EXHIBIT B

EXPERT REPORT OF MAXWELL PALMER, PH.D.

Introduction & Summary of Findings

I, Dr. Maxwell Palmer, declare as follows:

1. My name is Maxwell Palmer. I am currently an Associate Professor of Political Science at Boston University. I joined the faculty at Boston University in 2014, after completing my Ph.D. in Political Science at Harvard University. I was promoted to Associate Professor, with tenure, in 2021. I am also a Civic Tech Fellow in the Faculty of Computing & Data Sciences and a Faculty Fellow at the Initiative on Cities. I teach and conduct research on American politics and political methodology.

2. I submitted a report in this matter on March 8, 2023. My qualifications are set out in that report. An updated curriculum vitae is attached to this report.

3. I have been asked by counsel at Fink Bressack to describe the methodology used to advise the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission (MICRC) with its task of redrawing House districts in the Wayne County area. I was also asked to opine on the plaintiff's claims that the remedial map does not provide the appropriate number of Black opportunity districts.

4. This report explains and applies the methodology I developed in collaboration with Dr. Lisa Handley to assess, during the remedial mapping phase in January and February 2024, whether the proposed state house plans complied with the Voting Rights Act. The methodology was created to guide a comparison of the opportunity of Black voters to elect their candidates of choice in the various state house plans. The methodology described in this report was the basis for the VRA compliance reporting provided to the MICRC during the remedial mapping process, including, but not limited to, the VRA Data spreadsheets posted to the MICRC website for each of the ten proposed state house plans.

5. The candidates of choice of Black voters face two obstacles in seeking election: winning the Democratic primary and winning the general election. Analyzing performance in general elections is straightforward, and relies on recompiling past election results using the boundaries of the proposed districts. There are 16 general elections from 2012 to 2022 that were included in the GIS database available to the commission. Prior analyses conducted by Dr. Handley demonstrated that Black voters strongly and cohesively supported the Democratic candidates in each election. Across all of the proposed maps, the Black-preferred candidates were able to win election by wide margins in every district with 15% or greater Black population in Wayne County.

6. Primary elections are more challenging to analyze because there is only one contested Democratic primary in recent years (the 2018 gubernatorial primary), and Black voters do not have a consistent preferred candidate across Wayne County (see my prior report, ¶¶ 28–29). As there no other statewide primary elections available, we could not use the recompiled election results method to analyze performance in primary elections. Additionally, in the House and Senate primaries in recent years there is wide variation in the levels of polarization across districts and elections, and district-level primaries cannot be used to analyze primary performance as the district boundaries are different under the proposed maps. As a result, we had to consider alternate methods to measure the performance of districts under the proposed maps.

7. We developed two approaches to examine whether Black-preferred candidates would be likely to win the Democratic primaries in the proposed district. In the first method, we estimated turnout in the Democratic primary. When estimated Black turnout exceeds estimated White turnout in the Democratic primary, it is possible for Black voters to elect their candidate of choice when they cohesively support one candidate, even if White voters are cohesive in their opposition to that candidate. In the second method, we use the Michigan voter file and general election results to estimate the number of Black and White voters who supported the Democratic candidate in the general election. We call this group the "Democratic Primary Pool," and they represent the set of Democratic voters who could be potentially mobilized to vote in the Democratic primary. When there are more Black voters than White voters in this group, it suggests that there is a sufficiently large population of Black Democratic to nominate the Black-preferred candidate in the primary if they cohesively support a single candidate.

8. Both of these methods rely on a conservative assumption that Black voters cohesively support a single candidate and that White voters cohesively support a single candidate, such that the primary contest is highly polarized. If White voters are less cohesive than Black voters, then these districts would elect Black-preferred candidates with lower levels of Black voter turnout in the primary. Additionally, it is in two-candidate highly-polarized primaries like these where performance can most clearly be analyzed. When there are many candidates or when voting is less polarized, there may not be identifiable Black-preferred and White-preferred candidates, and the performance question is not clearly answerable. In my prior report I examined many cases of primaries where the preferred candidates are not clear, or where there were not preferred candidates.

Estimating Democratic Primary Turnout

9. Michigan is an open primary state—voters can choose whether to vote for Democratic candidates or Republican candidates on the ballot on election day. We used ecological inference analysis to estimate turnout in the Democratic primaries in 2018, 2020, and 2022. In 2018, as the result of the statewide primary for governor, all voters had the opportunity to vote in a primary. However, in 2020 and 2022, primaries were only contested in some legislative districts, and not every voter had the opportunity to

vote in a Democratic primary. Other voters, however, had the opportunity to vote in multiple primary contests on the same day, if they lived in a precinct where there were contested Congressional, State Senate, and/or State House elections.

