



**INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

**Thursday, February 17, 2022
6:00 PM**

Commission Members:

DISTRICT 1 – TERRY NICOL
DISTRICT 2 – JESSE SUSSELL
DISTRICT 3 – LISA M. TRAN
DISTRICT 4 – CURTIS W. HANSON
AT-LARGE – DELORES COOPER
AT-LARGE – CARLY MICHELE ALEJOS
AT-LARGE – SHERRY SMITH

DISTRICT 5 – WINSTON RHODES
DISTRICT 6 – ELISABETH WATSON
DISTRICT 7 – RANA CHO
DISTRICT 8 – ANDREW FOX
AT-LARGE – LUPE GALLEGOS-DIAZ
AT-LARGE – RONALD K. CHOY

PUBLIC ADVISORY: THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED EXCLUSIVELY THROUGH VIDEOCONFERENCE AND TELECONFERENCE

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e) and the state declared emergency, this meeting of the Independent Redistricting Commission will be conducted exclusively through teleconference and Zoom videoconference. The COVID-19 state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person and presents imminent risks to the health of attendees. Therefore, no physical meeting location will be available.

To access the meeting remotely using the internet: Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone, or Android device: Use URL <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81072988964>. If you do not wish for your name to appear on the screen, then use the drop down menu and click on "rename" to rename yourself to be anonymous. To request to speak, use the "raise hand" icon on the screen.

To join by phone: Dial **1-669-900-9128** or **1-877-853-5257 (Toll Free)** and Enter Meeting ID: **810 7298 8964**. If you wish to comment during the public comment portion of the agenda, press *9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair.

Written communications submitted by mail or e-mail to the Independent Redistricting Commission by 5:00 p.m. the Friday before the Commission meeting will be distributed to the members of the Commission in advance of the meeting and retained as part of the official record.

AGENDA

Roll Call

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Matters

Minutes for Approval

Draft minutes for the Commission's consideration and approval.

1. Minutes – January 27, 2022 regular meeting

Public Hearing

The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action as the item is taken up.

2. **Discussion, Review, and Direction on Draft City Council District Maps From: Independent Redistricting Commission**
Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing to discuss, review, and provide direction on the draft city council district maps.
Financial Implications:
Contact: Mark Numainville, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6900

Commission Action Items

The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action as the item is taken up.

3. **Review and Approval of Table of Contents for Final Report From: Independent Redistricting Commission**
Recommendation: Review and approve the table of contents for the final map report to accompany the final map.
Financial Implications:
Contact: Mark Numainville, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6900

Subcommittee Reports

Subcommittees may provide verbal reports on their activities and discuss topics under their purview with the full commission. To take action on a subcommittee item, the topic must be agendized on the commission's Action Calendar.

Information Reports

Items for Future Agendas and Meeting Calendar

- Discussion of items to be added to the next scheduled meeting calendar
- Discussion and possible modifications to the meeting calendar

Adjournment

~~~~~  
*This meeting will be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code Section 54953. Any member of the public may attend this meeting. Questions regarding this matter may be addressed to Mark Numainville, City Clerk, (510) 981-6900.*

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Independent Redistricting Commission regarding any item on this agenda are on file in the City Clerk Department at 2180 Milvia Street, 1st Floor, Berkeley, CA and are available upon request by contacting the City Clerk Department at (510) 981-6908 or [redistricting@cityofberkeley.info](mailto:redistricting@cityofberkeley.info).*

*Written communications addressed to the Independent Redistricting Commission and submitted to the City Clerk Department will be distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting.*

*Communications to the Independent Redistricting Commission are public record and will become part of the City's electronic records, which are accessible through the City's website. Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to the Independent Redistricting Commission, will become part of the public record. If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service to the City Clerk Department at 2180 Milvia Street. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the City Clerk Department for further information.*

**COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION:**

If you need ASL or Spanish translation services, please contact the City Clerk's Office at (510) 981-6908 or [redistricting@cityofberkeley.info](mailto:redistricting@cityofberkeley.info) at least three business days in advance of the meeting.



To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at (510) 981-6418 (V) or (510) 981-6347 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date.

~~~~~  
I hereby certify that the agenda for this meeting of the Independent Redistricting Commission was posted at the display case located near the walkway in front of the Maudelle Shirek Building, 2134 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, as well as on the City's website, on Thursday, February 10, 2022.



Mark Numainville, City Clerk

Communications

Communications submitted to the Independent Redistricting Commission are on file in the City Clerk Department at 2180 Milvia Street, 1st Floor, Berkeley, CA and are available upon request by contacting the City Clerk Department at (510) 981-6908 or redistricting@cityofberkeley.info or may be viewed through [Records Online](#).

Item #2: Discussion, Review, and Direction on Draft City Council District Maps

- 105. Henry Norr
- 106. Yes Duffy
- 107. Mary Lou Van Deventer, Urban Ore Inc.
- 108. Ben Gould
- 109. Nina Zurier
- 110. Chris Horgan

111. Amy Hill
112. Steven Donaldson
113. Toni Mester
114. Marc Treib
115. Jane Franch
116. Adam Fuchs
117. Lucy Smallsreed
118. Jill Korte
119. Joan Baylie & Jim Mullins
120. Lindsey Anne

**INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**Thursday, January 27, 2022
6:00 PM**

Commission Members:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| DISTRICT 1 – TERRY NICOL | DISTRICT 5 – WINSTON RHODES |
| DISTRICT 2 – JESSE SUSSELL | DISTRICT 6 – ELISABETH WATSON |
| DISTRICT 3 – LISA M. TRAN | DISTRICT 7 – RANA CHO |
| DISTRICT 4 – CURTIS W. HANSON | DISTRICT 8 – ANDREW FOX |
| AT-LARGE – DELORES COOPER | AT-LARGE – LUPE GALLEGOS-DIAZ |
| AT-LARGE – CARLY MICHELE ALEJOS | AT-LARGE – RONALD K. CHOY |
| AT-LARGE – SHERRY SMITH | |

PUBLIC ADVISORY: THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED EXCLUSIVELY THROUGH VIDEOCONFERENCE AND TELECONFERENCE

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e) and the state declared emergency, this meeting of the Independent Redistricting Commission will be conducted exclusively through teleconference and Zoom videoconference. The COVID-19 state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person and presents imminent risks to the health of attendees. Therefore, no physical meeting location will be available.

To access the meeting remotely using the internet: Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone, or Android device: Use URL <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82263782343>. If you do not wish for your name to appear on the screen, then use the drop down menu and click on "rename" to rename yourself to be anonymous. To request to speak, use the "raise hand" icon on the screen.

To join by phone: Dial **1-669-900-9128 or 1-877-853-5257 (Toll Free)** and Enter Meeting ID: **822 6378 2343**. If you wish to comment during the public comment portion of the agenda, press *9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair.

Written communications submitted by mail or e-mail to the Independent Redistricting Commission by 5:00 p.m. the Friday before the Commission meeting will be distributed to the members of the Commission in advance of the meeting and retained as part of the official record.

MINUTES

Roll Call: 6:03 p.m.

Present: Alejos, Cho, Cooper, Fox, Gallegos-Diaz, Hanson, Nicol, Smith, Sussell, Tran, Watson

Absent: Choy, Rhodes

Commissioner Choy present at 6:09 p.m.

Commissioner Rhodes present at 6:10 p.m.

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Matters: 4 speakers

Minutes for Approval

Draft minutes for the Commission's consideration and approval.

1. Minutes – January 10, 2022 regular meeting

Action: M/S/C (Hanson/Gallegos-Diaz) to approve the minutes of 1/10/2022.

Vote: Ayes - Alejos, Cho, Choy, Cooper, Fox, Gallegos-Diaz, Hanson, Nicol, Rhodes, Smith, Tran, Watson; Noes – None; Abstain – Sussell.

Public Hearing

The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action as the item is taken up.

**2. Discussion, Review, and Direction on Draft City Council District Maps
From: Independent Redistricting Commission**

Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing to discuss, review, and provide direction on the draft city council district maps.

Contact: Mark Numainville, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6900

Public Testimony: Chairperson Watson opened the public hearing. 31 speakers.

Recess 7:42 p.m. – 7:52 p.m.

Action: M/S/C (Nicol/Rhodes) to continue consideration of the Amber Map with modifications to the boundary between District 3 and District 8 near Ashby BART to prevent division of the community around the BART station.

Vote: All Ayes.

Action: M/S/C (Rhodes/Gallegos-Diaz) to remove the Blue Map from further consideration.

Vote: Ayes - Alejos, Cho, Cooper, Gallegos-Diaz, Hanson, Nicol, Rhodes, Smith, Sussell, Tran, Watson; Noes – Choy, Fox.

Action: M/S/C (Rhodes/Gallegos-Diaz) to 1) remove the Maroon Map from further consideration, and 2) create a new map with the Amber Map as the base map that moves the portion of the Northside neighborhood south of LeConte Avenue into the student-focused district, makes modifications to the boundary between District 3 and District 8 near Ashby BART to prevent division of the community around the BART station, and makes adjustments to District 4 in consideration of students and renters.
Vote: Ayes - Alejos, Cho, Cooper, Gallegos-Diaz, Hanson, Nicol, Rhodes, Smith, Sussell, Tran, Watson; Noes – Choy, Fox.

Action: M/S/C (Sussell/Nicol) to remove the Orange Map from further consideration.
Vote: All Ayes.

Action: M/S/C (Watson/Rhodes) to appoint Commissioner Fox to the Map Drafting Subcommittee.
Vote: All Ayes.

Action: M/S/C (Alejos/Gallegos-Diaz) to create a new map with the Amber Map as the base map that creates two student-focused districts in a side-by-side orientation, makes modifications to the boundary between District 3 and District 8 near Ashby BART to prevent division of the community around the BART station. This direction for a new map may be combined with the previously requested new map if feasible.
Vote: All Ayes.

Action: M/S/C (Gallegos-Diaz/Nicol) to extend the meeting past 9:00 p.m. to hear Item 3 and the remainder of the agenda.
Vote: Ayes - Alejos, Cho, Choy, Cooper, Fox, Gallegos-Diaz, Hanson, Nicol, Rhodes, Sussell, Tran, Watson; Noes – Smith.

Action Calendar

The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action as the item is taken up.

3. Review and Approval of Table of Contents for Final Report

From: Independent Redistricting Commission

Recommendation: Review and approve the table of contents for the final map report to accompany the final map.

Contact: Mark Numainville, Commission Secretary, (510) 981-6900

Action: M/S/Failed (Smith/Cooper) to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: Ayes – Alejos, Cooper, Smith; Noes – Cho, Choy, Fox, Gallegos-Diaz, Hanson, Nicol, Rhodes, Sussell, Tran, Watson.

Action: 1 speaker. Discussion of draft table of contents. No action taken. Item continued to February 17, 2022.

Subcommittee Reports

Subcommittees may provide verbal reports on their activities and discuss topics under their purview with the full commission. To take action on a subcommittee item, the topic must be agendaized on the commission's Action Calendar.

4. **Final Report Drafting Subcommittee**
 - Report provided under Item 3.
5. **Map and COI Subcommittee**
 - No report
6. **Outreach Subcommittee**
 - No report

Items for Future Agendas and Meeting Calendar

- **Discussion of items to be added to the next scheduled meeting calendar**
 - Consideration of Maps
 - Table of Contents for Report
- **Discussion and possible modifications to the meeting calendar**

Action: M/S/C (Sussell/Gallegos-Diaz) to schedule a special meeting for Saturday, February 19, 2022.

Vote: Ayes - Alejos, Cho, Choy, Cooper, Fox, Gallegos-Diaz, Hanson, Nicol, Rhodes, Sussell, Tran, Watson; Noes – None; Abstain – Smith.

Adjournment

Action: M/S/C (Smith/Tran) to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: All Ayes.

Adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct record of the Independent Redistricting Commission meeting held on January 27, 2022.

Mark Numainville
City Clerk

Supplemental Communications

Item #1: Discussion, Review, and Direction on Draft City Council District Maps

41. Allison, Jed, Avery, Eli and Emma

42. V. Sommer (2)

43. Anna Korn
44. Brenda Shank
45. Helga Recke, Buena-Cypress-McGee Neighborhood Group
46. Barbara Yoder
47. Antony J. Lepire
48. Betsy Morris
49. Sally Nelson
50. Tony Corman
51. Alfred Twu
52. Susan Payne
53. Jack Kurzweil
54. Pamela Speich
55. Stephanie Allan
56. Sabina McMurtry
57. David and Phyllis Ritvo
58. Nancy Holland and Wendy Alfsen
59. Alison Thomas
60. Summer Brenner
61. Berkeley Neighborhoods Council Executive Committee
62. Nicole Chabot
63. Kitty Calavita
64. Taylor Keep
65. Commissioner Ronald Choy (3)
66. Tom Lent
67. Jane Diamond
68. Rob Wrenn
69. Mickey Davis
70. Alex Sharenko
71. Gael Alcock
72. Brian Edquist
73. Jenny White
74. Holly Scheider
75. Lucy Smallsreed
76. Judy Grether
77. Noah Budnick
78. Max Ventura
79. Berkeley Neighbors for Housing and Climate Action
80. Jenny Wenk
81. Kara Yount
82. Dan Feinberg
83. Linda Zagula
84. Erin Branagan
85. Ginger Morris
86. Laralynn Rapoza
87. Cindy Shamban
88. Friends of Adeline

- 89. Associated Students of the University of California
- 90. Kelly Hammargren (2)
- 91. Christine Staples
- 92. Andrea Mullarkey, SEIU 1021 CSU/PTRLA

Supplemental Communications 2

- 93. Jeff Vincent
- 94. Bruce H. Feingold
- 95. Robert Cohen
- 96. Barbara White
- 97. Catherine Huchting
- 98. Lauren Parsons
- 99. Madeline Feingold
- 100. Vernon Theiss
- 101. Chimey Lee
- 102. Elsa Ramos
- 103. Maryhunter Austin
- 104. Daniel Tahara



City Clerk Department

February 17, 2022

To: Independent Redistricting Commission

From: Mark Numainville, Commission Secretary

Subject: Discussion, Review, and Direction on Draft City Council District Maps

Based on direction at the Independent Redistricting Commission's (IRC) meeting on January 27, two draft redistricting maps are attached to this memorandum. Staff recommends the Commission discuss the draft maps, receive community input, and provide direction regarding further map development and selection.

Development of Draft Maps

On January 10, 2022, the IRC created a Map Drafting Subcommittee and appointed Commissioners Rhodes, Nicol, and Alejos. The IRC also established the following themes to be used in the development of the first set of draft maps:

Themes to be prioritized in all draft maps

- a. 10% Maximum Population Variance
- b. Contiguity
- c. Communities of Interest/Neighborhoods
- d. Use major arterial streets as boundaries where possible
- e. Correct the features of the 2010 map for Councilmember residences
- f. Include at least one compact student district in every map

Themes to be included in one or more draft map variation:

- a. Single, north-south West Berkeley district
- b. Topography/Transit Access/Wildfire Risk
- c. Two different maps with different configurations for two student majority districts
- d. A map that has a high level of continuity with the existing boundaries that includes changes only as required by the six mandatory criteria above

Working with staff, the Subcommittee created four draft maps that responded to the full range of the IRC’s direction. Each draft map was given a non-numeric designation for the purpose of identification. The draft maps also include narratives explaining in detail how they were developed. The four draft maps are listed below in alphabetical order:

Designation	Description
Amber Map	Consistency Map with Changes Made Only to Address Universal Criteria West Berkeley (Two Districts)
Blue Map	Two Student Districts (East-West) West Berkeley (One District)
Maroon Map	Two Student Districts (North-South) West Berkeley (Two Districts)
Orange Map	Consistency Map with Changes Made Only to Address Universal Criteria West Berkeley (One District)

At the IRC public hearing on January 27, 2022, the Commission received public comment from 31 speakers and reviewed dozens of new written communications from the public regarding the four draft maps. Based on community input and the IRC deliberations, the Commission acted to advance a modified Amber Map to the February 17 public hearing and requested that a new map be created for evaluation. The Commission also added Commissioner Fox to the Map Drafting Subcommittee.

