1	BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE ON DEMOGRAPHIC
	RESEARCH AND REAPPORTIONMENT
3	
4	New York State Senate
5	Public Hearing on Legislative Redistricting
6	Goals, Criteria and Reforms
7	Hearing Room A
8	Legislative Office Bldg. Albany, NY
9	December 16, 2010
10	12:03 p.m.
11	PRESIDING:
12	Senator Martin Malave Dilan
13	Co-Chair Legislative Task Force on
14	Demographic Research and Reapportionment
15	PRESENT:
16	Dr. John Flateau, Task Force Member
17	Jeffrey M. Wice, Counsel
18	
19	
20	
21	

1	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	
2	TESTIMONY	
3	Blair Horner Legislative Director	
4	New York Public Interest Research Group (NYPIRG)	
5	Barbara Bartoletti	
6	Legislative Director	
7	League of Women Voters of NYS	39
	Dr. Jose E. Cruz Professor, SUNY Albany	
9	Director New York Latino Research and	
	Resources Network (NYLARNet)	58
10	Aaron Mair	
11	Arbor Hill Concerned Citizens	75
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		

1	CHAIRMAN DILAN: Good afternoon. I
2	am State Senator Martin Malave Dilan, and
3	I'm the co-chair to the Legislative Task on
4	Demographic Research and Reapportionment.
5	And I am also joined by Dr. Flateau, a task
6	force member, and our legal counsel, Jeffrey
7	M. Wice. And also, representing Senator
8	Ruth Hassell-Thompson, we have Gerard Savage
9	here today.
10	And today's meeting is a continuation
11	of a meeting which was first held this past
12	Monday in New York City, 250 Broadway. And
13	today we hope to continue the conversation
14	that we started at 250 Broadway with all
15	stakeholders. And hopefully we can get as
16	much testimony from those individuals that
17	have submitted to speak. And if there is
18	anyone in the public that would like to
19	speak, we will allow that today.
20	So at this time I'd like to call upon
21	Dr. Flateau.

- DR. FLATEAU: Thank you, Mr.
- 23 Chairman, Senator Dilan, for your
- outstanding leadership as co-chair of the

I	New York State Legislative Task Force on
2	Demographic Research and Reapportionment,
3	also know known as LATFOR.
4	Your early leadership of a series of
5	roundtable discussions with a wide array of
6	stakeholders in the redistricting process,
7	and your present convening of upstate and
8	downstate public meetings on redistricting
9	this early in the process is unprecedented.
10	It demonstrates your commitment and that of
11	the Senate Majority to openness,
12	transparency, public access, and input in
13	New York's congressional and state
14	legislative redistricting.
15	This process will facilitate political
16	representation of the people's voice in
17	New York's democracy and public policymaking
18	arenas, which is a fundamental and critical
19	ingredient in moving us forward in these
20	very challenging times for our Empire State
21	and indeed for our nation.

22	I'm sitting on my third redistricting
23	commission, both legislative and independent
24	bodies, and touching on my sixth

1	redistricting cycle. Only in America could
2	a descendent of Africans in America, slave
3	and free, help bring successful
4	voting-rights lawsuits against New York City
5	and New York State redistricting bodies to
6	increase minority representation and then be
7	appointed to serve on these bodies.
8	Senator, you and the Majority
9	Conference played a major role to ensure
10	that New Yorkers had an improved
11	participation rate in the 2010 census. And
12	now the results for congressional
13	reapportionment, state populations, the
14	American Community Survey and other
15	important data are being released to guide
16	the redistricting effort.
17	Today we look forward to listening to
18	the people's voice, opinions and expertise
19	on important questions, including: What
20	should be the proposed criteria, along with
21	the U.S. Voting Rights Act and federal and

22	state law, to be used in redistricting?
23	Second, what are some of New York's
24	demographic trends that should be taken into

1	account and will impact on redistricting?
2	Third, how will New York's pioneering
3	Prisoner Count Law enhance voting rights of
4	minorities, particularly in the Bronx,
5	Manhattan and Brooklyn, counties which are
6	covered by the Voting Rights Act? This law
7	requires preclearance by the U.S. Justice
8	Department.
9	And fourth, and most importantly, what
10	are key recommendations to reform the
11	redistricting process?
12	Thank you, Mr. Chairman, State
13	Senators, and members of the public who have
14	taken time out of your busy schedules to
15	participate in this crucial exercise in our
16	democracy. Let this important public
17	conversation begin.
18	CHAIRMAN DILAN: Thank you very much
19	Dr. Flateau.
20	I'd just like to note that this public
21	meeting is on the record and is also, I

22	believe, being webcast throughout the Senate
23	and perhaps the State of New York. So I'd
24	like to thank Senate Media Services and our

1	stenographer,	thank you	very muc	h, and all
---	---------------	-----------	----------	------------

- 2 the staff that have assisted in putting this
- 3 meeting together. Also in the audience we
- 4 have the executive director for the Majority
- 5 Conference, Matt Drury. Welcome.
- 6 Okay. So at this time I'd like to call
- 7 the first individual to testify, Mr. Blair
- 8 Horner, New York Public Interest Research
- 9 Group.
- MR. HORNER: Good morning. My name
- is Blair Horner. Thank you for this
- 12 opportunity to testify.
- I have submitted written testimony. I
- don't know if you have a copy of it already.
- 15 If you want, I can hand up -- I have three
- copies here. Let me just give it to you.
- 17 I'm not going to read the testimony.
- That's why I wanted to make sure you had it.
- 19 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Okay. I was going
- to let you read it.
- 21 (Laughter.)

MR. HORNER: Again, thank you for this opportunity to testify. And my name is Blair Horner. I'm legislative director with

1	NYPIRG, New York Public Interest Research
2	Group. NYPIRG's involved in many reform
3	issues, and we've been very interested and
4	involved in redistricting issues, certainly
5	in the 25 years that I've been here working
6	for NYPIRG at the State Capitol.
7	I'd like to start by of course thanking
8	the Senator for holding the hearing and the
9	Commission for holding the hearing. And I
10	would agree that the Senate Majority has
11	been probably the most responsive on the
12	issue of redistricting in the 25-plus years
13	that I've been doing this. You've held
14	hearings and I think it's certainly the
15	first time that I can ever remember, it was
16	the first time a committee actually reported
17	a reform bill on redistricting out of
18	committee. The Assembly did after the fact.
19	So the Senate Majority does certainly
20	from our view, we applaud the fact that
21	you've been interested in this issue.

22	I thought I would just start in terms
23	of my testimony to talk about what it is
24	like, and then whatever questions you want

1	to ask me, feel free to do so.
2	We support Senator Valesky's bill. And
3	the reason that we end up with that bill,
4	let me just take a step back and give you a
5	little sense of it from our perspective. As
6	you know, every 10 years the Census puts out
7	information, new district lines are drawn,
8	New York State figures out how many members
9	of Congress they're going to have. And then
10	lines are drawn by the Legislature.
11	And I was involved in 1992 and 2002 on
12	behalf of NYPIRG in the issue of
13	redistricting. So after the 2002 effort,
14	which I'll come back to in a second, we
15	worked on a bill that eventually became
16	Senator Valesky's bill. It was in 2005.
17	And we put out the bill, and at the time the
18	Senate Majority leaders said: Well, what's
19	the rush? It's only 2005. We've got till
20	2012 before we have to do anything.

And so I offer that anecdote to give

22	you a sense as to why we are supporting a
23	statutory change to the way redistricting is
24	done, as compared to a constitutional one.

1	We simply have never seen any evidence
2	historically. I can't speak for this
3	year up until this year, any evidence
4	that the Legislature was ever interested in
5	passing a reform bill. The closest thing
6	was I guess in 1967, in the Constitutional
7	Convention. But there's never been any
8	evidence that the Legislature was interested
9	in passing a bill.
10	And the whole thing always hinged, our
11	strategy in '92 and in 2002 always hinged on
12	trying to get the Governor to veto the
13	lines. That was the only leverage point we
14	ever saw.
15	But when you get into those kinds of
16	thoughts, it leads you to the fact that a
17	constitutional amendment takes too much
18	time, frankly, in the way that we
19	anticipated that this would play out. The
20	Legislature wouldn't want to do anything,
21	the Governor would rattle his saber, say

22	he's going to veto the lines, and then maybe
23	veto the lines, maybe there would be an
24	agreement. But there would certainly not be

1	enough time to do a constitutional
2	amendment.
3	We would agree a constitutional change
4	is you can deal with a lot of underbrush
5	in the state constitution dealing with
6	district lines, in addition to coming up
7	with what we prefer, which is an independent
8	commission using openness and criteria.
9	So with that in mind, we looked around
10	the country for a model. And the model we
11	found was in the state of Iowa. The State
12	of Iowa has an apolitical commission,
13	staffed by basically technicians, with clear
14	standards and openness in terms of how
15	they're going to operate. The Legislature
16	in Iowa has final authority. And under the
17	Iowa law which went into effect in 1980, the
18	first two versions of a redistricting plan
19	are thumbs up or thumbs down by the
20	legislature, they can't amend it. And if it

goes to a third one, which is never done,

- the legislature then would have the ability
- to amend the bill.
- 24 So from our perspective, since the

1	State Constitution clearly says that the
2	Legislature makes the call on redistricting,
3	our approach was really to put LATFOR out of
4	business and to replace it with an
5	independent commission to fulfill the role
6	that LATFOR currently plays.
7	And so that's where the Valesky bill
8	essentially comes from. It's a product of
9	obviously conversations among the members
10	themselves, Senator Valesky and
11	Assemblymember Gianaris, as well as other
12	groups that are interested in the issue.
13	But that was the construct that we
14	thought made the most sense, and it would be
15	able to apply to the problem as we saw it in
16	the State of New York.
17	By the way, there is nothing that has
18	changed my mind about how this will
19	ultimately play out. Again, while there's
20	far more interest in redistricting reform
21	now, after the 2010 election, than I think

- there's ever been, there's no guarantee that
- 23 anything will necessarily happen unless
- 24 Governor-elect Cuomo sticks to his

1	commitment that he will veto the lines if it
2	comes out of the same process that it has in
3	the past.
4	So again, we're in the same kind of
5	scenario. We think 2011 is the critical
6	year. We believe, though, that anything
7	that has to be done has to be built around
8	the creation of an independent commission,
9	that even the criteria, which is the focus
10	of your hearing as well as an important
11	component of it, only works if you have an
12	independent commission.
13	And so with I think the Valesky bill
14	has criteria issue in it, as you know. It's
15	in a sense bifurcated. There's four items
16	in the bill that are mandated. Three of
17	them are issues that are already covered
18	under U.S. Supreme Court decisions or law,
19	the fourth one in that mandated category
20	being that you can't rig the system to
21	benefit the political parties or incumbents

- or candidates. And so that was the mandate.
- And then there's another group of
- criteria that deal specifically with other

1	issues in terms of compactness, in terms
2	of population variation and that those
3	are done to the greatest extent practicable,
4	because frankly how you do some of these
5	things and shoehorning them into the state
6	constitutional requirements is going to be
7	difficult.
8	So that to us made sense. We like the
9	criteria that is laid out in Senator
10	Valesky's bill. We urge you to embrace
11	them.
12	And then I wanted to spend a little bit
13	of time on the issue of population variance
14	variance in population.
15	On page 4 of my testimony is a chart.
16	And in that it really lays out the number of
17	districts when they were drawn as you
18	know, the population variance has gotten
19	bigger over time, but when they were
20	originally drawn within the 10 percent
21	range, you can see that 70 of the 150

- Assembly districts have a very large
- variation in population, and 19 of the
- 24 Senate districts.

