week, Mr. Rafferty suggested by letter and an email to the City's special counsel that maps proposed by the City's demographer, Douglas Johnson of National Demographics Corporation ("NDC") needlessly divided the City's Lao community. NDC researched Mr. Rafferty's claim and reports:

Recent estimates of the total number of Laotians in the entire City of Richmond: according to the most recent American Community Survey data – the same data we are using for income, language spoken at home, etc. – are that there are 882 people born in Laos in Richmond, with a margin of error of +/- 382. And the latest estimate of people citing Laotian 'Race' (essentially those who trace their heritage to people from Laos) in the City as a whole is 1,134, with a margin of error of 443. (Those born in Laos – the 882 – would also be counted in the estimate of Laotian Race, so the two numbers cannot be added together).

Even if we assume every one of those 1,134 people live in a geographic area that could be included in a single district, and if we VERY favorably assume 90% of them are adults and 100% are citizens, they would reach a maximum at 15% of [Citizen Voting Age Population or "CVAP"] in the lowest-total-CVAP district of Map 101.

More realistically, Laotians are at most 5% of CVAP in that district. Note that only 24% of the City's total Latino CVAP live in District 1 of Map 101. Laotians may be more-concentrated than Latinos, but even if a very-unlikely 50% of all Laotians are in a single district, that would work out to a count of only 567 Laotians in a district of over 17,000 residents.

The Laotian numbers in Richmond are so small that the Census Bureau does not provide any breakdown of Laotians within the City — not by Census Block, Census Block Group, nor by Census Tract.

There were too few Laotians in the United States for the academic author of 'Asian' surname list used by the official California Statewide Database to create a list of Laotian surnames. So the California Statewide Database also does not provide any data on Laotians within the City. As a result the 'BSIG' method cited by Mr. Rafferty (combining

surname data and geographic data) cannot be applied using official California data (nor, as noted above, can it be done with official Census data). A voter list company called "Political Data" is probably the best-known source of 'BSIG'-method data. But I checked their listing of the all of the fields they compile, and they also do not have sufficient data -- even at the statewide level -- to compile counts of Laotians.

So the only available data – from government or commonly-used private sources – on the geographic concentration of Laotians in Richmond would be anecdotal. But we know from the Census Bureau's official counts that Laotians, even in an absolute-highest-case scenario, are going to be no more than 15% of CVAP in a single District, and more realistic assumptions would put them at about 5% of CVAP.

If any individual or group comes forward with any data on Laotian numbers and locations in the City that they have compiled (and for which they can cite the methodology used), NDC is happy to evaluate it further. But in the Federal and State databases, the counts of Laotians in Richmond are so small that the Federal and State databases cannot provide any counts by any level of geography below the citywide total.

At the City's January 6th community forum, Lao community members that spoke at the forum indicated that Lao residents of Richmond live in all sections of the city and are not particularly concentrated in any one neighborhood.

Accordingly, NDC does not recommend alteration of the maps it has proposed to account for the distribution of Lao residents of the City.

Analysis and Recommendation

Tonight's public hearing will be the fifth public hearing required to be held to receive public input on draft maps of voting district boundaries and election sequencing as part of the City's transition from an "at-large" election system of electing City Council Members to a "by-district" election system.

The City initially received 17 proposed maps from members of the public, of which NDC determined five were duplicates of earlier submitted maps. NDC initially proposed three additional maps. The City published those the 15 initial draft maps on November 26, 2019. After its third public hearing on December 3, 2019, the City received three more maps from the public, and NDC proposed one additional map. The City published 19 revised draft maps on December 10, 2019. An additional map from a member of the public arrived after the deadline and too late to process and post it seven days prior to this hearing. That additional map proposed changes to Map 114 and NDC's presentation of Map 114 will include discussion of the feedback on that map.

Staff recommends the Council consider the maps marked "relatively safe" for adoption. Those include Map 101, 101c, 103b, 103d, 114b, 115b. Each of these respect neighborhood boundaries and the other state requirements, meet the constitutional requirements for equal population and meet the federal voting rights act goal of including a district in which Latinos are effectively able to elect their preferred candidates (i.e., 45–51% of Citizen Voting Age Population, or CVAP, with a 15 to 30% advantage over the

next-largest group's share of CVAP). Please refer to the attached document titled "NDC Comments on Plan Compliance with Requirements" for more information.

City staff sought to provide residents with as many hearings and workshops as possible to increase participation in the district drawing and election sequencing process. Accordingly, the City desires to take full advantage of Elections Code section 10010's 90-day "Safe Harbor Period" by introducing an ordinance on January 14, 2020 and adopting the ordinance on or before the 90th day. The 90th day falls on January 20, 2020, Martin Luther King Jr. Day, a legal holiday. Under Civil Code section 11, the 90-day deadline is extended to the next business day, which is January 21, 2020.

Should a court fail to recognize the legal effect of Civil Code section 11, the City may protect itself by adopting an urgency ordinance within the "Safe Harbor Period" on January 14, 2020. Unlike the preferred method of adopting an ordinance that requires two readings and a majority vote, an urgency ordinance requires a single reading, a higher vote threshold, and specific findings. The regular ordinance includes a section repealing the urgency ordinance, thereby ensuring that either the urgency ordinance or regular ordinance will be in effect, but not both.

This two-step approach best serves the City's interests in increasing residents' participation while completing a legally defensible transition to district-based elections within the "Safe Harbor Period."

NEXT STEPS

Following this meeting, it is recommended that the Council adopt the regular district ordinance at its January 21, 2020, City Council meeting.

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:

Draft Ordinances
Tentative Public Hearing and Community Workshop Schedule
Draft Maps
Plan Submitter Comments
Proposed Election Sequence by Plan
NDC Comments on Plan Compliance with Requirements
Notes on and Comments Received from Community Forums

EXHIBIT A

Tentative Public Hearing Timeline

DATE	EVENT	COMMENT
November 5, 2019	1st Public Hearing	Council to receive input from community to be used to draw preliminary district maps. No maps yet drawn.
November 14, 2019 November 18, 2019	Community Workshops	Staff provides a presentation regarding the move to district elections, demonstrates the mapping tools and receives input on map designs.
November 19, 2019	2nd Public Hearing	Council to receive additional input from community to be used to draw preliminary district maps. No maps yet drawn.
November 21, 2019	Initial Map Submission Deadline	Deadline to submit maps that will be posted November 26 and considered by Council at third public hearing.
November 26, 2019	Publish Draft Maps and Potential Sequence of elections.	Maps will be posted at least 7 days prior to the third public hearing.
December 3, 2019	3rd Public Hearing	Regarding draft maps and proposed sequence of elections. Opportunity for public to respond and make recommendations regarding the proposed district boundaries and sequence of elections.
December 5, 2019	Community Workshop #3 7 – 8:30 p.m. Hilltop Community Church (Activity Room) 3118 Shane Drive, Richmond	Staff to receive input from community regarding draft maps submitted for review.
December 6, 2019	Revised Maps Deadline	Deadline to submit revisions to posted maps that will be posted December 10 and considered by Council at fourth public hearing.
December 10, 2019	Community Workshop #4 7 – 8:30 p.m. Booker T. Anderson Community Center 960 S. 47 th Street, Richmond	Staff to receive input from community regarding posted maps.

DATE	EVENT	COMMENT
December 17, 2019	4th Public Hearing	Regarding draft maps and proposed sequence of elections. Opportunity for public to respond and make recommendations regarding the proposed district boundaries and sequence of elections.
January 6, 2020	Publish Draft Maps & Sequence of Elections	Maps will be posted at least 7 days prior to the 5 th public hearing on January 14, 2020.
January 14, 2020	5 th Public Hearing	Expected that Council will select map to establish district boundaries, introduce an ordinance and adopt an urgency ordinance establishing district elections, and determine election sequence.
January 21, 2020	Special Meeting	Expected that Council will adopt an ordinance establishing district elections.

URGENCY ORDINANCE NO. ___-U

AN URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND ADOPTING SECTION 2.16.050 (CITY COUNCIL ELECTION DISTRICTS AND SEQUENCING) AND SECTION 2.16.060 (CITY COUNCIL RESIDENCY) OF CHAPTER 2.16 (ELECTIONS) OF ARTICLE II (ADMINISTRATION AND CITY GOVERNMENT) OF THE RICHMOND MUNICIPAL CODE TO TRANSITION FROM AT-LARGE TO BY-DISTRICT ELECTIONS OF CITY COUNCILMEMBERS

Section 1. Findings

WHEREAS, under the City Charter, members of the City Council are elected at large; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2019, the City received a certified letter from Attorney Scott Rafferty asserting the City’s at-large councilmember electoral system violates the California Voting Rights Act (“CVRA”) and threatening litigation if the City declines to voluntarily change to a district-based electoral system; and

WHEREAS, the City denies that its at-large electoral system violates the CVRA, or any other law, and continues to support the full participation of all voters in its elections; and

WHEREAS, the City Council concludes the public interest is served by transitioning to by-district elections to avoid the cost of disputing the matter; and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 99-19 on October 22, 2019, stating its intention to transition to by-district elections pursuant to Elections Code section 10010 and section 3 of article III of the Richmond City Charter; and

WHEREAS, any provision of the City Charter conflicting with the CVRA is preempted under *Jauregui v. City of Palmdale* (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 781, 802, which held the dilution of votes of a protected class and the transition to district-based elections are matters of statewide concern; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 99-19 triggered Elections Code section 10010’s 90-day safe harbor provision, which shields the City from litigation under the California Voting Rights Act while it holds public hearings and considers proposed maps regarding its intention to transition to district-based elections; and

WHEREAS, the City held public hearings on November 5, 2019, November 19, 2019, December 3, 2019, December 17, 2019, and January 14, 2020 as required under Elections Code section 10010, subdivision (a)(2), to receive input regarding communities of interest and the composition of districts; and

WHEREAS, the City held five supplementary community workshops on November 14, 2019, November 18, 2019, December 5, 2019, December 10, 2019, and January 6, 2020 to receive input regarding communities of interest and the composition of districts; and

WHEREAS, the City created a separate page on its website to inform voters of the process to transition to by-district elections, and posted a description of the process, the schedule of hearings and meetings, frequently asked questions, draft maps, notices, correspondence, presentations, resolutions, and staff reports; and

WHEREAS, the City contracted with National Demographics Corporation (“NDC”) to draw district maps and analyze submissions by the public and contracted with Compass Demographics to provide a peer review of NDC’s work; and

WHEREAS, the City provided a link on its website to data kits which allow members of the public to propose maps for NDC’s consideration; and

WHEREAS, the City received 17 proposed maps from members of the public, and NDC determined 5 were duplicates; and

WHEREAS, NDC proposed three additional maps; and

WHEREAS, the City timely published 15 draft maps on November 26, 2019; and

WHEREAS, after its third public hearing on December 3, 2019, the City received three more maps from the public, and NDC proposed one additional map; and

WHEREAS, the City timely published 19 revised draft maps on December 10, 2019; and

WHEREAS, on December 17, 2019, the City Council identified four maps, plus a fifth to be submitted by Compass Demographics, as those to be the focus of further community dialog and directed further efforts to seek community input before the Council’s January 14, 2020 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of districts will not affect the term of any sitting Councilmember, each of whom will serve the term to which he was elected.

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the City of Richmond does ordain as follows:

Section 2. Urgency Findings

Under Government Code section 36937, subdivision (b), the City Council finds as follows:

- (a) Multiple community outreach efforts were necessary to inform and hear from the diverse members of the City’s Latinx and Asian communities;

- (b) The five public hearings and multiple community outreach efforts took place over the holiday season, including Christmas, New Year’s Eve and El Dia de Los Reyes Magos (Epiphany);
- (c) The City and prospective plaintiffs were unable to reach an agreement to extend the safe harbor period by an additional 90 days as permitted by Elections Code section 10010, subdivision (e)(3)(C); and
- (d) In the interest of preserving public peace and welfare, this Urgency Ordinance must be adopted on one reading and made immediately effective to allow the City to adopt this Ordinance within Elections Code section Elections Code section 10010’s 90-day safe harbor period while still allowing maximum opportunity for meaningful public input on the subject of this Ordinance.

Section 3. Amendment of Municipal Code

Chapter 2.16 (Elections) of Article II (Administration and City Government) of the Richmond Municipal Code is hereby amended to add a new Section 2.16.050 as follows:

2.16.050 City Council Election Districts; Sequencing

- (a) **District Boundaries.** Commencing with the City’s regular election in 2020, the City Council will be elected from the six districts described on the map attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated by this reference. The districts identified in Exhibit A shall be subsequently reapportioned as required by law.
- (b) **Election Sequencing.** Commencing with the City’s regular election in 2020 and every four years thereafter, voters in Districts ____, ____, and ____ will elect members of the City Council for four-year terms. Commencing with the regular election in 2022 and every four years thereafter, the voters in Districts ____, ____, and ____ will elect members of the City Council for four-year terms.

Section 4. Amendment of Municipal Code

Chapter 2.16 (Elections) of Article II (Administration and City Government) of the Richmond Municipal Code is hereby amended to add a new Section 2.16.060 as follows:

2.16.060 Residency; Vacancies

- (a) **City Council.**
 - 1) Commencing with the City’s regular election in 2020, any candidate for the City Council must reside in, and be a registered voter of, the district which he or she seeks to represent and shall maintain status as a registered voter there during his or her service on the Council. Unless applicable law otherwise requires, to be eligible for office, a candidate must be such a resident and registered voter of the district at the time nomination papers are issued to the candidate, as provided in Elections Code section 10227.

- 2) If a City Council member elected by district ceases to be a registered voter in that district, that fact creates a vacancy unless he or she obtains another domicile within the district within 30 days after cessation of residency. Any vacancy arising for that reason, or otherwise under Government Code section 1770 or other applicable law, must be filled pursuant to section 2.16.090 of this Code and section 10 of article III of the City Charter by the remaining members of the City Council appointing a qualified resident and registered voter of the district to which the vacancy pertains.

(b) **Mayor.** Qualifications for and vacancies in the office of Mayor are governed by article III, sections 3 and 5 of the City Charter.

Section 5. Recordation; Publication

Upon adoption of this Urgency Ordinance by no less than four-fifths vote of the City Council, the Mayor shall sign and the City Clerk shall attest to its passage. The City Clerk shall file a copy of the Urgency Ordinance with the Contra Costa County Clerk-Recorder's office within 30 days of its passage and adoption and shall give notice of it as required by section 2.08.010 of the Municipal Code and record it in the Ordinance Book as required by section 2.08.020 of that Code.

Section 6. Severability

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Urgency Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, that decision will not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the Urgency Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted the Urgency Ordinance and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of the Urgency Ordinance would be subsequently declared invalid.

Section 7. Effective Date

The Urgency Ordinance shall be effective immediately upon passage and adoption.

Passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council held on January 14, 2020, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

ABSENT:

PAMELA CHRISTIAN
CLERK OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND
(SEAL)

Approved:

TOM BUTT
Mayor

Approved as to form:

BRUCE GOODMILLER
City Attorney

State of California }
County of Contra Costa } : ss.
City of Richmond }

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of Urgency Ordinance No. ____, passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Richmond at a regular meeting held on January 14, 2020.

Pamela Christian, City Clerk of the City of Richmond

ORDINANCE NO. ____

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND
ADOPTING SECTION 2.16.050 (CITY COUNCIL ELECTION DISTRICTS AND
SEQUENCING) AND SECTION 2.16.060 (CITY COUNCIL RESIDENCY) OF
CHAPTER 2.16 (ELECTIONS) OF ARTICLE II (ADMINISTRATION AND CITY
GOVERNMENT) OF THE RICHMOND MUNICIPAL CODE TO TRANSITION
FROM AT-LARGE TO BY-DISTRICT ELECTIONS OF CITY
COUNCILMEMBERS AND REPEALING ORDINANCE NO ____-U**

Section 1. Findings

WHEREAS, under the City Charter, members of the City Council are elected at large; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2019, the City received a certified letter from Attorney Scott Rafferty asserting the City's at-large councilmember electoral system violates the California Voting Rights Act ("CVRA") and threatening litigation if the City declines to voluntarily change to a district-based electoral system; and

WHEREAS, the City denies that its at-large electoral system violates the CVRA, or any other law, and continues to support the full participation of all voters in its elections; and

WHEREAS, the City Council concludes the public interest is served by transitioning to by-district elections to avoid the cost of disputing the matter; and

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 99-19 on October 22, 2019, stating its intention to transition to by-district elections pursuant to Elections Code section 10010 and section 3 of article III of the Richmond City Charter; and

WHEREAS, any provision of the City Charter conflicting with the CVRA is preempted under *Jauregui v. City of Palmdale* (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 781, 802, which held the dilution of votes of a protected class and the transition to district-based elections are matters of statewide concern; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 99-19 triggered Elections Code section 10010's 90-day safe harbor provision, which shields the City from litigation under the California Voting Rights Act while it holds public hearings and considers proposed maps regarding its intention to transition to district-based elections; and

WHEREAS, 90 days from October 22, 2019 is January 20, 2020, Martin Luther King Jr. Day, a legal holiday, and under Civil Code section 11, the 90-day deadline is extended to the next business day which is January 21, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the City held public hearings on November 5, 2019, November 19, 2019, December 3, 2019, December 17, 2019, and January 14, 2020 as required under Elections Code section 10010, subdivision (a)(2), to receive input regarding communities of interest and the composition of districts; and

WHEREAS, the City held five supplementary community workshops on November 14, 2019, November 18, 2019, December 5, 2019, December 10, 2019, and January 6, 2020 to receive input regarding communities of interest and the composition of districts; and

WHEREAS, the City created a separate page on its website to inform voters of the process to transition to by-district elections, and posted a description of the process, the schedule of hearings and meetings, frequently asked questions, draft maps, notices, correspondence, presentations, resolutions, and staff reports; and

WHEREAS, the City contracted with National Demographics Corporation (“NDC”) to draw district maps and analyze submissions by the public and contracted with Compass Demographics to provide a peer review of NDC’s work; and

WHEREAS, the City provided a link on its website to data kits which allow members of the public to propose maps for NDC’s consideration; and

WHEREAS, the City received 17 proposed maps from members of the public, and NDC determined 5 were duplicates; and

WHEREAS, NDC proposed three additional maps; and

WHEREAS, the City timely published 15 draft maps on November 26, 2019; and

WHEREAS, after its third public hearing on December 3, 2019, the City received three more maps from the public, and NDC proposed one additional map; and

WHEREAS, the City timely published 19 revised draft maps on December 10, 2019; and

WHEREAS, on December 17, 2019, the City Council identified four maps, plus a fifth to be submitted by Compass Demographics, as those to be the focus of further community dialog and directed further efforts to seek community input before the Council’s January 14, 2020 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of districts will not affect the term of any sitting Councilmember, each of whom will serve the term to which he was elected; and

WHEREAS. The Council adopted an Ordinance substantively identical to this as an urgency ordinance in one reading and with immediate effectiveness on January 14, 2020, and it is now appropriate to replace that urgency ordinance with this ordinance adopted on two readings and with 30-day effectiveness.

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the City of Richmond does ordain as follows:

Section 2. Amendment of Municipal Code

Chapter 2.16 (Elections) of Article II (Administration and City Government) of the Richmond Municipal Code is hereby amended to add a new Section 2.16.050 as follows:

2.16.050 City Council Election Districts; Sequencing

- (a) **District Boundaries.** Commencing with the City’s regular election in 2020, the City Council will be elected from the six districts described on the map attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated by this reference. The districts identified in Exhibit A shall be subsequently reapportioned as required by law.

- (b) **Election Sequencing.** Commencing with the City’s regular election in 2020 and every four years thereafter, voters in Districts ____, ____, and ____ will elect members of the City Council for four-year terms. Commencing with the regular election in 2022 and every four years thereafter, the voters in Districts ____, ____, and ____ will elect members of the City Council for four-year terms.

Section 3. Amendment of Municipal Code

Chapter 2.16 (Elections) of Article II (Administration and City Government) of the Richmond Municipal Code is hereby amended to add a new Section 2.16.060 as follows:

2.16.060 Residency; Vacancies

- (a) **City Council.**
 - 1) Commencing with the City’s regular election in 2020, any candidate for the City Council must reside in, and be a registered voter of, the district which he or she seeks to represent and shall maintain status as a registered voter there during his or her service on the Council. Unless applicable law otherwise requires, to be eligible for office, a candidate must be such a resident and registered voter of the district at the time nomination papers are issued to the candidate as provided in Elections Code section 10227.
 - 2) If a City Council member elected by district ceases to be a registered voter in that district, that fact creates a vacancy unless he or she obtains another domicile within the district within 30 days after cessation of residency. Any vacancy arising for that reason, or otherwise under Government Code section 1770 or other applicable law, must be filled pursuant to section 2.16.090 of this Code and section 10 of article III of the City Charter by the remaining members of the City Council appointing a qualified resident and registered voter of the district to which the vacancy pertains.

- (b) **Mayor.** Qualifications for and vacancies in the office of Mayor are governed by article III, sections 3 and 5 of the City Charter.

Section 4. Recordation; Publication

The City Clerk shall file a copy of the Ordinance with the Contra Costa County Clerk-Recorder's office within 30 days of its passage and adoption and shall give notice of it as required by section 2.08.010 of the Municipal Code and record it in the Ordinance Book as required by section 2.08.020 of that Code.

Section 5. Severability

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid by a decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, that decision will not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted the Ordinance and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of the Ordinance would be subsequently declared invalid.

Section 6. Effective Date

The Ordinance shall be effective 30 days after passage and adoption.

Section 7. Repealer

Ordinance No. ____-U is hereby repealed.

First read at a special meeting of the Council of the City of Richmond held on January 14, 2020, and finally passed and adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on January 21, 2020, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

ABSENT:

PAMELA CHRISTIAN
CLERK OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND
(SEAL)

Approved:

TOM BUTT
Mayor

Approved as to form:

BRUCE GOODMILLER
City Attorney


State of California }
County of Contra Costa } : ss.
City of Richmond }

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of **Ordinance No. ____**, passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Richmond at a regular meeting held on January 21, 2020.

Pamela Christian, City Clerk of the City of Richmond

**City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting**

101



- LEGEND**
- 101
 - + Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 101

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,511	16,642	16,590	18,062	18,077	16,819	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	227	-642	-694	778	793	-465	1,487
	% Deviation	1.31%	-3.71%	-4.02%	4.50%	4.59%	-2.69%	8.60%
Total Pop	% Hisp	71%	26%	20%	18%	54%	45%	39%
	% NH White	5%	11%	32%	35%	5%	15%	17%
	% NH Black	15%	36%	18%	28%	35%	27%	27%
	% Asian-American	6%	24%	26%	16%	4%	10%	14%
	Total	7,537	10,984	12,510	13,132	8,352	10,018	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	51%	21%	16%	12%	30%	27%	24%
	% NH White	10%	18%	39%	42%	9%	23%	26%
	% NH Black	21%	36%	15%	24%	52%	33%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	14%	22%	28%	19%	7%	13%	18%
	Total	5,896	7,351	10,317	11,678	7,505	8,136	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	54%	22%	18%	11%	34%	32%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	49%	20%	16%	10%	31%	28%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	9%	11%	7%	2%	5%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	3%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	14%	21%	52%	50%	10%	26%	32%
	% NH Black	28%	48%	19%	29%	53%	37%	34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	2,851	4,132	7,206	8,243	3,302	4,777	30,511
	% Latino est.	54%	20%	16%	10%	32%	29%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	48%	18%	15%	9%	29%	26%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	8%	9%	7%	2%	4%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	15%	22%	55%	57%	12%	29%	38%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% NH Black	28%	50%	19%	25%	53%	38%	32%
	Total	3,542	4,965	8,188	8,927	4,051	5,671	35,344
	% Latino est.	55%	21%	17%	10%	34%	31%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	49%	19%	15%	9%	30%	28%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	8%	10%	7%	2%	4%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	3%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%
ACS Pop. Est.	% NH White est.	15%	20%	50%	53%	9%	27%	35%
	% NH Black est.	25%	48%	20%	26%	53%	36%	32%
Age	Total	17,831	17,760	16,979	18,844	18,639	17,829	107,882
	age0-19	30%	23%	19%	20%	31%	25%	25%
	age20-60	59%	58%	56%	58%	56%	59%	58%
Immigration	age60plus	11%	18%	25%	22%	13%	16%	18%
	immigrants	44%	37%	28%	28%	37%	36%	35%
Language spoken at home	naturalized	33%	51%	64%	43%	26%	33%	40%
	english	26%	43%	61%	65%	39%	43%	46%
	spanish	63%	32%	17%	15%	53%	46%	38%
	asian-lang	8%	14%	14%	13%	6%	7%	10%
Language Fluency	other lang	3%	11%	9%	7%	2%	3%	6%
	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	38%	25%	16%	15%	29%	29%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	47%	57%	53%	47%	47%	53%	51%
	bachelor	9%	17%	25%	26%	10%	13%	17%
	graduatedegree	3%	7%	12%	17%	5%	6%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	43%	29%	24%	21%	36%	31%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	62%	58%	62%	64%	55%	60%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	21%	17%	11%	19%	26%	25%	20%
	income 25-50k	29%	21%	15%	19%	35%	24%	23%
	income 50-75k	20%	17%	15%	18%	14%	19%	17%
	income 75-200k	28%	40%	48%	36%	22%	29%	34%
	income 200k-plus	2%	4%	10%	8%	2%	3%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	74%	58%	85%	57%	60%	70%	67%
	multi-family	26%	42%	15%	43%	40%	30%	33%
	rented	54%	55%	29%	51%	63%	54%	51%
	owned	46%	45%	71%	49%	37%	46%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond
2019/2020 Districting

101B



- LEGEND**
- 101B
 - Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

National Demographics Corporation, December 9, 2019

City of Richmond - Draft Map 101b


District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,145	16,642	17,081	18,062	18,077	16,694	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	-139	-642	-203	778	793	-590	1,435
	% Deviation	-0.80%	-3.71%	-1.17%	4.50%	4.59%	-3.41%	8.30%
Total Pop	% Hisp	72%	26%	21%	18%	54%	45%	39%
	% NH White	5%	11%	31%	35%	5%	16%	17%
	% NH Black	15%	36%	19%	28%	35%	26%	27%
	% Asian-American	6%	24%	25%	16%	4%	10%	14%
	Total	7,174	10,984	12,940	13,132	8,352	9,951	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	52%	21%	18%	12%	30%	26%	24%
	% NH White	10%	18%	36%	42%	9%	26%	26%
	% NH Black	21%	36%	17%	24%	52%	31%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	13%	22%	28%	19%	7%	13%	18%
	Total	5,623	7,351	10,415	11,678	7,505	8,311	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	55%	22%	18%	11%	34%	32%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	49%	20%	17%	10%	31%	29%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	9%	11%	7%	2%	5%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	3%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	13%	21%	50%	50%	10%	28%	32%
	% NH Black	29%	48%	20%	29%	53%	35%	34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	2,699	4,132	7,263	8,243	3,302	4,872	30,511
	% Latino est.	54%	20%	17%	10%	32%	30%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	49%	18%	15%	9%	29%	27%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	8%	9%	7%	2%	4%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	14%	22%	53%	57%	12%	31%	38%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% NH Black	28%	50%	21%	25%	53%	35%	32%
	Total	3,344	4,965	8,275	8,927	4,051	5,781	35,344
	% Latino est.	55%	21%	17%	10%	34%	31%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	50%	19%	16%	9%	30%	28%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	8%	10%	7%	2%	4%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%
ACS Pop. Est.	% NH White est.	14%	20%	49%	53%	9%	29%	35%
	% NH Black est.	26%	48%	21%	26%	53%	34%	32%
Age	Total	17,469	17,760	17,520	18,844	18,639	17,651	107,882
	age0-19	30%	23%	19%	20%	31%	25%	25%
	age20-60	59%	58%	56%	58%	56%	59%	58%
Immigration	age60plus	11%	18%	25%	22%	13%	16%	18%
	immigrants	44%	37%	28%	28%	37%	37%	35%
Language spoken at home	naturalized	32%	51%	63%	43%	26%	34%	40%
	english	27%	43%	60%	65%	39%	43%	46%
	spanish	63%	32%	17%	15%	53%	46%	38%
	asian-lang	8%	14%	13%	13%	6%	8%	10%
Language Fluency	other lang	3%	11%	9%	7%	2%	3%	6%
	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	38%	25%	16%	15%	29%	29%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	47%	57%	53%	47%	47%	53%	51%
	bachelor	9%	17%	25%	26%	10%	13%	17%
	graduatedegree	3%	7%	12%	17%	5%	6%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	43%	29%	24%	21%	36%	31%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	62%	58%	62%	64%	55%	60%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	21%	17%	11%	19%	26%	25%	20%
	income 25-50k	29%	21%	15%	19%	35%	24%	23%
	income 50-75k	21%	17%	15%	18%	14%	19%	17%
	income 75-200k	27%	40%	48%	36%	22%	30%	34%
	income 200k-plus	2%	4%	10%	8%	2%	3%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	73%	58%	85%	57%	60%	71%	67%
	multi-family	27%	42%	15%	43%	40%	29%	33%
	rented	55%	55%	29%	51%	63%	53%	51%
	owned	45%	45%	71%	49%	37%	47%	49%

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.


Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

The previously attached map omitted to reflect a revision moving the boundary between 4 and 3 to San Pablo Avenue, as requested at one meeting. Please substitute this map.