The requested changes to the Amber Map modify the District 3/District 8 boundary on Adeline Street to better unify the community around Ashby BART in District 3. This revised map is named Amber Map Version 2.

The new draft map (Violet Map) uses the Amber Map as the base map and moves the portion of the Northside Neighborhood south of Le Conte Avenue into the student-focused district, modifies the boundary between District 3 and District 8 to prevent division of the community near Ashby BART, adjusts District 4 in consideration of students and renters, and further creates two student/renter-focused districts in a side-by-side orientation.

The Subcommittee has produced two new maps as follows.

Designation	Description
Amber Map Version 2	Consistency Map with Changes Made Only to Address Universal Criteria West Berkeley (Two Districts)
Violet Map	Two Student/Renter Focused Districts (East-West) West Berkeley (Two Districts)

Both the Amber Map Version 2 and the Violet Map adhere to the universal criteria of: 1) Maximum of 10% population deviation; 2) Contiguous districts; 3) Maintain Communities of Interest and Neighborhoods; 4) Use major arterial streets as boundaries where possible; 5) Correct the features of the 2010 map that accounted for prior Councilmember residences; and 6) Include at least one compact student district in every map.

Amber Map Version 2

The revised version of the Amber Map responds to community input and Commission direction by moving the border between District 3 and District 8 from Adeline Street eastward to Shattuck Avenue. Moving the boundary to Shattuck Avenue returns the Ashby BART east parking lot, Ed Roberts Campus, and St. Paul AME Church into District 3. The corresponding population change does not adversely affect the required deviation percentage for either district or the overall city map.

There are no changes to Districts 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, or 7 in Amber Map Version 2 from the original Amber Map.

The Amber Version 2 Map contains a renter population of 78.6% in District 4 and 94.5% in District 7.

Violet Map

The Violet Map responds to the direction of the Independent Redistricting Commission to create a draft map that uses the Amber Map as the base map with changes in the Northside Neighborhood and the Downtown area to focus on student and renter populations.

The Subcommittee attempted to include the portion of the Northside Neighborhood south of Le Conte Avenue into the student-focused district; however, the cascading effects into other districts presented other challenges. It was determined that drawing the border one block south of Le Conte Avenue on Ridge Road would achieve much of the IRC's objective and facilitate population balancing in other surrounding districts.

Moving a portion of Northside Neighborhood and the Foothill Dormitory into District 7 lead to changes in the District 5/District 6 border. The border moved from Spruce Street to Arlington Avenue north of the Marin Circle. This change then lead to District 5 moving south into District 4 to Hearst Avenue. And finally, this change caused District 4 to move slightly south into District 3 and east into the Southside Neighborhood.

As with the Amber Version 2 Map, the Violet Map modifies the boundary between District 3 and District 8 to prevent division of the community near Ashby BART. The border between District 3 and District 8 moves from Adeline Street eastward to Shattuck Avenue. Moving the boundary to Shattuck Avenue returns the Ashby BART east parking lot, Ed Roberts Campus, and St. Paul AME Church into District 3.

The Violet Map contains a renter population of 79.0% in District 4 and 90.7% in District 7.

Significant Features of Draft Maps

West Berkeley

At the January 27 public hearing and in the written communications, there was limited support for a single West Berkeley district. Most commenters favored two representatives for West Berkeley. Absent substantial community groundswell for a significant change to the West Berkeley alignment, the Commission decided to move forward with two draft maps that both have two West Berkeley districts.

“Student-Focused” District(s)

Similar to the West Berkeley discussion, a significant majority of community input favored the draft maps that had a single “student-focused” district. In the map drawing process, it is not readily apparent how to arrive at two fully student-focused districts. As noted below, since there is not a U.S. Census category for “UC Berkeley Student” the Subcommittee must rely on known UC-owned student housing, co-ops, and traditional student neighborhoods to approximate a student-district. The two maps under consideration both have two districts that encompass or border UC Berkeley and have the two highest renter-occupied percentages in the City.

Continuity and Neighborhoods

There is strong advocacy from the community through written and verbal comments for the new map to maintain neighborhood cohesion and keep communities of interest in their current council district. The Commission has reflected this interest by advancing the Amber Map (with changes) and creating a new map based on the Amber Map template.

Topography/Transit Access/ Wildfire Risk

During the attempt at creating a draft map that used Topography/Transit Access/ Wildfire Risk as a predominant theme in one of the variations, it was discovered that this theme was better addressed as a complimentary theme in the other maps. A single district that encompassed the full hills area along the City’s eastern border was not compact, was separated in the middle by Strawberry Canyon, and included communities that would not traditionally be associated with common social or geographic interests. For each draft map, it is noted how many districts represent the higher elevation areas of the City in two, three, or four districts.

Public Input

The draft maps are available to the public at cityofberkeley.info/redistricting. In addition to the interactive viewing tool, PDF maps can be downloaded. Staff also created accessible, text-based descriptions of the maps and district boundaries for people with vision impairments.

On February 10, the new/revised maps were distributed to all locations where the first group of maps were posted - the Central Library, the ASUC Student Union in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Building, and the South Berkeley Senior Center. Ledger-sized map

binders are available at all branch libraries and the Civic Center Building at 2180 Milvia Street.

The public may email written comments on the maps to redistricting@cityofberkeley.info, complete a Community of Interest Form, or provide verbal testimony at a public hearing.

Next Steps


At tonight's meeting, the Commission may take a range of actions, such as:

- Providing direction on modifications to one or more of the draft maps;
- Narrowing the number of maps under consideration; or
- Requesting a new draft map configuration.

The IRC has scheduled a special meeting for Saturday, February 19 to hear additional public input if needed. Depending on the public comments and commission deliberations on February 17, the Commission may continue discussion to the February 19 meeting or may cancel the February 19 meeting if it is not necessary to move the map development process forward. The Commission may also decide to continue consideration of all draft maps to the next public hearing on February 28. At the February 28 public hearing, the Commission will select the final map to be adopted on March 16, 2022.

Attachments:

- 1) Amber Map Version 2 Book
- 2) Violet Map Book
- 3) Community of Interest Matrix
- 4) Public Map Matrix



INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

BERKELEY



Mapping Berkeley Communities: Redistricting by the People

Draft City Council District Map: “AMBER MAP Version 2”

Published February 10, 2022

Contact the Independent Redistricting Commission: redistricting@cityofberkeley.info | (510) 981-6900
2180 Milvia Street, 1st Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704. To obtain additional redistricting information and view the draft maps in an interactive online map, please visit www.cityofberkeley.info/redistricting

AMBER MAP – Version 2

*Consistency Map with Changes to Address Universal Criteria
West Berkeley (Two Districts)*

The Amber Map responds to the direction of the Independent Redistricting Commission to create a draft map that has a high level of continuity with the existing council district boundaries and includes changes only as needed to meet the six universal map criteria. The universal criteria are: 1) Maximum of 10% population deviation; 2) Contiguous districts; 3) Maintain Communities of Interest and Neighborhoods; 4) Use major arterial streets as boundaries where possible; 5) Correct the features of the 2010 map that accounted for prior Councilmember residences; and 6) Include at least one compact student district in every map.

Version two of the Amber Map also responds to the Commission direction to adjust the border between District 3 and District 8 near Ashby BART.

The Amber Map follows the Commission direction by making the following noteworthy modifications:


- Move the border between District 3 and District 8 east from Adeline Street to Shattuck Avenue to include the Ed Roberts Campus, the Ashby BART east lot, and St. Paul AME Church in District 3.
- Unify the Westbrae Neighborhood in District 1;
- Unify the Poets Corner Neighborhood in District 2;
- Unify the LeConte Neighborhood in District 3;
- Unify the Lorin Neighborhood in District 3;
- Unify the Halcyon Neighborhood in District 8;
- Unify the Bateman Neighborhood in District 8;
- Unify the Willard Neighborhood in District 8;
- Unify Lower Spruce/Arch Street with the Northside Neighborhood in District 6;
- Move the census block that contains the International House from District 8 to the existing student district (District 7);
- Correct map features for prior Councilmember residences in District 4 and District 7;
- Maximize the use of the major arterials, University Avenue, Telegraph Avenue, Sacramento Street, Spruce Street, Oxford Street, and Cedar Street, as council district boundaries;
- Commission direction on topography/wildfire risk/transit access is reflected in higher elevation neighborhoods contained in two council districts (6, 8).

Each district is assigned a number (1 through 8)

2
3.79%

The percent shows the deviation from ideal number of people (15,554) in each district if population was distributed exactly equally among the eight districts.






Fields List

Field	Description
District	Number assigned to district (1 through 8)
PPA_Population	PPA = Population
Deviation	Deviation from ideal number of people (15,554) in each district if population was distributed exactly equally among the eight districts.
% Deviation	
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	
% PPA_Hispanic_Origin	
PPA White	
% PPA White	
PPA AfAm	Population – African American
%PPA_AfAm	
PPA_AiAn	Population – American Indian and Alaskan Natives
% PPA_AiAn	
PPA_Asian	
% PPA_Asian	
PPA_HoPI	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
%PPA_HoPI	
PPA_Other	
% PPA_Other	
PPA_CVAP_19	CVAP = City Voting Age Population
% PPA_CVAP_19	
Hispanic_Origin_CVAP	
% Hispanic_Origin_CVAP	
PPA_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	Non-Hispanic White
% PPA_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	
PPA_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	Non-Hispanic Black
% PPA_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	
PPA_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	Non-Hispanic American Indian
% PPA_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	
PPA_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	Non-Hispanic Asian
% PPA_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	
PPA_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	Non-Hispanic Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
% PPA NH Hwn CVAP 19	
ACS 14-18 HU Occupied	Housing Units Occupied
ACS 14-18 Owner occupied	
% ACS 14-18 Owner occupied	
ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	
% ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	
ACS 14-18 HH Median income	Household Median Income
ACS 14-18 Median Age	

“ACS” = American Community Survey

Amber Map - Version 2

District: 1



Field	Value
District	1
PPA_Population	15757
Deviation	203
% Deviation	1.31%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	2291
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	14.54%
PPA_White	7980
% PPA_White	50.64%
PPA_AfAm	1549
% PPA_AfAm	9.83%
PPA_AiAn	48
% PPA_AiAn	0.3%
PPA_Asian	2388
% PPA_Asian	15.16%
PPA_HoPI	67
% PPA_HoPI	0.43%
PPA_Other	171
% PPA_Other	1.09%
PPA_CVAP_19	10813
% PPA_CVAP_19	68.62%
hispanic_Origin_CVAP	1205
hispanic_Origin_CVAP	11.14%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	6594
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	60.98%
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	834
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	7.71%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	20
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.18%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	1661
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	15.36%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	14
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0.13%
14_18_HU_Occupied	6282
18_Owner_occupied	2902
18_Owner_occupied	46.2%

ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	3388
% ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	53.93%
ACS 14-18 HH Median income	1125399
ACS 14-18 Median Age	514.02

Amber Map - Version 2

District: 2




©2021 CALIPER

Field	Value
District	2
PPA_Population	15785
Deviation	231
% Deviation	1.49%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	2691
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	17.05%
PPA_White	6748
% PPA_White	42.75%
PPA_AfAm	2794
% PPA_AfAm	17.7%
PPA_AiAn	41
% PPA_AiAn	0.26%
PPA_Asian	2071
% PPA_Asian	13.12%
PPA_HoPI	57
% PPA_HoPI	0.36%
PPA_Other	179
% PPA_Other	1.13%
PPA_CVAP_19	11043
% PPA_CVAP_19	69.96%
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	1474
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	13.35%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	5276
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	47.78%
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	2708
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	24.52%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	4
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.04%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	906
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	8.2%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	141
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	1.28%
14_18_HU_Occupied	6275
18_Owner_occupied	2414
18_Owner_occupied	38.47%

ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	3863
% ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	61.56%
ACS 14-18 HH Median income	929633
ACS 14-18 Median Age	450.23

Amber Map - Version 2


District: 3



Field	Value
District	3
PPA_Population	15977
Deviation	423
% Deviation	2.72%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	2418
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	15.13%
PPA_White	7306
% PPA_White	45.73%
PPA_AfAm	2414
% PPA_AfAm	15.11%
PPA_AiAn	54
% PPA_AiAn	0.34%
PPA_Asian	2245
% PPA_Asian	14.05%
PPA_HoPI	24
% PPA_HoPI	0.15%
PPA_Other	176
% PPA_Other	1.1%
PPA_CVAP_19	12093
% PPA_CVAP_19	75.69%
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	1225
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	10.13%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	6912
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	57.16%
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	1903
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	15.74%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	69
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.57%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	1370
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	11.33%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	4
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0.03%
14_18_HU_Occupied	6114
18_Owner_occupied	2051
18_Owner_occupied	33.55%
18_Renter_occupied	4051
18_Renter_occupied	66.26%
HH_Median_income	944540
14_18_Median_Age	437.71

Amber Map - Version 2


District: 4



Field	Value
District	4
PPA_Population	15677
Deviation	123
% Deviation	0.79%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	1852
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	11.81%
PPA_White	6554
% PPA_White	41.81%
PPA_AfAm	1188
% PPA_AfAm	7.58%
PPA_AiAn	46
% PPA_AiAn	0.29%
PPA_Asian	4827
% PPA_Asian	30.79%
PPA_HoPI	34
% PPA_HoPI	0.22%
PPA_Other	161
% PPA_Other	1.03%
PPA_CVAP_19	12026
% PPA_CVAP_19	76.71%
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	1274
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	10.59%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	6126
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	50.94%
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	842
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	7%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	19
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.16%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	3033
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	25.22%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	184
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	1.53%
14_18_HU_Occupied	6588
18_Owner_occupied	1401
18_Owner_occupied	21.27%
18_Renter_occupied	5180
18_Renter_occupied	78.63%
HH_Median_income	539006
14_18_Median_Age	270.54

Amber Map - Version 2

District: 5




©2021 CALIPER

Field	Value
District	5
PPA_Population	14770
Deviation	-784
% Deviation	-5.04%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	1031
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	6.98%
PPA_White	10189
% PPA_White	68.98%
PPA_AfAm	305
% PPA_AfAm	2.06%
PPA_AiAn	7
% PPA_AiAn	0.05%
PPA_Asian	1917
% PPA_Asian	12.98%
PPA_HoPI	13
% PPA_HoPI	0.09%
PPA_Other	101
% PPA_Other	0.68%
PPA_CVAP_19	11164
% PPA_CVAP_19	75.59%
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	557
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	4.99%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	8649
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	77.47%
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	166
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	1.49%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	4
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.04%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	1341
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	12.01%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0%
14_18_HU_Occupied	6060
18_Owner_occupied	4356
18_Owner_occupied	71.88%
18_Renter_occupied	1708
18_Renter_occupied	28.18%
HH_Median_income	2097617
14_18_Median_Age	710.05