10. For each precinct, we calculated the total number of votes cast for each Democratic primary contest in each year, and then used the contest with the most votes cast in that year as the count of the number of voters who turned out to vote.ˆ[For example, suppose voters in a given precinct had the opportunity to vote in the primary for State House and a primary for State Senate in 2022. Suppose 100 votes were cast for State House candidates, but only 90 voters were cast for the State Senate candidates. In this case we would use 100 as the total number of voters who turned out to vote in the primary in this precinct.] We paired these vote counts with precinct-level data on total voting age population, and Black (single-race, non-Hispanic), White (single-race, non-Hispanic) and Other (everyone else) voting age population. For each county (Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb) and each election year, we then estimated a separate ecological inference model where the outcome variables were "Voted in Democratic Primary" and "Did Not Vote in Democratic Primary" (defined as VAP minus Voted in Democratic Primary), and the row variables were "Black VAP", "White VAP", and "Other VAP." Table 1, below, presents the estimated percent of each group that voted in the Democratic primary in each county in each year. Note that in 2020 there were no contested primaries in Macomb county. As a result, we only analyze turnout for 2018 and 2022 in the results provided to the commission.

Table 1: Ecological Inference Estimates of Voter Turnout in Democratic Primaries.

Year	County	Black	White	Other
2018	Macomb	17.2%	12.3%	10.7%
2018	Oakland	31.7%	17.8%	6.5%
2018	Wayne	21.4%	17.6%	5.8%
2020	Oakland	25.0%	21.0%	9.8%
2020	Wayne	24.2%	13.8%	9.2%
2022	Macomb	12.1%	10.1%	9.6%
2022	Oakland	26.9%	18.0%	6.7%
2022	Wayne	16.8%	13.9%	6.7%

11. While Black turnout was higher than White turnout overall, the difference was not nearly as dramatic as, for example, many jurisdictions in the South. On average, we found that Black turnout of Black voting age population (BVAP) averaged 5–6 percentage points higher than White turnout of White voting age population (WVAP) in Democratic primaries in the Wayne County area.[1]

[1]When Black and White turnout estimates for individual legislative Democratic primaries in 2018 and 2022 are compared, there is considerable variation across the districts and across the same district across years. Obviously, contest-specific dynamics play a role in the decision of registered voters whether to vote in a specific primary election.

12. Having estimated voter turnout rates by race in Democratic primaries for each county, we then use these rates to estimate voter turnout in each district by multiplying the Black, White, or Other VAP in each county and district by the rates in Table 1, and then aggregating to estimate turnout by race in each district. For example, suppose a district is entirely located in Wayne County, and is 40% White VAP, 55% Black VAP, and 15% Other VAP. For 2022, we would estimate that the primary electorate is $(.168 * .55)/(.168 * .55 + .139 * .4 + .067 * .15) = 58\%$ Black and $(.139 * .4)/(.168 * .55 + .139 * .4 + .067 * .15) = 35\%$ White. These estimates are found in the table below and the spreadsheets we provided to the MICRC under the heading "Estimated Turnout in Primaries." If Black turnout exceeded White turnout in both 2018 and 2022 in the proposed district, we determined that the district is likely to offer Black voters an equal opportunity to elect their candidates of choice in future Democratic primaries. In the column labeled "Primary turnout Black > White" a "yes" indicates that Black turnout exceeded White turnout in both 2018 and 2022.[2]

13. Table 2 presents the results for the Proposed Remedial Map. This table is a selection of the complete analysis provided to the MICRC. In this table I include all of the House districts that are at least 30% BVAP in the three-county area, with the exception of HD 53 in Pontiac. The results show that there are eleven districts where we estimate that Black voters make up a larger share of the primary voters than White voters, such that when Black and White voters cohesively support different candidates, the Black-preferred candidate is likely to win.

Table 2: Primary Turnout Estimates for the Proposed Remedial Map

	VAP	General Elections		Estimated Turnout in Primaries				Primary Turnout
HD	Black	Dem. Comp.	Biden 2020	Black 2018	White 2018	Black 2022	White 2022	Black > White
4	89.6%	97.1%	95.6%	94.3%	4.1%	93.6%	4.1%	Yes
5	80.7%	93.1%	91.3%	87.2%	11.2%	84.6%	13.4%	Yes
9	66.8%	95.7%	94.9%	75.3%	21.7%	74.1%	21.5%	Yes
8	66.3%	91.5%	90.9%	73.3%	24.6%	68.7%	28.5%	Yes
11	65.0%	87.5%	83.7%	76.3%	18.7%	74.5%	19.4%	Yes
7	56.2%	95.2%	93.5%	69.2%	24.2%	66.9%	23.6%	Yes
16	54.4%	77.2%	75.8%	61.8%	36.0%	61.0%	35.8%	Yes
18	52.2%	79.9%	79.3%	69.3%	27.9%	65.4%	31.4%	Yes
12	44.5%	70.3%	68.8%	55.7%	40.1%	53.1%	41.9%	Yes
17	42.4%	69.1%	69.2%	49.9%	47.4%	49.0%	47.0%	Yes
10	42.5%	66.0%	69.2%	49.1%	48.9%	48.5%	48.7%	No
26	35.8%	70.8%	65.8%	43.1%	53.6%	42.2%	53.0%	No
1	34.5%	90.5%	86.8%	54.5%	25.9%	49.8%	23.9%	Yes

[2]This analysis does not take into account either the level of cohesion among Black voters, or the level of White crossover votes for the candidates preferred by Black voters. Our EI analyses of voting patterns in state legislative district elections indicated that there was substantial, election-contest specific variation in both cohesion and crossover voting in legislative Democratic primaries.