City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting

101c



National Demographics Corporation, January 9, 2020

City of Richmond - Draft Map 101c

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	16,753	16,642	17,445	18,068	17,547	17,246	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	-531	-642	161	784	263	-38	1,426
	% Deviation	-3.07%	-3.71%	0.93%	4.54%	1.52%	-0.22%	8.25%
Total Pop	% Hisp	72%	26%	22%	18%	57%	44%	39%
	% NH White	6%	11%	32%	35%	5%	13%	17%
	% NH Black	14%	36%	18%	28%	32%	32%	27%
	% Asian-American	7%	24%	25%	16%	4%	9%	14%
	Total	7,513	10,984	13,131	13,137	7,942	9,825	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	51%	21%	18%	12%	32%	25%	24%
	% NH White	12%	18%	39%	42%	10%	20%	26%
	% NH Black	19%	36%	14%	24%	49%	39%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	14%	22%	27%	19%	7%	12%	18%
	Total	5,633	7,351	10,710	11,683	7,112	8,393	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	55%	22%	19%	11%	37%	30%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	50%	20%	17%	10%	33%	27%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	9%	11%	7%	2%	4%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	3%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	16%	21%	52%	50%	11%	22%	32%
	% NH Black	25%	48%	18%	29%	50%	44%	34%
	Total	2,818	4,132	7,447	8,245	3,120	4,749	30,511
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	54%	20%	17%	10%	34%	28%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	48%	18%	15%	9%	31%	25%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	8%	9%	7%	2%	4%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	18%	22%	55%	57%	12%	25%	38%
	% NH Black	25%	50%	19%	25%	51%	43%	32%
	Total	3,428	4,965	8,463	8,928	3,899	5,661	35,344
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% Latino est.	55%	21%	18%	10%	36%	29%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	49%	19%	16%	9%	33%	26%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	8%	10%	7%	2%	4%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	17%	20%	50%	53%	10%	24%	35%
	% NH Black est.	23%	48%	20%	26%	50%	41%	32%
	Total	17,195	17,760	17,925	18,850	17,854	18,298	107,882
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	17,195	17,760	17,925	18,850	17,854	18,298	107,882
Age	age0-19	29%	23%	19%	20%	32%	25%	25%
	age20-60	59%	58%	56%	58%	55%	59%	58%
	age60plus	12%	18%	25%	22%	12%	16%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	44%	37%	29%	28%	38%	35%	35%
	naturalized	33%	51%	62%	43%	24%	33%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	27%	43%	60%	65%	36%	45%	46%
	spanish	61%	32%	18%	15%	57%	44%	38%
	asian-lang	9%	14%	13%	13%	5%	8%	10%
	other lang	3%	11%	9%	7%	2%	3%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	38%	25%	17%	15%	31%	28%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	47%	57%	53%	47%	47%	52%	51%
	bachelor	9%	17%	25%	26%	9%	14%	17%
	graduatedegree	3%	7%	12%	17%	3%	6%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	42%	29%	25%	21%	38%	31%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	62%	58%	62%	64%	54%	60%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	21%	17%	11%	19%	28%	24%	20%
	income 25-50k	28%	21%	15%	19%	38%	24%	23%
	income 50-75k	20%	17%	15%	18%	14%	19%	17%
	income 75-200k	29%	40%	48%	36%	20%	30%	34%
	income 200k-plus	2%	4%	10%	8%	1%	3%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	75%	58%	85%	57%	61%	68%	67%
	multi-family	25%	42%	15%	43%	39%	32%	33%
	rented	53%	55%	30%	51%	65%	54%	51%
	owned	47%	45%	70%	49%	35%	46%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

**City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting**

102



LEGEND

-  102
-  Landmark Point
-  Landmark Area
-  Railroad
-  River
-  Streets
-  Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 102

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	16,894	17,028	17,668	17,910	17,113	17,088	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	-390	-256	384	626	-171	-196	1,016
	% Deviation	-2.26%	-1.48%	2.22%	3.62%	-0.99%	-1.13%	5.88%
Total Pop	% Hisp	73%	26%	23%	19%	56%	43%	39%
	% NH White	6%	11%	32%	35%	5%	13%	17%
	% NH Black	13%	36%	18%	28%	33%	32%	27%
	% Asian-American	6%	24%	25%	15%	4%	9%	14%
	Total	7,347	11,379	13,200	12,869	7,969	9,769	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	52%	21%	18%	12%	31%	26%	24%
	% NH White	13%	17%	39%	43%	9%	20%	26%
	% NH Black	18%	36%	16%	24%	50%	38%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	14%	23%	26%	18%	8%	13%	18%
	Total	5,690	7,630	10,622	11,802	6,929	8,209	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	55%	22%	19%	12%	36%	30%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	50%	20%	17%	11%	32%	27%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	9%	11%	7%	2%	4%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	3%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	17%	21%	51%	50%	11%	22%	32%
	% NH Black	24%	48%	19%	29%	51%	43%	34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	2,853	4,318	7,383	8,332	3,046	4,578	30,511
	% Latino est.	54%	20%	17%	10%	34%	28%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	49%	18%	15%	9%	30%	25%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	8%	9%	7%	2%	4%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	3%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	18%	22%	54%	56%	12%	25%	38%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% NH Black	24%	50%	19%	25%	52%	42%	32%
	Total	3,466	5,186	8,384	9,066	3,796	5,446	35,344
	% Latino est.	55%	21%	18%	11%	36%	29%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	49%	19%	16%	10%	32%	26%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	8%	10%	7%	2%	4%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%
ACS Pop. Est.	% NH White est.	18%	20%	50%	53%	10%	24%	35%
	% NH Black est.	22%	48%	20%	26%	51%	40%	32%
Age	Total	17,333	18,141	18,174	18,664	17,407	18,162	107,882
	age0-19	29%	23%	19%	20%	32%	25%	25%
	age20-60	59%	58%	56%	58%	55%	59%	58%
Immigration	age60plus	12%	18%	25%	22%	12%	16%	18%
	immigrants	44%	37%	29%	28%	38%	35%	35%
Language spoken at home	naturalized	33%	51%	61%	42%	25%	34%	40%
	english	27%	43%	59%	64%	36%	46%	46%
	spanish	61%	32%	19%	17%	57%	42%	38%
	asian-lang	9%	14%	13%	12%	5%	8%	10%
Language Fluency	other lang	3%	11%	9%	6%	2%	3%	6%
	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	38%	24%	17%	16%	31%	27%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	47%	57%	53%	47%	47%	53%	51%
	bachelor	9%	17%	25%	25%	9%	14%	17%
	graduatedegree	3%	7%	12%	17%	3%	6%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	42%	29%	25%	21%	38%	30%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	62%	58%	62%	64%	54%	60%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	21%	17%	12%	18%	28%	24%	20%
	income 25-50k	27%	21%	15%	19%	38%	25%	23%
	income 50-75k	21%	17%	15%	18%	14%	19%	17%
	income 75-200k	29%	40%	48%	36%	20%	29%	34%
	income 200k-plus	2%	4%	10%	9%	1%	3%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	74%	59%	85%	58%	61%	67%	67%
	multi-family	26%	41%	15%	42%	39%	33%	33%
	rented	54%	54%	30%	51%	65%	55%	51%
	owned	46%	46%	70%	49%	35%	45%	49%

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.


Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond 2019-2020 Districting

103

Slightly out of
population balance.



City of Richmond - Draft Map 103

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,666	16,263	18,308	16,379	17,264	17,821	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	382	-1,021	1,024	-905	-20	537	2,045
	% Deviation	2.21%	-5.91%	5.92%	-5.24%	-0.12%	3.11%	11.83%
Total Pop	% Hisp	64%	50%	43%	20%	29%	30%	39%
	% NH White	7%	18%	17%	32%	20%	10%	17%
	% NH Black	21%	25%	26%	19%	35%	34%	27%
	% Asian-American	6%	5%	11%	26%	14%	22%	14%
	Total	8,891	7,941	10,904	12,307	11,128	11,361	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	38%	27%	26%	18%	17%	23%	24%
	% NH White	14%	31%	28%	37%	27%	17%	26%
	% NH Black	33%	30%	29%	15%	35%	35%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	13%	9%	13%	28%	19%	21%	18%
	Total	7,151	7,448	9,078	10,079	9,478	7,648	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	42%	29%	30%	18%	18%	24%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	38%	26%	27%	16%	16%	21%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	4%	3%	5%	11%	7%	9%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%
	% NH White est.	20%	33%	32%	51%	30%	20%	32%
	% NH Black	33%	33%	32%	19%	45%	47%	34%
	Total	3,706	4,185	5,410	7,022	5,915	4,272	30,511
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	39%	23%	27%	16%	16%	21%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	35%	20%	24%	15%	14%	19%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	4%	3%	5%	9%	6%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	25%	45%	37%	55%	36%	21%	38%
	% NH Black	31%	27%	30%	20%	41%	50%	32%
	Total	4,455	4,805	5,994	8,017	6,952	5,120	35,344
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% Latino est.	41%	25%	29%	17%	17%	22%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	36%	23%	26%	15%	15%	20%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	4%	3%	5%	10%	6%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	22%	41%	35%	50%	33%	20%	35%
	% NH Black est.	30%	28%	29%	21%	41%	48%	32%
	Total	18,416	16,005	19,259	16,727	18,493	18,982	107,882
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	18,416	16,005	19,259	16,727	18,493	18,982	107,882
Age	age0-19	29%	29%	23%	19%	25%	24%	25%
	age20-60	59%	54%	60%	55%	58%	58%	58%
	age60plus	12%	17%	17%	26%	17%	18%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	40%	36%	35%	28%	33%	37%	35%
	naturalized	31%	25%	35%	65%	40%	49%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	33%	42%	46%	61%	56%	42%	46%
	spanish	57%	52%	41%	16%	26%	35%	38%
	asian-lang	8%	5%	10%	14%	12%	13%	10%
	other lang	2%	2%	3%	9%	7%	10%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	34%	28%	26%	16%	22%	26%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	47%	42%	50%	53%	53%	56%	51%
	bachelor	11%	14%	17%	25%	20%	16%	17%
	graduatedegree	5%	10%	8%	12%	10%	7%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	39%	32%	28%	24%	27%	30%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	61%	57%	62%	62%	61%	58%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	21%	24%	21%	11%	23%	18%	20%
	income 25-50k	27%	31%	24%	15%	22%	21%	23%
	income 50-75k	20%	14%	18%	15%	18%	18%	17%
	income 75-200k	29%	25%	32%	48%	32%	39%	34%
	income 200k-plus	3%	6%	4%	10%	4%	4%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	65%	60%	65%	84%	67%	60%	67%
	multi-family	35%	40%	35%	16%	33%	40%	33%
	rented	57%	58%	53%	30%	53%	55%	51%
	owned	43%	42%	47%	70%	47%	45%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

**City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting**

103b



- LEGEND**
- 103b
 - + Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 103b

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,485	16,564	17,535	17,131	17,653	17,333	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	201	-720	251	-153	369	49	1,089
	% Deviation	1.16%	-4.17%	1.45%	-0.89%	2.13%	0.28%	6.30%
Total Pop	% Hisp	54%	71%	40%	20%	23%	29%	39%
	% NH White	3%	7%	18%	24%	28%	23%	17%
	% NH Black	36%	14%	28%	28%	28%	24%	27%
	% Asian-American	4%	7%	11%	24%	17%	21%	14%
	Total	8,319	7,362	11,273	12,621	11,914	11,044	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	34%	48%	22%	20%	15%	17%	24%
	% NH White	6%	15%	26%	28%	37%	34%	26%
	% NH Black	50%	21%	33%	23%	26%	25%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	7%	15%	16%	27%	19%	21%	18%
	Total	7,219	5,811	9,030	10,369	10,623	7,830	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	34%	53%	27%	19%	16%	20%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	30%	48%	24%	17%	14%	18%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	4%	6%	10%	8%	9%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	7%	19%	31%	40%	43%	42%	32%
	% NH Black	56%	23%	36%	31%	32%	28%	34%
	Total	3,051	2,954	5,511	6,763	7,152	5,080	30,511
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	32%	52%	24%	17%	13%	17%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	29%	47%	22%	15%	12%	15%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	3%	5%	9%	7%	7%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	7%	21%	35%	44%	50%	48%	38%
	% NH Black	58%	24%	35%	30%	29%	27%	32%
	Total	3,928	3,560	6,484	7,813	7,850	5,709	35,344
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% Latino est.	34%	53%	26%	18%	15%	17%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	31%	48%	23%	16%	13%	15%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	4%	5%	9%	7%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	6%	20%	32%	40%	45%	45%	35%
	% NH Black est.	56%	21%	33%	30%	31%	27%	32%
	Total	17,788	17,118	18,687	17,383	18,653	18,253	107,882
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	17,788	17,118	18,687	17,383	18,653	18,253	107,882
Age	age0-19	31%	29%	24%	20%	22%	23%	25%
	age20-60	56%	59%	59%	55%	59%	57%	58%
	age60plus	12%	12%	16%	25%	19%	21%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	37%	44%	35%	28%	31%	36%	35%
	naturalized	25%	33%	36%	65%	43%	46%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	39%	28%	47%	58%	61%	44%	46%
	spanish	54%	61%	39%	21%	19%	32%	38%
	asian-lang	5%	8%	10%	13%	13%	12%	10%
	other lang	2%	2%	4%	7%	7%	11%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	29%	38%	26%	17%	19%	24%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	48%	48%	52%	57%	51%	48%	51%
	bachelor	10%	9%	16%	22%	23%	20%	17%
	graduatedegree	4%	3%	8%	10%	13%	12%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	39%	40%	28%	25%	25%	27%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	57%	60%	62%	58%	64%	59%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	26%	21%	23%	15%	19%	16%	20%
	income 25-50k	36%	29%	23%	17%	20%	20%	23%
	income 50-75k	15%	19%	18%	16%	18%	17%	17%
	income 75-200k	21%	29%	32%	44%	38%	39%	34%
	income 200k-plus	2%	2%	4%	8%	6%	8%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	62%	73%	66%	79%	67%	56%	67%
	multi-family	38%	27%	34%	21%	33%	44%	33%
	rented	64%	54%	53%	33%	50%	54%	51%
	owned	36%	46%	47%	67%	50%	46%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting

103C



National Demographics Corporation, December 10, 2019

City of Richmond - Draft Map 103c

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,691	17,444	17,811	16,379	17,264	17,112	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	407	160	527	-905	-20	-172	1,432
	% Deviation	2.35%	0.93%	3.05%	-5.24%	-0.12%	-1.00%	8.29%
Total Pop	% Hisp	63%	51%	44%	20%	29%	28%	39%
	% NH White	8%	17%	17%	32%	20%	10%	17%
	% NH Black	21%	24%	25%	19%	35%	35%	27%
	% Asian-American	6%	5%	11%	26%	14%	23%	14%
	Total	9,116	8,332	10,537	12,307	11,128	11,112	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	37%	28%	27%	18%	17%	22%	24%
	% NH White	15%	30%	28%	37%	27%	17%	26%
	% NH Black	33%	30%	29%	15%	35%	36%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	14%	9%	13%	28%	19%	22%	18%
	Total	7,195	7,823	8,854	10,079	9,478	7,453	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	41%	30%	30%	18%	18%	23%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	37%	27%	27%	16%	16%	21%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	4%	3%	5%	11%	7%	9%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%
	% NH White est.	21%	32%	32%	51%	30%	20%	32%
	% NH Black	33%	33%	32%	19%	45%	48%	34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	3,785	4,373	5,244	7,022	5,915	4,171	30,511
	% Latino est.	38%	23%	28%	16%	16%	21%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	34%	21%	25%	15%	14%	19%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	4%	3%	5%	9%	6%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	26%	44%	38%	55%	36%	21%	38%
	% NH Black	32%	27%	29%	20%	41%	50%	32%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	Total	4,520	5,028	5,820	8,017	6,952	5,007	35,344
	% Latino est.	40%	26%	29%	17%	17%	22%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	36%	23%	26%	15%	15%	19%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	4%	3%	5%	10%	6%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	23%	40%	35%	50%	33%	19%	35%
	% NH Black est.	31%	28%	29%	21%	41%	48%	32%
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	18,456	17,212	18,738	16,727	18,493	18,256	107,882
Age	age0-19	29%	29%	23%	19%	25%	24%	25%
	age20-60	59%	54%	60%	55%	58%	58%	58%
	age60plus	12%	17%	16%	26%	17%	18%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	40%	36%	36%	28%	33%	37%	35%
	naturalized	30%	26%	36%	65%	40%	50%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	34%	41%	45%	61%	56%	42%	46%
	spanish	57%	52%	41%	16%	26%	34%	38%
	asian-lang	8%	5%	10%	14%	12%	14%	10%
	other lang	2%	2%	3%	9%	7%	10%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	33%	29%	27%	16%	22%	25%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	47%	42%	50%	53%	53%	56%	51%
	bachelor	10%	14%	17%	25%	20%	16%	17%
	graduatedegree	5%	10%	8%	12%	10%	7%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	38%	32%	28%	24%	27%	30%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	60%	58%	62%	62%	61%	58%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	21%	24%	21%	11%	23%	18%	20%
	income 25-50k	26%	31%	24%	15%	22%	21%	23%
	income 50-75k	20%	15%	18%	15%	18%	17%	17%
	income 75-200k	29%	25%	33%	48%	32%	39%	34%
	income 200k-plus	3%	6%	4%	10%	4%	4%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	64%	60%	66%	84%	67%	60%	67%
	multi-family	36%	40%	34%	16%	33%	40%	33%
	rented	57%	58%	52%	30%	53%	55%	51%
	owned	43%	42%	48%	70%	47%	45%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

**City of Richmond
2019/2020 Districting**

103D



LEGEND

- Census Block
- 103d
- Census Tract
- Landmark Point
- Landmark Area
- Railroad
- River
- Streets
- Water Area

0 .5 1
Miles

City of Richmond - Draft Map 103d

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	18,101	17,599	17,562	16,853	16,944	16,642	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	817	315	278	-431	-340	-642	1,459
	% Deviation	4.73%	1.82%	1.61%	-2.49%	-1.97%	-3.71%	8.44%
Total Pop	% Hisp	71%	45%	43%	21%	28%	26%	39%
	% NH White	5%	20%	17%	32%	19%	11%	17%
	% NH Black	17%	27%	26%	18%	36%	36%	27%
	% Asian-American	6%	6%	11%	26%	13%	24%	14%
	Total	7,702	9,734	10,535	12,594	10,983	10,984	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	50%	21%	25%	18%	17%	21%	24%
	% NH White	10%	32%	28%	37%	26%	18%	26%
	% NH Black	23%	36%	29%	15%	37%	36%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	14%	9%	14%	28%	18%	22%	18%
	Total	5,974	9,119	8,737	10,269	9,432	7,351	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	53%	25%	30%	19%	17%	22%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	48%	22%	27%	17%	15%	20%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	3%	5%	11%	6%	9%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%
	% NH White est.	14%	36%	32%	51%	30%	21%	32%
	% NH Black	29%	34%	33%	19%	46%	48%	34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	2,809	5,349	5,212	7,162	5,847	4,132	30,511
	% Latino est.	53%	19%	27%	17%	15%	20%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	48%	17%	24%	15%	14%	18%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	3%	5%	9%	6%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	14%	47%	37%	54%	36%	22%	38%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% NH Black	29%	28%	30%	20%	42%	50%	32%
	Total	3,512	6,001	5,820	8,140	6,905	4,965	35,344
	% Latino est.	54%	21%	29%	18%	16%	21%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	48%	19%	26%	16%	14%	19%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	3%	5%	10%	6%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%
ACS Pop. Est.	% NH White est.	13%	43%	34%	49%	32%	20%	35%
	% NH Black est.	28%	29%	29%	20%	43%	48%	32%
Age	Total	18,536	17,700	18,489	17,212	18,185	17,760	107,882
	age0-19	31%	27%	23%	19%	25%	23%	25%
	age20-60	58%	56%	60%	56%	58%	58%	58%
Immigration	age60plus	11%	17%	17%	25%	17%	18%	18%
	immigrants	44%	33%	35%	29%	33%	37%	35%
Language spoken at home	naturalized	30%	28%	35%	64%	40%	51%	40%
	english	27%	46%	47%	60%	57%	43%	46%
	spanish	63%	46%	40%	17%	25%	32%	38%
	asian-lang	8%	6%	10%	14%	11%	14%	10%
Language Fluency	other lang	3%	2%	3%	9%	7%	11%	6%
	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	38%	25%	26%	17%	21%	25%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	46%	44%	50%	53%	53%	57%	51%
	bachelor	8%	17%	17%	25%	20%	17%	17%
	graduatedegree	3%	11%	9%	12%	10%	7%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	42%	30%	28%	24%	27%	29%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	59%	59%	62%	62%	61%	58%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	23%	22%	21%	11%	23%	17%	20%
	income 25-50k	31%	28%	24%	16%	22%	21%	23%
	income 50-75k	19%	15%	18%	15%	19%	17%	17%
	income 75-200k	26%	28%	32%	48%	32%	40%	34%
	income 200k-plus	2%	7%	4%	10%	4%	4%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	70%	58%	64%	86%	66%	58%	67%
	multi-family	30%	42%	36%	14%	34%	42%	33%
	rented	58%	56%	53%	29%	54%	55%	51%
	owned	42%	44%	47%	71%	46%	45%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

**City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting**

104



- LEGEND**
- 104
 - + Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

National Demographics Corporation, November 24, 2019

City of Richmond - Draft Map 104

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	18,157	17,156	17,655	16,477	16,517	17,739	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	873	-128	371	-807	-767	455	1,680
	% Deviation	5.05%	-0.74%	2.15%	-4.67%	-4.44%	2.63%	9.72%
Total Pop	% Hisp	67%	20%	54%	20%	44%	30%	39%
	% NH White	5%	36%	5%	32%	16%	10%	17%
	% NH Black	21%	25%	35%	19%	25%	34%	27%
	% Asian-American	6%	16%	4%	26%	12%	22%	14%
	Total	7,738	12,134	8,745	12,397	10,245	11,274	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	45%	10%	35%	19%	24%	22%	24%
	% NH White	9%	45%	11%	37%	25%	17%	26%
	% NH Black	30%	25%	45%	15%	31%	35%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	14%	18%	6%	28%	17%	21%	18%
	Total	6,404	10,832	7,487	10,132	8,443	7,584	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	50%	12%	32%	18%	31%	24%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	45%	11%	29%	16%	28%	21%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	8%	2%	11%	5%	9%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%
	% NH White est.	11%	53%	12%	51%	27%	20%	32%
	% NH Black	36%	25%	53%	19%	36%	47%	34%
	Total	2,940	7,721	3,574	7,052	4,991	4,232	30,511
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	50%	10%	30%	16%	29%	21%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	45%	9%	27%	15%	26%	19%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	7%	2%	9%	5%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	12%	60%	14%	55%	30%	21%	38%
	% NH Black	35%	21%	54%	20%	36%	50%	32%
	Total	3,743	8,340	4,192	8,050	5,937	5,082	35,344
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% Latino est.	52%	11%	31%	17%	30%	22%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	47%	10%	28%	15%	27%	20%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	7%	2%	10%	4%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	12%	56%	11%	50%	28%	20%	35%
	% NH Black est.	32%	22%	54%	21%	35%	48%	32%
	Total	18,310	17,831	18,554	16,826	17,460	18,901	107,882
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	18,310	17,831	18,554	16,826	17,460	18,901	107,882
Age	age0-19	31%	18%	32%	19%	24%	24%	25%
	age20-60	58%	59%	55%	56%	59%	58%	58%
	age60plus	11%	23%	13%	26%	16%	18%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	43%	27%	36%	28%	38%	37%	35%
	naturalized	29%	43%	26%	65%	38%	49%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	28%	66%	41%	61%	43%	42%	46%
	spanish	63%	14%	54%	16%	43%	35%	38%
	asian-lang	7%	14%	4%	14%	10%	14%	10%
	other lang	2%	7%	1%	9%	4%	10%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	37%	14%	30%	16%	28%	26%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	47%	44%	52%	53%	52%	56%	51%
	bachelor	8%	28%	8%	25%	15%	16%	17%
	graduatedegree	3%	19%	2%	12%	6%	7%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	43%	20%	37%	24%	29%	30%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	61%	66%	53%	62%	62%	58%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	23%	16%	30%	11%	23%	18%	20%
	income 25-50k	31%	17%	35%	15%	25%	21%	23%
	income 50-75k	20%	19%	15%	15%	16%	18%	17%
	income 75-200k	25%	38%	19%	48%	33%	39%	34%
	income 200k-plus	2%	10%	1%	10%	3%	4%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	67%	57%	64%	84%	73%	60%	67%
	multi-family	33%	43%	36%	16%	27%	40%	33%
	rented	59%	49%	64%	30%	50%	55%	51%
	owned	41%	51%	36%	70%	50%	45%	49%

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.


Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting

105

Not contiguous.



- LEGEND**
- 105
 - Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 105

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,454	17,056	17,210	17,692	17,350	16,939	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	170	-228	-74	408	66	-345	753
	% Deviation	0.98%	-1.32%	-0.43%	2.36%	0.38%	-2.00%	4.36%
Total Pop	% Hisp	44%	47%	45%	32%	48%	22%	39%
	% NH White	12%	15%	15%	26%	9%	25%	17%
	% NH Black	34%	28%	27%	23%	23%	25%	27%
	% Asian-American	8%	8%	10%	17%	17%	24%	14%
	Total	9,545	9,094	10,133	11,535	10,107	12,119	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	24%	25%	28%	19%	29%	21%	24%
	% NH White	21%	23%	26%	36%	17%	30%	26%
	% NH Black	42%	34%	33%	21%	29%	20%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	10%	15%	11%	20%	23%	27%	18%
	Total	7,556	7,766	8,475	10,168	6,807	10,110	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	27%	26%	31%	20%	37%	19%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	24%	24%	28%	18%	33%	17%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	5%	4%	4%	9%	7%	10%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	3%	2%
	% NH White est.	22%	28%	28%	45%	21%	42%	32%
	% NH Black	46%	39%	36%	26%	35%	28%	34%
	Total	3,962	4,335	5,018	6,889	3,756	6,551	30,511
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	23%	21%	29%	17%	33%	17%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	20%	19%	26%	16%	29%	16%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	5%	5%	4%	8%	6%	9%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	3%	2%
	% NH White est.	30%	37%	31%	51%	23%	46%	38%
	% NH Black	41%	34%	36%	24%	38%	28%	32%
	Total	4,726	5,010	5,917	7,547	4,429	7,714	35,344
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% Latino est.	24%	23%	30%	19%	34%	18%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	22%	21%	27%	17%	31%	17%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	5%	5%	4%	8%	6%	9%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	27%	33%	28%	47%	21%	42%	35%
	% NH Black est.	41%	35%	36%	24%	36%	28%	32%
	Total	18,164	17,333	18,319	18,509	18,232	17,324	107,882
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	18,164	17,333	18,319	18,509	18,232	17,324	107,882
Age	age0-19	27%	29%	25%	22%	26%	20%	25%
	age20-60	57%	55%	59%	60%	59%	56%	58%
	age60plus	16%	16%	16%	18%	15%	24%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	34%	37%	35%	35%	41%	30%	35%
	naturalized	36%	29%	33%	44%	41%	62%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	44%	44%	46%	53%	35%	57%	46%
	spanish	43%	45%	44%	26%	46%	22%	38%
	asian-lang	9%	7%	7%	14%	11%	13%	10%
	other lang	4%	4%	4%	6%	8%	8%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	26%	28%	28%	22%	31%	18%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	46%	46%	53%	50%	52%	57%	51%
	bachelor	17%	14%	14%	22%	13%	22%	17%
	graduatedegree	10%	9%	7%	11%	6%	10%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	34%	31%	31%	24%	35%	25%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	60%	56%	60%	65%	61%	58%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	20%	25%	24%	18%	15%	16%	20%
	income 25-50k	25%	31%	22%	23%	23%	17%	23%
	income 50-75k	18%	14%	19%	16%	21%	15%	17%
	income 75-200k	31%	25%	31%	37%	38%	43%	34%
	income 200k-plus	7%	4%	3%	5%	4%	9%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	64%	62%	70%	66%	62%	77%	67%
	multi-family	36%	38%	30%	34%	38%	23%	33%
	rented	54%	59%	53%	49%	55%	36%	51%
	owned	46%	41%	47%	51%	45%	64%	49%

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.


Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting

106

**Not contiguous.
Slightly out of
population balance.**



- LEGEND**
- 106
 - Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 106

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,130	16,896	17,175	16,356	17,974	18,170	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	-154	-388	-109	-928	690	886	1,814
	% Deviation	-0.89%	-2.24%	-0.63%	-5.37%	3.99%	5.13%	10.50%
Total Pop	% Hisp	57%	62%	51%	24%	21%	24%	39%
	% NH White	5%	5%	19%	23%	24%	27%	17%
	% NH Black	31%	27%	14%	35%	28%	24%	27%
	% Asian-American	5%	4%	13%	14%	25%	22%	14%
	Total	7,079	8,633	10,147	10,818	13,177	12,678	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	32%	40%	30%	17%	19%	15%	24%
	% NH White	10%	10%	29%	28%	28%	39%	26%
	% NH Black	46%	39%	21%	34%	23%	22%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	9%	8%	17%	19%	28%	20%	18%
	Total	6,480	6,926	7,970	9,513	10,758	9,235	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	38%	41%	37%	15%	19%	16%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	34%	37%	33%	14%	17%	14%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	2%	6%	7%	10%	10%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	11%	12%	35%	34%	40%	49%	32%
	% NH Black	48%	44%	22%	43%	31%	23%	34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	2,800	3,348	4,893	6,121	6,979	6,370	30,511
	% Latino est.	36%	40%	34%	13%	17%	13%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	32%	36%	30%	12%	15%	12%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	2%	5%	6%	9%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	13%	14%	37%	41%	44%	55%	38%
	% NH Black	48%	44%	23%	38%	31%	21%	32%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	Total	3,558	4,130	5,615	6,957	8,204	6,880	35,344
	% Latino est.	38%	41%	36%	14%	18%	14%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	34%	36%	32%	13%	16%	12%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	2%	5%	7%	9%	8%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%
	% NH White est.	11%	12%	36%	38%	39%	51%	35%
	% NH Black est.	47%	43%	21%	40%	31%	22%	32%
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	17,245	17,813	18,016	17,235	18,271	19,301	107,882
Age	age0-19	31%	30%	23%	24%	20%	21%	25%
	age20-60	56%	58%	60%	58%	56%	58%	58%
	age60plus	13%	11%	17%	19%	24%	21%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	39%	38%	40%	31%	29%	34%	35%
	naturalized	24%	29%	39%	44%	64%	47%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	36%	35%	39%	62%	58%	49%	46%
	spanish	56%	59%	45%	19%	21%	28%	38%
	asian-lang	6%	5%	11%	11%	13%	14%	10%
	other lang	2%	1%	5%	7%	8%	10%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	31%	34%	30%	19%	17%	21%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	46%	51%	49%	54%	57%	47%	51%
	bachelor	10%	8%	17%	20%	22%	23%	17%
	graduatedegree	4%	3%	7%	12%	10%	14%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	37%	43%	28%	26%	25%	25%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	55%	59%	64%	62%	58%	62%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	27%	24%	20%	22%	15%	14%	20%
	income 25-50k	37%	26%	24%	22%	17%	18%	23%
	income 50-75k	14%	23%	15%	17%	16%	18%	17%
	income 75-200k	20%	25%	37%	34%	43%	41%	34%
	income 200k-plus	2%	3%	4%	4%	8%	9%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	59%	68%	77%	68%	76%	54%	67%
	multi-family	41%	32%	23%	32%	24%	46%	33%
	rented	64%	59%	47%	52%	35%	52%	51%
	owned	36%	41%	53%	48%	65%	48%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond 2019-2020 Districting

107



- LEGEND**
- 107
 - Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 107

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	16,869	17,325	18,062	17,018	17,664	16,763	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	-415	41	778	-266	380	-521	1,299
	% Deviation	-2.40%	0.24%	4.50%	-1.54%	2.20%	-3.01%	7.52%
Total Pop	% Hisp	20%	30%	18%	52%	63%	54%	39%
	% NH White	31%	10%	35%	11%	9%	5%	17%
	% NH Black	19%	35%	28%	27%	17%	35%	27%
	% Asian-American	27%	21%	16%	7%	9%	4%	14%
	Total	12,731	10,911	13,132	9,210	8,673	7,876	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	18%	23%	12%	30%	39%	31%	24%
	% NH White	36%	17%	42%	23%	15%	10%	26%
	% NH Black	15%	36%	24%	35%	23%	50%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	29%	19%	19%	9%	18%	7%	18%
	Total	10,327	7,370	11,678	7,573	6,975	6,959	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	18%	24%	11%	34%	47%	34%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	16%	22%	10%	31%	43%	30%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	11%	9%	7%	3%	4%	2%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	51%	20%	50%	24%	20%	11%	32%
	% NH Black	20%	47%	29%	38%	28%	53%	34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	7,165	4,104	8,243	4,230	3,692	3,077	30,511
	% Latino est.	16%	21%	10%	31%	45%	31%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	15%	19%	9%	28%	41%	28%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	9%	8%	7%	3%	4%	2%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	54%	21%	57%	26%	23%	12%	38%
	% NH Black	20%	50%	25%	39%	28%	53%	32%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	Total	8,311	4,801	8,927	5,043	4,508	3,754	35,344
	% Latino est.	17%	22%	10%	32%	48%	33%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	15%	20%	9%	29%	43%	29%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	10%	8%	7%	3%	4%	2%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	49%	19%	53%	24%	23%	9%	35%
	% NH Black est.	22%	48%	26%	38%	24%	54%	32%
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	17,243	18,464	18,844	18,380	17,565	17,386	107,882
Age	age0-19	19%	24%	20%	27%	27%	31%	25%
	age20-60	56%	58%	58%	59%	59%	56%	58%
	age60plus	26%	18%	22%	13%	14%	13%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	29%	37%	28%	37%	44%	36%	35%
	naturalized	64%	49%	43%	28%	36%	26%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	61%	42%	65%	40%	31%	40%	46%
	spanish	16%	35%	15%	52%	56%	52%	38%
	asian-lang	14%	13%	13%	5%	11%	6%	10%
	other lang	9%	10%	7%	3%	3%	2%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	16%	26%	15%	31%	36%	29%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	53%	56%	47%	52%	48%	47%	51%
	bachelor	25%	16%	26%	12%	12%	11%	17%
	graduatedegree	12%	7%	17%	5%	4%	5%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	24%	30%	21%	37%	35%	36%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	62%	58%	64%	60%	62%	55%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	11%	18%	19%	25%	20%	26%	20%
	income 25-50k	16%	21%	19%	22%	32%	35%	23%
	income 50-75k	15%	18%	18%	22%	17%	14%	17%
	income 75-200k	48%	39%	36%	29%	29%	23%	34%
	income 200k-plus	10%	4%	8%	3%	2%	2%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	82%	61%	57%	67%	76%	60%	67%
	multi-family	18%	39%	43%	33%	24%	40%	33%
	rented	31%	54%	51%	58%	49%	63%	51%
	owned	69%	46%	49%	42%	51%	37%	49%

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.


Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting

108

Single-District
Proposal.



City of Richmond - Draft Map 108

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	16,826						103,701
	Deviation from ideal	-458						
	% Deviation	-2.65%						
Total Pop	% Hisp	51%						39%
	% NH White	18%	One-District					17%
	% NH Black	16%	Partial Map					27%
	% Asian-American	12%					14%	
	Total	9,755					62,532	
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	29%					24%	
	% NH White	30%					26%	
	% NH Black	22%					29%	
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	16%					18%	
	Total	7,791					50,882	
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	37%					26%	
	% Spanish-Surnamed	34%					23%	
	% Asian-Surnamed	6%					7%	
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%					2%	
	% NH White est.	34%					32%	
	% NH Black	23%					34%	
	Total	4,748					30,511	
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	34%					22%	
	% Spanish-Surnamed	31%					20%	
	% Asian-Surnamed	5%					6%	
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%					2%	
	% NH White est.	36%					38%	
	% NH Black	24%					32%	
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	Total	5,447					35,344	
	% Latino est.	36%					24%	
	% Spanish-Surnamed	32%					21%	
	% Asian-Surnamed	5%					6%	
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%					2%	
	% NH White est.	36%					35%	
	% NH Black est.	21%					32%	
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	17,594					107,882	
Age	age0-19	23%					25%	
	age20-60	60%					58%	
	age60plus	17%					18%	
Immigration	immigrants	40%					35%	
	naturalized	38%					40%	
Language spoken at home	english	39%					46%	
	spanish	46%					38%	
	asian-lang	11%					10%	
	other lang	5%					6%	
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	30%					25%	
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	50%					51%	
	bachelor	16%					17%	
	graduatedegree	7%					9%	
Child in Household	child-under18	28%					30%	
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	62%					60%	
Household Income	income 0-25k	21%					20%	
	income 25-50k	25%					23%	
	income 50-75k	16%					17%	
	income 75-200k	35%					34%	
	income 200k-plus	3%					5%	
Housing Stats	single family	76%					67%	
	multi-family	24%					33%	
	rented	48%					51%	
	owned	52%					49%	

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.


Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting

109

Single-District
Proposal.

Slightly out of
population balance.



City of Richmond - Draft Map 109

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	15,942						103,701
	Deviation from ideal	-1,342						
	% Deviation	-7.76%						
Total Pop	% Hisp	20%						39%
	% NH White	32%	One-District					17%
	% NH Black	18%	Partial Map					27%
	% Asian-American	26%					14%	
Citizen Voting Age Pop	Total	12,137						62,532
	% Hisp	18%						24%
	% NH White	37%						26%
	% NH Black	15%						29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	28%						18%
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	Total	9,899						50,882
	% Latino est.	18%						26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	16%						23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	11%						7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%						2%
	% NH White est.	51%						32%
	% NH Black	19%						34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	6,920						30,511
	% Latino est.	16%						22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	15%						20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	9%						6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%						2%
	% NH White est.	55%						38%
	% NH Black	20%						32%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	Total	7,878						35,344
	% Latino est.	17%						24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	15%						21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	10%						6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%						2%
	% NH White est.	50%						35%
	% NH Black est.	20%						32%
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	16,271						107,882
Age	age0-19	19%						25%
	age20-60	55%						58%
	age60plus	26%						18%
Immigration	immigrants	28%						35%
	naturalized	65%						40%
Language spoken at home	english	62%						46%
	spanish	16%						38%
	asian-lang	14%						10%
	other lang	9%						6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	16%						25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	53%						51%
	bachelor	25%						17%
	graduatedegree	12%						9%
Child in Household	child-under18	24%						30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	62%						60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	11%						20%
	income 25-50k	15%						23%
	income 50-75k	15%						17%
	income 75-200k	49%						34%
	income 200k-plus	11%						5%
Housing Stats	single family	86%						67%
	multi-family	14%						33%
	rented	28%						51%
	owned	72%						49%

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.


Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting

110

Single-district
proposal.



- LEGEND**
- 110
 - Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 110

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,916						103,701
	Deviation from ideal	632						
	% Deviation	3.66%						
Total Pop	% Hisp	26%						39%
	% NH White	23%	One-District					17%
	% NH Black	33%	Partial Map					27%
	% Asian-American	15%					14%	
Citizen Voting Age Pop	Total	11,822						62,532
	% Hisp	19%						24%
	% NH White	28%						26%
	% NH Black	32%						29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	18%						18%
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	Total	10,265						50,882
	% Latino est.	16%						26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	15%						23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	7%						7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%						2%
	% NH White est.	35%						32%
	% NH Black	41%						34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	6,582						30,511
	% Latino est.	14%						22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	13%						20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	6%						6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%						2%
	% NH White est.	42%						38%
	% NH Black	37%						32%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	Total	7,487						35,344
	% Latino est.	15%						24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	14%						21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	7%						6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%						2%
	% NH White est.	38%						35%
	% NH Black est.	38%						32%
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	18,961						107,882
Age	age0-19	24%						25%
	age20-60	58%						58%
	age60plus	18%						18%
Immigration	immigrants	31%						35%
	naturalized	43%						40%
Language spoken at home	english	60%						46%
	spanish	21%						38%
	asian-lang	11%						10%
	other lang	7%						6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	19%						25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	53%						51%
	bachelor	20%						17%
	graduatedegree	12%						9%
Child in Household	child-under18	26%						30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	63%						60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	22%						20%
	income 25-50k	22%						23%
	income 50-75k	17%						17%
	income 75-200k	35%						34%
	income 200k-plus	5%						5%
Housing Stats	single family	69%						67%
	multi-family	31%						33%
	rented	51%						51%
	owned	49%						49%

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.


Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond 2019-2020 Districting

111

Not contiguous.
Not population balanced.



- LEGEND**
- 111
 - + Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 111

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	19,114	16,733	18,483	15,094	17,142	17,135	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	1,830	-551	1,199	-2,190	-142	-149	4,020
	% Deviation	10.59%	-3.19%	6.94%	-12.67%	-0.82%	-0.86%	23.26%
Total Pop	% Hisp	30%	66%	33%	22%	37%	50%	39%
	% NH White	10%	9%	31%	24%	11%	18%	17%
	% NH Black	35%	15%	15%	31%	40%	24%	27%
	% Asian-American	22%	9%	18%	21%	8%	6%	14%
	Total	12,365	8,382	12,674	9,986	10,992	8,132	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	22%	43%	19%	17%	23%	25%	24%
	% NH White	17%	16%	39%	29%	19%	34%	26%
	% NH Black	35%	23%	17%	28%	45%	27%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	23%	15%	21%	24%	11%	12%	18%
	Total	8,408	6,273	10,317	9,015	9,081	7,788	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	23%	50%	24%	15%	21%	30%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	21%	45%	22%	14%	18%	27%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	9%	4%	8%	10%	4%	3%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	21%	21%	49%	38%	24%	36%	32%
	% NH Black	47%	24%	19%	36%	50%	30%	34%
	Total	4,752	3,392	6,965	5,989	5,039	4,373	30,511
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	21%	47%	21%	14%	17%	24%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	19%	42%	19%	13%	15%	22%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	8%	4%	7%	9%	5%	3%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	22%	23%	53%	44%	32%	47%	38%
	% NH Black	49%	26%	20%	33%	45%	24%	32%
	Total	5,697	3,979	7,860	6,909	5,816	5,083	35,344
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% Latino est.	22%	49%	23%	14%	19%	27%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	19%	44%	21%	13%	17%	24%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	8%	4%	7%	10%	4%	3%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	20%	21%	49%	40%	25%	43%	35%
	% NH Black est.	47%	24%	19%	34%	47%	24%	32%
	Total	20,285	17,235	19,310	15,818	18,422	16,810	107,882
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	20,285	17,235	19,310	15,818	18,422	16,810	107,882
Age	age0-19	24%	27%	21%	22%	26%	29%	25%
	age20-60	58%	59%	58%	57%	59%	54%	58%
	age60plus	18%	14%	21%	21%	14%	17%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	37%	42%	34%	31%	30%	37%	35%
	naturalized	50%	36%	48%	49%	33%	24%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	43%	31%	50%	61%	53%	41%	46%
	spanish	34%	56%	31%	17%	36%	52%	38%
	asian-lang	14%	9%	12%	13%	9%	5%	10%
	other lang	10%	3%	7%	8%	2%	2%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	25%	35%	23%	18%	21%	30%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	56%	49%	51%	52%	52%	42%	51%
	bachelor	16%	11%	21%	24%	17%	14%	17%
	graduatedegree	7%	5%	10%	12%	9%	9%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	30%	37%	26%	25%	30%	31%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	58%	62%	63%	60%	61%	56%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	17%	19%	16%	19%	22%	24%	20%
	income 25-50k	21%	26%	19%	20%	25%	32%	23%
	income 50-75k	18%	20%	14%	18%	19%	14%	17%
	income 75-200k	40%	32%	43%	36%	30%	24%	34%
	income 200k-plus	4%	2%	7%	7%	5%	6%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	61%	74%	81%	72%	56%	58%	67%
	multi-family	39%	26%	19%	28%	44%	42%	33%
	rented	54%	50%	39%	46%	58%	58%	51%
	owned	46%	50%	61%	54%	42%	42%	49%

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.


Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting

112

Two-district proposal.

Slightly out of
population balance.



City of Richmond - Draft Map 112

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,770	19,470					103,701
	Deviation from ideal	486	2,186					
	% Deviation	2.81%	12.65%					
Total Pop	% Hisp	54%	32%					39%
	% NH White	10%	10%	Two-District				17%
	% NH Black	29%	34%	Partial Map				27%
	% Asian-American	5%	21%					14%
Citizen Voting Age Pop	Total	8,432	11,937					62,532
	% Hisp	30%	23%					24%
	% NH White	16%	17%					26%
	% NH Black	41%	37%					29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	10%	21%					18%
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	Total	7,481	8,302					50,882
	% Latino est.	32%	25%					26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	29%	22%					23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	9%					7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	3%					2%
	% NH White est.	20%	19%					32%
	% NH Black	43%	48%					34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	3,704	4,544					30,511
	% Latino est.	27%	22%					22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	25%	20%					20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	8%					6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%					2%
	% NH White est.	27%	20%					38%
	% NH Black	39%	50%					32%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	Total	4,417	5,487					35,344
	% Latino est.	30%	23%					24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	27%	21%					21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	8%					6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%					2%
	% NH White est.	23%	19%					35%
	% NH Black est.	40%	48%					32%
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	17,884	20,593					107,882
Age	age0-19	31%	25%					25%
	age20-60	55%	58%					58%
	age60plus	14%	17%					18%
Immigration	immigrants	37%	38%					35%
	naturalized	25%	47%					40%
Language spoken at home	english	38%	41%					46%
	spanish	55%	36%					38%
	asian-lang	5%	13%					10%
	other lang	2%	10%					6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	30%	26%					25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	45%	56%					51%
	bachelor	11%	16%					17%
	graduatedegree	6%	7%					9%
Child in Household	child-under18	36%	31%					30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	55%	58%					60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	26%	18%					20%
	income 25-50k	35%	22%					23%
	income 50-75k	14%	18%					17%
	income 75-200k	22%	38%					34%
	income 200k-plus	3%	4%					5%
Housing Stats	single family	61%	60%					67%
	multi-family	39%	40%					33%
	rented	62%	56%					51%
	owned	38%	44%					49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

**City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting**

113



- LEGEND**
- 113
 - + Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - + Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 113

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,560	17,781	16,977	16,893	16,842	17,648	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	276	497	-307	-391	-442	364	939
	% Deviation	1.60%	2.88%	-1.78%	-2.26%	-2.56%	2.11%	5.43%
Total Pop	% Hisp	25%	24%	22%	68%	57%	42%	39%
	% NH White	11%	33%	37%	10%	5%	7%	17%
	% NH Black	36%	15%	22%	12%	32%	41%	27%
	% Asian-American	25%	24%	16%	8%	4%	6%	14%
	Total	12,179	12,655	11,408	8,593	7,926	9,771	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	21%	18%	12%	45%	34%	25%	24%
	% NH White	18%	40%	48%	19%	9%	12%	26%
	% NH Black	35%	14%	18%	17%	48%	50%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	24%	26%	19%	15%	7%	11%	18%
	Total	8,236	10,599	10,423	6,496	6,843	8,285	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	22%	20%	12%	52%	37%	26%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	20%	18%	11%	46%	33%	23%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	9%	11%	8%	4%	2%	3%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	22%	52%	56%	24%	10%	12%	32%
	% NH Black	47%	16%	22%	20%	51%	57%	34%
	Total	4,724	7,351	7,598	3,518	2,990	4,330	30,511
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	20%	18%	10%	49%	34%	24%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	18%	16%	9%	44%	31%	22%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	8%	9%	7%	4%	2%	3%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	23%	56%	61%	27%	12%	14%	38%
	% NH Black	50%	17%	19%	21%	51%	58%	32%
	Total	5,648	8,320	8,121	4,179	3,750	5,325	35,344
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% Latino est.	21%	19%	11%	50%	37%	25%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	18%	17%	10%	45%	33%	23%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	8%	10%	7%	4%	2%	3%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	21%	51%	58%	26%	9%	13%	35%
	% NH Black est.	47%	18%	20%	18%	51%	56%	32%
	Total	18,633	18,348	17,572	17,421	17,023	18,884	107,882
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	18,633	18,348	17,572	17,421	17,023	18,884	107,882
Age	age0-19	23%	20%	20%	27%	32%	27%	25%
	age20-60	58%	56%	58%	60%	56%	58%	58%
	age60plus	19%	24%	22%	13%	12%	15%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	36%	30%	29%	44%	38%	33%	35%
	naturalized	52%	59%	42%	35%	24%	31%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	45%	57%	61%	29%	36%	49%	46%
	spanish	31%	21%	19%	59%	57%	41%	38%
	asian-lang	14%	13%	13%	10%	5%	7%	10%
	other lang	11%	8%	7%	3%	2%	3%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	24%	18%	17%	37%	31%	26%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	57%	52%	44%	48%	48%	55%	51%
	bachelor	17%	24%	27%	10%	9%	13%	17%
	graduatedegree	8%	11%	18%	4%	3%	6%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	28%	25%	22%	37%	39%	31%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	58%	62%	65%	62%	56%	58%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	16%	12%	17%	20%	27%	27%	20%
	income 25-50k	21%	16%	18%	27%	37%	26%	23%
	income 50-75k	17%	14%	19%	19%	14%	19%	17%
	income 75-200k	41%	48%	37%	32%	20%	26%	34%
	income 200k-plus	4%	10%	9%	2%	1%	2%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	60%	85%	59%	76%	62%	62%	67%
	multi-family	40%	15%	41%	24%	38%	38%	33%
	rented	53%	31%	50%	51%	65%	59%	51%
	owned	47%	69%	50%	49%	35%	41%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

**City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting**

114



- LEGEND**
- 114
 - + Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

National Demographics Corporation, November 24, 2019

City of Richmond - Draft Map 114

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	16,982	16,642	17,834	16,739	17,887	17,617	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	-302	-642	550	-545	603	333	1,245
	% Deviation	-1.75%	-3.71%	3.18%	-3.15%	3.49%	1.93%	7.20%
Total Pop	% Hisp	21%	26%	29%	71%	52%	38%	39%
	% NH White	32%	11%	37%	7%	3%	12%	17%
	% NH Black	18%	36%	17%	13%	38%	37%	27%
	% Asian-American	25%	24%	15%	7%	5%	9%	14%
	Total	12,844	10,984	12,027	7,856	8,315	10,507	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	18%	21%	14%	49%	31%	22%	24%
	% NH White	37%	18%	48%	16%	5%	20%	26%
	% NH Black	16%	36%	18%	18%	51%	42%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	28%	22%	17%	14%	11%	13%	18%
	Total	10,394	7,351	10,844	5,995	7,222	9,076	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	19%	22%	16%	54%	32%	26%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	17%	20%	14%	49%	29%	23%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	11%	9%	8%	4%	2%	4%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	51%	21%	56%	20%	7%	21%	32%
	% NH Black	19%	48%	19%	21%	58%	49%	34%
	Total	7,243	4,132	7,854	3,135	3,051	5,096	30,511
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	17%	20%	13%	52%	31%	24%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	15%	18%	11%	46%	27%	22%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	9%	8%	7%	4%	2%	4%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	54%	22%	61%	22%	7%	23%	38%
	% NH Black	20%	50%	17%	22%	60%	48%	32%
	Total	8,244	4,965	8,250	3,733	3,966	6,186	35,344
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% Latino est.	17%	21%	13%	53%	33%	26%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	16%	19%	12%	47%	30%	23%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	10%	8%	7%	4%	2%	3%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	49%	20%	59%	22%	7%	21%	35%
	% NH Black est.	21%	48%	17%	20%	57%	47%	32%
	Total	17,413	17,760	18,329	17,292	18,235	18,853	107,882
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	17,413	17,760	18,329	17,292	18,235	18,853	107,882
Age	age0-19	19%	23%	21%	28%	30%	26%	25%
	age20-60	56%	58%	57%	59%	57%	58%	58%
	age60plus	25%	18%	21%	12%	13%	15%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	28%	37%	30%	44%	37%	35%	35%
	naturalized	63%	51%	37%	35%	26%	34%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	60%	43%	58%	28%	41%	48%	46%
	spanish	17%	32%	25%	60%	50%	41%	38%
	asian-lang	13%	14%	11%	9%	7%	8%	10%
	other lang	9%	11%	6%	3%	2%	3%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	16%	25%	19%	38%	28%	27%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	53%	57%	43%	48%	48%	56%	51%
	bachelor	25%	17%	25%	10%	11%	13%	17%
	graduatedegree	12%	7%	17%	4%	5%	5%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	24%	29%	23%	40%	37%	30%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	62%	58%	62%	62%	58%	59%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	11%	17%	18%	20%	26%	26%	20%
	income 25-50k	15%	21%	21%	26%	35%	25%	23%
	income 50-75k	15%	17%	17%	20%	15%	19%	17%
	income 75-200k	48%	40%	35%	31%	22%	28%	34%
	income 200k-plus	10%	4%	9%	2%	2%	2%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	85%	58%	59%	76%	59%	67%	67%
	multi-family	15%	42%	41%	24%	41%	33%	33%
	rented	29%	55%	51%	52%	63%	56%	51%
	owned	71%	45%	49%	48%	37%	44%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

**City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting**

114b



- LEGEND**
- 114b
 - + Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 114b

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	16,982	16,642	18,063	16,739	17,340	17,935	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	-302	-642	779	-545	56	651	1,421
	% Deviation	-1.75%	-3.71%	4.51%	-3.15%	0.32%	3.77%	8.22%
Total Pop	% Hisp	21%	26%	18%	71%	57%	44%	39%
	% NH White	32%	11%	35%	7%	5%	12%	17%
	% NH Black	18%	36%	28%	13%	31%	33%	27%
	% Asian-American	25%	24%	16%	7%	5%	8%	14%
Citizen Voting Age Pop	Total	12,844	10,984	13,129	7,856	7,758	9,961	62,532
	% Hisp	18%	21%	12%	49%	33%	24%	24%
	% NH White	37%	18%	42%	16%	9%	21%	26%
	% NH Black	16%	36%	24%	18%	47%	41%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	28%	22%	19%	14%	8%	11%	18%
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	Total	10,394	7,351	11,679	5,995	6,801	8,662	50,882
	% Latino est.	19%	22%	11%	54%	37%	29%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	17%	20%	10%	49%	34%	26%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	11%	9%	7%	4%	2%	4%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	51%	21%	50%	20%	11%	21%	32%
	% NH Black	19%	48%	29%	21%	49%	45%	34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	7,243	4,132	8,243	3,135	2,969	4,788	30,511
	% Latino est.	17%	20%	10%	52%	35%	27%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	15%	18%	9%	46%	32%	25%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	9%	8%	7%	4%	2%	4%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	54%	22%	57%	22%	12%	24%	38%
	% NH Black	20%	50%	25%	22%	50%	44%	32%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	Total	8,244	4,965	8,927	3,733	3,734	5,740	35,344
	% Latino est.	17%	21%	10%	53%	37%	29%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	16%	19%	9%	47%	34%	26%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	10%	8%	7%	4%	2%	3%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	49%	20%	53%	22%	10%	23%	35%
	% NH Black est.	21%	48%	26%	20%	49%	43%	32%
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	17,413	17,760	18,844	17,292	17,475	19,097	107,882
Age	age0-19	19%	23%	20%	28%	32%	26%	25%
	age20-60	56%	58%	58%	59%	55%	59%	58%
	age60plus	25%	18%	22%	12%	12%	15%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	28%	37%	28%	44%	39%	35%	35%
	naturalized	63%	51%	43%	35%	24%	33%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	60%	43%	65%	28%	35%	45%	46%
	spanish	17%	32%	15%	60%	58%	44%	38%
	asian-lang	13%	14%	13%	9%	5%	8%	10%
	other lang	9%	11%	7%	3%	2%	3%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	16%	25%	15%	38%	32%	27%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	53%	57%	47%	48%	47%	52%	51%
	bachelor	25%	17%	26%	10%	8%	14%	17%
	graduatedegree	12%	7%	17%	4%	3%	6%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	24%	29%	21%	40%	39%	31%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	62%	58%	64%	62%	55%	60%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	11%	17%	19%	20%	28%	24%	20%
	income 25-50k	15%	21%	19%	26%	38%	24%	23%
	income 50-75k	15%	17%	18%	20%	14%	19%	17%
	income 75-200k	48%	40%	36%	31%	19%	29%	34%
	income 200k-plus	10%	4%	8%	2%	1%	3%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	85%	58%	57%	76%	61%	68%	67%
	multi-family	15%	42%	43%	24%	39%	32%	33%
	rented	29%	55%	51%	52%	65%	55%	51%
	owned	71%	45%	49%	48%	35%	45%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