Amber Map - Version 2

District: 6



Field	Value
District	6
PPA_Population	15635
Deviation	81
% Deviation	0.52%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	1447
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	9.25%
PPA_White	9636
% PPA_White	61.63%
PPA_AfAm	444
% PPA_AfAm	2.84%
PPA_AiAn	7
% PPA_AiAn	0.04%
PPA_Asian	2859
% PPA_Asian	18.29%
PPA_HoPI	33
% PPA_HoPI	0.21%
PPA_Other	145
% PPA_Other	0.93%
PPA_CVAP_19	10967
% PPA_CVAP_19	70.14%
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	775
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	7.07%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	7756
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	70.72%
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	275
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	2.51%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	4
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.04%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	1793
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	16.35%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	34
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0.31%
14_18_HU_Occupied	5680
18_Owner_occupied	3631
18_Owner_occupied	63.93%
18_Renter_occupied	2056
18_Renter_occupied	36.2%
HH_Median_income	1750752
14_18_Median_Age	532.57

Univ of California
©2021 CALIPER

Amber Map - Version 2

District: 7



Field	Value
District	7
PPA_Population	15405
Deviation	-149
% Deviation	-0.96%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	3638
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	23.62%
PPA_White	4946
% PPA_White	32.11%
PPA_AfAm	435
% PPA_AfAm	2.82%
PPA_AiAn	6
% PPA_AiAn	0.04%
PPA_Asian	5492
% PPA_Asian	35.65%
PPA_HoPI	2
% PPA_HoPI	0.01%
PPA_Other	73
% PPA_Other	0.47%
PPA_CVAP_19	10577
% PPA_CVAP_19	68.66%
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	1890
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	17.87%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	3877
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	36.66%
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	304
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	2.87%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	3858
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	36.48%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0%
14_18_HU_Occupied	2098
18_Owner_occupied	119
18_Owner_occupied	5.67%

ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	1982
% ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	94.47%
ACS 14-18 HH Median income	202115
ACS 14-18 Median Age	115.36

Amber Map - Version 2


District: 8



©2021 CALIPER

Field	Value
District	8
PPA_Population	15427
Deviation	-127
% Deviation	-0.82%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	1661
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	10.77%
PPA_White	9098
% PPA_White	58.97%
PPA_AfAm	452
% PPA_AfAm	2.93%
PPA_AiAn	18
% PPA_AiAn	0.12%
PPA_Asian	2903
% PPA_Asian	18.82%
PPA_HoPI	23
% PPA_HoPI	0.15%
PPA_Other	109
% PPA_Other	0.71%
PPA_CVAP_19	13035
% PPA_CVAP_19	84.49%
hispanic_Origin_CVAP	1226
hispanic_Origin_CVAP	9.41%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	8483
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	65.08%
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	375
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	2.88%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	49
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.38%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	2352
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	18.04%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	30
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0.23%
14_18_HU_Occupied	5801
18_Owner_occupied	2391
18_Owner_occupied	41.22%

ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	3418
% ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	58.92%
ACS 14-18 HH Median income	1370912
ACS 14-18 Median Age	459.19



INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

BERKELEY



Mapping Berkeley Communities: Redistricting by the People

Draft City Council District Map: “VIOLET MAP”

Published February 10, 2022

Contact the Independent Redistricting Commission: redistricting@cityofberkeley.info | (510) 981-6900
2180 Milvia Street, 1st Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704. To obtain additional redistricting information and view the draft maps in an interactive online map, please visit www.cityofberkeley.info/redistricting

VIOLET MAP

Two Student/Renter Focused Districts with Two West Berkeley Districts

The Violet Map responds to the direction of the Independent Redistricting Commission to create a draft map that uses the Amber Map as the base map and moves the portion of the Northside Neighborhood south of Le Conte Avenue into the student-focused district, modifies the boundary between District 3 and District 8 to prevent division of the community near Ashby BART, adjusts District 4 in consideration of students and renters, and further creates two student/renter-focused districts in a side-by-side orientation.

The Violet Map adheres to the universal criteria of: 1) Maximum of 10% population deviation; 2) Contiguous districts; 3) Maintain Communities of Interest and Neighborhoods; 4) Use major arterial streets as boundaries where possible; 5) Correct the features of the 2010 map that accounted for prior Councilmember residences; and 6) Include at least one compact student district in every map.

The Violet Map follows the Commission direction by making the following noteworthy modifications:


- Unify the Westbrae Neighborhood in District 1;
- Unify the Poets Corner Neighborhood in District 2;
- Unify the LeConte Neighborhood in District 3;
- Unify the Lorin Neighborhood in District 3;
- Unify the Bateman Neighborhood in District 8;
- Unify the Willard Neighborhood in District 8;
- Unify Lower Spruce/Arch Street with the Northside Neighborhood in District 6;
- Move the border between District 3 and District 8 east from Adeline Street to Shattuck Avenue to include the Ed Roberts Campus, the Ashby BART east parking lot, and St. Paul AME Church into District 3.
- Move the District 5 and District 6 border from Spruce Street to Arlington Avenue north of the Marin Circle;
- Move the portion of Northside Neighborhood south of Ridge Road into District 7;
- Move the census blocks that contain the International House, Lawrence Berkeley Lab, and Foothill Dormitory to the existing student district (District 7);
- Correct map features for prior Councilmember residences in Dist. 4 and Dist. 7;
- Move the border between District 5 and District 4 south to Hearst Avenue;
- Move the border between District 4 and District 7 east to Dana Street;
- Move the border between District 4 and District 3 south to Parker Street;
- Maximize the use of the major arterials, University Avenue, Telegraph Avenue, Sacramento Street, Spruce Street, Oxford Street, Hearst Avenue, Arlington Avenue, and Cedar Street, as council district boundaries;
- Commission direction on topography/wildfire risk/transit access is reflected in higher elevation neighborhoods contained in three council districts (6, 7, 8).

Each district is assigned a number (1 through 8)

2
3.79%

The percent shows the deviation from ideal number of people (15,554) in each district if population was distributed exactly equally among the eight districts.






Fields List

Field	Description
District	Number assigned to district (1 through 8)
PPA_Population	PPA = Population
Deviation	Deviation from ideal number of people (15,554) in each district if population was distributed exactly equally among the eight districts.
% Deviation	
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	
% PPA_Hispanic_Origin	
PPA White	
% PPA White	
PPA AfAm	Population – African American
%PPA_AfAm	
PPA_AiAn	Population – American Indian and Alaskan Natives
% PPA_AiAn	
PPA_Asian	
% PPA_Asian	
PPA_HoPI	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
%PPA_HoPI	
PPA_Other	
% PPA_Other	
PPA_CVAP_19	CVAP = City Voting Age Population
% PPA_CVAP_19	
Hispanic_Origin_CVAP	
% Hispanic_Origin_CVAP	
PPA_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	Non-Hispanic White
% PPA_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	
PPA_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	Non-Hispanic Black
% PPA_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	
PPA_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	Non-Hispanic American Indian
% PPA_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	
PPA_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	Non-Hispanic Asian
% PPA_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	
PPA_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	Non-Hispanic Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
% PPA NH Hwn CVAP 19	
ACS 14-18 HU Occupied	Housing Units Occupied
ACS 14-18 Owner occupied	
% ACS 14-18 Owner occupied	
ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	
% ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	
ACS 14-18 HH Median income	Household Median Income
ACS 14-18 Median Age	

“ACS” = American Community Survey

Violet Map

District: 1



Field	Value
District	1
PPA_Population	15757
Deviation	203
% Deviation	1.31%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	2291
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	14.54%
PPA_White	7980
% PPA_White	50.64%
PPA_AfAm	1549
% PPA_AfAm	9.83%
PPA_AiAn	48
% PPA_AiAn	0.3%
PPA_Asian	2388
% PPA_Asian	15.16%
PPA_HoPI	67
% PPA_HoPI	0.43%
PPA_Other	171
% PPA_Other	1.09%
PPA_CVAP_19	10813
% PPA_CVAP_19	68.62%
hispanic_Origin_CVAP	1205
hispanic_Origin_CVAP	11.14%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	6594
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	60.98%
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	834
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	7.71%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	20
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.18%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	1661
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	15.36%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	14
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0.13%
14_18_HU_Occupied	6282
18_Owner_occupied	2902
18_Owner_occupied	46.2%

ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	3388
% ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	53.93%
ACS 14-18 HH Median income	1125399
ACS 14-18 Median Age	514.02

Violet Map

District: 2



©2021 CALIPER

Field	Value
District	2
PPA_Population	15785
Deviation	231
% Deviation	1.49%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	2691
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	17.05%
PPA_White	6748
% PPA_White	42.75%
PPA_AfAm	2794
% PPA_AfAm	17.7%
PPA_AiAn	41
% PPA_AiAn	0.26%
PPA_Asian	2071
% PPA_Asian	13.12%
PPA_HoPI	57
% PPA_HoPI	0.36%
PPA_Other	179
% PPA_Other	1.13%
PPA_CVAP_19	11043
% PPA_CVAP_19	69.96%
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	1474
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	13.35%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	5276
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	47.78%
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	2708
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	24.52%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	4
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.04%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	906
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	8.2%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	141
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	1.28%
14_18_HU_Occupied	6275
18_Owner_occupied	2414
18_Owner_occupied	38.47%

ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	3863
% ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	61.56%
ACS 14-18 HH Median income	929633
ACS 14-18 Median Age	450.23

Violet Map

District: 3



Field	Value
District	3
PPA_Population	15226
Deviation	-328
% Deviation	-2.11%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	2315
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	15.2%
PPA_White	6888
% PPA_White	45.24%
PPA_AfAm	2339
% PPA_AfAm	15.36%
PPA_AiAn	53
% PPA_AiAn	0.35%
PPA_Asian	2128
% PPA_Asian	13.98%
PPA_HoPI	24
% PPA_HoPI	0.16%
PPA_Other	173
% PPA_Other	1.14%
PPA_CVAP_19	11577
% PPA_CVAP_19	76.03%
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	1176
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	10.16%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	6594
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	56.96%
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	1875
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	16.2%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	69
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.6%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	1281
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	11.07%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	4
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0.03%
14_18_HU_Occupied	5814
18_Owner_occupied	1933
18_Owner_occupied	33.25%
18_Renter_occupied	3872
18_Renter_occupied	66.6%
HH_Median_income	895688
14_18_Median_Age	414.48

Violet Map

District: 4




Field	Value
District	4
PPA_Population	15376
Deviation	-178
% Deviation	-1.14%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	1937
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	12.6%
PPA_White	6261
% PPA_White	40.72%
PPA_AfAm	1151
% PPA_AfAm	7.49%
PPA_AiAn	44
% PPA_AiAn	0.29%
PPA_Asian	4847
% PPA_Asian	31.52%
PPA_HoPI	33
% PPA_HoPI	0.21%
PPA_Other	149
% PPA_Other	0.97%
PPA_CVAP_19	11647
% PPA_CVAP_19	75.75%
hispanic_Origin_CVAP	1149
hispanic_Origin_CVAP	9.87%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	5653
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	48.54%
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	860
A_NH_Blk_CVAP_19	7.38%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	19
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.16%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	3163
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	27.16%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	184
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	1.58%
14_18_HU_Occupied	6422
18_Owner_occupied	1342
18_Owner_occupied	20.9%

ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	5074
% ACS 14-18 Renter occupied	79.01%
ACS 14-18 HH Median income	487769
ACS 14-18 Median Age	265.88

Violet Map

District: 5




©2021 CALIPER

Field	Value
District	5
PPA_Population	15222
Deviation	-332
% Deviation	-2.13%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	1124
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	7.38%
PPA_White	9742
% PPA_White	64%
PPA_AfAm	417
% PPA_AfAm	2.74%
PPA_AiAn	8
% PPA_AiAn	0.05%
PPA_Asian	2608
% PPA_Asian	17.13%
PPA_HoPI	10
% PPA_HoPI	0.07%
PPA_Other	114
% PPA_Other	0.75%
PPA_CVAP_19	11625
% PPA_CVAP_19	76.37%
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	782
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	6.73%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	8637
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	74.3%
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	194
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	1.67%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	1534
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	13.2%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0%
14_18_HU_Occupied	6448
18_Owner_occupied	3729
18_Owner_occupied	57.83%
18_Renter_occupied	2718
18_Renter_occupied	42.15%
HH_Median_income	1817302
14_18_Median_Age	634.37

Violet Map

District: 6



Field	Value
District	6
PPA_Population	15727
Deviation	173
% Deviation	1.11%
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	1099
PPA_Hispanic_Origin	6.99%
PPA_White	10402
% PPA_White	66.14%
PPA_AfAm	340
% PPA_AfAm	2.16%
PPA_AiAn	5
% PPA_AiAn	0.03%
PPA_Asian	2567
% PPA_Asian	16.32%
PPA_HoPI	34
% PPA_HoPI	0.22%
PPA_Other	137
% PPA_Other	0.87%
PPA_CVAP_19	11582
% PPA_CVAP_19	73.64%
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	650
ispanic_Origin_CVAP	5.61%
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	8534
A_NH_Wht_CVAP_19	73.68%
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	250
A_NH_BlK_CVAP_19	2.16%
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	6
A_NH_Ind_CVAP_19	0.05%
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	1739
A_NH_Asn_CVAP_19	15.01%
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	33
A_NH_Hwn_CVAP_19	0.28%
14_18_HU_Occupied	6316
18_Owner_occupied	4410
18_Owner_occupied	69.82%
18_Renter_occupied	1916
18_Renter_occupied	30.34%
HH_Median_income	1988137
14_18_Median_Age	627.41