Estimating the Democratic Primary Pool

14. The second method we devised to determine if a proposed district is likely to elect the Black-preferred candidate in future Democratic primary relies on estimating the possible Democratic "primary pool" of voters in a proposed district. The idea behind this analysis is that each district has a population of voters who support Democratic candidates in the general election, and who could be potentially mobilized to vote in a primary election. If the number of these voters who are Black exceeds the number of these voters who are White, then there is a sufficient population that could be mobilized to vote in a Democratic primary if such a primary were highly polarized and Black and White voters were highly cohesive in support of opposing candidates.

15. The first step in this process was to estimate the number of voters by race in each census block. We were provided with a voter file for Wayne, Macomb, and Oakland Counties from EDS. The voter file from EDS included the name, address, and census block for each voter. We then estimated the race of each voter using Bayesian Improved Surname Geocoding (BISG), a procedure that uses the surname of each voter as well as information about the census tract in which they reside, to assign racial probabilities to each voter. The racial probabilities for all of the voters falling within a proposed district were then summed to estimate racial demographics of the proposed district. This information is found in the spreadsheet in the column labeled "Estimated Current Voters."

16. The second step in this process was to use this information to estimate the percentage of voters in the proposed district likely to cast ballots for Democrats. This we refer to as the potential Democratic "primary pool"—voters who support Democrats, and who are therefore potential voters in the Democratic primary. To calculate this, we began with the Democratic composite vote share from the data matrix (the column labeled "Dem. Comp.") and assumed that 95% of Black voters (as calculated in "Estimated Current Voters") supported Democrats, and 5% supported Republicans. Given this premise, all of the other votes for the Democratic and Republican candidates had to come from White and Other voters. We then conservatively assumed that White and Other voters cast ballots for Democrats at the same rate, and determined the percentage of voters who must have supported Democrats to make the total vote share accurate.[3]

17. We compared the estimated percentage of Black Democrats in the "primary pool" to the estimated percentage of White Democrats in the pool in the proposed district. If the percentage of potential Black voters exceeded the number of potential White voters we determined that the proposed district offered Black voters an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice in the district. The column labeled "Dem. Primary Pool" indicates if the percentage of potential Black voters exceeds the percentage of potential White voters in the proposed district.

[3]This is a conservative approach because if Other voters supported Democrats at higher rates than assumed, the "White Dems" variable would be reduced.

18. Table 3 presents the results for the Proposed Remedial Map. This table is a selection of the complete analysis provided to the MICRC. In this table I include all of the House districts that are at least 30% BVAP in the three-county area, with the exception of HD 53 in Pontiac. The results show that there are twelve districts where we estimate that there are more Black voters supporting Democratic than White voters supporting Democrats, such that there is a sufficient Black population that could be mobilized to vote in a Democratic primary to elect a Black-preferred candidate.

Table 3: Democratic Primary Pool Estimates for the Proposed Remedial Map

	VAP	Estimated Current Voters		Est. Pct. of Electorate by Race and Party				Dem. Primary Pool
HD	Black	Black	White	Black Dems.	White Dems.	Black Reps.	White Reps.	Black > White
4	89.6%	89.6%	5.3%	87.0%	5.1%	2.6%	0.2%	Yes
5	80.7%	79.0%	16.5%	75.1%	14.2%	4.0%	2.3%	Yes
9	66.8%	70.6%	23.6%	67.6%	22.6%	3.0%	1.0%	Yes
8	66.3%	67.1%	28.5%	63.8%	24.0%	3.4%	4.5%	Yes
11	65.0%	66.7%	27.1%	63.4%	19.7%	3.3%	7.5%	Yes
7	56.2%	61.1%	22.8%	58.1%	21.7%	2.9%	1.1%	Yes
16	54.4%	54.0%	39.7%	51.3%	22.3%	2.7%	17.3%	Yes
18	52.2%	46.5%	45.3%	44.2%	30.2%	2.3%	15.1%	Yes
12	44.5%	45.2%	50.3%	43.0%	25.1%	2.3%	25.2%	Yes
17	42.4%	41.6%	51.1%	39.5%	25.9%	2.1%	25.2%	Yes
10	42.5%	39.3%	55.6%	37.3%	26.3%	2.0%	29.3%	Yes
26	35.8%	34.9%	57.3%	33.1%	33.1%	1.7%	24.2%	No
1	34.5%	40.0%	19.1%	38.0%	16.8%	2.0%	2.4%	Yes

Analyzing Performance

19. These two estimates formed the basis for evaluating if a proposed district would perform for Black-preferred candidates. We found that both measures tend to agree—across all of the proposed maps, districts that perform using the primary turnout measure also perform under the primary pool measure. A small number of districts perform under the primary pool measure but not the primary turnout measure. When both measures agree, it indicates that Black voters are likely to be the majority in the Democratic primary, and that there are likely more Black Democrats than White Democrats in the district.

