

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
SPECIAL REDISTRICTING PANEL
A21-0243
A21-0546**

FILED

December 7, 2021

**OFFICE OF
APPELLATE COURTS**

Peter S. Wattson, Joseph Mansky, Nancy
B. Greenwood, Mary E. Kupper, Douglas
W. Backstrom, and James E. Hougas, III,
individually and on behalf of all citizens
and voting residents of Minnesota
similarly situated, and League of Women
Voters Minnesota,

Plaintiffs,

and

Paul Anderson, Ida Lano, Chuck Brusven,
Karen Lane, Joel Hineman, Carol
Wegner, and Daniel Schonhardt,

Plaintiff-Intervenors

vs.

Steve Simon, Secretary of State of
Minnesota; and Kendra Olson, Carver
County Elections and Licensing Manager,
individually and on behalf of all
Minnesota county chief election officers,

Defendants,

and

Frank Sachs, Dagny Heimisdottir,
Michael Arulfo, Tanwi Prigge, Jennifer
Guertin, Garrison O'Keith McMurtrey,
Mara Lee Glubka, Jeffrey Strand, Danielle
Main, and Wayne Grimmer,

Plaintiffs,

and

Dr. Bruce Corrie, Shelly Diaz, Alberder
Gillespie, Xiongpaoo Lee, Abdirazak
Mahboub, Aida Simon, Beatriz Winters,
Common Cause, OneMinnesota.org, and
Voices for Racial Justice,

Plaintiff-Intervenors,

vs.

Steve Simon, Secretary of State of
Minnesota,

Defendant.

**SACHS PLAINTIFFS’ MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
ADOPT PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE REDISTRICTING PLAN**

Pursuant to the scheduling order issued by the Special Redistricting Panel (the “Panel”) on October 26, 2021, Plaintiffs Frank Sachs, Dagny Heimisdottir, Michael Arulfo, Tanwi Prigge, Jennifer Guertin, Garrison O’Keith McMurtrey, Mara Lee Glubka, Jeffrey Strand, Danielle Main, and Wayne Grimmer (the “Sachs Plaintiffs”) hereby submit this memorandum in support of their motion to adopt their proposed legislative redistricting plan (the “Sachs legislative plan”).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
DESCRIPTION OF PLAN.....	1
APPLICATION OF REDISTRICTING PRINCIPLES	3
I. Equal Population.....	3
A. Senate Districts	4
B. House Districts.....	4
II. Minority Voting Rights.....	4
III. American Indian Reservations.....	10
IV. Convenience and Contiguity	12
V. Political Subdivisions.....	12
A. Greater Minnesota	14
B. Twin Cities Metropolitan Area	23
C. Twin Cities	30
1. Minneapolis.....	30
2. Saint Paul.....	32
VI. Communities of Interest	33
VII. Compactness	36
VIII. Effects on Incumbents, Candidates, and Political Parties	38
CONCLUSION	38

INTRODUCTION

Ten years ago, the special redistricting panel (the “*Hippert* panel”) drew a map that fairly divided Minnesota into 67 senate and 134 house districts that reflected both the changing demographics of the state and traditional redistricting principles. With the current map as a baseline, the Sachs Plaintiffs have drawn new districts that take into account the shifts in population and even greater shifts in demographics that have occurred over the past decade, in order to ensure fair and effective representation for all Minnesotans while also satisfying the Panel’s redistricting principles.

After providing a brief overview of the Sachs legislative plan and the considerations underlying it, the Sachs Plaintiffs describe below how their proposed map satisfies the redistricting principles adopted by the Panel. *See generally* Order Stating Preliminary Conclusions, Redistricting Principles, & Requirements for Plan Submissions (“Order”) (Nov. 18, 2021).

DESCRIPTION OF PLAN

The Sachs legislative plan satisfies the redistricting principles laid out by the Panel. Each district maintains less than a 1 percent population deviation; protects minority voting rights; consists of contiguous, convenient territory; preserves American Indian reservations; maintains other political subdivisions where possible; and protects communities of interest. In so doing, the Sachs legislative plan is guided by two fundamental considerations.

First, consistent with the current map, the Sachs legislative plan recognizes the distinct interests of urban versus rural communities. This consideration guides district lines

not only in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, but also around the population hubs in Greater Minnesota like Duluth, Moorhead, St. Cloud, Mankato, and Rochester. In these areas, rather than drawing districts that combine population centers with rural surrounding areas, districts are drawn to ensure that urban residents have representation separate from rural residents. These types of divisions were requested by residents across Minnesota, as discussed further below.

Second, the Sachs legislative plan was carefully crafted to recognize the continued demographic shifts in Minnesota. Over the past ten years, growth across the state has been driven almost entirely by minority communities; indeed, the white population has decreased while the Black, Asian, and Latinx populations have each grown by approximately 40 percent. Following the Hippert panel's legislative redistricting, minority representation increased in the Legislature: a decade ago, there were no American Indian or Asian members of Legislature, but now at least two American Indian and six Hmong members are serving in Saint Paul. But in total, only 25 members—12 percent—of the Legislature identify as members of minority groups, while the minority population of the state is now almost 25 percent. Accordingly, the Sachs legislative plan seeks to redress these imbalances by creating twelve majority-minority house and senate districts, and 53 districts, or about 25 percent of the total, where minority populations constitute at least 30 percent of the total population and thereby have the opportunity to influence the political process and ensure that their voices are heard.