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
1	7/19/2021	7	Raina Zhao on behalf of ASUC	UC Berkeley student body	District 7, south of UC Berkeley campus. Most students live within 1 mile of campus.	2490 Channing Way, 94704		STUDENT REPRESENTATION		YES	STUDENTS SHOULD BE GROUPED TOGETHER			
2	7/20/2021	2	Joanna Louie	Infrastructure; crime; pollution	South west Berkeley	2995 San Pablo Ave, 94702		NEIGHBORHOOD EQUITY; CRIME		NO				
3	7/20/2021	5	B. Yoder	Safety concerns	Ada Street between Ordway and Acton. Ada between Acton and Sacramento, folks on Acton and on Ordway from Hopkins to Rose, a few folks on Hopkins just below and just above Orway.	1400 Ada St, 94702		NEIGHBORHOOD COHESIVENESS; SAFETY		YES	MAINTAIN COI			
4	7/20/2021	5	Margot Dashiel	Close proximity; neighborhood area	Ada street	1400 Ada St, 94702		NEIGHBORHOOD COHESIVENESS		YES	MAINTAIN COI			
5	7/21/2021	5	Joe Berry	Demographics; Development	Lower hills, near Marin/Arlington Circle.	2100 Marin Ave, 94707		AFFORDABLE HOUSING; HOUSING EQUITY		NO				
6	7/21/2021	5	John	Gardening, art, music, food, being outdoors	Ada Street between Ordway and Acton.	1400 Ada St, 94702		NEIGHBORHOOD COHESIVENESS		YES	MAINTAIN NEIGHBORHOOD CONTIGUITY			
7		1	Prateek Haldar	High quality schools, development at North Berkeley BART, affordable housing, creation of bike lanes, improving vibrancy of Hopkins/Gilman shopping/restaurants	Bound by Hopkins Street on the north, Sacramento on the west (or San Pablo) MLK on the east, and Cedar on the south.	1359 Rose St, 94702		HOUSING EQUITY; HOUSING DEVELOPMENT; NO BERK BART		NO				
8	7/28/2021	5	1546 Milvia	Gerrymandered out of District 4. Neighborhood/block split in 2	Milvia at District 4/5 - split the 2 sides of the block and put in District 5	1450 Milvia St, 94709		COUNCILMEMBER RESIDENCY; NEIGHBORHOOD SPLIT		YES	BOUNDARIES SHOULDN'T BE DRAWN BASED ON COUNCILMEMBER RESIDENCY			
9	7/28/2021	None		Helping each other- sharing tools, offering rides, celebrating wins, informing each other about noisy construction, or house repairs	Tilden Park to the east and south, grizzly peak to the west and Cragmont to the north	50 Whitaker Ave, 94708	(Unclear geographic location. Selected Grizzly Peak Park address.)	NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION		NO				
10	7/30/2021	8	Vincent Casalaina	Crime reduction, maintaining characteristic housing (single-family or single family + ADU), transit	Willard neighborhood. Telegraph/Parker & College/Ashby.	2730 Hillegass Ave, 94705		IMPROVED RESOURCE/SERVICE EQUITY; TRANSPORTATION; CRIME; SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING		YES				
11	8/16/2021	5	No name (kktompkins@gmail.com)	Beautification, Solano Ave corridor development, property crime	Far north Berkeley adjacent to Solano Ave to Albany border in the west.	1559 Solano Ave, 94707		NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION; CRIME		NO				
12	8/20/2021	2	No name	Schools, garbage; effects from nearby homeless population	Fourth & Fifth, from Dwight to Addison	800 Bancroft Way, 94710		NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY; HOMELESSNESS		NO				
13	8/26/2021	None	No name	clean air, affordable low density housing, transportation networks that dont smash thru our neighborhoods, slow streets, public safety, litter and street trash, childcare, parks, trees, community green space	north west berkeley - west of San Pablo to University	1529 Sixth St, 94710		NEIGHBORHOOD EQUITY/SERVICES; INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY/ DEVELOPMENT/POLLUTION		NO				
14	8/26/2021	1	nan@essentialbusinessbehaviors.com	Families, safety, community	North Berkeley BART, Adult school on Virginia, Rose St. on other side of Cedar-Rose Park, San Pablo Avenue, Cedar Street	1201 Virginia St, 94702		HOMELESSNESS; NORT BERK BART; HOUSING DENSITY		NO				
15	9/12/2021	3	No name	More racially mixed than North or Central Berkeley	Corner of Parker and McGee	1700 Parker St, 94703		RACIAL DIVERSITY; PROPERTY VALUES		NO				
16	9/12/2021	None	No name	International Coastal Clean-up month; Disaster Relief Committees; Food/beverage committee; Clean-up committee	B/W West Berkeley and North	1720 Eighth St, 94710	Changed it to James Kenney (Unclear geographic location. Picked an intersection in Northwest Berkeley neighborhood for pin.)	AFFORDABILITY; INCLUSION; WATERFRONT CLEAN-UP		NO				

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
17	9/14/2021	6	No name	Context (scale & mix), distant views, especially of the bay and the coastal hills; mainly a residential area with single-family homes, many with secondary units, typically with backyards and gardens; could see a mix of smaller vehicles and better transit, but it needs to be phased in, grandfathering older residents who depend on cars. Streets could be rethought. Filling every backyard with an ADU or building out single-family sites would be a mistake, but a thoughtful mix would be fine. Same comment about the Shattuck corridor - do't overload it. Some density but not a view-blocking wall.	Oxford Street and east. Odd situation where three districts overlap and near neighbors are represented by Hahn, Harrison, and Wengraf, whose districts differ substantially. District 6 should take in the north Shattuck corridor. We are closer to Thousand Oaks (Hahn) than the west side of Shattuck (Harrison) in interests, I sense.	1600 Oxford St, 94709		HOME OWNERSHIP; VIEW PRESERVATION; DISTRICT BOUNDARIES (5&6); MAINTAIN SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING		YES	MAINTAIN COI			
18	9/23/2021	2	Veronica	Latinos with long history of home ownership and multiple generation households	5th street and San Pablo, between University and Dwight	920 Allston Way, 94710		SERVICE ALLOCATION; RACIAL EQUITY; HISTORICAL LATINO NEIGHBORHOOD; RESOURCE EQUITY; MULTIGENERATIONAL LIVING		NO				
19	9/27/2021	2	Sheryl	public safety, education, beautification	San Pablo Park neighborhood, West Berkeley, Left Bank are all names used for D2	2501 San Pablo Ave, 94702		HOMELESSNESS; INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION; DIVERSITY; PUBLIC SAFETY		NO				
20	9/28/2021	2	Ms. Ty	Crime reduction, clean streets (eliminate illegal dumping), affordable housing	South Berkeley	3100 Adeline St, 94703	(Unclear geographic location. Selected park near Sacramento and Fairview.)	FORGOTTEN NEIGHBORHOOD; ILLEGAL DUMPING; CRIME; AFFORDABLE HOUSING		NO				
21	9/28/2021	3	Ayanna Davis	Berkeley Black Community, State of Black Berkeley	My community of interest is South West Berkeley beginning at Cedar and 4th Street and ending at 62nd and Adeline. West Berkeley, South Berkeley, Loren District	2546 Tenth St, 94710	(Large geographic location. Selected an address central to the described area.)	HOUSING/RESOURCE EQUITY; POVERTY; FOOD INSECURITY; HEALTH/ECONOMIC EQUITY; HISTORICAL BLACK NEIGHBORHOOD		YES	No, MAINTAIN DISTRICT 3			UNDERFUNDED?
22	9/29/2021	1	James	Public safety (homelessness/mentally ill people)	Gourmet Ghetto	1549 Shattuck Ave, 94709	(Unclear geographic area. Selected address in North Shattuck neighborhood.)	PUBLIC SAFETY; HOMELESSNESS; MENTAL ILLNESS		NO				
23	9/29/2021	3	No name	diversity in ppl and architecture. nice flat and walkable, close to SF, Oakland, easy access;	South Berkeley	3075 Adeline St, 94703	(Unclear geographic area. Selected address near streets named in COI form.)	HOMELESSNESS; CRIME; ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT; RESOURCE EQUITY; DIVERSITY		NO				
24	10/2/2021	4	No name	Safe neighborhood (walkable/bike friendly); traffic concerns, homelessness/littering, UC Berkeley take over of town.	Central Berkeley between Sacramento and downtown.	2246 McGee Ave, 94703		PUBLIC SAFETY; TRANSPORTATION SAFETY; HOMELESSNESS; RELATIONSHIP WITH UCB		NO				
25	10/8/2021	5	north Shattuck	Environment, trees, city upkeep, art, ease of shopping, parking, good food, lovely parks, socializing, access to BART.	Marin Circle to University Avenue, from Grizzly Peak to Sacramento streets. Name provided: North Shattuck	1444 Shattuck Pl, 94709	Changed the pin to the Safeway in North Berkeley	TRANSPORTATION; FIRE SAFETY/EVACUATION; ROADWAY CONDITIONS; HOMELESSNESS		YES				DISTRICT 5
26	10/16/2021	8	Elizabeth		Elmwood District	2703 Stuart Street, 94705		None		See map	See map			MAP
27	10/16/2021	2	Ben Gardella	Strawberry Creek Park	Alston, Sacramento, Sacramento and Dwight Street Name provided: Poet's Corner	1314 Bancroft Way, 94702		MAINTAIN COI; NEIGHBORHOOD CONTIGUITY; PARK		YES	MAINTAIN DISTRICT			
28	10/16/2021	2	Heather Clauge	Strawberry Creek Park	University to Dwight, Sacramento to San Pablo Name provided: Poet's Corner	1298 Bancroft Way, 94702		PARK/RECREATION; HOMELESSNESS; COI NEIGHBORHOOD CONTIGUITY		YES	MAINTAIN DISTRICT			

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
29	10/17/2021	2	Douglas Smith	Families raising young children, retirees and elders aging in place, multigenerational housing--all of whom patronize the businesses along the San Pablo and University corridors and make use of primary parks like San Pablo Park, Strawberry Creek Park & Aquatic Park. Neighbors band together to monitor safety & crime, pedestrian/bike safety, working closely with our new Councilmember Taplin. There is a cohesive atmosphere which underscores a sense of this being a true community of individuals, looking out for each other.	South to San Pablo Park, the 9th Street Bike Boulevard to the west, north to University Avenue, and east to Sacramento Street. University Avenue does seem to be a true dividing line and an appropriate boundary between D2 and D1; somehow San Pablo does not divide the Community. Name provided: Poet's Corner	1312 Bancroft Way, 94702		MULTIGENERATIONAL HOUSING; PARKS & RECREATION; SAFETY; CRIME		YES	MAINTAIN DISTRICT			
30	10/17/2021	1	No name	Preserving residential character of neighborhood for livability. Safety of residents (crime prevention and optimal traffic/pedestrian flow). Diverse demographics.	San Pablo to the west, University Avenue to the South; Shattuck to the East; and Vine to the north. Name provided: Northbrae	1619 Edith St, 94703		TRAFFIC/TRANSPORTATION SAFETY; POPULATION DENSITY; NEIGHBORHOOD LIVABILITY; ZONING; INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION		YES	PRESERVE RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER			
31	10/18/2021	2	No name	commitment to Family, school, community events, shared political affiliations, diverse cultures, mixed low and middle income housing and proximity to shopping. We enjoy our Great walking and biking score!	From the Bay to Sacramento Street; from University to Bancroft. Connected to neighbors, particularly on Byron Street and Cowper. Name provided: Poet's Corner	2228 San Pablo Ave, 94702		TRAFFIC CONTROL; STREET PAVING; DENSITY; ECONOMIC DEV; FERRY; MIXED HOUSING		YES	MAINTAIN DISTRICT			
32	10/18/2021	2	Ariel Smith-Iyer	Appreciation for diversity; common interest in continuing to be a place for all in the neighborhood. Strawberry Creek Park is an important community meeting place; area surrounding the park, Corp Yard, and bowling green vacant lot should remain together to collectively decide the future of the space.	San Pablo to Sacramento; University Avenue to Dwight Way. Name provided: Poet's Corner	1302 Bancroft Way, 94702		TRASH COLLECTION; PARKS & RECREATION; OVER POPULATION; ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT; DIVERSITY		YES	MAINTAIN DISTRICT			
33	10/18/2021	2	No name	Traffic and speeding	West Berk Flat Lands between Sacramento & San Pablo.	2500 Bonar St, 94702	Incomplete boundaries; selected address at intersection of Dwight Way & Bonar Street.	TRANSPORTATION SAFETY; SERVICE ALLOCATION; TRAFFIC SAFETY		NO				
34	10/26/2021		No name	Communities of interest that previous cycles of redistricting have dismissed: 1. Prospect Street is a community of interest currently split between District 7 and District 8. The east side of Prospect is in District 8, and the west side is in District 7. Both sides of the street should be in the same district. Both sides of Prospect Street have more in common with Southside than with Panoramic Hill or Elmwood-Claremont. 7. Clark Kerr Campus is in District 8. The students who live there have more in common with Southside than with Elmwood-Claremont. 8. Redwood Gardens, a senior housing facility located on the Clark Kerr Campus, has more in common with Elmwood-Claremont neighbors than with students and should be considered a community of interest separate from students' community of interest. 9. Faculty housing on Clark Kerr Campus is a community of interest that has more in common with Elmwood-Claremont than with students. 10. The blocks within Dwight-Waring-Derby-Telegraph have more in common with Southside than with Elmwood-Claremont. 11. House and the student co-ops behind it are in District 8. The residents of these dorms have more in common with Southside than with Elmwood-Claremont. 12. The blocks within Cedar-Oxford-Hearst-Arch are part of Northside and not split between District 5 and District 6. Northside should extend to Walnut, maybe even Shattuck. 13. The blocks within Sacramento-Ashby-California-border are in District 2. They should be in District 3. 14. The blocks within University-Acton-Allston-Sacramento are part of Poet's Corner, which is in District 2. 15. Part of Cragmont is in District 6, and part is in District 5. 16. The blocks within Fulton-Dwight-Dana-Channing are in District 4 and should be in District 7. 17. Using Ellsworth as the border between District 3 and District 7 and District 8 is wrong. Fulton is a better border, and Shattuck even better. 18. Codonices, in District 6, has more in common with Live Oak than the Berkeley Hills. 19. The "hat" of District 4, where Jesse lives, should be in District 5. 20. The "dog leg" of District 7, where Kriss lives, includes parts of LeConte and Willard that should		2180 Milvia Street, 94704	Not specific to one address or area; used Civic Center address as a general location,	None		See map	See map			MAP

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
35	11/3/2021	1	Phil Allen	By the looks of things in my part of D-1, this is a townish and family (dwellings) area of the city. I see family activity and the retail and recreational which sustain them. There is no overt presence of UC students; they seem to be elsewhere. Retired friends gather here, internet junkies there. San Pablo Avenue provides a traditionally gritty 'home' to a constant presence of lost and forgotten citizen/ghosts and their movable social spots.	My 'felt' boundaries, running from close-by San Pablo/Delaware as center, are: Addison (south); 9th St. (west); Gilman (north), indeterminate (east). Names provided: Cutthroat Corner or Almost Oceanview	1740 San Pablo Avenue, 94702	Incomplete boundaries; selected intersection of San Pablo/Delaware.	RETURN TO PAST; HOMELESSNESS; MENTAL ILLNESS; ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT; FORGOTTEN CITIZENS		NO				
36	11/6/2021	5	Barbara Ann Yoder	I am part of a vibrant neighborhood group established probably in the 1980s, when former fire chief Bill Brock and his wife initiated annual gatherings during National Night Out. For the last 13 years since I moved to Ada Street, our neighborhood group has worked together sharing safety concerns and looking out for each other. We currently have 65 households in our group. We are in touch via email. We meet annually. We know each other by name. We have a neighborhood earthquake cache and a neighbor on Ordway offers trainings. All of Ada Street below Sacramento should be in District 1, where we used to be. When the lines were redrawn, they went right down the middle of our street. As a neighborhood we are impacted by development plans at N. Berkeley BART, Ruth Acty School traffic and events, Cedar-Rose Park events, traffic on Hopkins and the Ohlone Greenway—all in District 1. We should be rejoined with District 1.	Our neighborhood group currently includes 65 homes along Ada Street from Ordway to Acton and about halfway up the next block toward Sacramento. It includes most homes on Ordway from Hopkins to Rose, several homes on Rose and on Hopkins that back to Ada between Ordway and Acton, and most homes on Acton from Hopkins to Ada. Everyone in these blocks are welcome in our group. When you redraw the lines, if a street needs to be split down the middle, it shouldn't be a quiet short street like Ada; it should be a busy through street with double yellow lines, like Hopkins from Ordway to Acton. Also, if Ordway between Hopkins and Ada is split down the middle, it too should be reincorporated into District 1.	1400 Ada St, 94702	Appended to COI Form #3 (submitter's first COI form)	NEIGHBORHOOD CONTINUITY; TRAFFIC SAFETY; BART; RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER		YES	REJOIN ADA ST TO DISTRICT 1			
37	11/8/2021	3	Carl McPherson	Students & Renters	There is considerable overlap between renters and students, and we are concentrated in the areas around Berkeley main campus and the two BART stations. As I look at the maps already submitted, I think that Alfred Twu's "Compact Donut" map does a good job of collecting the main student populations into 2 districts on the southside and the areas just west and north of the main campus. It's unfortunate that we don't have 9 districts to work with, as I think—for population balancing purposes—Alfred Twu's map is unable to extend far enough North-South along the Shattuck corridor or far enough south on the Telegraph corridor to create 3 renter/student districts (Southside, Northside and "Westside"). Stephen Young's excellent map (which has several nice innovations, including taking the hillier parts of current Districts 5 and 6 and combining them into a single district) creates a district for the	1947 Center Street, 94704	(Unclear geographic boundaries; selected 1947 Center Street as central location).	ADD ANOTHER STUDENT DISTRICT; UP-ZONING (HOUSING DIVERSITY); PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION		YES	STUDENT REPRESENTATION			