20. In the MICRC's proposed remedial map there are eleven districts–HD 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, and 18–where Black voters are likely to be successful in electing their preferred candidates in racially polarized Democratic primaries, as determined by both measures. In a twelfth district, HD 10, we find that Black voters are likely to be successful in electing their preferred candidates in racially polarized Democratic Primaries under the Primary Pool measure, and equally likely to be successful in electing their preferred candidates in racially polarized Democratic Primaries under the Primary Turnout measure.

21. The plaintiffs in this litigation argue that the Proposed Remedial Map is not a valid remedy because there are eight majority-Black districts. The plaintiffs

> contend that ten such districts could be drawn, and support this assertion with evidence from Dr. Trende's remedial report in this matter, where he conducted "race-blind computer simulations of remedial house districts" (ECF No. 168, at 18). Notwithstanding the criticisms of Dr. Trende's simulation analysis that I offered in my prior report and at trial, the plaintiffs' assertion here misreports Dr. Trende's simulation analysis. In this analysis, Dr. Trende simulated 100,000 house plans (ECF No. 168-2, at 24–34). The number of majority-Black districts in these race-blind simulated plans ranged significantly, from 5 to 11 districts. The most likely result was 8 majority-Black districts, which matches the result in the Proposed Remedial Map.[4] Only four percent of Dr. Trende's simulated maps yielded ten or more majority-Black districts.[5] While such a result is possible, it is unlikely, and these simulations do not provide evidence that the Proposed Remedial Map violates the Voting Rights Act.

I reserve the right to supplement my report in this case in light of additional facts, testimony, and/or materials that may come to light.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Maxwell Palmer

Executed this 15th day of March, 2024, at Arlington, Massachusetts.

[4] I analyzed Dr. Trende's simulation results using code and data he provided with his remedial report.

[5] In the simulations analyzed in Dr. Trende's trial report, the most likely result was 6–7 majority-Black districts, depending on the constrains that Dr. Trende used in the simulations. Less than 0.01% of Dr. Trende's simulated plans in his trial report yielded ten majority-Black districts.

Maxwell Palmer

CONTACT

Department of Political Science
Boston University
232 Bay State Road
Boston, MA 02215

E-mail: mbpalmer@bu.edu
Website: www.maxwellpalmer.com
Phone: (617) 358-2654

APPOINTMENTS

Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, 2021–Present

Associate Chair, Dept. of Political Science, July 2023–Present

Civic Tech Fellow, Faculty of Computing & Data Sciences, 2021–Present

Faculty Fellow, Initiative on Cities, 2019–Present

Director of Advanced Programs, Dept. of Political Science, July 2020–June 2023

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, 2014–2021

Junior Faculty Fellow, Hariri Institute for Computing, 2017–2020

EDUCATION

Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Ph.D., Political Science, May 2014.

A.M., Political Science, May 2012.

Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine

A.B., Mathematics & Government and Legal Studies, May 2008.

BOOK

Neighborhood Defenders: Participatory Politics and America's Housing Crisis (with Katherine Levine Einstein and David M. Glick). 2019. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Selected chapters republished in *Political Science Quarterly*.
- Reviewed in *Perspectives on Politics*, *Political Science Quarterly*, *Economics 21*, *Public Books*, *City Journal*, and *Urban Studies*.
- Covered in Vox's "The Weeds" podcast, CityLab, Slate's "Gabfest," Curbed, Brookings Institution Up Front.

REFEREED ARTICLES

Palmer, Maxwell, Benjamin Schneer, and Kevin DeLuca. Forthcoming. "A Partisan Solution to Partisan Gerrymandering: The Define-Combine Procedure". *Political Analysis*.

de Benedictis-Kessner, Justin and Maxwell Palmer. 2023. "Driving Turnout: The Effect of Car Ownership on Electoral Participation." *Political Science Research and Methods* 11(3): 654–662.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, Joseph Ornstein, and Maxwell Palmer. 2022. "Who Represents the Renters?" *Housing Policy Debate*.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David Glick, and Maxwell Palmer. 2022. "Developing a pro-housing movement? Public distrust of developers, fractured coalitions, and the challenges of measuring political power." *Interest Groups & Advocacy* 11:189–-208.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David Glick, Luisa Godinez Puig, and Maxwell Palmer. 2022. "Still Muted: The Limited Participatory Democracy of Zoom Public Meetings." *Urban Affairs Review*.

Glick, David M. and Maxwell Palmer. 2022. "County Over Party: How Governors Prioritized Geography Not Particularism in the Distribution of Opportunity Zones." *British Journal of Political Science* 52(4): 1902–1910.

Einstein, Katherine Levine and Maxwell Palmer. 2021. "Land of the Freeholder: How Property Rights Make Voting Rights." *Journal of Historical Political Economy* 1(4): 499–530.