But even that number doesn't tell the

2	story. What really tells the story is the
3	last page of the testimony. And you should
4	have two maps in front of you. Both of
5	those show how population variances were
6	used by the majorities in both houses to rig
7	it, the outcome, to their partisan and
8	incumbent protection concerns.
9	On the first one, the map is a blue
10	map. The darker the blue, the larger the
11	population. And these are Assembly
12	districts. As you can see, when the
13	Assembly Democrats drew the lines, the areas
14	basically in the City of New York have the
15	smallest-population Assembly districts.
16	Well, why would they do that? They want to
17	have the largest number of districts in the
18	City of New York. Why? Because they have
19	an overwhelming enrollment advantage in the
20	City of New York.
21	If you take the City of New York out of

- the enrollment population, the rest of the
- state is sort of purple. It's really the
- 24 city has an overwhelming Democratic

1	enrollment advantage. So the Democrats
2	controlled the Assembly in 2002. They drew
3	the lines. They did it in a way to maximize
4	the number of districts that they would get
5	by using the variance, the 10 percent range,
6	to do it.
7	The map below that shows what the
8	Senate Republican majority at the time did
9	when they drew the lines. They did the
10	exact opposite. The Senate districts in
11	upstate New York have the smallest
12	populations. The City of New York has the
13	districts with the largest populations. Why
14	do they do that? Well, they're Republicans.
15	The way to deal with minimizing the number
16	of Senate Democratic districts is by having
17	the largest districts in the City of New
18	York.
19	So that 10 percent range is an example
20	of how criteria matter. And we think it
21	actually happens to be a very important

- criteria. The Valesky bill talks about,
- again, to the greatest extent practicable, a
- 24 1 percent range from the mean. Basically,

1	you'd have a 2 percent range, then, from
2	largest to smallest districts. We think
3	that makes the most sense. The smaller the
4	range, certainly, the better. And it makes
5	it harder to do the things that I think the
6	map illustrates.
7	So combining that with the mandated
8	section in the Valesky bill that you can't
9	use redistricting to increase the partisan
10	advantage, a political party's partisan
11	advantage or to protect incumbents, we think
12	that those two criteria are important, and
13	we would urge that you include them in any
14	recommendations that the commission
15	ultimately makes.
16	With that, I'm done.
17	CHAIRMAN DILAN: I'm going to ask,
18	with respect to the size of the Senate, do
19	you have any opinion on that?
20	MR. HORNER: NYPIRG has no position
21	on what the numbers should be. You know, I

22	saw that in the list. Smaller makes more
23	sense to me, the smaller number of Senate
24	districts, whether or not they be odd or

1 even. I notice certainly in the	: iast iew
-----------------------------------	------------

- 2 years we've noticed that when you have a
- 3 32-30 majority, and the possibility of 31-31
- 4 stalemate, that odd has appeal. But that
- 5 really has more a function to do, I think,
- 6 with the relative strength of the political
- 7 parties. It's never really been an issue in
- 8 the Assembly. So NYPIRG doesn't have a
- 9 position on it. But again, generally
- speaking, our view would be smaller is
- 11 better.
- 12 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Dr. Flateau?
- DR. FLATEAU: I'm going to defer to
- counsel before me.
- MR. WICE: Okay, I have a few
- 16 questions. Good afternoon, Mr. Horner.
- 17 MR. HORNER: Hi.
- MR. WICE: Just a few questions on
- 19 your testimony.
- I notice that you're looking at Senator
- Valesky's bill and a population deviation

- range of 2 percent overall from the size of
- the smallest to largest. I know some people
- had interpreted that earlier as being a

I	I percent	maxımum	from	smallest	to
---	-----------	---------	------	----------	----

- 2 largest --
- 3 MR. HORNER: From the mean.
- 4 MR. WICE: -- but 2 percent I think
- 5 is a different picture.
- Would you have a problem, though, since
- federal law supersedes state law, that in
- 8 order to comply with Section 5 of the Voting
- 9 Rights Act, to maintain the number of
- 10 effective minority districts or, need be, to
- increase the number of minority districts,
- if there could be some variance to that?
- Also given that the federal Voting Rights
- 14 Act would supersede or trump the state law,
- but only in that instance?
- MR. HORNER: I mean, let me just be
- 17 clear, the state can't do anything to erode
- the protections of the Voting Rights Act.
- We are fully supportive of the Voting Rights
- Act, and we think that obviously you have to
- comply with that.

22	And I think Valesky's bill anticipated
23	that by saying to the greatest extent
24	practicable he has in fact language in

1	there that makes it crystal-clear that he
2	believes that the state should follow at
3	least, if not better, the Voting Rights Act
4	restrictions.
5	So the short answer is we would agree
6	that if that's the reason why you had to
7	go beyond the 1 percent from the mean, a
8	total of 2 percent, that that's the reason,
9	of course, then that would be one of the
10	issues that you'd have to agree to.
11	MR. WICE: Okay. I'd also like to
12	ask about the creation of a commission.
13	Senator Dilan had a bill introduced as
14	recently as a week or two ago. Senator
15	Skelos, in an interview in a Long Island
16	paper, said last week that he favored
17	nonpartisan redistricting at this point as
18	well. So obviously it's going to continue
19	into next year.
20	Senator Valesky's bill, S1614A, at this
21	point, had it been enacted already, has a

- calendering that would have already kicked
- 23 in.
- MR. HORNER: Right.

1	MR. WICE: So in a practical sense,
2	and whether the bill needs to be amended or
3	a different approach taken, when do you
4	think the Legislature will need to have
5	acted so that if you have the
6	Valesky-Gianaris approach, which is to have
7	a nominations pool followed by an actual
8	commission, then to hold hearings
9	ideally, hearings before, during and after
10	each step of the process what would be
11	the latest that things really need to happen
12	in the Legislature for this to move forward?
13	Have you given that thought, or can you
14	maybe follow up with us later?
15	MR. HORNER: I guess the answer would
16	be yesterday, right? I mean, I think that
17	the most truncated way, if you took the
18	Gianaris-Valesky language and applied it to
19	a timetable that led to final passage of a
20	plan in June of 2012, I think you could get
21	away with as late as May 15th of 2011. I've

22	sort of tried to game it out as much as we
23	could. But I think you're really looking at
24	this session. This session has to be when

1 the issue gets addressed, and a commission

- will basically have to be up and running by
- 3 May 15th, which probably is --
- 4 MR. WICE: Of 2011?
- 5 MR. HORNER: 2011.
- 6 MR. WICE: Right. Also, just be
- 7 cognizant in the 2012 calendar that enough
- 8 time needs to be worked into the calendar
- 9 for either the federal district court in
- Washington or the Justice Department to
- 11 review. So we're probably looking at a
- March deadline just to move things along
- properly.
- MR. HORNER: Yeah. Well, that's why
- my first answer was yesterday. But I think
- if you game it back with, again, a sort of
- timetable of playing it out in the spring of
- 18 2012, I think you can get away with as late
- as the middle of May of this year.
- But again, I mean, sooner is better.
- And we'll be urging the Governor and the

- legislative leaders in January to try to
- tackle this issue quickly. I mean, the
- 24 LATFOR funding in the budget, even though

1	it's a legislative item, does provide, I
2	think, a platform upon which to have a
3	conversation about whether or not you can
4	replace the existing LATFOR structure with
5	something new.
6	MR. WICE: In the work you've done,
7	the research over the last 20 years, can you
8	point to examples of how commissions have
9	actually worked well? You know, that we've
10	had recent experience in Arizona;
11	California's commission, as of I think a day
12	or two ago, is now in place; and Florida
13	recently passed some reforms to improve
14	their process. Anything gleaned from those
15	states that might help us in New York?
16	MR. HORNER: Well, again, given I
17	think there are lots of interesting models
18	that have developed. I mean, we've begun to
19	look at some of these issues in other states
20	even though we're a New York State-based
21	group.

