

Peter S. Wattson
5495 Timber Lane
Shorewood, Minnesota 55331
(952) 457-6328

January 15, 2022

To: Senate and House Redistricting Committees
From: Peter Wattson and Joe Mansky
Subj: Congressional Redistricting Plan 2022 PW 8C10

The Minnesota Constitution assigns to you the responsibility for drawing congressional plans. We know – and the Special Redistricting Panel explicitly recognizes - that you would like to be able to fulfill that responsibility.

Both of us have long experience in the redistricting process and have been successful in past years submitting proposals to previous special redistricting panels that attracted the interest of the judges. Along those lines, we have taken the liberty to prepare a new congressional proposal for your consideration. We hope that this plan, and the explanation we have given of it, will serve as the catalyst to get things moving.

This proposal attempts to resolve the differences among the four different congressional redistricting plans submitted to the Minnesota Special Redistricting Panel in *Wattson v. Simon* in a way that would be acceptable to both the Minnesota Senate and House. We believe there is adequate time to enact a plan before the February 15, 2022 statutory deadline. Copies of our proposal and a comparison to the other plans now before the Panel are attached to this message.

Since approximately 62% of the state’s population now resides in the 11-county metropolitan area, we wanted to prepare a proposal that includes five metropolitan districts and three districts in Greater Minnesota, with as little overlap between these two regions as possible. Following are its highlights.

1. **Incumbents.** Like the Anderson plan, no incumbents are paired. The Sachs plan pairs Reps. Emmer and Fischbach. The Panel has said it “will not draw districts based on the residence of incumbent officeholders,” but that “Districts must not be drawn with the purpose of protecting, promoting, or defeating any incumbent” You will want to weigh whether the Panel will draw a plan that pairs two incumbents.
2. **Cores of Prior Districts.** Like the plan the Wattson Plaintiffs presented to the Panel, this plan preserves 94% of the cores of the prior districts. The Anderson plan would preserve 96% of the cores of the prior districts and the Sachs plan 78%. While preserving the cores

of prior districts is not a legal necessity, doing so may make it easier for the members of the Senate and House reach a consensus on the adoption of a new congressional plan.

3. **Partisanship**

- a. **Districts with a Plurality.** Like the plan used for the 2020 election, this is a 4-4 plan, with four districts favoring Democrats and four districts favoring Republicans. The Anderson and Sachs plans presented to the Panel were both 4-4 plans.
- b. **District Lean.** The lean of each district is similar to that in the Anderson plan, with CDs 2, 3 and 4 the same as in the Anderson plan. The Sachs plan has CDs 2 and 3 that are quite different. You will want to weigh whether the Panel will draw them that way.
- c. **Partisan Bias.** Three of the four measures of partisan bias for this plan are the same as for the Anderson and Sachs plans. Only the Mean-Median Gap is different: Anderson 7%, Wattson-Mansky 6%, Sachs 3%.
- d. **Competitive Districts.** All three plans have two competitive Republican districts. Anderson and Wattson-Mansky have one competitive DFL district and Sachs has none.
- e. **Safe Seats.** All three plans have two safe DFL seats and no safe Republican seats.

4. **District Descriptions**

- a. **CD 1.** Like the Sachs plan, CD 1 sheds the southwestern counties of the 2020 plan and adds Wabasha and Goodhue counties, making the district more compact and removing the most rural counties from CD 2. Its Republican lean goes from 5% under the 2020 plan to 4% under this plan, the same as under the Sachs plan. The Anderson plan would keep CD 1 at 5% Republican.
- b. **CD 2.** Like the Anderson plan, this plan includes all of Scott and Dakota Counties in CD 2, and reaches into Rice County to pick up Northfield and Northfield Township, but it also includes all of Dundas and Bridgewater Township. The Sachs plan includes all of Dakota County, but none of Scott. Like the Sachs plan, this plan excludes all of Goodhue and Wabasha Counties. The Anderson plan excludes Wabasha, but keeps Goodhue. The net effect of all these changes is to keep all of CD 2, except the Northfield area, within the metropolitan area. The partisan lean of CD 2 would go from 2% DFL under the 2020 plan to 3% under this plan, the same as under the Anderson plan. The Sachs plan would have it at 11%. You will want to weigh whether the Panel will draw it that way.
- c. **CD 3.** This is from the Anderson plan, except that Edina is kept whole, requiring a slight change in the way Blaine is divided to equalize the population. It differs from the Sachs plan by including Bloomington and Richfield, rather than the Carver County cities of Chanhassen, Chaska, and Victoria, and including all of Brooklyn Center and Coon Rapids, plus part of Blaine. This is why it leans DFL

by 9%, the same as the Anderson plan, rather than 12%, as in the Sachs plan.