City of Richmond 2019-2020 Districting

115



LEGEND

- 115
- Landmark Point
- Landmark Area
- Railroad
- River
- Streets
- Water Area

City of Richmond - Draft Map 115

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,445	17,386	16,828	16,941	17,618	17,483	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	161	102	-456	-343	334	199	790
	% Deviation	0.93%	0.59%	-2.64%	-1.98%	1.93%	1.15%	4.57%
Total Pop	% Hisp	69%	26%	55%	20%	22%	45%	39%
	% NH White	4%	22%	5%	27%	23%	21%	17%
	% NH Black	19%	27%	34%	26%	35%	18%	27%
	% Asian-American	6%	22%	4%	24%	15%	13%	14%
	Total	7,271	11,951	8,594	12,243	11,767	10,705	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	47%	17%	34%	19%	15%	24%	24%
	% NH White	9%	32%	11%	31%	32%	32%	26%
	% NH Black	28%	25%	48%	23%	33%	23%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	13%	23%	5%	25%	19%	18%	18%
	Total	6,100	8,145	7,182	10,222	10,454	8,779	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	52%	18%	34%	19%	14%	32%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	47%	16%	30%	17%	12%	28%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	9%	2%	10%	8%	6%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	11%	41%	12%	42%	38%	37%	32%
	% NH Black	34%	31%	51%	29%	39%	25%	34%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	Total	2,750	5,336	3,385	6,687	6,806	5,547	30,511
	% Latino est.	53%	15%	31%	17%	12%	28%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	48%	14%	28%	15%	11%	25%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	8%	2%	9%	7%	5%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	12%	46%	14%	46%	46%	41%	38%
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% NH Black	32%	29%	52%	28%	33%	26%	32%
	Total	3,539	6,128	4,029	7,693	7,643	6,311	35,344
	% Latino est.	54%	16%	32%	18%	13%	30%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	49%	14%	28%	16%	12%	27%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	8%	2%	9%	7%	6%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%
ACS Pop. Est.	% NH White est.	12%	44%	11%	42%	41%	38%	35%
	% NH Black est.	30%	29%	52%	29%	36%	25%	32%
Age	Total	17,557	18,267	17,649	17,202	18,836	18,371	107,882
	age0-19	31%	21%	31%	20%	22%	23%	25%
	age20-60	59%	57%	56%	55%	60%	59%	58%
Immigration	age60plus	11%	22%	13%	24%	18%	18%	18%
	immigrants	44%	35%	36%	28%	30%	37%	35%
Language spoken at home	naturalized	29%	49%	26%	64%	41%	38%	40%
	english	26%	47%	40%	59%	62%	43%	46%
	spanish	64%	29%	55%	20%	18%	41%	38%
	asian-lang	7%	13%	4%	13%	14%	10%	10%
Language Fluency	other lang	2%	11%	1%	8%	6%	5%	6%
	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	38%	22%	30%	17%	17%	28%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	47%	49%	50%	57%	51%	50%	51%
	bachelor	8%	21%	9%	22%	23%	17%	17%
	graduatedegree	2%	13%	3%	10%	13%	8%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	44%	26%	37%	25%	23%	28%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	61%	60%	53%	59%	63%	64%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	22%	14%	29%	15%	20%	21%	20%
	income 25-50k	32%	19%	34%	17%	21%	22%	23%
	income 50-75k	20%	18%	15%	15%	19%	16%	17%
	income 75-200k	25%	41%	20%	44%	34%	37%	34%
	income 200k-plus	2%	8%	1%	9%	6%	4%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	69%	58%	63%	80%	57%	76%	67%
	multi-family	31%	42%	37%	20%	43%	24%	33%
	rented	58%	52%	64%	33%	54%	47%	51%
	owned	42%	48%	36%	67%	46%	53%	49%


Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

**City of Richmond
2019-2020 Districting**

115B



- LEGEND**
- 115b
 - Census Block
 - Landmark Point
 - Landmark Area
 - Railroad
 - River
 - Streets
 - Water Area

National Demographics Corporation, December 9, 2019

City of Richmond - Draft Map 115

District		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
	Total Pop	17,445	17,919	16,306	17,131	17,618	17,282	103,701
	Deviation from ideal	161	635	-978	-153	334	-2	1,613
	% Deviation	0.93%	3.67%	-5.66%	-0.89%	1.93%	-0.01%	9.33%
Total Pop	% Hisp	69%	30%	53%	20%	22%	43%	39%
	% NH White	4%	21%	5%	24%	23%	24%	17%
	% NH Black	19%	27%	35%	28%	35%	15%	27%
	% Asian-American	6%	20%	4%	24%	15%	15%	14%
	Total	7,271	11,670	8,206	12,621	11,767	10,997	62,532
Citizen Voting Age Pop	% Hisp	47%	18%	33%	20%	15%	23%	24%
	% NH White	9%	31%	12%	28%	32%	34%	26%
	% NH Black	28%	29%	47%	23%	33%	21%	29%
	% Asian/Pac.Isl.	13%	20%	6%	27%	19%	18%	18%
	Total	6,100	7,982	7,126	10,369	10,454	8,852	50,882
Voter Registration (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	52%	19%	33%	19%	14%	31%	26%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	47%	17%	29%	17%	12%	28%	23%
	% Asian-Surnamed	3%	9%	2%	10%	8%	7%	7%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	11%	39%	13%	40%	38%	40%	32%
	% NH Black	34%	32%	51%	31%	39%	22%	34%
	Total	2,750	5,061	3,423	6,763	6,806	5,709	30,511
Voter Turnout (Nov 2018)	% Latino est.	53%	15%	30%	17%	12%	28%	22%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	48%	14%	27%	15%	11%	25%	20%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	7%	2%	9%	7%	6%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	12%	46%	15%	44%	46%	44%	38%
	% NH Black	32%	30%	52%	30%	33%	23%	32%
	Total	3,539	5,825	4,068	7,813	7,643	6,456	35,344
Voter Turnout (Nov 2016)	% Latino est.	54%	16%	31%	18%	13%	30%	24%
	% Spanish-Surnamed	49%	14%	28%	16%	12%	27%	21%
	% Asian-Surnamed	2%	7%	2%	9%	7%	6%	6%
	% Filipino-Surnamed	2%	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%
	% NH White est.	12%	43%	11%	40%	41%	41%	35%
	% NH Black est.	30%	30%	53%	30%	36%	22%	32%
	Total	17,557	18,944	17,110	17,383	18,836	18,052	107,882
ACS Pop. Est.	Total	17,557	18,944	17,110	17,383	18,836	18,052	107,882
Age	age0-19	31%	23%	31%	20%	22%	22%	25%
	age20-60	59%	57%	56%	55%	60%	59%	58%
	age60plus	11%	20%	13%	25%	18%	18%	18%
Immigration	immigrants	44%	35%	36%	28%	30%	37%	35%
	naturalized	29%	46%	26%	65%	41%	41%	40%
Language spoken at home	english	26%	45%	40%	58%	62%	45%	46%
	spanish	64%	33%	54%	21%	18%	39%	38%
	asian-lang	7%	12%	4%	13%	14%	11%	10%
	other lang	2%	10%	1%	7%	6%	6%	6%
Language Fluency	Speaks Eng. "Less than Very Well"	38%	23%	30%	17%	17%	27%	25%
Education (among those age 25+)	hs-grad	47%	48%	51%	57%	51%	50%	51%
	bachelor	8%	20%	9%	22%	23%	18%	17%
	graduatedegree	2%	12%	3%	10%	13%	9%	9%
Child in Household	child-under18	44%	28%	36%	25%	23%	27%	30%
Pct of Pop. Age 16+	employed	61%	59%	53%	58%	63%	65%	60%
Household Income	income 0-25k	22%	16%	29%	15%	20%	19%	20%
	income 25-50k	32%	20%	33%	17%	21%	21%	23%
	income 50-75k	20%	17%	16%	16%	19%	14%	17%
	income 75-200k	25%	39%	20%	44%	34%	40%	34%
	income 200k-plus	2%	8%	1%	8%	6%	5%	5%
Housing Stats	single family	69%	58%	62%	79%	57%	78%	67%
	multi-family	31%	42%	38%	21%	43%	22%	33%
	rented	58%	54%	63%	33%	54%	45%	51%
	owned	42%	46%	37%	67%	46%	55%	49%

Total population data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Surname-based Voter Registration and Turnout data from the California Statewide Database.

Latino voter registration and turnout data are Spanish-surname counts adjusted using Census Population Department undercount estimates. NH White and NH Black registration and turnout counts estimated by NDC. Citizen Voting Age Pop., Age, Immigration, and other demographics from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey and Special Tabulation 5-year data.

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 /

Stege; 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/Stege 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.

The “Focus Maps” are the maps selected by the City Council on December 17, 2019, as their currently-preferred or “focus” maps.

Focus Maps	2020 Elections	2022 Elections
101	1, 6 and one of 2, 4 or 5	3 and two of 2, 4 or 5
103b	2, 3 and either 1 or 5	4, 6 and either 1 or 5
114b	4, 6 and one of 2, 3 or 5	1 and two of 2, 3 or 5
115b	3, 6 and 1, 2 or 5	4 and two of 1, 2 or 5
New Maps	2020 Elections	2022 Elections
103d	1, 3 and one of 2, 4 or 6	5 and two of 2, 4 or 6
101c	1, 6 and one of 2, 4 or 5	3 and two of 2, 4 or 5
Other Maps	2020 Elections	2022 Elections
101b	1, 6 and one of 2, 4 or 5	3 and two of 2, 4 or 5
102	1, 6 and one of 2, 4 or 5	3 and two of 2, 4 or 5
103	1, 3 and either 2 or 6	4, 5 and either 2 or 6
103c	1, 3 and either 2 or 6	4, 5 and either 2 or 6
104	3, 5 and one of 2 or 6	1, 4 and one of 2 or 6
107	4, 5 and one of 2 or 3	1, 6 and one of 2 or 3
113	4, 6 and one of 1 or 3	2, 5 and one of 1 or 3
114	4, 6 and one of 2 or 3	1, 5 and one of 2 or 3
115	3, 6 and 4 or 5	1, 2 and 4 or 5

Maps 108, 109, 110 and 112 are partial maps and thus do not have any proposed election sequencing.

Maps 105, 106 and 111 are not contiguous and thus do not have any proposed election sequencing.

NDC Comments on Plan Compliance with Requirements

At the Council’s request, NDC has reviewed the various draft districting maps and, based on our experience, below are the “tiers” as we would describe them related to each map’s compliance with the various legal requirements.

Relatively Safe

<p>Maps 101, 104, 113, 114, 115; (new) 101b, 103b 115b</p>	<p>Each of these maps follow neighborhoods while preserving a district where Latinos are 51% [map 101] or 45 to 49 percent of Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) [104, 113, 114, 115 and 103b], and Latinos in that district have a 15 to 31 percent CVAP advantage over the next-largest population group.</p> <p>Within this group, the larger the Latino CVAP advantage, the better, so probably safest are either Map 101 (51% Latino CVAP with a 30% advantage over the next-largest group), Map 101b (52% Latino with a 30% advantage), Map 114 at 49% Latino with a 31% advantage, or Map 103b at 48% Latino with a 27% advantage; followed by Map 113 at 45% with a 26% advantage, Maps 115 and 115b at 47% with a 19% advantage, and last would be Map 104 at 45% with a 15% advantage.</p> <p>Remember that there is a 2% to 4% “margin of error” in the CVAP data in all of the maps.</p>
--	--

Legally Risky

<p>Map 103 and 103c</p>	<p>A number of residents, and the current Latino on the Council, expressed support for Map 103. But with a most-Latino district that is only 38% Latino – and where the next-largest group is close behind at 33% -- NDC has concerns about whether this map would meet Federal Voting Rights Act concerns.</p> <p>To attempt to preserve the elements of this map that the residents like while also addressing the voting rights act concerns, NDC developed map 103b (see above, in the “Also Relatively Safe” group).</p>
<p>Map 102</p>	<p>This map has a majority-Latino district (52% Latino, with a 34% advantage over the next-largest group), but the edges of many districts, and in particular the majority-Latino District 1, have jagged edges with no explanations in the record – and they appear to be picking and choosing individual Census Blocks one by one depending on their Latino percentages, which exposes the map to a potential “racial gerrymander” challenge.</p>
<p>Map 107</p>	<p>This map has compact districts that generally follow neighborhood boundaries, but its most-Latino district is only 39% Latino by CVAP, though that does represent a 16% advantage over the other population CVAP numbers.</p>

Not Legal Maps

Maps 108, 109, 110 and 112	Partial maps with only one or two districts included. These districts could be incorporated into a citywide map, but on their own they are not legal maps.
Maps 105, 106 and 111	These maps are not contiguous and thus violate the requirements of California's "Fair Maps" law.

At the time of this writing, residents have submitted revised versions of 106 and 103. Those maps will be added to this report as soon as we have processed and analyzed them.

Public Comment Card

City Council Voting Districts Community Workshop



Thomas KAUN

Full Name

3261 South ridge Dr

Address (Optional)

tomkaun@gmail.com

Email

Organization (Optional)

Do you have any questions/comments regarding this topic that you would like to share?

I live in Hilltop and therefore like the maps that keep the area together. These include maps 101, 102, 113, 114

Map 107 could work except for the exclusion of the mall from District 2

Map 104 is also good from the point of view of dividing the waterfront betw. two districts

Public Comment Card

City Council Voting Districts Community Workshop



Don Gosney

Full Name

929 Casson St Richmond 94805

Address (Optional)

dongosney@comcast.net

Email

Radio Free Richmond.

Organization (Optional)

Do you have any questions/comments regarding this topic that you would like to share?

One of Richmond's assets are the neighborhood councils BUT most are inactive or barely active. On my block, I would bet that I am the only person who even knows they exist. Over the years, some have become highly politicized where people have been invited to stay away. My own NC has even told the media that they are not welcome (against the law).

MAP 103 may split the waterfront but it creates districts where there is a vast array of interests. The people along the San Pablo border have little in common with the Point, the Marina and the Annex.

Public Comment Card

City Council Voting Districts Community Workshop



Leisa Johnson

Full Name

Address (Optional)

leisa-johnson@icloud.com

Email

Organization (Optional)

Do you have any questions/comments regarding this topic that you would like to share?

① Keep Point Richmond & Marina Bay on Shoreline together

② Separate Annex & put w/ San Pablo Corridor → e.g., maps ~~106~~ 106 & 110 show the San Pablo Corridor the best, & break out the Annex from Marina Bay & Pt. Richmond.

③ Please do not break up Marina Bay

④ Please show where each Council member & the mayor live.

Please note that Dennis Johnson's address has changed & he currently lives @ 45th & Mac Donald

Public Comment Card

City Council Voting Districts Community Workshop



JOHN O PITTS

Full Name

3110 FIESTA CT. RICHMOND 94903

Address (Optional)

JOHN.PITTS1251@GMAIL.COM

Email

Organization (Optional)

Do you have any questions/comments regarding this topic that you would like to share?

YOU HAVE TOO MANY BOXES
AND YOU DON'T HAVE ENOUGH BOXES
TO PUT US IN.
DON'T PUT US IN BOXES

Public Comment Card

City Council Voting Districts Community Workshop



Rock Brown
Full Name

772 Mc Laughlin STREET
Address (Optional)

Lets Rock richmond@yahoo.com
Email
- Richmond Heights Neighborhood Council
Organization (Optional) "

Do you have any questions/comments regarding this topic that you would like to share?

Richmond Heights / Richmond Annex
= Keep SAN PABLO AVE CORRIDOR
* TOGETHER *

POINT Richmond / MARINA BAY
= Shoreline "TOGETHER"

= KEEP EDGES "TOGETHER"

= KEEP 23RD TOGETHER

PARADIGE

Greatest change Edges / Then work in 😊

Public Comment Card

City Council Voting Districts Community Workshop



DARLENE DRAPKIN

Full Name

Address (Optional)

darlenedrapkin@gmail.com

Email

Organization (Optional)

Do you have any questions/comments regarding this topic that you would like to share?

Please consider commercial nodes or local economies as the criteria for creating districts

San Pablo Ave as ^{the} or divide Upper/Lower
Mac Donald Ave ^{or divide} Downtown and/or Uptown
23rd St - Latino district
Pt Richmond/Marina Bay
Hilltop / Carriage Hills - suburban

All the maps split up 23rd Street. It should be the heart ~~of~~ of a Latino district.