22	I just think that given the
23	restrictions that you face, which is you
24	can't do a constitutional amendment in tim

1	unless you're going to do something in the
2	next two weeks, which isn't going to happen,
3	that as a and even then it would be too
4	late. But as a practical matter, you're
5	dealing with statutory regimens. So my
6	strongest recommendation is to look at Iowa.
7	It's been there a long time. They've had to
8	work out the kinks. It's a similar kind of
9	situation as you would now face in the State
10	of New York. That that would be and it
11	appears to be empirically again, Iowa is
12	not New York, right? I mean it's a totally
13	different population, you have different
14	kind of enrollment patterns. But I think in
15	terms of a structure and a process, New York
16	can learn a lot from that. It has a 30-year
17	history. And that would be where I urge the
18	focus of changes.
19	MR. WICE: My last question, has
20	NYPIRG taken a position on the recently
21	enacted state law to reallocate prisoners to

22	their home of record before incarceration?
23	MR. HORNER: We did not take a
24	position on it. It's certainly a reasonable

l	thing,	what	the	Legislai	ture	passed	. <i>P</i>	Anc
1	uning,	wnat	uic	Legisia	iuic	passeu	. 1	711

- 2 you know, you have to count people
- 3 somewhere, so it makes sense to us. But we
- 4 were not involved in the lobbying or
- 5 advocacy on that issue.
- 6 MR. WICE: I have no other questions.
- 7 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Doctor?
- 8 DR. FLATEAU: I have a question on
- 9 the concept of regionalism. You pointed out
- in your remarks how a deft combination of
- 11 regionalism and population deviation was
- used by both houses in the last round to
- politically -- I guess in your
- interpretation, politically advantage
- themselves by drawing smaller Assembly
- districts, I think you said, in the city
- favoring the Democratic Assembly and then
- the Republican majority Senate drawing
- smaller districts primarily upstate.
- In the Valesky-Gianaris they mention
- 21 regionalism as one of those diversity

22	criteria, but I'm not sure it shakes out in
23	terms of the final commission. So is that
24	sort of serendipitous, or are you talking

1	about formalized regional representation on
2	the redistricting commission?
3	MR. HORNER: I think the idea is to
4	get both racial, ethnic and geographic
5	diversity in the representation of the
6	members of the commission itself. As I
7	recall in the bill, that language I
8	believe, anyway applies to the
9	development of the nominations pool, and
10	that you're looking for the individuals that
11	are diverse so it's not just from one region
12	of the state.
13	Certainly in terms of the lines being
14	drawn, I think that the strategy should be
15	really focused on the data, not trying to
16	benefit one region over another. If that's
17	where you're going with the question.
18	DR. FLATEAU: Again, back to the
19	represent of the 11 members on the
20	commission, should all regions of the state
21	be represented or just sort of a general

- effort --
- MR. HORNER: I think it would be more
- general. I mean, at a certain it would be

1	very difficult because some people believe
2	that upstate New York starts at the northern
3	border of the Bronx. You talk to some
4	people upstate, and it's really the western
5	border of Albany County. Right? So
6	there's, you know, different interpretations
7	of that.
8	So I think the goal certainly, as I
9	understand it from talking to the Senate and
10	the Assembly members, is to ensure that the
11	nominations commission has the geographic
12	diversity so that no part of the state feels
13	like they're being left out. There is a, as
14	you know, an intense issue between upstate
15	and downstate. And so I think I think
16	development of a redistricting commission
17	should be cognizant of that and be sensitive
18	to that.
19	DR. FLATEAU: Now the Part 2, still
20	relating to regionalism. To what extent do
21	you have any thoughts that redistricting

- should use sort of a regional frame in
- perhaps ensuring diversity? In other words,
- depending on which agency you use, some say

1	there are	eignt i	regions	to the	state	· you

- 2 know, Western New York, Finger Lakes,
- 3 Central New York, North Country, et cetera,
- 4 out to Long Island. To what extent do you
- 5 have any thoughts that that might be a frame
- 6 for drawing legislative districts?
- 7 MR. HORNER: Drawing the districts.
- 8 DR. FLATEAU: Yes.
- 9 MR. HORNER: Well, again, in terms of
- drawing the districts, the Valesky bill has
- sort of criteria that, you know, as much as
- possible try to work within the existing
- political borders of counties and towns and
- things like that. You still have to deal
- with the state constitutional issues. And
- that's why he says all these things as to
- the greatest extent practicable that you
- want to comply with the restrictions of the
- state constitution in the bill.
- 20 But in terms of just generally speaking
- of the regions, I think it's a data-driven

- decision. I know that there are some people
- 23 upstate that are nervous that if you just
- follow the numbers, we know where the

1	population	losses are	Western New	York,
---	------------	------------	-------------	-------

- the Southern Tier, the Mohawk Valley. I
- 3 mean, those areas have lost population in
- 4 the state. Hudson Valley and New York City
- 5 and to some extent Long Island have gained.
- 6 DR. FLATEAU: But if I could, let's
- stay with, say, Western New York and then
- 8 the next region over is the Finger Lakes
- 9 region. If the data shows that there, for
- 10 example, are enough people in the Finger
- 11 Lakes region to hold three Senate districts,
- is that a process that should be used?
- And by the way, you can look now at a
- map of Senate districts and even
- particularly congressional districts and
- clearly see that they traverse regions of
- 17 the state. They go far beyond a compact
- region of the state.
- MR. HORNER: Right.
- DR. FLATEAU: So I'm just trying to
- get a sense of what the value --

MR. HORNER: Well, I may not be
giving you a clear answer because I think to
some extent, you know, it's a domino effect.

1	Right? Once you start making decisions on
2	where the district lines are going to be
3	drawn, it impacts districts in other places,
4	Congress being different than the
5	legislature. Right? So the congressional
6	issue is a little bit different because
7	you're actually losing seats.
8	In 2002, just to give you an idea of
9	how the process as I was watching the
10	process, Amo Houghton, congressman from the
11	Southern Tier, created the largest political
12	action committee in the state to funnel
13	campaign contributions to the Senate
14	Republican majority to protect his district.
15	He had people wearing T-shirts showing up at
16	hearings to save the district.
17	So, I mean, I think there are regional
18	issues, clearly, in terms of trying to
19	ensure representation. I'm giving less
20	maybe less clear answers on this because I

think it's a complicated issue where you're

- pulling on one thread that may impact
- somewhere else.
- So I think just my general reactions

1	are there are state constitutional issues
2	which we can't get rid around. There are
3	voting rights issues which we can't get
4	around. We shouldn't. There are standards
5	within the Valesky bill that shall be
6	followed, and some to the greatest extent
7	practicable shall be followed.
8	And I think this issue that we're
9	discussing is one of those where you want to
10	just deal with it to the extent that's
11	reasonable in terms of all of the other
12	competing demands. As you know, this isn't
13	the one item. Right? So there's a million
14	other things that the mapmakers have to
15	think through in putting these districts
16	together.
17	Generally speaking, I think the people
18	should take into consideration regional
19	issues. Generally speaking, the district
20	lines should follow political boundaries to
21	the greatest extent possible. Generally

22	speaking, you should follow the data as to
23	where those lines are drawn based on as
24	close a number of people in the district

1 within 1 percent of the mean, or 2 percent

- 2 from top to bottom -- as you can.
- 3 So again, I can't really go beyond that
- 4 because there's a whole series of issues
- 5 that are all entwined in that, and it's hard
- 6 to tease one of them out.
- 7 DR. FLATEAU: Okay, I have one last
- 8 question.
- 9 Are you familiar with the concept of
- nesting?
- 11 MR. HORNER: Yes.
- DR. FLATEAU: Do you have a position,
- does NYPIRG have a position on to what
- extent that criteria might --
- MR. HORNER: This actually flows back
- to the previous conversation. I mean, to
- 17 the extent that you try to -- I mean you're
- trying to make it as easy -- the point of
- all this is to try to make it as easy for
- the voters as possible to know whose
- 21 districts they're in. Right? And so to the

- 22 extent that you can ensure that there are as
- few Assembly districts in a Senate district
- as possible, to the greatest extent

1	practicable, then I think that that makes
2	sense. I think that would be the way that
3	you would try to do that.
4	Historically, since the Assembly
5	Democrats drew the lines for the Assembly
6	and the Senate Republicans drew the lines
7	for the Senate and they're in this sort of
8	mutually assured destruction mode, there's
9	no conversation going on between the two
10	houses in terms of what they're doing other
11	than to say I will not mess with your lines
12	if you don't mess with mine.
13	And if you have an independent
14	commission, you might be able to have a more
15	coherent look at the plan to say things
16	like, well, you know, there's roughly
17	two-plus Assembly districts per Senate
18	district, and we're going to try to the
19	greatest extent practicable to try to keep
20	them together.
21	But you have the Voting Rights Act, you

- have the state constitutional issues,
- there's regional issues that we just
- discussed. And so it's hard to say exactly

1 how that should look. But I thin	k generally
------------------------------------	-------------

- 2 speaking a goal of the mapmakers is to try,
- 3 to the greatest extent possible, to keep as
- 4 few Assembly districts per Senate district
- 5 as they can.
- 6 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Mr. Wice.
- 7 MR. WICE: I know we're running short
- 8 on time, but just one quick question.
- 9 MR. HORNER: I'm not.
- MR. WICE: We had a pretty good list
- of witnesses for the rest of the afternoon.
- But if I recall, you spent some time
- working for the Attorney General --
- MR. HORNER: That's correct.
- MR. WICE: -- and developed a website
- there to open up government more. And I was
- iust wondering what kinds of data, whether
- we have a commission or the Legislature,
- whoever redistricts, what kind of data
- should be made available and posted and what
- 21 kind of access should New Yorkers have to

- submit plans or view things online or in the
- 23 media?
- MR. HORNER: Well, I mean, there's --

1	it's true I worked with the Attorney General
2	on the development of the Sunlight website,
3	and sunlightNY.com, if anybody wants to
4	take look at it. But I am 56 years old, and
5	I don't pretend to be a
6	media-tech-savvy-type person. But my sense
7	is that I think what you want is you want to
8	do things that draw people in. And my guess
9	is that the technology probably exists where
10	people could, online, use the existing data
11	to draw their own maps. I think that would
12	be kind of a cool thing and people would be
13	very excited to participate in that.
14	Now, to be perfectly honest, I'm not
15	exactly sure how helpful that would be to
16	MR. WICE: Well, let's make it
17	simple. What kinds of databases would you
18	want made public? You know, you will get
19	the basic census-driven data.
20	MR. HORNER: Oh, I see what you're

saying.

- MR. WICE: What other kind of kinds
- of data should be made available?
- MR. HORNER: Well, certainly the

1	census information. Certainly voter
2	enrollment information. I think that for
3	the public they should have access to the
4	addresses of the incumbents so that they
5	know where they live. It's all public
6	information anyway. And to the extent
7	that I mean the census information, as
8	you know, is a rich treasure trove of data,
9	you know, I think that would be very
10	helpful. I think that would be you know,
11	off the top of my head, those would be some
12	of the things that public would want to have
13	access to.
14	But having access to the data doesn't
15	draw people in. That's for guys like me. I
16	mean, we made maps last time because we got
17	the data, and we made little maps of our
18	own. We didn't draw lines, but we analyzed
19	what was going on. And that's where in fact
20	the two maps at the back of my testimony
21	come from.