Ultimately, the Sachs legislative plan complies with all of the principles adopted by the Panel to guide redistricting during the present cycle. The Sachs Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Panel adopt their new map for the Senate and House.

APPLICATION OF REDISTRICTING PRINCIPLES

The Sachs legislative plan complies with each of the eight legislative-focused principles adopted by the Panel. *See* Order 5–8.¹

I. Equal Population

State legislative districts must also adhere to the concept of population-based representation. *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 568 (1964); *see* U.S. Const. amend. XIV. Some deviation from perfect equality is permissible to accommodate a state’s clearly identified, legitimate policy objectives. *Reynolds*, 377 U.S. at 579. But a court performing the task of redistricting is held to a high standard of population equality. *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 414 (1977). Accordingly, the goal is de minimis deviation from the ideal district population. *Id.* The population of a legislative district must not deviate by more than two percent from the population of the ideal district. *Hippert [v. Ritchie]*, No. A11-0152 (Minn. Special Redistricting Panel Nov. 4, 2011) (Order Stating Redistricting Principles and Requirements for Plan Submissions); *Zachman [v. Kiffmeyer]*, No. C0-01-160 (Minn. Special Redistricting Panel Dec. 11, 2001) (Order Stating Redistricting Principles and Requirements for Plan Submissions). This is a maximum deviation, not a level under which all population deviations will be presumed acceptable.

¹ The Sachs legislative plan also reflects the Panel’s preliminary requirements: it was prepared using the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File for Minnesota and Maptitude for Redistricting, contains “a single senator for each state senate district[] and a single representative for each state house district,” and is numbered in the manner prescribed by the Panel. Order 2–5.

The Sachs legislative plan satisfies this principle. *See* Population Summary Report (Senate); Population Summary Report (House). “The total resident population of the State of Minnesota after the 2020 Census is 5,706,494 people.” Order 4. Minnesota has 67 senate districts and 134 house districts. Therefore, the ideal population of a senate district is 85,172 persons and the ideal population of a house district is 42,586 persons. *See id.*

A. Senate Districts

All senate districts in the Sachs legislative plan have deviations of less than 1 percent from the ideal population. The relative mean deviation is 0.42 percent. The least-populated senate district, Senate District 65, has a deviation of –0.97 percent (828 persons). The most-populated senate district, Senate District 60, has a deviation of +0.98 percent (832 persons). Only 16 districts exceed a 0.6 percent deviation.

B. House Districts

All house districts in the Sachs legislative plan also have deviations of less than 1 percent from the ideal population. The relative mean deviation is 0.56 percent. The least-populated house district, House District 65B, has a deviation of –0.99 percent (422 persons). The most-populated house district, House District 63B, has a deviation of +0.99 percent (422 persons).

II. Minority Voting Rights

Districts must not be drawn with either the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the voting rights of any United States citizen on account of race, ethnicity, or membership in a language minority group. U.S. Const. amends. XIV, XV; Voting Rights Act of 1965, 52 U.S.C. § 10301(a) (2018). Districts shall be drawn to protect the equal opportunity of racial, ethnic, and language minorities to participate in the

political process and elect candidates of their choice, whether alone or in alliance with others. 52 U.S.C. § 10301(b) (2018).

The Sachs legislative plan satisfies this principle. *See* Minority Voting Age Population Report (Senate); Minority Voting Age Population Report (House); District Statistics Report (Senate); District Statistics Report (House). It was not drawn with either the purpose or effect of denying or abridging minority voting rights and otherwise complies with the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Minnesota’s demographics have continued to change dramatically over the past decade. Indeed, the state’s white population decreased over the past ten years, while its minority populations have increased. *See, e.g.,* Written Public Comments in A21-0243 (“Written Comments”) 234–38 (testimony of S. Sen).² Yet Minnesota’s minority communities are still underrepresented in the Legislature in relation to their populations. According to the 2020 Census, Minnesota has a minority population of 23.7 percent. *See Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino by Race*, U.S. Census Bureau, https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?g=0400000US27_0USfalse&tid=DECENNIALPL2020.P2 (last visited Dec. 7, 2021).³

² For citations to the written comments submitted to the Panel, the Sachs Plaintiffs employ the page numbering of the 247-page PDF file, rather than individual comments’ internal paginations.

³ This data was generated by searching for the table “Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino by Race,” and filtering for Minnesota. The table includes demographic information from both the 2020 and 2010 Public Law 94-171 data.