Godinez Puig, Luisa, Katharine Lusk, David Glick, Katherine L. Einstein, Maxwell Palmer, Stacy Fox, and Monica L. Wang. 2020. "Perceptions of Public Health Priorities and Accountability Among US Mayors." *Public Health Reports* (October 2020).

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David M. Glick, and Maxwell Palmer. 2020. "Can Mayors Lead on Climate Change? Evidence from Six Years of Surveys." *The Forum* 18(1).

Ban, Pamela, Maxwell Palmer, and Benjamin Schneer. 2019. "From the Halls of Congress to K Street: Government Experience and its Value for Lobbying." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 44(4): 713–752.

Palmer, Maxwell and Benjamin Schneer. 2019. "Postpolitical Careers: How Politicians Capitalize on Public Office." *Journal of Politics* 81(2): 670–675.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, Maxwell Palmer, and David M. Glick. 2019. "Who Participates in Local Government? Evidence from Meeting Minutes." *Perspectives on Politics* 17(1): 28–46.

- Winner of the Heinz Eulau Award, American Political Science Association, 2020.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David M. Glick, and Maxwell Palmer. 2019. "City Learning: Evidence of Policy Information Diffusion From a Survey of U.S. Mayors." *Political Research Quarterly* 72(1): 243–258.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David M. Glick, Maxwell Palmer, and Robert Pressel. 2018. "Do Mayors Run for Higher Office? New Evidence on Progressive Ambition." *American Politics Research* 48(1) 197–221.

Ansolabehere, Stephen, Maxwell Palmer and Benjamin Schneer. 2018. "Divided Government and Significant Legislation, A History of Congress from 1789-2010." *Social Science History* 42(1): 81–108.

Edwards, Barry, Michael Crespin, Ryan D. Williamson, and Maxwell Palmer. 2017. "Institutional Control of Redistricting and the Geography of Representation." *Journal of Politics* 79(2): 722–726.

Palmer, Maxwell. 2016. "Does the Chief Justice Make Partisan Appointments to Special Courts and Panels?" *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* 13(1): 153–177.

Palmer, Maxwell and Benjamin Schneer. 2016. "Capitol Gains: The Returns to Elected Office from Corporate Board Directorships." *Journal of Politics* 78(1): 181–196.

Gerring, John, Maxwell Palmer, Jan Teorell, and Dominic Zarecki. 2015. "Demography and Democracy: A Global, District-level Analysis of Electoral Contestation." *American Political Science Review* 109(3): 574–591.

Other Publications

Shafer, Paul, Maxwell Palmer, Ahyoung Cho, Mara Lynch, Pierce Louis, and Alexandra Skinner. Forthcoming. "A dataset of geocoded Medicaid office locations in the United States." *Data in Brief*.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David M. Glick and Maxwell Palmer. 2023. "Public participation" in *A Research Agenda for US Land Use and Planning Law*, eds. John J. Infranca and Sarah Schindler. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David M. Glick and Maxwell Palmer. 2020. "Neighborhood Defenders: Participatory Politics and America's Housing Crisis." *Political Science Quarterly* 135(2): 281–312.

Ansolabehere, Stephen and Maxwell Palmer. 2016. "A Two Hundred-Year Statistical History of the Gerrymander." *Ohio State Law Journal* 77(4): 741–762.

Ansolabehere, Stephen, Maxwell Palmer, and Benjamin Schneer. 2016. "What Has Congress Done?" in *Governing in a Polarized Age: Elections, Parties, and Po-*

litical Representation in America, eds. Alan Gerber and Eric Schickler. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Policy Reports

Glick, David M., Katherine Levine Einstein, and Maxwell Palmer. 2023. 2022 Menino Survey of Mayors: Economic Opportunity, Poverty, and Well-Being. Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Glick, David M., Katherine Levine Einstein, and Maxwell Palmer. 2023. 2022 Menino Survey of Mayors: Mayors and the Climate Crisis. Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Einstein, Katherine Levine and Maxwell Palmer. 2022. Greater Boston Housing Report Card 2022, Special Topic: Who Can Win the Lottery? Moving Toward Equity in Subsidized Housing. Research Report. The Boston Foundation.

Glick, David M., Katherine Levine Einstein, and Maxwell Palmer. 2022. Looking back on ARPA and America's Cities: A Menino Survey Reflection. Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Einstein, Katherine Levine and Maxwell Palmer. 2022. Representation in the Housing Process: Best Practices for Improving Racial Equity. Research Report. The Boston Foundation.

Glick, David M., Katherine Levine Einstein, and Maxwell Palmer. 2022. 2021 Menino Survey of Mayors: Closing the Racial Wealth Gap. Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Glick, David M., Katherine Levine Einstein, and Maxwell Palmer. 2021. 2021 Menino Survey of Mayors: Building Back Better. Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Glick, David M., Katherine Levine Einstein, Maxwell Palmer, Stacy Fox, Katharine Lusk, Nicholas Henninger, and Songhyun Park. 2021. 2020 Menino Survey of Mayors: Policing and Protests. Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Glick, David M., Katherine Levine Einstein, Maxwell Palmer, and Stacy Fox. 2020. 2020 Menino Survey of Mayors: COVID-19 Recovery and the Future of Cities. Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

de Benedictis-Kessner, Justin and Maxwell Palmer. 2020. Got Wheels? How Having Access to a Car Impacts Voting. *Democracy Docket*.