22	But to draw the public in I think it
23	has to be some sort of interactive thing
24	where people can sort of play with it. And

1	it's the ki	nd of thing	that educators	can
---	-------------	-------------	----------------	-----

- 2 use in classrooms. You'd have a much more
- 3 robust civic conversation if whatever is
- 4 ultimately designed draws people to it in a
- 5 state-of-the-art way. That being said, I'm
- 6 not the state-of-the-art guy on technology,
- 7 and so I couldn't necessarily tell you how
- 8 that would be done. But I think it can be.
- 9 MR. WICE: I think we're a little bit
- older than you are, so we get the message.
- 11 Thank you very much.
- MR. HORNER: (Laughing.) You don't
- look it, though.
- MR. WICE: The older we get, the
- 15 younger we stay.
- MR. HORNER: Right.
- 17 Again, though, my only parting comment
- is I know that this is to some extent
- uncomfortable for you as members of the
- 20 commission. I mean, my message is we urge
- you to put yourself out of business. I mean

- that is the point. Put yourself out of
- business, replace yourself with something
- that we think would have widespread public

- support, would change forever the dynamic
- within the State of New York and, if
- accomplished, would create the preliminary
- 4 dialogue that would lead to the
- 5 constitutional amendment, which actually
- 6 ultimately has to be done.
- 7 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Thank you very much.
- 8 DR. FLATEAU: The ultimate role of an
- 9 organizer: Put yourself out of business.
- 10 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Thank you very much,
- 11 Mr. Horner, for your participation this
- 12 afternoon.
- 13 MR. HORNER: Thank you for having me.
- DR. FLATEAU: Mr. Chair, we would
- also like to acknowledge the presence of
- Dr. Roman Hedges, who is also a member of
- the Legislative Task Force on Redistricting
- and Reapportionment, from the Assembly.
- 19 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Thank you for being
- 20 here, sir.
- 21 The next person testifying will be

- 22 Barbara Bartoletti, New York League of Women
- Voters.
- Welcome.

1	MS. BARTOLETTI: Good morning,
2	Senator Dilan. Or maybe good early
3	afternoon, perhaps. And Mr. Wice and Dr.
4	Flateau, who I don't think we've had the
5	pleasure of meeting and working with, but we
6	probably will.
7	Thank you. My name is Barbara
8	Bartoletti. I'm legislative director for
9	the League of Women Voters of New York
10	State. The League is a nonpartisan
11	political organization which strives to
12	improve citizen and voter participation in
13	our political process. We strive to do that
14	through education and advocacy.
15	And I will tell you that I sit before
16	you today having had long experience of my
17	own; however, the League has been in the
18	forefront of this issue since 1966. I will
19	also further tell you that Mr. Horner
20	mentioned the state of Iowa. It was the
21	League of Women Voters of Iowa which brought

- the lawsuit back in 1967 that eventually led
- 23 to that state's implementation of their
- 24 nonpartisan commission.

1	I will also tell you that I have spoken
2	over several decades with the past and
3	current presidents of Iowa, and they tell me
4	that this is not even an issue in Iowa for
5	the past 30 years. It is now done pro forma
6	by, as Blair noted, by technicians. There
7	is no controversy. The Legislature just
8	assumes that these lines will be drawn
9	appropriately, nonpartisanly, without
10	benefit to either party. And indeed, it
11	works as it was proposed.
12	As you know, Arizona recently has gone
13	through one series of that, and had a little
14	bit more deviation because they have federal
15	lands, Indian lands that they have to move
16	around. We look forward, actually, to
17	seeing what California and what some of the
18	other states that are now in the process of
19	doing that happens in this series.
20	However, it does not diminish at all
21	our forceful our in fact very forceful

assurances that a nonj	partisan redistricting
	partisan redistricting

- commission is the way to go here in New
- York. We believe that in addition to

1	improving goals and criteria for the
2	redistricting process, this series is an
3	opportunity to fundamentally change
4	elections in New York State by removing the
5	process from partisan influences.
6	The most important point we wish to
7	make today before you is that the drawing of
8	district lines for legislative and
9	congressional district lines should not
10	in all deference, should not be done by
11	legislators.
12	The current process allows elected
13	officials to choose their voters before the
14	voters ever get an opportunity to choose
15	them. It is in the self-interest of
16	legislators and legislative leaders to
17	preserve both the careers of individual
18	legislators and the dominance of their
19	political party. The resulting partisan
20	gerrymandering has significantly reduced the
21	rights of New Yorkers to be fairly

- represented and has resulted in the highest
- rate of incumbency and legislators being
- reelected in the country.

1	I call your attention to some recent
2	statistics from our last, most recent 2010
3	gubernatorial election, where as you all
4	know unless you've been living under a
5	rock, and I know Mr. Dilan has not been,
6	he's been here working sometimes that
7	this was an anti-incumbent year. And all
8	over the country we saw legislators being
9	unelected, except here in New York State,
10	where currently in our State Assembly I
11	believe, for the general Assembly, the
12	number and I want to make sure I have
13	these numbers exactly right the
14	incumbency return rate in the Assembly was
15	86.89 percent, and in the Senate it was
16	92.59.
17	So clearly we didn't have either
18	we're doing an extraordinarily good job or
19	we have an incumbency protection plan. And
20	unfortunately for those of you who must get
21	reelected, most advocates feel that it is

- indeed that we have a very strong incumbency
- protection plan and indeed part of that
- protection plan is the way we redistrict our

1	lines. You can add campaign financing and
2	the need for reform to that also. And there
3	are other variables. But certainly we
4	believe that redistricting is a major factor
5	in reelection of incumbents.
6	We believe that an independent
7	commission to draw the lines for legislative
8	and congressional districts can operate
9	under existing state constitutional
10	requirements. And as Blair said and
11	Blair and I have done this for so long
12	together that we kind of can finish one
13	another's sentences, plainly. But certainly
14	when you talk about the need for a
15	constitutional amendment, we have actually
16	believed that from the very beginning.
17	And I have lobbied this every decade.
18	And in the middle of the decade my board
19	says, Okay, now we must start educating
20	legislators and the public about the need
21	for independent redistricting lines. The

- public we can get to. We have over fifty
- leagues throughout New York State. We have
- right now an ongoing public education

1	program that is being done across our
2	leagues involving other civic organizations
3	in the community, at which I will tell you
4	we have had very good attendance.
5	I think that may very well be reflected
6	in a recent Quinnipiac poll that did show
7	that 69 percent of respondents believe that
8	New Yorkers favor an independent nonpartisan
9	commission to draw the lines and that
10	71 percent of respondents in New York State
11	felt that more competitive elections were
12	needed.
13	So we have done our part. I will tell
14	you, in all of the time I have lobbed this
15	issue, we have not felt that there has been
16	the political will to deal with a
17	constitutional amendment.
18	So therefore, the Valesky bill, which
19	we do support, is doing what legislators
20	often are like a group of college students.
21	They wait until the exact deadline before

- they ever get their term papers done. And
- 23 we are up against a deadline; the
- constitutional amendment cannot be done. So

1	the statutory solution that Mr. Valesky's
2	bill represents is certainly one that we
3	think must be done for this. And then we
4	will go back, certainly, to advocating for
5	constitutional changes.
6	The members of the commission would be
7	fairly chosen, nonpartisan, and reflect the
8	diversity of the state. The lines should be
9	drawn in a manner that does not favor any
10	incumbent or political party, and under
11	guidelines that provide for fair and
12	effective representation of racial and
13	language minorities. The process should be
14	transparent and open to public input.
15	Finally, there should be an effective
16	mechanism for legislative approval of the
17	commission's plans.
18	We believe that Senator Valesky's bill,
19	S1614B, accomplishes all of these things and
20	strongly support its passage as soon as
21	possible to draw the lines for the next

- decade.
- We urge that the following criteria and
- 24 guidelines for redistricting, which are to a

1	large extent listed and prioritized in the
2	Valesky bill, be adopted. Districts should
3	be of contiguous territory and with the
4	smallest parameter possible. Areas divided
5	by water should not be included in the same
6	district except if connected by bridge or
7	tunnel. Districts should be drawn to
8	protect the Voting Rights Act and the rights
9	of racial and language minorities.
10	Districts should not be drawn to favor or
11	disfavor any candidate or political party.
12	The League, I will add here, has been a
13	strong supporter of the Voting Rights Act
14	since its inception, and we continue to
15	think that it is a vitally important part
16	when we consider redistricting.
17	Subject to the above guidelines, state
18	legislative districts should be drawn with
19	no more than a 1 percent deviation and I
20	do recognize the fact that the Valesky bill,
21	in legislation there is always some

22	compromise from the mean population of
23	districts within that house. Counties and
24	county subdivisions should not be divided

1	except when necessary to comply with the
2	requirements described above. And in that
3	case, more populous counties or subdivisions
4	should be divided before those with smaller
5	populations. Villages should not be
6	divided.
7	Again, subject to the first set of
8	guidelines, districts should be as compact
9	as possible and legislative districts should
10	be drawn to keep communities of interest
11	together. And that's an issue I will tell
12	you that early on in our League consensus
13	and study was not as prominent, certainly
14	and we've been doing this, as I said, since
15	1966. It has become far more prominent as
16	far as communities of interest.
17	And when I talk about communities of
18	interest, we mean everything from rural
19	communities of interest to urban communities
20	of interest to racial and minority/majority
21	districts. So we are including many

- different communities of interest. But we
- do feel strongly that they are a large
- consideration.

1	Open-source software designed by social
2	scientists and computer programmers has been
3	developed recently to make the process more
4	transparent. We believe that the process
5	should be transparent in all aspects, both
6	through multiple public hearings throughout
7	the state and by using technology to have
8	citizens participate at all stages of the
9	process.
10	All data on which the commission relies
11	should be available to the public, both in
12	writing and electronically through the
13	commission's website, including all draft
14	and proposed final maps of districts,
15	criteria used to generate each draft, and
16	proposed final maps of districts, software
17	used to generate each draft, and a final
18	proposed map of districts and proposed
19	plans.
20	In all of its 90-plus years of history,
21	the League has stood for fair and equitable

- representation for the people of our state.
- We believe that the overriding concern in
- drawing new districts is to provide all

1	New York residents fair representation in
2	Congress and the Legislature. To do
3	otherwise discourages participation in the
4	political process and increases voter
5	cynicism.
6	Ten years ago we went before this body
7	during similar hearings on the last round of
8	redistricting and lamented the fact that
9	New Yorkers had a voter turnout of
10	49 percent. I will add that that was a
11	presidential year. This year, our voter
12	turnout here in New York in a gubernatorial
13	election, in an anti-incumbency environment
14	but with that incumbency protection plan,
15	our voter turnout was 31 to 32 percent, the
16	lowest in the United States.
17	There are many reasons for that low
18	voter turnout, and at some other hearing on
19	other reform issues we can certainly get
20	into that. But we had the lowest turnout in
21	the country this year.