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
38	11/8/2021	4	David Ushijima	The community in this neighborhood is tied together not only by our geographical proximity and walkability of the neighborhood but our shared interest in many activities that are within walking distance in the nearby Downtown and Theatre districts. Also because of our close proximity to the University, we also share the common interests of cultural and intellectual events held on the UC Berkeley campus.	Dwight Way (south), University Avenue (north); MLK (east), Sacramento (west). Name provided: Spaulding-McGee tract. Please do not break up this community by drawing lines which would bisect the natural geographic boundaries of this community.	1700 Bancroft Way, 94703		CULTURAL ACCESS; RELATIONSHIP WITH UCB		YES	NEIGHBORHOOD CONTIGUITY DIST 4			
39	11/12/2021	4	Stephanie Allan	As a resident of the Flatlands since 1969, I have a strong interest in how District 4 is drawn or redrawn. When I first moved here, the neighborhood bounded by Shattuck/University/Sacramento/Dwight Way was primarily a working class area, predominantly white, but with some black families on Jefferson and Spaulding. It was a fairly tight community, located between the student/University area to the east, the historic black community to the west. There were lots of families here and a lot of kids. My son grew up & went to Washington school in this area. I worked hard to build a tot lot on Roosevelt and get a barrier at Channing & Roosevelt as well as a stop sign on McGee. (Pedestrian safety is still a major worry here, though) The housing used to be affordable. No longer, of course, like the rest of Berkeley. My neighborhood on Channing Way has been affected by the homeless crisis. Because we have a free box on Channing, between Roosevelt & McGee, we get a lot of homeless traffic from Downtown. Also, until we, reluctantly, agreed to have parking restrictions, the streets were jammed with UC students' parking. We supported making Channing Way a bike street although the condition of the road makes biking hazardous. The park area on the Ohlone strip was a great addition to the area. Aside from the park at Washington (where I participated in the redesign and addition of a regulation size basketball court when I was chair of the remodel committee) and the Tot Lot on Roosevelt, there isn't a lot of open space in our neighborhood. Civic Center Park was for so many years not a hospitable space. There is still a great deal of drug dealing going on there, probably migrating down from Shattuck. While much has changed, a lot hasn't. There's still a strong culture of neighborliness and cooperation. And a sense that this is the area where the much-talked-about middle class lives. I would like to keep and strengthen that. So adding in Shattuck Ave. with all the new apartments being built there (which I support) would dramatically alter the character of my neighborhood. For the same rationale, it's never been clear to me what the areas north of Ohlone were doing in District 4. University is a natural boundary and the	University/Shattuck/Dwight Way/Sacramento Name provided: The Flatlands	1712 Channing Way, 94703		TRANSPORTATION SAFETY; PARKS & RECREATION; CRIME		YES	NEIGHBORHOOD CONTIGUITY DIST 4			
40	11/13/2021	2	No name	Strawberry Creek Park brings our neighbors together - park should be in one district with all of its surrounds.	Strawberry Creek	1260 Allston Way, 94702	Strawberry Creek address	STRAWBERRY PARK IN ONE DISTRICT; NEIGHBORHOOD CONTIGUITY		YES	NEIGHBORHOOD CONTIGUITY DIST 2			
41	11/14/2021	2	No name	Culture, history, community - preservation of those. Black Repertory Group has been a vital part of that for almost 60 years. Redistricting such that would exclude Black Repertory Group from district 2 will mean that Black Repertory group and the commitment BRG has to district 2 and the community has to BRG are not being recognized or considered. please keep Black Repertory Group in district 2	South Berkeley, Adeline Corridor Name provided: District 2	3201 Adeline St, 94703	Used Black Repertory Group address	BLACK CULTURAL COHESIVENESS/HISTORY		YES	MAINTAIN DISTRICT			DISTRICT 2 OR 3?
42	11/14/2021	2	Monika Scott	I live and work in the Lorin District. The Lorin District 2 is historical African American community. I would like the community to remain unchanged and that Black Repertory Group remain in the district.	The Lorin / District 2	3215 Adeline St, 94703	Address next to the Black Repertory Group	CULTURAL COHESIVENESS; MAINTAIN HISTORICAL BLACK COMMUNITIES; LORIN DISTRICT		YES	MAINTAIN DISTRICT			DISTRICT 2 OR 3?

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
43	11/15/2021	3	No name	<p>Protect neighborhood resources of light, air, space, open areas, common spaces. Help neighbors and be vigilant for diverse communities who have been marginalized/victimized - particularly Muslim people, Asians and African Americans who reside in our immediate neighborhood. We live near/adjacent to Shattuck, with lots of traffic in and out of Berkeley and so we keep an eye out for each other.</p> <p>Socializing in the neighborhood is important - especially since the pandemic. Our door gatherings are now a thing. Watching our for children and making sure that traffic -vehicular and pedestrian- respect the ability of children to run around and play outside in a positive environment. Solar access for gardens and solar panels is a concern in our neighborhood in every house. Our western sky/space is especially important for the sunlight, air and views. The area is densely populated with small houses, apartments, coop houses and group living. With this density and close proximity people are very respectful.</p>	Walker Street has become our gathering spot - that runs between Derby and Ward that runs from Shattuck on the West to east of Fulton. We also have gatherings on Fulton with the blocks running East up towards Telegraph. Walker Street is a frequent name for our neighborhood.	2655 Shattuck Ave, 94704	Used intersection of Walker Street and Shattuck Avenue	NEIGHBORHOOD RESOURCES; TRANSPORTATION SAFETY; MARGINALIZED COMMUNITY; RESOURCE EQUITY		YES	MAINTAIN DISTRICT			
44	11/14/2021	3	C. Hutching	<p>Many African Americans (AA) moved to South Berkeley during WW2 to support the war effort. They were restricted from living in other parts of Berkeley due to redlining laws. Together, with other newcomers from Asia and Central America, they shaped the neighborhood into a thriving community which reflected their cultural, artistic, religious and political beliefs. Key tenets of our historical neighborhood are shared by my community members today. Those beliefs include, but are not limited to, respecting the civil rights for every citizen, housing rights for all, rights to jobs and a right to worship.</p> <p>The faith community is actively engaged in supporting the values upheld by my community and is represented with churches scattered around South Berkeley. For example, The Church by The Side of the Road located east of Shattuck on Russell St. is leading a consortium of church leaders in the mentoring of young people. The Ephesian Church, with the active support of community groups in this area, is committed to building low/low-income housing on its site. The Buddhist Temple on Russell is also engaged in service in the community and is a welcoming place to families and neighbors for outdoor weekend lunches.</p> <p>There are many places of interest and programs serving my community like Kiwi Pediatrics on Alcatraz, Healthy Black Families, The Farmer's Market on Adeline/62nd, the NAACP office on Adeline, Community Acupuncture on Sacramento and the Women's Cancer Resource Center on Ellsworth. The Berkeley Bowl has a special place in our community. They sell foods representing many cultures in our neighborhood and it's also a place to run into your neighbors.</p>	<p>This area is known as South Berkeley. The current geographic location is Dwight Way on the North, Ellsworth on the East, 62nd on the South and Sacramento and California on South.</p> <p>The eastern swath of this area (from Dwight on the North going south on Ellsworth to Ashby and moving slightly westward at Deakin) should remain intact to represent the shared interests (stated above) of this community.</p> <p>Additionally, the southern swath of this District (going from Dwight on the North to 62nd on the South) is instrumental in reflecting the common shared interests of our community.</p> <p>Based on the maps that have been submitted to date, Howard Rosenberg's map looks the closest</p>	1730 Oregon St, 94703	Used Grove Park address	BLACK CULTURAL COHESIVENESS; FAITH COMMUNITY; TRANSPORTATION; MAINTAIN HISTORICALLY BLACK NEIGHBORHOOD; PUBLIC SAFETY; INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION		YES	MAINTAIN DISTRICT			REFERENCE HOWARD ROSENBERG MAP

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes	
45	11/14/2021	1	Meryl Siegal	<p>There are several common interests in our community: we are a transit oriented community bounded by BART, AC Transit and cars looking for parking once BART depletes the number of spaces. It makes sense to sever the district at Sacramento Street since the communities East of Sacramento do not have the same interests, development and history as the communities West of Sacramento. It is a community of interest because it has a major street that runs all the way to the hills and down to the Bay, East to West. It is a community of interest because it includes a highway as a street (San Pablo Ave). Furthermore, the community is also one that experiences toxic fumes from industrial corporate concerns. Finally, it is a community of interest because several of the houses are still owned by people of color who were not allowed to buy homes east of Sacramento.</p> <p>The community houses several families. It really is a community about families, schools and play grounds. The community is a conduit for evacuation from the hills if there should be a fire emergency. The community also is a nexus for growth over the next decade. The community includes Cedar up until Sacramento, West to Oceanview and the Marina. The community also currently houses a great majority of the unhoused people in Berkeley and these unhoused</p>	<p>Geographically it is a community of interest because it includes the Berkeley Marina district and so should expand past University (not stop there as it does now). Geographically, the community is flat and down hill from the rest of Berkeley. The community is also an international community from the Brazilian cultural center, to Spanish table, to the Halal restaurants, our community is international and cosmopolitan.</p>	1529 San Pablo Ave, Berkeley, CA 94702	Used address central to current District 1 (intersection of San Pablo and Cedar)	<p>TRANSPORTATION; INDUSTRIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION</p>		YES	EXPAND DISTRICT				BNC REDISTRICTING MAP
46	11/15/2021	7	No name	<p>Renters; pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders; students.</p>	<p>This is concentrated in the areas with a high density of renters, including Downtown, southside blocks south of the current District 7, Clark Kerr campus, and "northside" up to Virginia Street</p> <p>The renter community is overwhelmed in the current districting by being split among districts dominated by homeowners. Renters vote less frequently than homeowners as a community and are therefore further drowned out. We need an additional district that protects and represents the significant number of renters in the City, such as the donut district on the map proposed by Alfred Twu, one draft example attached.</p>	2355 Telegraph Ave, 94704	Incomplete boundaries provided; selected address at Durant/Telegraph	<p>RENTERS/STUDENT COMMUNITY; TRANSPORTATION SAFETY; HOMELESSNESS</p>		YES	ADD NEW DISTRICT			MAP ATTACHED	

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes	
47	11/15/2021	4	Ben Gould	<p>1. Housing affordability; 2. Bike/pedestrian/transit access & safety; 3. Homelessness</p> <p>Downtown Berkeley is an incredibly diverse community of over 6,000 residents, 95% of whom are renters. Downtown is comprised of students, young professionals, immigrants, families, retirees, and long-time residents alike, including both housed and unhoused neighbors.</p> <p>Downtown has been historically considered "everyone's neighborhood" because of the diverse commercial and leisure activities and the access to transit and major institutions (UC Berkeley, LBNL, City of Berkeley). However, for the thousands of people who call Downtown home on a daily basis, it is also a residential community, where we need to be able to get home safely and comfortably at night, have non-automotive transportation options that make it easy to get to our destinations, and have enough housing options and tenant protections to keep rent affordable. City Council has historically neglected the residential experience in Downtown Berkeley.</p> <p>Downtown Berkeley is most similar to the mixed-use and medium density neighborhoods immediately north and south along Shattuck Avenue. Because the most unifying experience of living in Downtown is "renters who don't have cars", other neighborhoods with high concentrations of renters who don't have cars are particularly good matches for joining into a Council district. Other campus periphery areas, such as Northside or Southside, are good candidates.</p> <p>Because renters in Berkeley typically vote at lower rates than homeowners (for a variety of reasons - in Downtown, many renters are either immigrants ineligible to vote, or students who register to</p>	Hearst to the north; Oxford/Fulton to the east; Dwight to the south; MLK to the west. Name provided: Downtown Berkeley	2272 Shattuck Ave, 94704		TRANSPORTATION SAFETY; HOMELESSNESS; HOUSING AFFORDABILITY; TRANSIT ACCESS; TRANSPORTATION; RENTER/ STUDENT REPRESENTATION		YES	ADD NEW RENTER/STUDENT DISTRICT				ALFRED TWU MA
48	11/15/2021	3	Berkeley Branch of the NAACP	<p>Berkeley's Black community; churches, businesses, homeowners and tenants in primarily South Berkeley's area which now falls into "District 3." History and ancestors in common; many of us moved in the migration west from the Deep South after slavery and Jim Crow, many of us share a deep and abiding faith in God (Black Christian Churches are historic pillars of the city for a hundred years: Church by the Side of the Road, McGee Ave Baptist Church, St. Paul's AME Church, Ephesians Church, Phillips AME, etc).</p> <p>Black academics, artists and activists are a core part of our community; housing should be available to ensure Black members thrive in our historic district that should be deemed the Black Community Historical Zone. The Adeline Corridor and So Berkeley needs to not be further displaced or diluted. Berkeley NAACP, BEEMA and other Black organizations in Berkeley strongly urge that District 3 remain without alteration. Specifically: McGee Ave Baptist Church should not be placed into District, 2, nor should Church by Side of Road be drawn into District 8. Without exception, the new African American Holistic Resource Center @1890 Alcatraz, Black Rep, Ephesians, Ebenezer, McGee, Phillips, St. Paul's must remain 'as is'</p>	Current District 3	1730 Oregon St, 94703	Used Grove Park address for pin	HISTORICAL BLACK/MUSLIM NEIGHBORHOOD; FAITH BASED COMMUNITY; ACCESS		YES	MAINTAIN DISTRICT 3				MAP ATTACHED