Palmer, Maxwell, Katherine Levine Einstein, and David Glick. 2020. Counting the City: Mayoral Views on the 2020 Census. Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, Maxwell Palmer, Stacy Fox, Marina Berardino, Noah

Fischer, Jackson Moore-Otto, Aislinn O'Brien, Marilyn Rutecki and Benjamin Wuesthoff. 2020. COVID-19 Housing Policy. Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, Maxwell Palmer, David Glick, and Stacy Fox. 2020. Mayoral Views on Cities' Legislators: How Representative are City Councils? Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Einstein, Katherine Levine and Maxwell Palmer. 2020. "Newton and other communities must reform housing approval process." *The Boston Globe*.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David Glick, Maxwell Palmer and Stacy Fox. 2020. "2019 Menino Survey of Mayors." Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Palmer, Maxwell, Katherine Levine Einstein, David Glick, and Stacy Fox. 2019. Mayoral Views on Housing Production: Do Planning Goals Match Reality? Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Wilson, Graham, David Glick, Katherine Levine Einstein, Maxwell Palmer, and Stacy Fox. 2019. Mayoral Views on Economic Incentives: Valuable Tools or a Bad Use of Resources?. Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David Glick, Maxwell Palmer and Stacy Fox. 2019. "2018 Menino Survey of Mayors." Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, Katharine Lusk, David Glick, Maxwell Palmer, Christiana McFarland, Leon Andrews, Aliza Wasserman, and Chelsea Jones. 2018. "Mayoral Views on Racism and Discrimination." National League of Cities and Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David Glick, and Maxwell Palmer. 2018. "As the Trump administration retreats on climate change, US cities are moving forward." The Conversation.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David M. Glick, Maxwell Palmer, and Robert Pressel. 2018. "Few big-city mayors see running for higher office as appealing." LSE United States Politics and Policy Blog.

Einstein, Katherine Levine, David Glick, and Maxwell Palmer. 2018. "2017 Menino Survey of Mayors." Research Report. Boston University Initiative on Cities.

Williamson, Ryan D., Michael Crespin, Maxwell Palmer, and Barry C. Edwards. 2017. "This is how to get rid of gerrymandered districts." *The Washington Post*,

Monkey Cage Blog.

Palmer, Maxwell and Benjamin Schneer. 2015. "How and why retired politicians get lucrative appointments on corporate boards. " *The Washington Post*, Monkey Cage Blog.

Current Projects

"Descended from Immigrants and Revolutionists: How Family Immigration History Shapes Legislative Behavior in Congress" (with James Feigenbaum and Benjamin Schneer).

"When are Mayors Polarized?" (with Katherine Levine Einstein and David M. Glick)

"The Gray Vote: How Older Home-Owning Voters Dominate Local Elections." (with Katherine Levine Einstein, Ellis Hamilton, and Ethan Singer).

"How Affordable Housing Can Exclude: The Political Economy of Subsidized Housing" (with Katherine Levine Einstein).

"Durable Majority Gerrymanders: Where Partisan Gerrymandering can Displace Democracy" (with Benjamin Schneer)

"Who Should Make Decisions? Public Perceptions of Democratic Inclusion in Housing Policy." (With Justin de Benedictis-Kessner and Katherine Levine Einstein).

"Renters in an Ownership Society: Property Rights, Voting Rights, and the Making of American Citizenship." Book Project. With Katherine Levine Einstein.

"Menino Survey of Mayors 2023." Co-principal investigator with David M. Glick and Katherine Levine Einstein.

Grants and Awards

The Boston Foundation Grant. "2022 Greater Boston Housing Report Card" (Co-principal investigator). 2022. $70,000.

The Rockefeller Foundation, "Menino Survey of Mayors" (Co-principal investigator). 2021. $355,000.

American Political Science Association, Heinz Eulau Award, for the best article published in *Perspectives on Politics* during the previous calendar year, for "Who Participates in Local Government? Evidence from Meeting Minutes." (with Katherine Levine Einstein and David M. Glick). 2020.

Boston University Initiative on Cities, COVID-19 Research to Action Seed Grant.

"How Are Cities Responding to the COVID-19 Housing Crisis?" 2020. $8,000.

The Rockefeller Foundation, "Menino Survey of Mayors" (Co-principal investigator). 2017. $325,000.

Hariri Institute for Computing, Boston University. Junior Faculty Fellow. 2017–2020. $10,000.

The Rockefeller Foundation, "2017 Menino Survey of Mayors" (Co-principal investigator). 2017. $100,000.

The Center for Finance, Law, and Policy, Boston University, Research Grant for "From the Capitol to the Boardroom: The Returns to Office from Corporate Board Directorships," 2015.