22	The League believes it is imperative
23	that an independent redistricting process be
24	adopted so that people, not parties, are

protected. We hope that this series of	1	protected.	We hope	that this	series	of
--	---	------------	---------	-----------	--------	----

- 2 public hearings is in fact the beginning of
- a fair, transparent and objective
- 4 redistricting process.
- 5 Thank you very much, and I'll take any
- 6 questions you have.
- 7 CHAIRMAN DILAN: We're going to have
- 8 Mr. Wice ask a question.
- 9 But I think this year, in this year's
- 10 election, we lost I think about slightly
- over 10 percent of the incumbent senators.
- 12 Is that correct?
- MS. BARTOLETTI: Yes. The figures I
- cite come from the Brennan Center, that it
- was still --
- 16 CHAIRMAN DILAN: But the real number
- is over 10 percent.
- MS. BARTOLETTI: The real number, I'm
- 19 sorry?
- 20 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Of senators that we
- lost, incumbent senators. Brennan numbers

- 22 maybe one thing, but I believe we lost about
- 23 10 percent of the incumbent senators.
- MS. BARTOLETTI: Yes. Yes, you did.

1	Which	is	certainl	\mathbf{v}	higher.	but	given	
•	, , ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	10	Cortaini	J '	,	Cut	51,011	

- 2 CHAIRMAN DILAN: I just wanted to
- 3 clear that up for the record.
- 4 MS. BARTOLETTI: And I certainly
- 5 don't want to go where I think this is going
- 6 to go, but --
- 7 CHAIRMAN DILAN: No, I'm not going
- 8 anywhere with it. I just want to state the
- 9 facts.
- MS. BARTOLETTI: For the reasons why
- we lost as many as we did. Yes. Yes. Yes.
- 12 CHAIRMAN DILAN: I just wanted to
- state the facts, that's all. Thank you.
- DR. FLATEAU: I would also, for
- information purposes, indicate that I think
- there's debate about that turnout number.
- 17 If you look at the active registration for
- the State of New York, turnout in this last
- 19 election I think was closer to 40 percent.
- There's an organization, I think
- 21 Professor McDonald and his organization are

22	using a broader number. They're talking
23	about eligible voters, which isn't actual
24	registered voters who are actively able to

1	vote.
2	So it's somewhere between depending
3	on which set of data you use, it's either
4	around 33 percent but if you use cold
5	registration numbers from the New York State
6	Board of Elections, it's a little over
7	40 percent. Which is about average for a
8	gubernatorial year in New York State over
9	the last few election cycles.
10	MS. BARTOLETTI: Yes. And we can
11	slice numbers all ways. But I think it's
12	generally agreed, from everyone from the
13	Washington Post that I think reported this
14	to the New York Times, that our voter
15	turnout was down.
16	Now, as I said, there are many
17	variables that you could quote as to the
18	reasons why our voter turnout was down. But
19	certainly we have believed since we started
20	doing this that the fact that New York has
21	such an incumbency protection plan,

22	including, as I said, campaign finance and
23	the way those laws are as lax as they are,

Candyco Transcription Service, Inc. (518) 371-8910

and the fact that the redistricting is done

1	to protect incumbents, is a major reason why
2	we have this incumbency return rate.
3	We can argue the numbers and which way
4	we slice them, but I don't think there's any
5	argument about the fact that this is the way
6	it is in New York. And Senator Dilan and I
7	have talked about this.
8	CHAIRMAN DILAN: I agree that that's
9	the way it's been done in New York for a
10	long time. Hopefully it will change.
11	MS. BARTOLETTI: Yes. We certainly
12	hope so. And we hope actually, we
13	released a summary today of a survey that we
14	conducted across the state on voting
15	machines and how people interfaced with
16	that, because this was the first election
17	where we used the machines, and certainly we
18	have recommendations coming out of that.
19	But we have always, the League of Women
20	Voters, we have always been concerned about
21	how voters are able to vote and that voting

- is done in the most secure and accurate way.
- 23 And certainly all of the reform issues we
- talk about is so that voters can participate

1	more actively in their democracy.
2	MR. WICE: Just one question. Thirty
3	years ago when the Legislature created the
4	redistricting task force known as LATFOR, we
5	were seen as the cutting edge in
6	redistricting technology, law and practice.
7	We fast-forward the 1990 process, the 2000
8	process, there was hope that a governor
9	might step in, veto a plan by some. That
10	didn't happen. I haven't seen a bigger
11	movement for reform in this arcane area than
12	in the last two, three years.
13	We're now at the last month of 2010
14	about to enter the line-drawing years. Is
15	there anything that gives you hope that it
16	would in fact be a different decade than we
17	had seen before, when there might have been
18	a smaller group calling for reform, but the
19	past year has been so intense New York
20	Uprising, No Labels, other groups have come
21	forward. Something holding out hope that we

- could see something different?
- MS. BARTOLETTI: Yeah. I don't think
- I would still be doing this after 33 years

1	if I wasn't an optimist. And I do think
2	that this is different. We've seen this
3	difference around the state. As I said, we
4	have we conducted all of these hearings in
5	our own communities that the League has
6	spearheaded with other organizations.
7	People are beginning to really get it. They
8	now understand the importance of
9	redistricting. I think that also goes into
10	the Quinnipiac study.
11	Whether it is because we have new
12	technology and people are reading blogs all
13	of the time, or whether it is because we
14	have certainly the press has been helpful
15	in making sure and certainly I want to
16	come back to that, but certainly the
17	dysfunction that has shown over the past two
18	years has begun to have an effect on people
19	looking more closely at how their
20	legislative process works. And I think that
21	has made it easier on some of us reform

22	groups who have been batting our heads
23	against a wall for 30-some years. It has
24	really helped bring this to the forefront,

and people are beginning to say, Oh, I	ge	3	t	
--	----	---	---	--

- it. And unless we do this, we aren't going
- 3 to get to where we want with an efficient
- 4 and effective government.
- 5 So certainly, as Blair said, we have
- 6 gone to the governor, we went to every
- 7 candidate, we asked all of our elected
- 8 officials, as they were up for reelection
- 9 this past year, how they felt about
- 10 nonpartisan redistricting. And what we will
- do, of course, as we do with other issues,
- is we will hold legislators accountable for
- the pledges they made and for the statements
- they made.
- 15 And I believe almost all of your
- 16 conference, Mr. Dilan, is -- maybe a few,
- but are on record -- perhaps not yourself; I
- 18 know you have some bills out there that you
- 19 prefer. But certainly Mr. Sampson is now on
- 20 the record. Everyone, I believe, but
- 21 Mr. Silver, the Speaker of the Assembly. I

22	don't think he has actually come out. But
23	we do think that this governor is going to
24	push hard on this issue, and so we do have

J	more	optimism	that peop	de will	not	onl	У
---	------	----------	-----------	---------	-----	-----	---

- 2 participate but that they will look at their
- 3 legislators and hold them accountable also.
- 4 MR. WICE: Thank you.
- 5 CHAIRMAN DILAN: I just want to say
- 6 that yes, I'm on the record that there
- 7 should be reform.
- 8 MS. BARTOLETTI: Yes.
- 9 CHAIRMAN DILAN: However, I did not
- sign the pledge because it's my policy not
- to sign pledges. As an elected official, I
- feel that I should hear both sides before I
- make a commitment.
- But I do agree that there needs to be a
- change in this process. And I hope that as
- we move forward that that does happen,
- whether it be the Valesky bill, the Dilan
- bill or someone else's bill. Or whatever
- 19 evolves, hopefully it's a positive result.
- MS. BARTOLETTI: Yes, I would agree
- with you there many legislators who do not

- 22 like signing pledges because they'd like to
- hear what the voters are saying out there.
- 24 And certainly I can't disagree with you

1	there.
2	Thank you very much.
3	CHAIRMAN DILAN: Okay, thank you
4	Thank you very much.
5	The next individual testifying will be
6	Dr. Jose Cruz, from SUNY Albany.
7	And as he's moving forward, I'd just
8	like to indicate that the Senate Majority
9	does have a redistricting website. For
10	anyone interested in going to that website,
11	it is RedistrictingNYSenate.gov, where you
12	would be able to find the testimony, for
13	example, of this meeting today, the one that
14	occurred on Monday, and there are listings
15	of all the redistricting reform proposals.
16	And so hopefully we can have an interactive
17	website as we move forward.
18	And also I'd just like to acknowledge
19	that also in the audience we have
20	Assemblymember-elect Sam Roberts of
21	Syracuse. Welcome.

- Doctor, how are you? You may proceed.
- DR. CRUZ: Thank you. Good
- afternoon. And thank you for the

1	opportunity.
2	I would like, before I present my
3	remarks, to apologize for not remaining for
4	the duration of the hearings after my
5	participation. Although I would like to do
6	that, the semester is not over and I have
7	teaching responsibilities that I have to get
8	back to this afternoon.
9	I did submit my testimony in writing
10	for all of you. And I will just read some
11	parts of it, the highlights of the points
12	that are made there.
13	CHAIRMAN DILAN: I appreciate that.
14	And I will make sure that all testimonies
15	are included in the record in its entirety.
16	Thank you.
17	DR. CRUZ: Thank you.
18	First of all, I would like to also note
19	that I am here as director of the New York
20	Latino Research and Resources Network. And

the comments that I would like to offer are

22	presented from the perspective of some of
23	the research that has been carried out on
24	the question of redistricting. That would

1	be kind of like the emphasis that I would
2	like to note. And also from the perspective
3	of the goals that we think that the
4	redistricting process should emphasize.
5	For the most part, the research on
6	redistricting historically has focused on
7	the issues of gerrymandering and
8	malapportionment. More recently, scholars
9	have explored the consequences of minority
10	concentration in majority/minority districts
11	for presidential politics, for the parties
12	and balance of power in Congress, for the
13	substantive representation of minority
14	interests, and for the political behavior of
15	ethnic minorities.
16	What we would like to suggest today is
17	that the redistricting process is an
18	important tool for minority representation,
19	and in that sense it is important that the
20	State Legislature use the opportunity to
21	revise district lines wisely, taking into

- consideration criteria beyond the
- restoration of incumbent advantages, however
- appropriate and legal that may be.