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes	
49	11/15/2021	1	No name	Working-class neighborhood, which includes many Craftsman-style homes (and a few Victorians), built by blue-collar workers for their families. It also retains a - albeit diminishing - level of racial and socioeconomic diversity as one of the only neighborhood in which restrictive covenants were not placed on housing (as a formerly redlined area). This area bounds the MU-R and MU-LI areas, and neighborhoods have striven to coexist with industry that would now be deemed to be incompatible with residential - and has embraced the ecosystem of small manufacturing, arts, and crafts businesses, some of whose owners reside in live-work units in the neighborhood.	The Oceanview District is roughly bounded by San Pablo on the East Side, the waterfront on the West Side, Gilman St. on the North Side, and University Ave. on the South Side. However, our community arguably has more in common with the entire area below San Pablo than other neighborhoods. We certainly have more in common with other areas below Sacramento (roughly bounded by the North Berkeley BART) than areas to the east of Sacramento. Name provided: Oceanview District For your consideration, a West Berkeley Business District oriented map proposal has been created (most districts except 2 are within less than 1% of the threshold for compactness, the least compact district is D6 and it's within 3.6%).	1720 Eighth St, 94710	Used James Kenney Community Center	SINGLE FAMILY ZONING; LOCAL/SMALL BUSINESSES; WORKING CLASS NEIGHBORHOOD; HOUSING DENSITY; MANUFACTURING/ARTS & CRAFTS; LIVE/WORK UNITS; LIGHT INDUSTRIAL; COMMON CULTURE		YES	MAINTAIN OCEANVIEW DISTRICT				MAP ATTACHED
50	11/15/2021	4	Wendy Alfson & Nancy Holland	Geographic, historical, economic, cultural, and racial/ethnic diversity interests; common interests in quiet with less noise, less litter, less flooding, less air pollution, fewer vehicles, improved traffic safety, reduction of danger from cut-through & commute traffic; religious centers.	See map attachment to COI form Name provided: Greater Flatlands	1607 Bancroft Way, 94703	Used intersection of McGee Avenue & Bancroft Way.	MAJOR TRAFFIC ARTERY; TRANSPORTATION SAFETY; DENSITY; TRAFFIC		YES	RECONFIGURE DISTRICT				MAP INCLUDED
51	11/16/2021	3	No name	Sun, air, and space are resources we want to protect. We have just enough space, and we get along well and watch out for each other. This is important because we have small children, senior citizens and members of marginalized communities that have seen a lot of hatred: Muslims, Asian, and African American. We keep an eye out for our neighbors and have a history of showing up, in person to take care of mutual concerns. We love the sound of children playing outside, and during the pandemic our outside space on Walker Street became the focus of neighborhood outdoor gatherings. These gatherings were about the only "socializing" any of us did for a year.	Shattuck to the west. Comprises Derby and Ward all the way past Fulton. Name provided: Walker Street / Le Conte	2108 Derby St, 94705	Used intersection of Derby Street & Walker Street.	INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION; HOUSING DENSITY; HOMELESSNESS; ECONOMIC/RACIAL DIVERSITY		YES	KEEP NEIGHBORHOOD BOUNDARIES- DISTRICT 3				
52	11/16/2021	1	Afi Kambon for Berkeley Visionary Equity Summit Alliance	Historically Black community. A place of inclusion, tolerance, and caring; youth and elders connecting; affordable housing and a fair and inclusive approach to development that benefits low-income residents including a right of return for those displaced or unhoused, and safe community policing.	Maintain current District 1 boundaries; at least as far east as Sacramento Street, the former "color line."	1531 San Pablo Ave, 94702	Intersection of Cedar & San Pablo.	HISTORICAL BLACK NEIGHBORHOOD; AFFORDABLE HOUSING; LOW INCOME RESIDENCE; INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION; SENIOR RESOURCE EQUITY; CRIME/POLICING		YES	KEEP BOUNDARIES				

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
53	11/16/2021	2	Betsy Morris	I am a 30 year old resident of historic West Berkeley (split between District 1 and 2), and a current member of the Poet's Corner Advocates for the Unhoused and the Berkeley Visionary Equity Alliance. We want an inclusive community, and are working with existing institutions like Women's Day Time Drop In Center and Youth Spirit Artworks to recognize the massive displacement of the Black and Hispanic community members. We support a variety of truly affordable housing. strategies to reintegrate, including "good neighbor" shelters, tiny home villages, and safe parking lots while more affordable housing can be built.	Current boundaries work well (University, Sacramento, and Dwight Way). Strawberry Creek Park neighborhood with Berkeley Youth Alternatives, the park, the corp yard, Daytime Drop In Center and Strawberry Creek Lodge, Berkeley Youth Alternatives, belong in District 2. West Berkeley from south of University Avenue, to the Marina, Aquatic Park and east to Sacramento Street (the old de facto "color line" reflect. I am suprised to see the decline of West Berkeley and the Oceanview Neighborhood in favor of "South West Berkeley" and Northwest Berkeley." San Pablo Park was/is a distinctive neighborhood. The displacement of Black neighbors is striking west of San Pablo - the current census map looks scrubbed.	2246 San Pablo Ave, 94702	Used Intersection of San Pablo Avenue & Bancroft Way	SHELTERS; DIVERSITY; DISTRICT INEQUITY; HOMELESSNESS; INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION; AFFORDABLE HOUSING; DISPLACEMENT OF COMMUNITIES OF COLOR		YES	MAINTAIN CURRENT BOUNDARIES			
54	11/24/2021	4		As a result of the last redistricting, Spruce and Arch Streets were split down the middle. Those who lived on the westside of the street were put into District 4, while those who lived on the East side of the street remained in District 6. Before, when we had common problems, we could go to our District 6 representative. Now, while we may have common problems--traffic, trash pick-up, lighting for the street, we now have to	Lower Spruce area including Spruce Street and Arch Street			TRANSPORTATION SAFETY; LIGHTING; CRIME; TRASH-PICK; WATER RUN-OFF; INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION		YES	Yes, District 6 should continue south to Hearst and west to Oxford, instead of a little chunk being taken out and added to District 4. Fix what			
55	11/25/2021	4			Cedar to the North, Hearst to the South, Oxford to the West and Euclid to the East			NEIGHBORHOOD COHESIVENESS; OWNER-OCCUPIED SINGLE FAMILY HOMES GROUPED TOGETHER; SMALL ADJUSTMENTS TO THE EXISTING DISTRICT MAP; RETIRED POPULATION; YOUNG FAMILIES; HOMEOWNER / LONG-TERM RESIDENTS VS STUDENT CONSTITUENCY		YES	Yes, Move from District 4 to District 6 (unite with the rest of homeowning neighbors. Want south side of Virginia Street added to District 6); "Our neighborhood is roughly bordered by Cedar to the North, Hearst to the South, Oxford to the West and Euclid to the East. Currently our neighborhood is divided into at least three separate districts."			

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
56	11/29/2021	8			Willard Neighborhood - Ashby to Dwight and Telegraph to College Avenue			NEIGHBORHOOD COHESIVENESS		YES	Yes, WANTS ALL OF WILLARD NEIGHBORHOOD TO BE IN DISTRICT 8; "The Willard neighborhood runs from Ashby to Dwight and from Telegraph to College. To me it makes common sense that a given neighborhood is within one voting district"			
57	1/11/2022	1	Anonymous	Parks. Walkways and parks are important to our community. They need to be neat, clean, well kept and most of all safe. We want to see homeless cared for properly for and not living on the street, in tents, on park benches or in inoperable RVs or vans for days on end.	We are on Virginia St near Cedar Rose Park and the walkway that replaced the old Southern Pacific right of way. We would consider our area to extend to the North to shops on Hopkins, West to San Pablo and East to BART and on to Shattuck Westbrae			PARK/RECREATION; WALKABILITY; HOMELESSNESS; SAFETY; BART STATION; NEW CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS	NO	YES	NO			
58	1/11/2022	1,5	Anonymous	Long time residents, with a mix of renters and homeowners. Close to a small shopping village. Walkability. Friendly, neighborly with an annual block party. Until recently, this was an affordable neighborhood with neighbors that have a variety of income levels	Westbrae			RENTER AND HOMEOWNER INTERESTS; WALKABILITY; NEIGHBORLINESS; AFFORDABILITY VS INCREASED HOUSING PRICES	NO	YES	NO			
59	1/11/2022	5	Alan Tobey	Aged largely middle class but not more than c. 2/3 Caucasian; but across those lines very communitycentered and community active, working on local causes together and keeping in touch with others. We've had a number of new residents arriving from the suburbs just to live in such an active and diverse neighborhood. New residents from Kansas to Thailand to India are swiftly welcome here	Walkable Westbrae. You could stretch the boundaries from say Monterey Market to Whole Foods, and from the Albany line a few blocks			COMMUNITY CENTERED; WALKABILITY; THRIVING LOCAL BUSINESS SCENE; TRAFFIC CONCERNS	NO	YES	NO			
60	1/11/2022	1	Anonymous	More industrial pollutants here than any other Berkeley district. Lower income than rest of Berkeley/ greater need for social services. Greatest number of tent/rv cities in Berkeley.	Northwest Berkeley; we tend to identify with Northwest Berkeley BART station.			POLLUTION; SOCIAL SERVICES NEEDS; LOW INCOME; HOMELESSNESS; INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION	NO	YES	NO			
61	1/11/2022	5	Cathy Brown	We are a neighborhood, linked by proximity, friendship, and our CERT group. Most of the neighbors have lived here for more than 25 years; some much longer. People know each other, look out for one another, share keys, newspapers, tools, lemons, and kid and elder equipment. The neighborhood kids go to Berkeley public schools; we're 6 blocks from Ruth Acty and 2 blocks from King.	Generally, the 1500 block of McGee and the 1700 block of Vine. Vine/McGee Neighbors.			LONG TERM RESIDENTS; NEIGHBORLINESS; BERKELEY PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS; WALKABILITY; ROADWAY CONDITIONS	NO	YES	NO			

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
62	1/11/2022	1,5	Deborah Malbec	neighborliness, taking care of our homes, crime prevention, safety, small neighborhood stores, businesses and restaurants.	Westbrae, "Gilman District", East of San Pablo, near Gilman Street			NEIGHBORLINESS; CRIME PREVENTION; SAFETY; LOCAL BUSINESS AND RESTAURANTS; PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION; LAST MILE NEEDS	NO	YES	NO			
63	1/13/2022		No name	Walking to local restaurants, post office, parks, library, shops. This is extremely important, that's why we chose this area.	North of University and east of San Pablo. People refer to this area as Poets Corner but it is not. I've seen it referred to as Curtis Tract on official city plans. I think this district should span University Ave.			WALKABILITY; LOTS OF DEVELOPMENT; PARKING ISSUES; HOMELESSNESS; CLEANLINESS; INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION; FEELING OF OLDER RESIDENTS BEING PUSHED OUT	NO	YES	YES - EXPAND BOUNDARIES TO SPAN UNIVERSITY AVE. "Using main arteries as dividing lines leaves people unrepresented"			
64	1/14/2022		No name	Living within walking distance of North Berkeley BART. This is important because drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians have different interests. Also, our community has many members in "regular" jobs (teaching, retail, government, transportation) versus some of Berkeley where residents are uniformly in higher income jobs.	Name provided: West Berkeley West of Sacramento, North of University, South of Gilman			MULTIMODAL TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE; PUBLIC TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT / DECISIONMAKING; "REGULAR" INCOME EARNERS--ARTISTS AND TEACHERS; PEDESTRIAN SAFETY; INCLUSIVE HOUSING POLICIES- HOMELESSNESS	NO	YES	NO			
65	1/14/2022	5	Iris Starr	A wide range of people living here- students, elderly, families, homeowners, renters, unhoused, Black, Native American, Asian, Latino and all other groups that are not "census defined". Access to transit, cafe's, restaurants, grocery stores, services. Walkable and bike-able neighborhood. On street parking for residents. Decisions about the BART station development are key in the coming year. Those decisions should be majorly influenced by those that will live next door to it, and not those who drive to it. Enlarging District 5 will disadvantage those of us who live next door. Some people are writing in form letters to enlarge District 5. Please ignore form letters. Create districts that make geographic sense. On the north, Rose or Hopkins is the obvious boundary.	Rose or Hopkins street, Shattuck Ave, University Avenue, the Marina. ~2 blocks from the BART station.			DIVERSE RESIDENTS; WALKABILITY; PUBLIC TRANSIT; PUBLIC TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT / DECISIONMAKING; AGAINST ENLARGEMENT OF DISTRICT BOUNDARY	NO	YES	NO - Against increasing the size of D5, Rose / Hopkins suggested as North boundary			

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
66	1/16/2022	2	Jeff Hobson	The parks and paths: Strawberry Creek Park + the West Street path, Ohlone Park and paths, Cedar Rose Park, plus Totland. That's where I see my neighbors (particularly during COVID), where I see kids playing, where I see people walking their dogs.	I live in the neighborhood around the North Berkeley BART station. To me, the most central elements are North Berkeley BART, the path along West Street, Strawberry Creek Park, and Cedar Rose Park. My conception of the neighborhood extends south to Dwight (+ Homemade Cafe!) and north to Hopkins. On the west it goes at least to San Pablo Avenue, or maybe all the way to the railroad tracks (to include Rosa Parks + the Adult School and Cafe Leila and Viks -- but it doesn't include the Fourth Street shopping district). On the east it goes at least to California (Monterey Market + the softball field next to the BART station), or maybe as far as MLK Jr Way (for Totland, the rest of Ohlone Park, and King Middle School).			PROXIMITY TO PARKS AND PATHS; PUBLIC TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT / DECISIONMAKING; MAJOR CORRIDORS	NO	YES	NO - "North Berkeley Bart Station is part of the Berkeley flats." See Geographic Region for specifics on boundaries			
67	1/17/2022		No name	Living so close to the North Berkeley BART station, I see that as a focal point for the community, and something that priorities and interests are organized around. Those who walk or bike to that BART station, and are invested and impacted by it as a use, definitely feel like one economic community. One of the biggest factors for lifestyle in Berkeley is whether you live in a walkable/bikable neighborhood in the flats, or in a driving neighborhood in the hills. Those are two very distinct lifestyles and interests, and residents of each lifestyle should be able to elect councilmembers that advocate for those interests and needs.	Gilman/Hopkins in the north (Monterrey Market, Gioia Pizza, and the swimming pool at King Middle being key parts of my community), San Pablo to the west (Casa Latina, Cafe Leila, and Acme being core parts of what I access), MLK to the east (Ohlone Park is important to me), and Allston to the south (I take Allston to get to Aquatic Park and Cesar Chavez park). I think of the BART station as a central organizing feature of my neighborhood, as well as the Ohlone Greenway. Urban Adamah and the Gilman Corridor is also an important part of my community, and something I access often.			WALKABILITY; PUBLIC TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT / DECISIONMAKING; MAJOR CORRIDORS; PARKS; MULTIMODAL TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE; MOBILITY	NO	YES	NO - Suggestion to use mobility to inform neighborhood boundaries and thus district maps			