Senator Charles Sumner Prize, Dept. of Government, Harvard University. 2014.

Awarded to the best dissertation "from the legal, political, historical, economic, social or ethnic approach, dealing with means or measures tending toward the prevention of war and the establishment of universal peace."

The Center for American Political Studies, Dissertation Research Fellowship on the Study of the American Republic, 2013–2014.

The Tobin Project, Democracy and Markets Graduate Student Fellowship, 2013–2014.

The Dirksen Congressional Center, Congressional Research Award, 2013.

The Institute for Quantitative Social Science, Conference Travel Grant, 2014.

The Center for American Political Studies, Graduate Seed Grant for "Capitol Gains: The Returns to Elected Office from Corporate Board Directorships," 2014.

The Institute for Quantitative Social Science, Research Grant, 2013.

Bowdoin College: High Honors in Government and Legal Studies; Philo Sherman Bennett Prize for Best Honors Thesis in the Department of Government, 2008.

Selected Presentations

"How Affordable Housing Can Exclude: The Political Economy of Subsidized Housing." Political Economy of Housing Conference, University of Southern California, Sol Price School of Public Policy, 2024.

"A Partisan Solution to Partisan Gerrymandering: The Define-Combine Procedure." MIT Election Data and Science Lab, 2020.

"Who Represents the Renters?" Local Political Economy Conference, Washington, D.C., 2019.

"Housing and Climate Politics," Sustainable Urban Systems Conference, Boston University 2019.

"Redistricting and Gerrymandering," American Studies Summer Institute, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum, 2019.

"The Participatory Politics of Housing," Government Accountability Office Seminar, 2018.

"Descended from Immigrants and Revolutionists: How Immigrant Experience Shapes Immigration Votes in Congress," Congress and History Conference, Princeton University, 2018.

"Identifying Gerrymanders at the Micro- and Macro-Level." Hariri Institute for Computing, Boston University, 2018.

"How Institutions Enable NIMBYism and Obstruct Development," Boston Area Research Initiative Spring Conference, Northeastern University, 2017.

"Congressional Gridlock," American Studies Summer Institute, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum, 2016.

"Capitol Gains: The Returns to Elected Office from Corporate Board Directorships," Microeconomics Seminar, Department of Economics, Boston University, 2015.

"A Two Hundred-Year Statistical History of the Gerrymander," Congress and History Conference, Vanderbilt University, 2015.

"A New (Old) Standard for Geographic Gerrymandering," Harvard Ash Center Workshop: How Data is Helping Us Understand Voting Rights After Shelby County, 2015.

"Capitol Gains: The Returns to Elected Office from Corporate Board Directorships," Boston University Center for Finance, Law, and Policy, 2015.

"Capitol Gains: The Returns to Elected Office from Corporate Board Directorships," Bowdoin College, 2014.

American Political Science Association: 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2022
Midwestern Political Science Association: 2012, 2013, 2014, 2017, 2019, 2023

Southern Political Science Association: 2015, 2018
European Political Science Association: 2015

EXPERT TESTIMONY AND CONSULTING

Bethune-Hill v. Virginia (3:14-cv-00852-REP-AWA-BMK), U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. Prepared expert reports and testified on racial predominance and racially polarized voting in selected districts of the 2011 Virginia House of Delegates map. (2017)

Thomas v. Bryant (3:18-CV-441-CWR-FKB), U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi. Prepared expert reports and testified on racially polarized voting in a district of the 2012 Mississippi State Senate map. (2018–2019)

Chestnut v. Merrill (2:18-cv-00907-KOB), U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama. Prepared expert reports and testified on racially polarized voting in selected districts of the 2011 Alabama congressional district map. (2019)

Dwight v. Raffensperger (No. 1:18-cv-2869-RWS), U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. Prepared expert reports and testified on racially polarized voting in selected districts of the 2011 Georgia congressional district map. (2019)

Bruni, et al. v. Hughs (No. 5:20-cv-35), U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas. Prepared expert reports and testified on the use of straight-ticket voting by race and racially polarized voting in Texas. (2020)

Caster v. Merrill (No. 2:21-cv-1536-AMM), U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama. Prepared expert report and testified on racially polarized voting in selected districts of the 2021 Alabama congressional district map. (2022)

Pendergrass v. Raffensperger (1:21-CV-05339-SCJ), U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. Prepared expert reports and testified on racially polarized voting in selected districts of the 2021 Georgia congressional district map. (2022)

Grant v. Raffensperger (1:22-CV-00122-SCJ), U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. Prepared expert reports and testified on racially polarized voting in selected districts of the 2021 Georgia state legislative district maps. (2022)

Galmon, et al. v. Ardoin (3:22-cv-00214-SDD-SDJ), U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana. Prepared expert reports and testified on racially polarized voting for the 2021 Louisiana congressional district map. (2022)

United States v. Robert Bowers (2:18-cr-00292-DWA), U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. Prepared expert reports on the demographics

of the voter registriation list and composition of the master jury wheel. (2020–2023)