1	We believe that the redistricting
2	process should pay special attention to the
3	need for minority representation, and in
4	keeping with the mission of NYLARNet, of the
5	New York Latino Research and Resources
6	Network, we wish to highlight the needs of
7	Latinos in the state in this regard.
8	I would like to jump ahead to 1964, the
9	part of my testimony that looks at arguments
10	heard by the Supreme Court in 1964 in a
11	consolidated case involving six states, the
12	states of Alabama, Colorado, Delaware,
13	Maine, New York and Virginia. The outcome
14	of that case required that districts drawn
15	for state legislatures had to meet the "one
16	person, one vote" standard. And the courts
17	have measured one person, one vote at the
18	district level as a population differential
19	of less than 15 percent. The margin for
20	deviation, the legal margin is quite high.
21	However, plans with differences between 10

- and 15 percent have had difficulty passing
- judicial scrutiny without significant
- evidence supporting the plan; hence, the

1	emphasis on the smallest possible margin.
2	Eight other legal standards have been
3	established through lawsuits. Number one,
4	the standard of minority/racial fairness;
5	number two, political/partisan fairness;
6	contiguity; compactness; preservation of
7	communities of interest; continuity of
8	representation it's important; avoidance
9	of pairing; and respect for political
10	boundaries and topographical features.
11	While these standards have helped
12	identify the factors state legislatures
13	should consider when redistricting, it
14	remains unclear the importance that should
15	be given to each factor. Racial fairness
16	has been the biggest factor addressed by the
17	U.S. Supreme Court, and therefore has had
18	the most influence in shaping redistricting
19	law. And for this reason, and for the fact
20	that we are interested in minority
21	representation, Latino representation in

- particular, we wish to highlight and
- emphasize that.
- For better or for worse, since the U.S.

1	Supreme Court decisions in Shaw v. Reno and
2	Miller v. Johnson, racial fairness has come
3	to mean either the end of racial
4	gerrymandering or the use of race in the
5	drawing of district lines only if a
6	compelling state interest is served.
7	As my colleague Roberto Brischetto has
8	argued, ever since Shaw v. Reno the court's
9	application of equal protection in the
10	redistricting cases views the use of
11	racially motivated redistricting as harmful
12	in itself even when it has neither the
13	intent nor the effect of minority vote
14	dilution.
15	This places state legislatures in a
16	very difficult situation. They must take
17	race and ethnicity into account in order to
18	ensure racial fairness, but must avoid
19	relying on racial and ethnic criteria if
20	doing so may lead to wrongful-districting
21	litigation. The essence of this dilemma

22	lies in the tension between the notion that
23	race and ethnicity should not matter and the
24	reality that they do matter. As Brischetto

1	has noted, the solution to this dilemma has
2	been intimated by the Miller court itself by
3	indicating that "a state could treat racial
4	groups as communities for the purpose of
5	drawing 'provided its action is directed
6	toward some common thread of relevant
7	interests.'"
8	In order for the state legislature to
9	do this, however, racial and ethnic data is
10	indispensable. Color-blindness in the
11	abstract cannot substitute for empirical
12	research that describes the social, economic
13	and political characteristics of racial and
14	ethnic groups in specific jurisdictions to
15	provide "substantive data about which
16	residents share common political and social
17	characteristics."
18	Now, what kind of group characteristics
19	should the New York State Legislature be
20	looking for in order to draw racially and
21	ethnically fair districts in 2011? Size and

- 22 concentration are two important features.
- In the case of Latinos, the evidence of
- demographic growth is abundant. Nationally

their numbers increased almost twofold

2	between 1990 and 2000, from 9 percent to 15
3	percent of the total population. In New
4	York State during that period their numbers
5	increased by 29 percent.
6	A recent analysis of 2009 census
7	estimates suggests that at the national
8	level Latinos experience greater residential
9	segregation than African-Americans.
10	According to a report in the Daily News, the
11	average white person now lives in a
12	neighborhood that is 79 percent white,
13	compared to 81 percent in 2000. The average
14	black person lives in a 46 percent black
15	neighborhood, down from 49 percent. But for
16	Hispanics, their average neighborhood last
17	year was 45 percent Hispanic, up slightly
18	from 44 percent.
19	Perhaps the most important criterion to
20	take into account is community of interest.
21	Minority communities are no doubt diverse,

22	but common interests do join them. Latinos
23	are no exception to this pattern, and the

24 degree of care to which common interest

1	exists among them can be estimated by
2	looking at sociological and demographic data
3	as well as partisan identification, voting
4	patterns, public opinion data, and group
5	affiliations.
6	We believe, for example, that the fact
7	that Latinos are the youngest population
8	group in New York State, the group with the
9	largest average household size, and the
10	group with the lowest number of high school
11	diplomas, just to name a few
12	characteristics, makes them distinctive as a
13	community and creates a context of
14	commonality that can be the basis for a
15	coherent program of interest representation
16	in politics and policy making, a program of
17	interest representation that in large part
18	is dependent on how the redistricting
19	process unfolds.
20	To conclude, the increasing number of
21	Latinos in New York is part of a national

22	pattern of growth that promises to continue
23	well into the future. Latinos are now the
24	largest minority in the United States. They

1	represent 51 percent of population growth in
2	the country as a whole since 2000. States
3	that are bound to lose congressional
4	representation would have fared worse had
5	Latinos not moved here in record numbers,
6	and New York State is a prime example of
7	this.
8	Latinos represent 77 percent of
9	population growth in the 11 states projected
10	to lose a House seat. Studies also show
11	that Latinos vote in higher percentages when
12	living in majority Latino districts, and in
13	even higher percentages when in overlapping
14	majority/minority districts. So
15	redistricting can be an incumbent protection
16	plan, but it also can be a strategy that can
17	be used to increase political participation.
18	Research also suggests that effective
19	descriptive representation can offset
20	negative responses to growing minority
21	populations, and that it encourages

- political activity.
- 23 It is important to emphasize this,
- given the negative light that had been

1	recently shined upon the idea of descriptive
2	representation as the result of the behavior
3	of a few minority elected officials. The
4	solution to this problem is not less but
5	more and better descriptive representation,
6	and redistricting is a tool that can help
7	accomplish this objective.
8	The State Legislature should be aware
9	that in some cases, outside of areas with
10	highly concentrated Latino populations,
11	substantive representation may be best
12	served by distributing minority voters
13	equally across districts as opposed to
14	concentrating them. Also, it is always
15	possible that the creation of districts that
16	make optimal descriptive representation
17	possible can also bring about more polarized
18	neighboring districts. In such cases,
19	minority representatives may be outnumbered
20	by representatives that are against
21	pro-minority policies.

22	This unfortunately can apply to
23	interminority residents as well. And in
24	this case the pertinent question is whether

1	the	creation	of a	L	atino	distric	t is	a

- 2 worthwhile enterprise if an existing
- 3 minority representative represents them well
- 4 and/or if the new district may impede a
- 5 needed interminority alliance.
- 6 There is no easy way to address these
- 7 issues, but it is best to do so based on
- 8 intensely local analyses, as the literature
- 9 refers to this strategy of relying on
- research and data, rather than on the simple
- 11 criterion of incumbency advantage.
- 12 Systematic research on the socioeconomic,
- demographic and political characteristics of
- minority communities in the state must be
- the necessary preclude to the technical
- process of drawing new district lines in the
- 17 state.
- Thank you very much.
- 19 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Thank you very much.
- DR. FLATEAU: Yes, thank you, Dr.
- 21 Cruz.

22	Using your concept you mentioned of
23	racial fairness, and another concept,
24	proportionality you talked about the

1	growth of Launo populations not only
2	nationally but right here in New York do
3	you have any specific assessment of the
4	current Latino representation in, say, the
5	Assembly, the Senate and the Congress versus
6	where you think the trend might go vis-a-vis
7	the growth in Latino population in New York
8	State, with reference to special locales?
9	You mentioned local analysis as well. I'm
10	interested in any information you might have
11	on that.
12	DR. CRUZ: In 2009, NYLARNet produced
13	a report called "Latinos in New York State:
14	Demographic Status and Political
15	Representation" that suggested that there
16	was a ways to go in terms of achieving
17	parity in representation for Latinos in this
18	state, parity being defined as the
19	relationship between the Latino proportion
20	of the population and the Latino proportion
21	of elected officials.

22	In New York City the situation at the
23	time of the writing of the report was
24	positive and encouraging, but that was not

1	the case throughout the state. There are
2	disparities in terms of how much Latinos'
3	numbers have grown vis-a-vis the level of
4	descriptive representation of Latinos in the
5	state.
6	That's a report that came out in 2009
7	based on data up to the year 2000. We
8	estimate that, given the astonishing level
9	of growth, demographic growth that Latinos
10	have experienced since 2000, that that gap
11	in representation, in terms of parity, has
12	increased.
13	We've seen some gains in terms of
14	representation in the last few years. Most
15	recently, the number of Latino elected
16	officials in the State Senate increased as
17	well. But it is likely that the gap that we
18	identified in 2009 is not only still there
19	but that it has grown. We are not prepared
20	at this point to specify, you know, the
21	nature of that gap. And what we would like

- to do is just wait until the actual census
- count comes out to revisit that analysis and
- to have a clearer picture in that regard.

1	CHAIRMAN DILAN: I just want a quick
2	follow-up with respect to this same issue.
3	I know that many of us know the
4	situation when it comes to New York City and
5	perhaps even Nassau, Suffolk County when it
6	comes to Latino representation. And I
7	believe that all the representation that we
8	do have here in the State Legislature now
9	perhaps may be 100 percent from the
10	downstate area. Are you suggesting that
11	there are areas in upstate New York, maybe
12	here in Albany, Buffalo, anywhere else, that
13	there could be the possibility of a Latino
14	district?
15	DR. CRUZ: I'm not prepared to say
16	that at this point based on the data that we
17	have.
18	CHAIRMAN DILAN: That's why I used
19	the word "suggested."
20	DR. CRUZ: Right. Right. We would
21	need to wait until the official census count

- comes out to do that analysis.
- We do know that at the local level
- there are areas such as in Rochester,

1	Buffalo, Syracuse, Westchester County, where
2	the numbers are such that the possibilities
3	for increased representation at the local
4	level is greater than 10 years ago.
5	CHAIRMAN DILAN: Thank you.
6	MR. WICE: Just to follow up on that,
7	on Senator Dilan's question, are you
8	familiar with the U.S. Supreme Court
9	decision last year called Bartlett v.
10	Strickland? It's a case where the Supreme
11	Court held that where you are arguing a
12	Voting Rights Act violation and are trying
13	to create an effective minority district,
14	that there is bright line 50 percent minimum
15	population, which was discouraging to
16	others. But that's where you have a Voting
17	Rights Act violation.
18	If the new census data shows us that
19	you've got Latino populations that are in a
20	compact, contiguous community in other
21	words, you're not connecting dots, which is

- what the Supreme Court warns against -- but,
- you know, looking at Nassau County, Suffolk
- County, where there's a compact area with

l	smal	ler poi	tions o	f an	emerging	Latino
---	------	---------	---------	------	----------	--------

2 population that would not violate what the

- 3 court has said, that you're not purposefully
- 4 drawing different Latino pockets but it
- 5 makes sense to put them into one district --
- 6 DR. CRUZ: Right.
- 7 MR. WICE: And it wouldn't be a
- 8 majority, maybe 20 percent, 30 percent. And
- 9 the differing communities are cohesive, that
- you've got like-minded voting patterns, that
- you would advocate putting them into a new
- district or shaping a district in the new
- lines that reflects that?
- DR. CRUZ: Right.
- MR. WICE: Okay. Wanted to make
- sure.
- 17 And the other question, are you
- familiar with the new state law -- I asked
- 19 this question earlier -- about where to
- 20 count incarcerated persons in state prisons,
- reassigning them to their homes of record?