City Council Districts Meeting
ORGANIZED Comment Card Responses
December 5, 2019 & December 10, 2019

Summary Points

- Maps 103 and 115B are mentioned the most with the majority of comments regarding these maps being positive.
- The question of whether or not to split/divide the shoreline/waterfront into multiple districts is brought up several times. There seems to be no clear majority standpoint on whether or not it should be kept as one or split into multiple.
- Other geographic areas of contention:
 - 23rd Street
 - San Pablo Ave Corridor
 - East Richmond / Richmond Heights
 - Atchinson
- There are multiple questions regarding how Council members will be selected to represent each district.

Shoreline / Waterfront

- Map 103 splits the waterfront but it creates districts where there is a vast array of interests.
- Keep Point Richmond and Marina Bay on shoreline together
- Point Richmond/ Marina Bay = shoreline “together”
- I would like to see more than one district include the shoreline.
- On maps that have all the waterfront in one district will have to have major reconfigurations because of the many developments - Terminal 1, Shea Homes, Qrang Project, NOMA and the Autral Project in the Richmond Annex.

San Pablo

- The people along the San Pablo border have little in common with the Point, the Marina, and the Annex.
- Seperate annex and put with San Pablo corridor, e.g. maps 106 and 110 show the San Pablo corridor the best, and break out the Annex from Marina Bay and Pt. Richmond
- Keep San Pablo Ave Corridor *TOGETHER*
- San Pablo Ave as one or divide upper / lower MacDonal Ave or divide downtown and/or uptown
- 23rd street - Altino District

23rd Street Corridor

- Keep 23rd “together”
- All the maps split up 23rd Street. It should be the heart of a Latino District.

Commercial Interests / Economy

- Please consider commercial nodes or local economies as the criteria for creating districts.
- Ensure no social economic gerrymandering - make sure that each district considers the population is diverse along economic background

East Richmond / East Richmond Heights

- East Richmond Heights has more commonalities with the San Pablo Corridor than the areas north and east of the San Pablo Dam Rd.
- Map 103B meets the legal requirements best for the communities of E. Richmond heights.
- East Richmond Heights people do not “feel” connected with the people in the outlying areas of El Sobrante. Our concerns lay mainly with the San Pablo Corridor. Only maps 103B and 115B address our concerns.

General Comments About Map Preferences

- I live in Hilltop and therefore like the maps that keep the area together. These include maps 101, 102, 113, 114.
- Map 107 could work except for the exclusion of the mall from District 2.
- Map 104 is also good from the point of view of dividing the waterfront between two districts.
- Map 103 splits the waterfront but it creates districts where there is a vast array of interests. The people along the San Pablo border have little in common with the Point, the Marina, and the Annex.
- Comments: My preference would be option 103B because it provides for more than one district touching the water. It also keeps Park Plaza together and pairs it with similar neighborhoods (Laurel Park, etc). However, other map options are okay except #115B. Lumping parts of Park Plaza into the downtown zone doesnt make sense. Please dont move forward with #115B.
- My feeling is that Map 103B is the best compromise among these competing values. The virtues of 103B:
 - Preserves continuity of District 5 around San Pablo Ave Corridor
 - Divides a potentially dominant voting block of Pt Richmond and Marina Bay
 - Gives 4 Districts a voting interest in our shoreline, with its tremendous economic potential.
- Map 103B meets the legal requirements best for the communities of E. Richmond heights.
- I feel 103B is the best map for keeping my community intact, and is indicative of where my life is lived. It is where I often shop, drive, and participate in my city's government. I attend crime prevention meetings downtown. The areas off of San Pablo Dam Rd are just areas I drive through, not stopping.
- 103B = yes yes yes
 - Very fair = shoreline
 - Very fair = san pablo corridor

- 103B (underlined multiple times)
- 103B: ok expect Atchison Village paired with Pt. Richmond. I live there and preferred to be paired with surrounding streets like in 115B, 115, 113 etc
- BEST - 115B: ok because Atchison Village paired with some neighborhoods, and waterfront has 2 districts, and Richmond Heights not part of hills
- I would like Atchison Village to be in the same district as its nearest neighbors.
- 103B best
- 115B ok too
- Favor maps that:
 - Minimize # of districts that "have waterfront" e.g. 101, 104, 114, 114, 115
 - Minimize risk of legal battles! We do not have \$ for court and lawyer fees
 - Maximize # of districts that have majority underrepresented groups. Very important to me.
- 103B - somewhat distressed economically (4 districts touch waterfront)
- 115 - somewhat distressed economically (splits 580)

Race / Protected Classes

- Race being used to determine maps?
- If hispanic not elected - is it necessary to redraw maps?

Neighborhood Councils

- One of Richmond's assets are the neighborhood councils BUT most are inactive or barely active. On my block, I would bet that I am the only person who even knows they exist. Over the years, someone have become highly politicized where people have been invited to stay away. My own NC has even told the media that they are not welcome (against the law).

Clarifications / Confusions

- Where are slides available?
- Can a current councilperson be waived to represent an outside district til the following election if borders are not in agreement? Or can one pick which district to re[represent]?
- How much should/could be similar to school districts, and transportation lines? Has either been a major consideration?
- Would any annexation of North Richmond be used in making districts?
- The requirements of contiguity and pursuing communities of shared interest come into conflict. When they do which requirement should prevail?
- My question is can the connector on McBride Ave that goes through the unincorporated areas be challenged under the Fair Map act since there are no connecting precincts? I heard conflicting information.
- What is this good for.
- All this is doing is further segregating the Richmond community
- Richmond is already has 6 districts we don't need anymore districts

Other

- You have too many boxes and you don't have enough boxes to put us in
- Don't put us in boxes
- Keep edges "together"
- Paradige
- Greatest change edges / then work in
- Pt Richmond/Marina Bay
- Hilltop/Carriage Hills - suburban
- Notes/thanks:
 - Thank you for an excellently ran and very respectful gathering here at Booker T on Tues Dec 10. The forum was very enlightening in many ways for all residents attending, including city officials and aspirants to office I saw and talked with who attended.
 - Also San Francisco Pizza was very good! Thoughtful to help us have a slice - means a lot!
- No matter how flawed the maps may be I strongly urge the City Council to vote to adopt one at the next meeting in order to avoid litigation.
- Kudos to the City staff.
- That the City of Richmond has to endure this process for something that will be obsolete in 1 year i.e. a census that is obsolete, is unconscionable.
- Thanks for your efforts to facilitate.

December 5, 2019

Thomas Kaun, 3261 Soutridge Dr, tomkaun@gmail.com

- I live in Hilltop and therefore like the maps that keep the area together. These include maps 101, 102, 113, 114.
- Map 107 could work except for the exclusion of the mall from District 2.
- Map 104 is also good from the point of view of dividing the waterfront between two districts.

Don Gosney, 929 Lasson St Richmond 94805, DONGOSNEY@COMCAST.NET,

- One of Richmond's assets are the neighborhood councils BUT most are inactive or barely active. On my block, I would bet that I am the only person who even knows they exist. Over the years, someone have become highly politicized where people have been invited to stay away. My own NC has even told the media that they are not welcome (against the law).
- Map 103 splits the waterfront but it creates districts where there is a vast array of interests. The people along the San Pablo border have little in common with the Point, the Marina, and the Annex.

Leisa Johnson, leisa_johnson@icloud.com

- Keep Point Richmond and Marina Bay on shoreline together
- Separate annex and put with San Pablo corridor, e.g. maps 106 and 110 show the San Pablo corridor the best, and break out the Annex from Marina Bay and Pt. Richmond
- Please show where each council member and the mayor live. Please note Demnlus Johnson's address has changed and he currently lives at 45th and MacDonald.

John O Pitts, 3110 Fiesta Ct Richmond 94803, johnpitts1251@gmail.com

- You have too many boxes and you don't have enough boxes to put us in
- Don't put us in boxes

Rock Brown, 772 McLaughlin Street, letsrockrichmond@yahoo.com, Richmond Heights Neighborhood Council

- Keep San Pablo Ave Corridor *TOGETHER*
- Point Richmond/ Marina Bay = shoreline "together"
- Keep edges "together"
- Keep 23rd "together"
- Paradige
- Greatest change edges / then work in

Darlene Drapkin, darlenedrapkine@gmail.com

- Please consider commercial nodes or local economies as the criteria for creating districts.

- San Pablo Ave as one or divide upper / lower MacDonal Ave or divide downtown and/or uptown
- 23rd street - Altino District
- Pt Richmond/Marina Bay
- Hilltop/Carriage Hills - suburban
- All the maps split up 23rd Street. It should be the heart of a Latino District.

December 10, 2019

Daniel Mark Harrington, 641 Amador St 94805, harrington.sf@gmail.com

- Where are slides available?
- Can a current councilperson be waived to represent an outside district til the following election if borders are not in agreement? Or can one pick which district to re[represent?]
- How much should/could be similar to school districts, and transportation lines? Has either been a major consideration?
- Would any annexation of North Richmond be used in making districts?
- Notes/thanks:
 - Thank you for an excellently ran and very respectful gathering here at Booker T on Tues Dec 10. The forum was very enlightening in many ways for all residents attending, including city officials and aspirants to office I saw and talked with who attended.
 - Also San Francisco Pizza was very good! Thoughtful to help us have a slice - means a lot!

David Davenport, 260 S 43rd St, davedaven@gmail.com

- Comments: My preference would be option 103B because it provides for more than one district touching the water. It also keeps Park Plaza together and pairs it with similar neighborhoods (Laurel Park, etc). However, other map options are okay except #115B. Lumping parts of Park Plaza into the downtown zone doesnt make sense. Please dont move forward with #115B.

Kokoye Sande, crosti800@gmail.com

- No matter how flawed the maps may be I strongly urge the City Council to vote to adopt one at the next meeting in order to avoid litigation.
- Kudos to the City staff.

Nick Despota, 633 Kern St, nick@lumina-media.com

- The requirements of contiguity and pursuing communities of shared interest come into conflict. When they do which requirement should prevail?
- My feeling is that Map 103B is the best compromise among these competing values. The virtues of 103B:
 - Preserves continuity of District 5 around San Pablo Ave Corridor
 - Divides a potentially dominant voting block of Pt Richmond and Marina Bay

- Gives 4 Districts a voting interest in our shoreline, with its tremendous economic potential.

Karen Henry, East Richmond Heights resident, guanacaste101@yahoo.com

- East Richmond Heights has more commonalities with the San Pablo Corridor than the areas north and east of the San Pablo Dam Rd.
- Map 103B meets the legal requirements best for the communities of E. Richmond heights.
- That the City of Richmond has to endure this process for something that will be obsolete in 1 year i.e. a census that is obsolete, is unconscionable.
- Thanks for your efforts to facilitate.

Lana Hameister, Richmond Heights, lhameister@live.com

- I feel 103B is the best map for keeping my community intact, and is indicative of where my life is lived. It is where I often shop, drive, and participate in my city's government. I attend crime prevention meetings downtown. The areas off of San Pablo Dam Rd are just areas I drive through, not stopping.

Nel Benningshof, nel@lumina-media.com

- My question is can the connector on McBride Ave that goes through the unincorporated areas be challenged under the Fair Map act since there are no connecting precincts? I heard conflicting information.
- East Richmond Heights people do not "feel" connected with the people in the outlying areas of El Sobrante. Our concerns lay mainly with the San Pablo Corridor. Only maps 103B and 115B address our concerns.

Anonymous

- Race being used to determine maps?
- If hispanic not elected - is it necessary to redraw maps?

Rock Brown, 772 McLaughlin Street Richmond, CA 94805

- 103B = yes yes yes
 - Very fair = shoreline
 - Very fair = san pablo corridor
 - 103B (underlined multiple times)

Susan O'Sullivan, 270 Collins St, susansullivan270@gmail.com

- 103B: ok expect Atchison Village paired with Pt. Richmond. I live there and preferred to be paired with surrounding streets like in 115B, 115, 113 etc
- BEST - 115B: ok because Atchison Village paired with some neighborhoods, and waterfront has 2 districts, and Richmond Heights not part of hills
- I would like to see more than one district include the shoreline.
- I would like Atchison Village to be in the same district as its nearest neighbors.

Iarvin Winzer, 4226 Rosewood Ave, Richmond, CA 94804

- What is this good for.
- All this is doing is further segregating the Richmond community
- Richmond is already has 6 districts we don't need anymore districts

Michele Rappaport, 5629 Sierra Ave. Richmond CA 94805, michelle rappaport@gmail.com,
WCCUSD, Dancing Voices Small business, East Richmond Neighborhood Council

- 103B best
- 115B ok too

Irene Kuhn, 5647 San Pablo Ave Richmond, irenekuhn9@gmail.com

- Favor maps that:
 - Minimize # of districts that "have waterfront" e.g. 101, 104, 114, 114, 115
 - Minimize risk of legal battles! We do not have \$ for court and lawyer fees
 - Maximize # of districts that have majority underrepresented groups. Very important to me.

Anonymous

- On maps that have all the waterfront in one district will have to have major reconfigurations because of the many developments - Terminal 1, Shea Homes, Qrang Project, NOMA and the Autral Project in the Richmond Annex.

Janet Johnson, jjohnsonconsulting@att.net

- Ensure no social economic gerrymandering - make sure that each district considers the population is diverse along economic background
- 103B - somewhat distressed economically (4 districts touch waterfront)
- 115 - somewhat distressed economically (splits 580)

Summary of the Audio Recording from the January 6, 2020 District Meeting

- Several comments and/or questions regarding the plan to redraw these maps after the 2020 Census data is collected. Questions revolved around whether or not they would redraw, how they would redraw, and if maps would have to be redrawn from scratch.
- Several comments regarding the fact that Richmond has changed a lot since the 2010 census and that these numbers may not accurately represent the City now.
- Several comments about the racial divisions of the maps and taking into account representation of different racial groups.
- Specific comments on map preferences:
 - The consultant mentioned that maps 101, 103, and 114B received more dots (during the dot activity in which residents placed a dot on the map they liked the most) than maps 103B, 103D, and 115. However, he mentioned that it did not appear to be significantly more and that this was not a scientific process, but more of an elimination activity of maps.
 - One resident stated "I like 114B and 103B."
 - One resident stated "I like 103B and 115B."
 - One resident stated "I like the map 103B and D because one has 4 districts [on the waterfront] and one has 3 [on the waterfront] because of the economy and more balance in fighting the development."
 - One resident stated "So I like 103D only because its kinda split equally, none are [really] split equally."
 - One resident stated "I like 103D because there were less splits [among the neighborhoods on the waterfront]. I don't want all of the people with the [most] resources on the shoreline to have more seats."
 - One resident stated "I chose 3D because it was easy to see [connections] and because the communication could be together because it was close."