Agee, et al. v. Benson, et al. (1:22-CV-00272-PLM-RMK-JTN), U.S. District Court for the Western District of Michigan. Prepared expert report and testified on racially polarized voting and racial predominance in the Michigan House and Senate maps adopted by the Michigan Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission. (2023)

In Re: Georgia Senate Bill 202 (1:12-MI-55555-JPB), U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. Prepared expert report and testified on demographics and racially polarized vboting in Georgia. (2023)

Vet Voice Foundation, et al., v. Hobbs, et al. (No. 22-2-19384-1 SEA), King County Superior Court, Washington. Prepared expert reports and testified on ballots rejected for non-matching signatures in Washington. (2023)

Vet Voice Foundation, et al., v. Griswold (No. 2022CV033456), District Court, City and County of Denver, State of Colorado. Prepared expert reports and testified on ballots rejected for non-matching signatures in Colorado. (2023)

"Brief Of Political Science Professors As *Amici Curiae* In Support Of Appellees," in the case of *Alexander vs. South Carolina State Conference of the NAACP*, in the Supreme Court of the United States (No. 22-807). (with Stephen Ansolabehere, Bruce E. Cain, James M. Snyder, Jr., and Charles Stewart III)

Racially Polarized Voting Consultant, Virginia Redistricting Commission, August 2021.

The General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Joint Committee on Housing, Hearing on Housing Production Legislation. May 14, 2019. Testified on the role of public meetings in housing production.

Teaching

Boston University

- *Introduction to American Politics* (PO 111; Fall 2014, Fall 2015, Fall 2016, Fall 2017, Spring 2019, Fall 2019, Fall 2020)
- *Congress and Its Critics* (PO 302; Fall 2014, Spring 2015, Spring 2017, Spring 2019)
- *Voting Rights* (PO 336; Spring 2024)
- *Data Science for Politics* (PO 399; Spring 2020, Spring 2021, Fall 2021, Fall 2022, Fall 2023)
- *Formal Political Theory* (PO 501; Spring 2015, Spring 2017, Fall 2019, Fall 2020)

- *American Political Institutions in Transition* (PO 505; Spring 2021, Fall 2021)
- *Prohibition* (PO 540; Fall 2015, Fall 2022)
- *Political Analysis (Graduate Seminar)* (PO 840; Fall 2016, Fall 2017)
- *Graduate Research Workshop* (PO 903/4; Fall 2019, Spring 2020)
- *Spark! Civic Tech Research Design Workshop* (CDS DS 290; Spring 2023)
- *Spark! Civic Tech Toolkit Workshop* (CDS DS 292; Spring 2023)

Service

Boston University

- Research Computing Governance Committee, 2021–.
- Initiative on Cities Faculty Advisory Board, 2020–2022.
- Undergraduate Assessment Working Group, 2020-2021.
- College of Arts and Sciences
  - Ad Hoc Committee on the CAS BA-Level Curriculum, 2023.
  - CAS Conduct Liaison, 2023–.
  - Search Committee for the Faculty Director of the Initiative on Cities, 2020–2021.
  - General Education Curriculum Committee, 2017–2018.
- Department of Political Science
  - Associate Chair, 2023–.
  - Director of Advanced Programs (Honors & B.A./M.A.). 2020–2023.
  - Political Methodology Search Committee, 2021.
  - Delegate, Chair Selection Advisory Process, 2021.
  - Comprehensive Exam Committee, American Politics, 2019, 2023.
  - Comprehensive Exam Committee, Political Methodology, 2016, 2017, 2021, 2022.
  - American Politics Search Committee, 2017.
  - American Politics Search Committee, 2016.
  - Graduate Program Committee, 2014–2015, 2018–2019, 2020–2021.

Co-organizer, *Boston University Local Political Economy Conference*, August 29, 2018.

Editorial Board Member, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 2020–2023

Malcolm Jewell Best Graduate Student Paper Award Committee, Southern Political Science Association, 2019.

Reviewer: *American Journal of Political Science*; *American Political Science Review*; *Journal of Politics*; *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*; *Science*; *Political Analysis*; *Review of Economics and Statistics*; *Legislative Studies Quarterly*; *Public Choice*; *Political Science Research and Methods*; *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*; *Election Law Journal*; *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*; *Urban Affairs Review*; *Scientific Data*; *Applied Geography*; *PS: Political Science & Politics*; Cambridge University Press; Oxford University Press.

Elected Town Meeting Member, Town of Arlington, Mass., Precinct 2. April 2021–Present.

Arlington Election Reform Committee Member, August 2019–April 2022.

Coordinator, Harvard Election Data Archive, 2011–2014.

Other Experience

Charles River Associates, Boston, Massachusetts 2008–2010

Associate, Energy & Environment Practice

Economic consulting in the energy sector for electric and gas utilities, private equity, and electric generation owners. Specialized in Financial Modeling, Resource Planning, Regulatory Support, Price Forecasting, and Policy Analysis.

Updated March 13, 2024