- 22 Do you have any opinion on that?
- DR. CRUZ: NYLARNet does not have a
- position on that issue.

1	Persona	lly,	from	my	own	persp	ective	as
---	---------	------	------	----	-----	-------	--------	----

- 2 a political scientist and someone who has
- done some work on the question of felon
- 4 disenfranchisement, even though I have not
- 5 systematically, you know, thought about this
- 6 particular question, intuitively it makes
- 7 sense to me.
- 8 MR. WICE: Okay, thank you.
- 9 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Thank you very much
- 10 for your testimony.
- DR. CRUZ: Thank you.
- 12 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Our next witness is
- 13 Aaron Mair, Arbor Hill Environmental
- 14 Justice.
- MR. MAIR: Good afternoon, gentlemen.
- 16 Thank you for your time.
- 17 CHAIRMAN DILAN: Good afternoon.
- Thank you.
- MR. MAIR: I wish to say and come at
- 20 this from a different perspective, in that,
- you know, we had the previous testimony

- talking about the process. But our point of
- view is not only is reapportionment
- important, it's also about outcomes.

1	One of the regularly cited cases,
2	recent cases in the Capital Region is Arbor
3	Hill Concerned Citizens, which was our
4	neighborhood association, v. Albany County.
5	And one of the critical points was or the
6	burden on the community was that we had to
7	show harm, harm in outcomes. And we did an
8	analysis of employment, hiring, distribution
9	of services, allocation of amenities, zoning
10	decisions.
11	And what we found is that not only
12	with, you know, political disempowerment,
13	there was also a high correlation between
14	negative outcomes or discretionary decisions
15	or political decision-making, which is why
16	you have an elected legislative body. So
17	with malapportionment comes, as they say,
18	poor allocation of resources and delivery of
19	resources to communities. And from that
20	point of view we were able to develop
21	standing.

22	And what was also unique about our case	
23	that we had to file is that the initial plan	
24	or discussion or conversation was actually	

1	signed off by the NAACP. And the
2	neighborhood association actually had to
3	pass the hat, and we had to go down to
4	Washington, D.C., and link up with the
5	national NAACP and the Lawyers Committee for
6	Civil Rights. And we showed them what the
7	population data and what the plans were that
8	Albany County had proposed with regards to
9	reapportionment.
10	And again, the connection to the state
11	is that the state, by doing these hearings
12	and this process, is very instructive for
13	counties and local levels. They actually
14	take their plans and they take their process
15	from what the state is doing. So this
16	process, the hearings and the calling for a
17	nonpartisan commission is very instructive
18	to submunicipalities and minor civil
19	divisions, you know, when they come to
20	reapportion the counties and the localities.
21	So this process is extremely important.

22	And one of the deficiencies in their
23	process in defining minorities because,
24	again, when we talk about majority/minority,

1	folks don't realize, the common citizen
2	but you do is that there are various
3	stratifications and slicings and dicings of
4	ethnic minority populations. And creative
5	majorities do a couple of things.
6	In the case of Albany County, when they
7	talk about a minority district, they took
8	for those folks that only identified
9	themselves racially as black or black
10	one-race-only. So all other blacks, any
11	other way defined, if you are a multiethnic
12	black such as myself, we weren't counted.
13	So taking an extreme narrow position is
14	one of the tools and techniques that
15	redistricting or redistricting masters
16	usually include, as they say, to again
17	continually empower the incumbent or the
18	majority at the expense of ethnic
19	minorities. And, also, as they say, is the
20	allocation of favors. Because then, again,
21	it's not a just clear black and white or

- 22 minorities versus the majority. We will
- have, in many cases, people of color brought
- in through favors or what have you and they

1	are pitted against a population that's
2	advocating for its "one person, one vote"
3	representation within the reapportionment
4	process.
5	So when we brought all these factors
6	before the Lawyers Committee for Civil
7	Rights and the national NAACP, they ordered
8	the local NAACP to more or less reexamine
9	our data again, and they also backed us with
10	the resources to file the lawsuit, which led
11	to the creation of four majority/minority
12	legislative districts at the county level.
13	Unfortunately, we pressed for that at
14	the city level and, again, resources and
15	that's one of the biggest things
16	resources were not available for us to push
17	for much more successful action at the
18	municipal level.
19	But the civic exercise that we engaged
20	in exposed a number of things. And when you
21	talk about technical resources or what's

22	needed by a community, absolute access to
23	data and technology. I think that, number
24	one, one of the resources that you can

1	provide, I think it was mentioned, open
2	source GIS systems.
3	I think to the extent that this body
4	would begin the process of even networking
5	with Google and trying to see if they can
6	come up with an application for using their
7	KML files for people to use Google
8	transparently to basically create samples
9	or, as they say, reapportionment plans that
10	they can submit, I think that that is a
11	platform that's universal and that's readily
12	accessible by any citizen in any library.
13	The other issue is making available a
14	geo-coded, again, down to the census block
15	level of your state voter file. You don't
16	have to put the names, but do the counts,
17	aggregate them or geo-code them to a block
18	so you have the polygons with the voting
19	population. Because having that as a
20	variable is very important. We talk about
21	ethnic minorities, we talk about communities

of interest. But it gets to the core of
what really drives these lines. And it
really exposes whether or not you have a

1	plan that's really being driven by
2	bipartisan interests and then using
3	minorities to facilitate partisan interests.
4	And I think that what you start to look
5	at is that areas that have, you know, again,
6	registered voters I mean, one of the
7	issues that we came across in the Albany
8	County fight was that even the
9	majority/minority districts that they
10	proposed were kind of disingenuous. Because
11	we did an additional analysis of the voter
12	file and not only well, we found two
13	problems.
14	The voter file was not regularly
15	updated, so it deflated the number of
16	minorities, number one. And number two,
17	those that were there, if you were to take
18	that portion and look at past voter
19	tabulation data for turnout, we found that
20	they had like a 12 percent turnout rate. So
21	even though you would have a district that

22	was 56 percent minority with a 12 percent
23	turnout rate, and then you paired that with
24	a so-called community of interest where the

1	median income is more than double in one
2	case they were putting West Albany and
3	linking it with Loudonville. And so the
4	Bishop Gates area, which is over Shaker
5	Ridge, many of you who are familiar with the
6	Capital Region. West Albany has a median
7	income of about \$25,000 to \$35,000.
8	Loudonville is about \$75,000 to \$100,000
9	median income, heavily Republican voting.
10	And more importantly, it also included
11	the working-class area of Shaker Ridge. And
12	one of the things that we found is that
13	whites, even though they are different
14	parties so they mixed a group of whites,
15	Democrats and Republicans they do vote
16	strategically. So if there's a minority
17	candidate, they will link together and vote
18	not necessarily for a Republican, but they
19	will vote for a white candidate. So we had
20	to do an analysis and show that there is a
21	preference for a white candidate over a

- 22 minority candidate.
- And when you couple a 40 to 50 percent
- 24 turnout rate amongst that economic milieu,

1	with a 12 percent turnout rate, even though
2	it's a majority/minority district, that
3	gamesmanship actually plays in their favor.
4	So they can absolutely have lower numbers,
5	but using income as a proxy criteria and
6	communities of interest amongst whites and
7	their preference, we were able to show that
8	you can absolutely have a majority/minority
9	district but unfortunately, through voter
10	turnout and other factors, you can actually
11	end up with a white in this particular
12	case, the candidate, the incumbent was
13	Virginia Maffia-Tobler. And she still is an
14	elected official.
15	And what was really important about
16	relating that particular incident is because
17	it wasn't until we had the redistricting
18	master upon the stand that our attorneys
19	asked him to turn over a notepad that he was
20	reading as he was referencing the data of
21	how he drew the lines for that area. And

- one of the things that he had in that
- 23 notepad was a meeting with her in which she
- 24 was specifically saying "I do not want these

1	particular areas." And those areas happened
2	to be areas of high minority concentration.
3	So even though they were professing
4	that they were drawing a plan that was
5	sensitive to the Voter Rights Act, within
6	the redistricting master's notes we had
7	clear evidence of a legislator saying that
8	they did not want minorities in their
9	district, or trying to draw a district that
10	would at least be as biased to her interests
11	as much as possible.
12	So these type of tricks can occur. So
13	I think that when you look at the process
14	and look at the process relative to the
15	Voter Rights Act and then you look at the
16	state constitutional requirements, in that
17	gap problems can be created that would end
18	up diluting the choice and the preference of
19	minority communities of interest. And I
20	think that great sensitivity should be to
21	that.