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
68	1/17/2022		Blaine Merker	<p>The North Berkeley Bart station is the single biggest defining feature of my neighborhood, and the landmark used to convey the neighborhood within a 15-20 minutes walk of the station.</p> <p>It's very important to our neighborhood's identity that the area around the Bart station not be split into different districts. The walkshed/bikeshed around the station has build that community identity. Those who walk and bike to the station see the same people people (our neighbors who walk and bike) daily, exchange news and create community. Because of the Ohlone Greenway in particular, which acts as a feeder from the blocks to the north, there is a strong culture of people who walk or bike to transit. Many people I know moved to this neighborhood in order to drive less. This an "eco neighborhood" of people making transportation choices in line with their sustainability objectives.</p>	<p>The area is described as the "neighborhood around the North Berkeley Bart station", or just "North Berkeley Bart". Because the station is named "North Berkeley", many people around here use that name to refer to the area around the station rather than the wider part of Berkeley towards Hopkins and Gilman. The use of this station version of the name usually refers to the area between San Pablo Ave, Martin Luther King, Hopkins and University. Because the Ohlone Greenway (and Ohlone Park) transport people by foot and bike to the Bart station, many Bart commuters who use the station consider themselves affiliated with "North Berkeley" by virtue of the station they use.</p>			<p>PUBLIC TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT / DECISIONMAKING; PARKS; MULTIMODAL TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE; SUSTAINABILITY; ECO; MOBILITY</p>	NO	YES	NO - Suggestion to use mobility to inform neighborhood boundaries and thus district maps; those living around public transit should be kept as one district and not be split			
69	1/17/2022		Riti Dhesi	<p>Common means of transportation, most notably the ability to walk to North Berkeley BART and bike to various places. I believe that when developing the council districts, North Berkeley BART and ones proximity to it should be considered a factor. Another common interest in my community is that we live near Cedar Market and Monterey Market/Magninis etc. Another example of community is the night that my community puts out lights for our annual Luminaria night (Christmas eve) - people from all over the city come to walk the streets in this community that are bounded by MLK, University, Rose and Sacramento (or North Berkeley BART) to enjoy the luminaria's and the community that we have built over the years. My community and its concerns/interests are unique from that of the Berkeley Hills/Thousand Oaks neighborhoods. It is important to NOT lump us in with the Berkeley Hills or Thousands Oaks neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Name provided: North Berkeley BART East.</p> <p>Boundaries: Berkeley BART to Rose Street to MLK to University.</p>			<p>PUBLIC TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT / DECISIONMAKING; MULTIMODAL TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE; COMMUNITY FESTIVALS; WALKABILITY</p>	NO	YES	NO - North Berkeley Bart Station is part of the Berkeley flats not Thousand Oaks or Hills; Suggestion to use mobility to inform neighborhood boundaries and thus district maps; those living around public transit should be kept as one district and not be split			
70	1/17/2022		Libby Lee-Egan North Berkeley Now!	<p>Many people chose to live in this neighborhood because of the walkable streets and proximity to buses and the North Berkeley BART station (NBB). We enjoy walking or biking to places and patronizing local businesses. Our neighborhood has a grid, not wavy switchback style streets seen in the Berkeley Hills.</p>	<p>The attached map shows the area around North Berkeley BART where one can walk to the station from their home in less than 10 minutes. Residents living in that area are most affected by regional usage of BART and zoning changes there. Because of the grid, the walkable area is more of a diamond shape than a square.</p>			<p>WALKABILITY; PUBLIC TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT / DECISIONMAKING; MULTIMODAL TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE; GRID PLANNING; DENSE HOUSING; LOTS OF URBANISTS, ARCHITECTS, PLANNERS</p>	NO	YES	NO - Suggestion to use mobility to inform neighborhood boundaries and thus district maps; those living around public transit should be kept as one district and not be split			

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes
71	1/18/2022		Victoria Eisen	Our community is WALKABLE! We walk to run errands, go to school and work, visit each other and exercise our dogs and ourselves. Most importantly, we can walk to the North Berkeley BART station, which is why we chose to purchase our home 28 years ago.	Sacramento and the North Berkeley BART station to the east, Ohlone Greenway to the south, MLK to the east and Rose to the north.			WALKABILITY; PUBLIC TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT / DECISIONMAKING; PARKS; ROAD AND PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE; DISASTER PREPAREDNESS	NO	YES	NO			
72	1/18/2022		Will Travis	Books, gardening, political discussions, "the joy of engaging with our neighbors during our walks in our community". Our two most popular walking destinations are the North Berkeley BART station and the neighborhood commercial center at the Hopkins/California/Monterey intersection. Everywhere within our community is within walking distance of its hub, the North Berkeley BART station.	Name provided: Cow Hollow Bordered on the north by Northbrae, east by Shattuck Avenue, east by the Ohlone Greenway with a little bump to University Avenue along Sacramento Street and on the west by San Pablo Avenue.	1704 Vine Street		WALKABILITY; PUBLIC TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT / DECISIONMAKING; PARKS; MIXED DEVELOPMENT; COMMUNITY CENTRIC	NO	YES	NO - Suggestion to use mobility to inform neighborhood boundaries and thus district maps			
73	1/24/2022	3	No Name	A walkable neighborhood with safe bike and pedestrian access to everyday needs (e.g. Ashby BART, Berkeley Bowl, UC Berkeley, libraries, parks and trails, commercial districts at Elmwood or Rockridge or downtown Berk). A diverse, friendly and caring community of neighbors who support each other with health, housing, food, gardening and pet care. Pulling our sliver of neighborhood into District 8 is not a good fit unless we are joined by LeConte neighborhood (blue map).	Halcyon community centered on Halcyon Park with strong borders at Ashby and Telegraph (due to intense traffic, dangerous crossings), Woolsey (due to Oakland city boundary), and Ashby BART at Adeline. We feel connected to Ashby BART. We feel less connected to neighborhoods in the Berkeley hills, that seems more exclusive and white and car-oriented.			WALKABILITY; MULTIMODAL TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE; DIVERSE; COMMUNITY; PUBLIC TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT / DECISIONMAKING	NO	YES	NO - Halcyon community belongs with north and not Hills, D8 is NOT a good fit unless joined by LeConte			
74	1/24/2022	4	No Name	Mainly small, residential neighborhoods with middle-age and older residents, of middle income, primarily college educated, mainly English speaking. Share transportation nearby, of buses and BART. We are an active area and pay close attention to the actions of the City and the City Council. We are hoping that District 4 will remain, and thus "vote" for either the orange or amber district maps.	South Berkeley. Near University in the north, Dwight in the south, Sacramento to the west. McGee Spaulding neighborhood is the name of this community			MIDDLE-AGED AND OLDER RESIDENTS; MIDDLE INCOME; COLLEGE-EDUCATED; PUBLIC TRANSIT	YES - AMBER OR ORANGE MAPS BC D4 SHOULD REMAIN AS IS	YES	?			
75	1/25/2022		Laurie Nardinelli	We have a lower average income, more diversity, and generally less clout with respect to local politics compared with the people who live in the hills. More outreach time is required for our area compared to the hills because people have less leisure time for political involvement and somewhat less confidence in local government. Environmental impact of businesses need to be constantly addressed. This necessarily consumes a lot of councilperson(s) time. That's why we need two. We need two different councilpersons like or much like we have now.	From 3 blocks East of San Pablo to the Bay			LOWER AVERAGE INCOME; DIVERSE; INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION; NEED GREATER OUTREACH; LOCAL BUSINESSES REQUIRE SIGNIFICANT TIME SO NEED MORE REPRESENTATION	NO	YES	NO - Need two districts to adequately represent needs of residents and businesses			

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes	
76	1/27/2022	3	Sylvia C.	<p>A member of my family lived in South Berkeley. I visited and became part of the community. I made my way back and have been a part of the South Berkeley neighborhood, workforce and services for over 13 years. I could only find housing in the North of Berkeley, but I am working hard to get back home.</p> <p>Like all of Berkeley, as portrayed in Berkeleyvisit tourist comment, we represent the beauty of diversity in all our districts. District 3's cultural and historical ethnic diversity and traditions are a rich contribution to Berkeley's appeal to all. I agree with the history of Berkeley's democratic process, that all districts should be afforded the basic right to choose what cultural, historical diversity in which they identify.</p> <p>We, South Berkeley neighbors and associations, are developing our home so all (those of the long-time residents presentation) and those who were displaced can live well. To choose and have access to what they identify as their heritage. South Berkeley for nearly a century have had leaders that benefited all of Berkeley. Our families have been disrupted by eminent domain, predatory loans, high rental and homeownership rates by corporate, penal profit, high mortality rates and extreme inhumane conditions that</p>	District 3's boundaries that if redlined, will sever a cultural diverse distinctness for generations for South Berkeley. A ethnic flavor that has contributed to the appeal to residents and tourists of Berkeley. It should be left intact from east to west district limits from San Pablo Avenue to Telegraph Avenue; and south to north boundaries limits(Alcatraz Ave to Dwight Way). There are funding projects and investments that South Berkeley's long-time residents and neighborhood improvement nonprofits have in place based on the current district mapping			CULTURAL, HISTORICAL DIVERSITY; COMMUNITY; ORGANIZING; REDLINING AND DISCRIMINATION	NO	YES	NO - KEEP SOUTH BERKELEY INTACT				
77	1/27/2022		Juliet Lee	<p>Historically redlined, recently gentrifying. Pressure on housing, people who grew up here can't afford to stay here (like Mildred Howard). Newer Americans also settle here esp in cheaper & section 8 apartments-this has been the case for the whole brief history of this city -Little India around lower University Ave. -Unstably housed folks camp around Aquatic Park. -Orthodox Jews live here to be within the "eruv" (zone in which they are permitted to walk to 2 synagogues; eruv is delimited by the rabbis), but because it's Berkeley these are socially progressive Jews.</p> <p>If districts break up voting blocks, people can lose their say. If business-zoned areas are overconcentrated in one or two districts, the residents of those districts bear the burden of any traffic, parking, crime, environmental impacts (like toxic waste in air) associated with businesses If some districts have few residents but other districts have many residents, but each district has one council rep, people in smaller zones are overrepresented (like in US Senate now). It looks like the Amber map best addresses those concerns</p>	HOLC maps from 1940s show redlined boundaries. -Newer Americans reside between Sacramento-Sixth-University-Oakland border. -Little India clusters within lower University-Sacramento-Dwight-San Pablo. -Unstably housed: Aquatic Park -Poorer folks, newer Americans: large older apartment complexes esp which allow Section 8			GENTRIFICATION; AFFORDABLE HOUSING; REDLINING	YES - AMBER MAP TO ADDRESS ADEQUATE REPRESENTATION; BUSINESSES NOT OVERCONCENTRATED OVERBURDENED IN A COUPLE OF DISTRICTS	YES	?				

If YES, entire Commission will assess what considerations there are for applicable boundary/district changes

#	Date Received	District	Submitted By	COI Summary	General Geographic Region	Approx Location for Map Pin	Approx Location Comments	COI Themes	Reference or Endorsement to Submitted Map? If Y, which one?	Is COI mappable? (Y/N)	Boundary Change Requested by Submitter (Y/N)	Boundary Change Recommended by Cx (Y/N)	Rationale for Recommendation by Cx	Notes	
78	1/27/2022	2	No Name	Common goals to keep our community safe and help people in need especially older folks, environmentally conscious, community clean ups especially Strawberry Creek Park, neighbors look out for one another. Two representatives are needed to represent West Berkeley to address citizens concerns with all the development, homeless issues, the industrial district, the marina, Aquatic Park, etc and of course homeowners and increase in renters that will house these developments. Poets Corner should remain in district 2. There should be fair representation in West Berkeley. Looking at the maps what makes a majority of UC students who live in Berkeley for 2 to 4 years get more representation in some of the maps?	Poets Corner			COMMUNITY CENTERED; PARKS; TRAFFIC; PARKING; DEVELOPMENT; HOMELESSNESS; CRIMES	NO	YES	NO - WEST BERKELEY NEEDS TWO DISTRICTS FOR REPRESENTATION ; POETS CORNER SHOULD STAY IN D2				
79	1/31/2022		Donaldson	Public safety, traffic and walkability to stores near by. The walking nature of our community is a real core to what I see. We all are connected and visible to each other on a daily basis. We are a mix of young families, kids, retired people and some single folks. Families tend to dominate. We all look out for each other as much as we can.	neighbors that are east of San Pablo Avenue. Our common thread is that we are mostly small homes and families that range accross "the flatlands" of Berkeley. I consider our community to be from Albany in the north to roughly Univesity to the south and Sacramento to the east. The similarities, connections and boundaries of streets really define this area. And, I should add the type of use, residential single family with a few in-fill apartment buildings and ADUs.			WALKABILITY; PUBLIC SAFETY; MIX OF RESIDENTS; SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING; ROAD MAINTENANCE; TRAFFIC	NO	YES	YES - UNITE WEST BERKELEY INTO ONE DISTRICT (BUT THEY ARE EAST OF SAN PABLO)				

Map Identification					DRAFT Map Inclusion	Final Map Inclusion
Map #	Map Name (Use File Name from Dropbox)	District(s) Affected	Narrative Summary (Verbatim)	Map Highlights & Themes (Commission Summary - Will be used by Cx as directives to staff in creation of maps)	IRC Action(s) Taken	IRC Decision
1	01_2021-10-08 Howard Rosenberg	7,8	Please include in dist. 8 this small area that was carved out and placed in dist. 7 to include former home of K. Worthington when he was in office.	Neighborhood Cohesion and Compactness Maptitude submission does not reflect the narrative. Map is unchanged.	Amber map reflects these minimal changes.	
2	02_2021-10-12 Anonymous A	All	Re: Northside population #s - There is no way this is correct. Pop in Northside is at least 7000	Major reconfigurations of all districts	Submission was evaluated; no further action was taken.	
3	03_2021-10-19 Anonymous B-1	All	None	Major reconfiguration of Districts 4 through 7; creation of two student districts (Dist 4 and 7); changes Dist 4 and 7 to E-W orientation; removes thousand oaks from Dist 5, combines DT and University, decreases Dist 7 and limits to area south of Campus	Blue and Maroon maps reflect two student focused districts.	
4	04_2021-10-19 Anonymous B-2	All	None	Creates two student Disticts(4/7); major modifications to 3,5,6; improves overall neighborhood integrity	Blue and Maroon maps reflect two student focused districts.	
5	05_2021-10-19 Anonymous B-3	All	None	Creation of two student districts; major changes to district 5/6; reconfigures 5 to include North student population from Dist 6/4	Blue and Maroon maps reflect two student focused districts.	

Map Identification					DRAFT Map Inclusion	Final Map Inclusion
Map #	Map Name (Use File Name from Dropbox)	District(s) Affected	Narrative Summary (Verbatim)	Map Highlights & Themes (Commission Summary - Will be used by Cx as directives to staff in creation of maps)	IRC Action(s) Taken	IRC Decision
6	06_2021-10-25 Anonymous B-4	All	None	Creation of two student districts; major changes to district 5/6; reconfigures 5 to include North student population from Dist 6/4	Blue and Maroon maps reflect two student focused districts.	
7	07_2021-10-26 Troy Kaji	All	Map configured to equalize population target size and provided contiguity among districts.	Districts renumbered. Creates one district for western portion of the City.	Orange and Blue maps reflect a unified West Berkeley district.	IRC declined to include this based on public input. Decision was made at 1/27 public hearing.
8	08_2021-10-28 Alfred Twu Map 1	All	Keep southside as an Asian-plurality student super majority district. Group other blocks close to the campus that are mostly renters in the Donut renter supermajority district. Keep Black community together with Adeline Corridor / San Pablo Park area. Keep the lower housing density Hills together. Unify West Berkeley including 4th Street, most of San Pablo Avenue, and western part of University Avenue.	Two student districts. Creates non-contiguous "donut" district for south campus population and irregular-shape district north, west, and south of the UC Berkeley campus.	Blue and Maroon maps reflect two student focused districts.	

Map Identification					DRAFT Map Inclusion	Final Map Inclusion
Map #	Map Name (Use File Name from Dropbox)	District(s) Affected	Narrative Summary (Verbatim)	Map Highlights & Themes (Commission Summary - Will be used by Cx as directives to staff in creation of maps)	IRC Action(s) Taken	IRC Decision
9	09_2021-10-31 Alfred Twu Map 2		This is a variant of the Donut plan, which creates more compact borders. The Southside district includes the big Southside dorms, including the Units and Clark Kerr, as well as more of the area around Telegraph Ave.	Two student districts. Creates non-contiguous "donut" district for south campus population and irregular-shape district north, west, and south of the UC Berkeley campus.	Blue and Maroon maps reflect two student focused districts.	
10	10_2021-11-01 Stephen Young	All (least impact to 1/2; most impact to 5/6)	This proposal unites all of hilly North Berkeley in district 5, keeps 1 and 2 more or less the same, with the principal division being University Avenue, and 7 more compact while keeping its community of interest. District 5 is partially reconfigured to capture the Northside renting community of interest. There are consequent modifications to 3 and 4 for population equality. Otherwise, the plan complies with contiguity and precinct assignment requirements.	Realigns principle boundary between districts 5/6 from north/south to east/west. Minor changes elsewhere, relative to existing boundaries.	Submission was evaluated; no further action was taken.	