- d. **CD 4.** This is the same as the Anderson plan, except that Woodbury is kept whole and the district's population is balanced in the northwest, rather than the southeast, by putting part of Mounds View into CD 6. The Sachs plan for CD 4 is quite different. It puts all of Woodbury, Afton and other cities into CD 2, extends CD 4 north to the Chisago County border, and adds Lino Lakes, Centerville, and part of Circle Pines from Anoka County. The net effect of the changes made by the Sachs plan would be to make CD 4 less DFL by 2% and CD 6 more Republican by 2%, and to help make CD 2 more DFL by 9%. To be frank, we don't think the Panel will do that.
- e. **CD 5.** Our proposal reduces the population of CD 5 by putting Spring Lake Park, part of Fridley, and the rest of Edina into CD 3. The Anderson plan does so by moving Hopkins and 9,270 more people from Edina into CD 3, and adding 5,609 people from New Brighton in Ramsey County. Both plans give CD 3 a DFL lean of 9%. Our proposal gives CD 5 a DFL lean of 56%. Anderson is 55%. The core of the voting-age population of CD 5 under this plan is 100%. Under Anderson it is 99%. The Sachs CD 5 is quite different. It reduces the population by moving all the first-tier western suburbs, other than Brooklyn Center, into CD 3. It then adds part of Brooklyn Park and all of the Anoka County cities of Coon Rapids and Blaine, and parts of the cities of Anoka and Circle Pines. These territorial additions bring the core of the Sachs CD 5 voting-age population down to only 76% of the 2020 CD 5. We think it is highly unlikely that the Panel will adopt a district like that.
- f. **CD 6.** This district is similar to the 2020 plan, whose CD 6 forms 96% of its core voting-age population. The Anderson CD 6 has almost as little change, with a core of 91%. The difference in cores between the two plans is mostly because the Anderson CD 6 includes all of Chaska and Chanhassen, which were not in the district in 2020, whereas this plan puts all of Chaska and most of Chanhassen into CD 2. The other significant difference between the plans is the way they treat the St. Cloud urbanized area. The Anderson plan splits the City of St Cloud by moving Benton County into CD 8. This plan keeps the city whole by keeping all of Benton County in CD 6. The Sachs plan for CD 6 is again quite different. It reduces the population of CD 6 by moving all of Anoka County north of Coon Rapids into CD 8. It replaces that population by moving all of Kandiyohi, Meeker, and McLeod Counties from CD 7 into CD 6, and all of Scott County from CD 2 into CD 6. This leaves 2020 CD 6 as only 63% of the core voting-age population of the Sachs CD 6. We do not believe the Panel will adopt a district like that.
- g. **CD 7.** Like the Sachs plan, CD 7 in this plan extends all the way from the Canadian border to the Iowa border. Like the Sachs plan, it picks up the necessary additional population from the southwest counties of Rock, Nobles, Jackson, and

Cottonwood, as well as the west central county of Wadena. Unlike Sachs, it also picks up population from the portion of Stearns County west of St. Cloud. These additions are enough to permit the district to omit Lake of the Woods, Beltrami, Clearwater, Mahnommen, and part of Becker Counties from CD 7 and be included in CD 8. As a consequence, our proposal creates a district that is almost entirely agricultural in orientation. In spite of these changes of territory, CD 7 in this plan retains 87% of its core voting-age population from 2020 CD 7. The comparable numbers for Anderson and Sachs are 95% and 77%.

- h. **CD 8.** The Anderson plan picks up the necessary additional population for CD 8 by moving Benton County from CD 6 to CD 8 and subtracting the portion of Bemidji and part of Northern Township that were in 2020 CD 8 by moving them to CD 7. The Sachs plan does it by moving the portion of Anoka County north of Coon Rapids from CD 6 into CD 8, and balancing that off by moving Hubbard, Wadena, Morrison, and part of Cass County into CD 7. This plan also moves Wadena County into CD 7. In addition, it moves Lake of the Woods, Beltrami, Clearwater, Mahnommen, and part of Becker Counties from CD 7 into CD 8 to keep all of the northern Minnesota American Indian Reservations in one district. Neither the Anderson nor the Sachs plans do that, but it is our top priority for the congressional plan, so we offer it to you for your consideration. The result of our proposal is a district that has a strong orientation toward mining, forest products, and tourism. In spite of all those additional counties, CD 8 in this plan retains 93% of its core voting-age population from 2020 CD 8. The comparable numbers for Anderson and Sachs are 94% and 83%.

5. **Conclusion**

We realize that the members of both your committees have put great effort into the plans you have posted on the legislature's website, both as products of your committees' work and as a result of the help you have given to the Anderson and Sachs plaintiffs for their presentations to the Special Redistricting Panel. We believe our proposed plan may help serve as a starting point in negotiations between the Senate and House that results in a plan that the majority of members in both bodies can support and that Governor Walz will approve.

We stand ready to assist you in any way you think would be helpful.

PSW:JM