22	And to that end, to your point one
23	and I think it's the point of Senator
24	Valesky's bill. And I think that population

1	variance is something that's very important
2	and I think that that should be, as they
3	say, a model given the constraint in time
4	that we would face of trying to get
5	something that would make, as they say, a
6	much more fair, just and equitable process.
7	Per your question on prisons and
8	institutional facilities where you have
9	populations, though they serve to fill and
10	meet the number of count with regards to
11	assigning an reapportionment, but the
12	question is how do you reference them
13	accurately to where they actually come from.
14	You know, is a person to be counted from
15	where they sleep or where they come from?
16	Well, I think that the question there
17	is choice. If the choice is due to medical
18	condition, physical disability or legal
19	status, meaning something that's beyond
20	their choice or control that puts them in a
21	facility that was placed there by, say, the

- Legislature, you know, wherever we decide to
- build or allocate facilities, I think it
- makes sound sense, fair sense that they

1	should be apportioned to the community from
2	whence they came.
3	We do that with welfare. We talk about
4	counties of fiscal responsibility for
5	welfare recipients. We make sure that to
6	lessen the burden on any other county we
7	assign them back to the counties where they
8	come from when we talk about covering their
9	Medicaid coverage, et cetera. That should
10	also you cannot have it both ways. You
11	cannot not want them to the point that
12	they're an economic burden or a drain, but
13	yet when it comes to the importance of, as
14	they say, increasing one's political power
15	vis-a-vis other areas, then use them at
16	their head count for, as they say, for your
17	political partisan purposes.
18	So to that end, it just makes sound
19	legal sense to have them apportioned to the
20	neighborhoods or the communities from whence
21	they came. And, more importantly, it

- 22 eliminates another inequity whereby a
- 23 legislator from upstate New York is able to
- have, as they say, 50,000 to 100,000 less

1	folks that he really doesn't have to really
2	respond to and yet be law-and-order in the
3	case of prisons or incarcerated populations.
4	So, you know, that is, you know, a huge
5	issue.
6	The other point that I wish to look at
7	is, again, the concept of interracial
8	minorities and the definition of minorities
9	and how they are allocated. Again, the
10	bigger picture is to try to be as inclusive
11	as possible but also not come up with a
12	constraint that would pit minority
13	communities against one another but also, by
14	the same token, for the purposes of counting
15	and defining majority black or majority
16	Hispanic or majority Asian, come up with
17	criteria that are so porous so as to weaken
18	populations and counts when they're trying
19	to develop plans. So that's where the case
20	or the issue of communities of interest,
21	compactness, contiguousness, to the extent

- that they live together, I think that
- looking at that choice and then looking at
- socio-demographic variables that, as they

1	say, tease out an understanding of now they
2	choose and they interact as a community, I
3	think that these things are important.
4	And the other issue I think that is
5	really important, I think that, again,
6	looking at the border constitutional issues.
7	To the extent that the New York State
8	Constitution runs afoul of the Voter Rights
9	Act, and to the extent that the New York
10	State Constitution makes complying with the
11	Voter Rights Act difficult, I think that
12	again, you know, we would want to push for a
13	broader conversation on making the State
14	Constitution more compliant and amenable so
15	that it does not trump and it politically
16	cannot be used to trump the Voter Rights Act
17	so as to defeat plans that would increase
18	majority/minority choice and preference.
19	With that, I thank you for your time.
20	CHAIRMAN DILAN: Thank you very much.
21	Doctor?

- DR. FLATEAU: I have two questions.
- You mentioned early on in your
- 24 testimony that -- I believe it was in

1 relation to the Albany County

- 2 redistricting --
- 3 MR. MAIR: Correct.
- 4 DR. FLATEAU: -- that there was too
- 5 narrow a definition of black?
- 6 MR. MAIR: Yes.
- 7 DR. FLATEAU: Could you elaborate on
- 8 what was missing from that definition or how
- 9 you would make it more robust?
- MR. MAIR: Yes. If you in fact, when
- drawing the lines and by taking out blacks
- of more than one race or black multiethnic,
- you were able to then start packing a
- district. So if your definition is the
- black-only category as you're building your
- 16 counts of your district, say, you know, to
- 17 60 or 70 percent and you start to get a
- target, by narrowing the definition you're
- enabling the drafter of a reapportionment
- plan to pack, which is a clear violation of
- 21 the Voter Rights Act.

22	And one of the tools that they've been
23	using nationwide to pack districts has been
24	relying exclusively upon the substrata by

categories of black or black plus	one,
-----------------------------------	------

- 2 et cetera. And then you start playing the
- game of arguing when is a black person not a
- 4 black person, you know, which is really an
- 5 absurd game and an insulting game. But
- 6 unfortunately, it's a game that has been
- 7 played by, you know, reapportionment
- 8 specialists who are seeking to
- 9 disenfranchise communities of color. And
- it's not only just for blacks; they will
- probably do it in California or -- you know,
- 12 for Asian or Latin American categories as
- well.
- DR. FLATEAU: So you're suggesting
- the category "black" alone, or in
- 16 combination, that one which is more
- inclusive?
- 18 MR. MAIR: Right.
- 19 I think when you're defining black
- districts or when you're starting to build
- 21 that -- because you start -- say that a

certain whole number gives you your 10, 12
or your 51 or 52 percent. If you start to

put those things outside of it, you know,

24

1	you	may	have	a	district	that	may	be
---	-----	-----	------	---	----------	------	-----	----

2 51 percent black only, but if the other, as

- 3 they say, 45 percent is black plus other
- 4 race, but you don't count them as black, you
- 5 actually have a district of 95 or 96 percent
- 6 black. And that's what the County of Albany
- 7 was engaging in. It was another way of
- 8 packing.
- 9 DR. FLATEAU: You also mentioned the
- term ethnicity. Is there some way -- and
- there are black ethnicities. For example,
- the Census Bureau uses a category called
- sub-Saharan African. They have another
- category called West Indian. Is there any
- way that you would see those categories
- 16 coming into play?
- MR. MAIR: Well, if they are
- quantifiable and aggregatable categories and
- 19 you're defining, as they say -- you know,
- again -- and let me just take a big step
- back. I go to the principle of when my

22	ancestors were counted as three-fifths of a
23	human being. And so you now go to a whole
24	human being, and then now you're coming up

1	with a census that now is parsing the other
2	parts of, as they say, of your racial
3	admixture to make you something other than
4	that. And then now you can be counted as
5	part of the majority rather than the
6	statutory population that your Voter Rights
7	Act speaks to.
8	A person looking at me would not know
9	what percent white, Hispanic or Hindu that I
10	may be because of my Caribbean ancestry.
11	They just see an African-American male. But
12	for the purposes of Albany County, because I
13	checked "black plus other race," I was
14	viewed as part of the majority population.
15	So when they were apportioning trying
16	to be sensitive to the Voter Rights Act and
17	to quote, unquote, comply with the Voter
18	Rights Act, they used the 100 percent or
19	African-American only as their criteria of
20	defining black when, as they say,
21	calculating their districts. The other

- parts they did not count. So therefore,
- when they were creating their
- 24 majority/minority districts, they were

disingenuously packing the district. And so

- 2 here I had to give testimony of arguing, you
- 3 know, the objective fact, in front of a
- 4 bunch of whites at the county legislature,
- 5 am I not black.
- 6 DR. FLATEAU: Okay. One other
- question. In your remarks you used a phrase
- 8 "to the extent that the New York State
- 9 constitution runs afoul of the Voting Rights
- 10 Act."
- MR. MAIR: Right.
- DR. FLATEAU: Can you elaborate on
- that statement, where you see that instance
- might occur?
- MR. MAIR: Well, I think looking at
- the lower part of the state when they're
- going to start to deal with Senate and
- 18 Assembly districts. And if you have to take
- in whole townships and whole counties and
- you have to be sensitive to that as you're
- 21 drawing districts down there, you're now --

- in my opinion, you're hindering them
- reaching, say, into Long Island and, as they
- say, creating new majority/minority

1	districts in parts of Westchester.
2	And I think that what ends up happening
3	is that it does not give the task force the
4	broader latitude it needs to draw
5	majority/minority districts in any given
6	direction that they want. I think that the
7	Voting Rights Act redresses the real and
8	current harm that is done by creating
9	political subdivisions of choice and then
10	the long-term outcome, resources that come
11	from the process that comes from that, ends
12	up adversely affecting these populations.
13	And I think that having the ability to
14	draw the lines freely I think is important.
15	I mean, again, not getting afoul of the
16	issue of reaching out just to find a
17	minority. But if communities start to
18	cluster around a particular area, and they
19	may overlap a township and they're
20	geographically compact within an area, I
21	think it would make sense not to be

- constrained, you know, by a technical
- political subdivision line.
- I think that, you know, there is -- you

1	know, the issue of compactness can reach to
2	address the issue of reaching too far. But
3	I don't think that the technical provision
4	of a town line should be used, you know, to
5	deny the full and robust application of the
6	Voting Rights Act.
7	CHAIRMAN DILAN: Thank you very much
8	for your testimony today.
9	At this time we do have several
10	individuals on the list to also testify
11	representing various organizations.
12	However, they have not come forward. If
13	they are here, would you like to do so now?
14	And if they are not here, anyone who is
15	present from the public that would like to
16	make any comments can do so right now.
17	Anyone interested? I guess not.
18	Well, what I'll do in regard to those
19	individuals that had reserved the slot to
20	speak today, what I'll do is I will leave
21	the record open for them until the end of

22	business, 5:00 p.m. today, to submit any
23	written testimony that they may have. So
24	that way hopefully their comments will get

1	into the record also.
2	So in view of the fact that they are
3	not here and there is no one from the public
4	that would like to testify, first I'd like
5	to thank the staff who assisted in putting
6	these public meetings together, my staff and
7	also others that helped. I'd like to
8	especially thank our legal counsel, Jeff
9	Wice, and of course Dr. Flateau, Andres
10	Ledesma, and Lindsay Godt.
11	Anyone else I'm forgetting here? I
12	think I have everyone.
13	But thank you all for participating in
14	these meetings. And hopefully the fact that
15	we set this precedent, it can continue the
16	conversation with everyone in New York
17	State, that the conversation can continue
18	once 2011 begins.
19	So thank you very much.
20	DR. FLATEAU: Mr. Chair, if I could,
21	I just wanted to acknowledge, we should

- acknowledge the presence of Ms. Tunisha
- Walker, who's here representing the Council
- of Black State Senators.

1	CHAIRMAN DILAN: Thank you. And also
2	I'd just also like to acknowledge and thank
3	Senator Ruth Hassell-Thompson, who has shown
4	a tremendous interest in our work. She was
5	at the Monday meeting, and she would have
6	been here today, but there are other issues
7	going on, and she does have a representative
8	here today. So thank you very much, Senator
9	Ruth Hassell-Thompson.
10	And with that said, have a good
11	afternoon, everyone. Thank you. Happy
12	holidays.
13	
14	(Whereupon, the public hearing
15	concluded at 1:36 p.m.)
16	
17	TESTIMONY CLOSED
18	
19	
20	
21	