Map Identification					DRAFT Map Inclusion	Final Map Inclusion
Map #	Map Name (Use File Name from Dropbox)	District(s) Affected	Narrative Summary (Verbatim)	Map Highlights & Themes (Commission Summary - Will be used by Cx as directives to staff in creation of maps)	IRC Action(s) Taken	IRC Decision
11	11_2021-11-02 Anonymous B-5	All	2 Student Districts	Creates two student districts (4 and 7). Expands District 4 to eastern city limits and splits downtown among two reconfigured districts (4 and 5). Adds Thousand Oaks neighborhood to reconfigured District 6. Adds Northbrae to reconfigure District 1. Splits North Berkeley, Berkeley Hills, Central Berkeley, South Berkeley, LeConte, Elmwood, and Panoramic Hill neighborhoods.	Blue and Maroon maps reflect two student focused districts.	
12	12_2021-11-04 Phil Allen	All	All 8 districts are renumbered and have east-west orientation. See submitted PDF for full narrative.	Proposed district configuration reflects generally much longer northern and southern boundaries and shorter western and eastern boundaries relative to current boundaries.	Submission was evaluated; no further action was taken.	
13	13_2021-11-06 Bruce Stangeland	All	Here's my attempt to redraw our 8 districts. My maximum population = 16000 and my minimum is 15,200. My intent was to minimize the length of the boundary of each district, so as to not gerrymander.	Does not appear to focus on COI type criteria; rather boundaries are chosen for maximal compactness, utilizing major arteries when possible.	Submission was evaluated; no further action was taken.	

Map Identification					DRAFT Map Inclusion	Final Map Inclusion
Map #	Map Name (Use File Name from Dropbox)	District(s) Affected	Narrative Summary (Verbatim)	Map Highlights & Themes (Commission Summary - Will be used by Cx as directives to staff in creation of maps)	IRC Action(s) Taken	IRC Decision
14	14_2021-11-06 Thomas Lord	All (minor changes)	This map tries not to deviate radically from existing districts while, at the same time, trying to increase the diversity of interests each council member must represent. For example, this map gives both the representatives from District 1 and District 4 a stake in Ohlone Park. This map gives District 6 a larger stake in the interests of students. I have not adhered strictly to the traditional use of Sacramento St. as a district boundary for similar reasons. Perfect racial balance equality is geographically impossible in any set of compact districts at this time but I have tried to improve the balance. I am not sure I m satisfied with the boundaries between district 1 and 2 which I changed only minimally - but I left them as is for lack of deep familiarity with the area. The population size balances are all very close to ideal.	Per the narrative, this map seeks to maximize within-district diversity of constituents for each district. This is contrary to various requests to maintain COIs.	Submission was evaluated; no further action was taken.	
15	15_2021-11-06 Lissa Miner	All (minor changes to 1/2)	Equitable representation by population. Districts and council members will need to collaborate as each district has multiple types of housing and neighborhoods and geography, except perhaps for District 7 that has dense student population.	reorients boundary between 4/3 from east/west to north south, creating less contiguous districts	Submission was evaluated; no further action was taken.	

Map Identification					DRAFT Map Inclusion	Final Map Inclusion
Map #	Map Name (Use File Name from Dropbox)	District(s) Affected	Narrative Summary (Verbatim)	Map Highlights & Themes (Commission Summary - Will be used by Cx as directives to staff in creation of maps)	IRC Action(s) Taken	IRC Decision
16	16_2021-11-11 Berkeley Progressive Alliance	All	The map ensures the integrity of the following communities of interest: Districts 2 and 3 include South Berkeleys historically African American neighborhoods, and include the following communities: San Pablo Park, West Berkeley, the Adeline Corridor, Lorin, LeConte and Bateman District 1 encompasses Northwest Berkeleys Gilman, 4th Street, and North Berkeley communities. District 4 has of Central Berkeleys McGee Spaulding, North Shattuck and Downtown communities District 7 restores Berkeleys traditional student district including the predominantly student parts of the Northside District 8 has Southeast Berkeleys Panoramic Hill, Elmwood and Claremont neighborhoods District 5 includes Central North Berkeleys Westbrae, Northbrae, Live Oak, Thousand Oaks, and Solano District communities. District 6 has Northeast Berkeley's South Hampton, Cragmont, Northside, Terrace View and Hills communities.	Neighborhood integrity	Amber map reflects these minimal changes.	

Map Identification					DRAFT Map Inclusion	Final Map Inclusion
Map #	Map Name (Use File Name from Dropbox)	District(s) Affected	Narrative Summary (Verbatim)	Map Highlights & Themes (Commission Summary - Will be used by Cx as directives to staff in creation of maps)	IRC Action(s) Taken	IRC Decision
17	17_2021-11-12 BNC (Janis Ching)	All	This map is being submitted by Berkeley Neighborhoods Council, using input from many neighborhood groups across the city. Considerations: 1.Keep neighborhoods together as much as possible. 2. Combine the Northside and Southside student housing units to create a more unified student district. 3. Keep the blocks surrounding the North Berkeley BART station in one district as they share interests in upcoming development. 4. Keep the Shattuck business district together from Downtown to at least Cedar St. 5. Dwight Way serves as the natural border for District 3, and should continue to do so, as the neighbors to the south of Dwight continue to fight for equity in terms of resources. 6. The LeConte Neighborhood has been split for decades. We put them back together in District 3. 7. The McGee-Spaulding Tract has historical significance and should be kept together. Its borders are Dwight Way to University, Sacramento to MLK. 8. Spruce Santa Barbara are natural borders for District 56. Neighborhoods there are less cohesive . 9. Include Panoramic Hill in District 8 to keep the high fire zones together	See description	Amber map reflects these minimal changes.	
18	18_2021-11-12 Sheryl	1,2,3,4,5,6	I am a district 2 resident. just got into the numbers. District 3, I	Marginal changes to current map	Amber map reflects these	
19	19_2021-11-14 Alfred Twu		Inspired by Berkeley's creek watersheds, with some modifying to	Two student districts.	Blue and Maroon maps reflect	
20	20_2021-11-14 Ben Gould	All	I tried to balance three goals. In order: 1. Keep communities	changes 5/6 boundary from	Blue and Maroon maps reflect	
21	21_2021-11-15 Anonymous C	All	None	Substantial changes to 1/5/6/4/7/8.	Submission was evaluated; no	
22	22_2021-11-15 RCJR	All	The most important change proposed by our map is the creation	Two student districts	Blue and Maroon maps reflect	
23	23_2021-11-15 West	All	None	Single West Berkeley district, two	Orange and Blue maps reflect	IRC declined to include this
24	24_2021-11-15 Kelly	All	Small adjustments to existing district map	Small changes to district	Amber map reflects these	
25	25_2021-11-15 Kelly	All	Variation 2 on existing district map	Small changes to district	Amber map reflects these	
26	26_2021-11-15 ASUC (Riya)	All	The most important change proposed by our map is the creation	Single West Berkeley district, two	Orange and Blue maps reflect	IRC declined to include this
27	27_2021-11-15 Gregory	All	This map uses current districts as a base to try to straighten out	Corrects Councilperson perogatives.	Amber map reflects these	

Map Identification					DRAFT Map Inclusion	Final Map Inclusion
Map #	Map Name (Use File Name from Dropbox)	District(s) Affected	Narrative Summary (Verbatim)	Map Highlights & Themes (Commission Summary - Will be used by Cx as directives to staff in creation of maps)	IRC Action(s) Taken	IRC Decision
28	28_2021-11-15 Berkeley Citizens Action (BCA)	All	<p>Berkeley Citizens Action (BCA) is a non-partisan political club, which has served Berkeley since 1974, fighting for progressive policies, especially with regard to affordable housing, social justice and equality. The Steering Committee of Berkeley Citizens Action is submitting the enclosed map to the redistricting committee for your consideration, feeling that it meets the specified contiguity, compactness, population, and geographic requirements, and protects the integrity of the following communities of interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts 2 and 3, which are South Berkeley's historically African American neighborhoods, include the following communities: San Pablo Park, West Berkeley, the Adeline Corridor, Lorin, LeConte and Bateman; In particular, the Lorin and LeConte neighborhoods, which have active community engagement, are no longer split between different council districts • District 1 encompasses Northwest Berkeley's Gilman, 4th Street, and North Berkeley communities; • District 4 is comprised of Central Berkeley's McGee Spaulding, North Shattuck and Downtown communities; • District 7 restores Berkeley's traditional student district including the predominantly student parts of Northside and Southside; • District 8 encompasses Southeast Berkeley's Panoramic Hill, Elmwood and Claremont neighborhoods; • District 5 includes Central North Berkeley's Westbrae, Northbrae, Live Oak, Thousand Oaks, and the Solano District communities. • District 6 includes Northeast Berkeley's South Hampton, Cragmont, Northside, Terrace View and Hills communities 	Incorporates Northside of University of California in District 7 and adds areas east of Sacramento St to District 2.	Violet map reflects the inclusion of Northside into District 7.	
29	29_2021-11-15 Alfsen & Holland	1,2,3,4,7	None	Shifts District 4 westward, excludes portions of Shattuck	Submission was evaluated; no further action was taken.	

To: Berkeley Independent Redistricting Commission
 From: Final Report Subcommittee
 Date: January 21, 2022
 Re: DRAFT Report Table of Contents / Topics

The final report subcommittee has developed a draft table of contents / list of items we believe should be included in the Final Report. Please excuse formatting issues as our meeting schedule did not allow us time to properly format the combined documents. If you have additions, deletions, or suggestions, we will discuss them at our next public hearing on January 27, 2022.

The overarching topics for the report are:

- Legal criteria for new districts
 - Fair Maps Act, City Charter, Federal Voting Rights Act
- Maps that meet those criteria
- Maps that respond to COI information / public input
- Redistricting process / process transparency
- Public engagement efforts / participation
 - Awareness, Education, Engagement
- Timeline of IRC major events

The schedule for completing the Final Report is:

1/21	Finalize table of contents / topics draft
1/27	Begin reviewing existing materials Engage full commission on report contents Assign writing tasks to new material
1/31	Capture public comment from first public hearing on draft maps
2/18	Capture public comment from second public hearing on draft maps
2/28	Incorporate updated map matrix which includes response to each map
3/1	Capture public comment from public hearing on Final Map
3/8	Final Report complete Possible IRC meeting to discuss final report
3/16	Commission approves final report

IRC Final Map Report

Table of Contents / Topic List

Exec Summary

Letter to Council

Letter to the Public

Acknowledgements

- Public / Community Input at Meetings
- Community organizations
- Media outlets
- Map and COI Submitters
- Commissioners
- Former Commissioners
- Alternates
- City Attorney's Office
- City Clerk
- IT / Map
- Redistricting Partners

Charge / Mission / Charter

Charter / History / 1st citizen commission in Berkeley

Representative Commission / Selection Process

Transparent Process

- Number of Meetings (with data tracking appendix)
 - ooo # of attendees? What meeting information do we have?
 - ooo Subcommittee
 - ooo Public input schedule
- Subcommittees (purpose, duration, membership)

Community Involvement / Engagement – Awareness / Education / Engagement

Commission Playbook

Outreach

- Summary
- Subcommittee
- Slogan (Subcommittee)
- Daily Cal OpEd (Subcommittee)

- Graphic design consultant
- Web content and resources
- Translation of materials & meetings
- Outreach Log as Appendix

Regulatory Governance

- Charter Section 9.5 (Measure W – 2016)
- Berkeley Municipal Code
- Fair Maps Act
- Voting Rights Act
- Brown Act
- All included as appendices
- Census data – objective data from a single point in time

The Process

- COVID-19 challenges & opportunities
 - Census data collection process
 - Compressed time frame
 - Virtual meetings / technical access for elders for economically disenfranchised and differently abled, visually challenged community
 - Good for people who don't have transit
- Timeline - Detailed
- Application and Selection
 - Demographic Data
 - Diversity considerations for At-Large
- Commissioner Training / Workflow
 - Consensus building
 - By Law development and adoption (appendix)
 - Training slides as appendices
- Subcommittees (purpose, duration, membership)
- COI Form Launch
 - COIs as appendix
 - Matrix as appendix
- Develop Matrix / Approach to information analysis and synthesis
 - Developing a commission playbook
- July Public Hearing #1 (Subcommittee)
 - Include the presentation
- 2020 Census Data
 - Appendix: data by tract-block, block map w/data, 2010—>2020 changes: city, each district —>need to redraw districts, minority or majorly
 - Release Date / later than usual

- Redistricting Partners Analysis
 - Incarcerated reallocation
- October Public Hearing #2
- Public Input and Submissions
 - Public Packet (appendix)
 - Public submission timing
 - Late submissions
 - Subcommittee
 - Public input schedule
-
- Map Submission Period (10/2 – 11/15)
 - Maptitude Tool and Paper Option
 - Tool selection
 - Limitation of tool, ease of use
 - Paper maps
 - Public Maps as appendix
 - Map Matrix as appendix
 - Subcommittee
 - Analysis and presentation
 - Maps as public comment / late entries
- Number of Meetings (with data tracking appendix)
 - # of attendees? What meeting information do we have?
- Public Discussion?
 - Public comment
- Required Criteria Summary – Map Criteria
 - Criteria
 - Ranking
 - 2 legal requirements - population and contiguity
- Themes in COIs
 - Matrix discussion
- Themes in Public Maps
 - Commission adopted themes
 - Student district
 - West Berkeley
 - Hills
- **Analyze, Synthesize** of COI's and Maps
 - Required Criteria
 - Deviation: spread < 10%
 - - theme identification
 - - Develop analysis tools-Develop Matrix / Approach to information analysis and synthesis

- COI matrix
- Map Matrix, including column describing response to individual map
- COI Matrix as appendix
- Map Matrix as appendix
- Subcommittee [Watson Rhodes Cooper Sussell Tran Nichol]
- Analysis and presentation
- Public Hearing #3 (1/27/22)
- Public Hearing #4 (2/17/22)
- Public Hearing #5 (2/28/22)
- Adoption of Final Map (3/16/22)
 - Report Drafting (Subcommittee)

Final Map

- Narrative
- Required Analysis
 - Districts Substantially Differ from Existing?
- Criteria Compliance
- Noteworthy Features
- District-by-District maps and data tables
- Legal Considerations
- FVRA Compliance & CVRA Compliance – Analysis – No Majority Minority / protected class
- Concluding Remarks

Appendices

IRC Hub

Outreach Emails, including to applicant

Applicant Summary

Commission training materials / slide decks and recordings

Census Data / Map of census blocks with population

Public emails

Sub Appendices

Commissioner Applications

Recordings – meetings

Materials

- Every meeting packet
- All training materials
- Every map
- COI
- Logs
 - COI
 - Map
 - Communications
- Presentations
- Press releases
- Email blasts
- All recordings
 - census data, by block, tract, neighborhood, district
 - table comparing district populations of proposed maps
- census data, by block, tract, neighborhood, district
 - table comparing district populations of proposed maps

table showing how COI and proposed maps addressed themes and priorities (*Is this different from the matrices?*)

Content Collection / Analysis

Final TOC	Existing Supporting Materials	Summary / New Content	Link to Original / Supporting Content	Appendices
-----------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------	------------