Race	2020 Population	Percentage of Population	Change from 2010 to 2020 (Persons)	Change from 2010 to 2020 (Percentage)
Total	5,706,494	100%	+402,569	+7.6%
White Alone	4,353,880	76.3%	−51,262	−1.2%
Black or African American Alone	392,850	6.9%	+123,709	+46.0%
American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	57,046	1.0%	+1,625	+2.9%
Asian Alone	297,460	5.2%	+84,464	+39.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone	2,621	0.0%	+761	+40.9%
Some Other Race Alone	20,963	0.4%	+15,016	+252.5%
Two or More Races	236,034	4.1%	+132,874	+128.8%
Hispanic or Latino (Any Race)	345,640	6.1%	+95,382	+38.1%

Currently, 19 members of the House and six members of the Senate identify as members of minority communities. *See Self-Reported Minority Legislators*, Minn. Legis. Reference Libr., <https://www.lrl.mn.gov/legdb/minority?search=minority&q=all&gender=both&sess=92&body=both> (last visited Dec. 7, 2021). Allowing Minnesota’s minority communities to proportionally elect candidates of their choice to the Legislature would require that opportunity in 32 house and 16 senate districts.

The Sachs legislative plan attempts to redress these imbalances, to the degree possible, by preserving the core of districts that currently have minority representation and

ensuring that, to the extent districts must change, they give minority populations the opportunity to influence elections and elect more candidates of their choice.

Specifically, the Sachs legislative plan creates nine house districts that are majority-minority districts (House Districts 51A, 51B, 59A, 59B, 62B, 65A, 66B, 67A, and 67B) with respect to both total population and voting-age population. And to reflect the growing minority communities through the state, the Sachs legislative plan creates 15 more house districts in which minorities constitute at least 30 percent of the voting-age population and thus have sufficient population and voting strength to influence political decisions in a given district. *See Bartlett v. Strickland*, 556 U.S. 1, 13 (2009) (plurality op.). There are an additional 12 districts where minorities constitute at least 30 percent of the total population, meaning that over the next ten years, these districts will likely reach the 30 percent threshold for voting-age population as well.

House District	Minority Population	Minority Voting-Age Population
HD 2A	33.58%	28.07%
HD 14B	35.64%	28.55%
HD 34B	41.54%	35.03%
HD 35A	30.74%	25.53%
HD 37A	38.43%	32.10%
HD 37B	40.46%	34.44%
HD 38B	34.53%	29.13%
HD 39B	37.97%	31.23%
HD 41B	37.20%	30.41%
HD 44A	31.13%	26.56%
HD 45A	31.35%	26.70%

House District	Minority Population	Minority Voting-Age Population
HD 45B	36.18%	30.15%
HD 47A	30.71%	26.43%
HD 50B	34.52%	29.73%
HD 51A	67.94%	60.15%
HD 51B	59.22%	53.87%
HD 52B	36.07%	30.97%
HD 53A	39.74%	33.50%
HD 55A	36.91%	33.26%
HD 56B	31.40%	26.64%
HD 58A	35.95%	30.38%
HD 58B	41.52%	36.00%
HD 59A	69.26%	61.68%
HD 59B	59.54%	51.99%
HD 60A	31.15%	26.58%
HD 60B	41.43%	38.06%
HD 62A	47.08%	41.78%
HD 62B	64.52%	57.56%
HD 63A	35.76%	31.17%
HD 63B	30.34%	26.07%
HD 65A	69.86%	62.69%
HD 65B	41.25%	35.61%
HD 66A	30.76%	26.96%
HD 66B	66.25%	59.02%
HD 67A	72.79%	65.72%
HD 67B	67.13%	59.51%

The Sachs legislative plan also creates three senate districts that are majority-minority districts (Senate Districts 51, 59, and 67) with respect to voting-age population. And to reflect the growing minority communities throughout the state, the Sachs legislative plan creates six senate districts in which minorities constitute at least 30 percent of the voting population and thus have sufficient population and voting strength to influence political decisions in a given district. Two of these districts (Senate Districts 62 and 65) are majority-minority with respect to total population and, given population trends over the past ten years, are likely to become majority-minority with respect to voting-age population over the next ten years. There are an additional eight districts where minorities constitute more than 30 percent of the total population, and therefore also likely to reach the 30 percent threshold for voting-age population in the next ten years:

Senate District	Minority Population	Minority Voting-Age Population
SD 2	31.18%	25.62%
SD 14	31.55%	25.06%
SD 34	33.58%	27.77%
SD 37	39.45%	33.27%
SD 41	33.52%	27.82%
SD 44	30.47%	26.01%
SD 45	33.76%	28.48%
SD 51	63.59%	57.00%
SD 53	32.79%	27.50%
SD 58	38.72%	33.18%
SD 59	64.40%	56.55%
SD 60	36.29%	32.56%
SD 62	55.80%	49.06%

Senate District	Minority Population	Minority Voting-Age Population
SD 63	33.05%	28.67%
SD 65	55.56%	48.27%
SD 66	48.50%	41.77%
SD 67	69.96%	62.56%

In short, the Sachs legislative plan makes significant strides in improving the voting opportunities for Minnesota’s fast-growing minority communities, giving them the chance to ensure that their voices are heard in the Legislature.

III. American Indian Reservations

The reservation lands of a federally recognized American Indian tribe will be preserved and must not be divided more than necessary to meet constitutional requirements. *See Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.*, 572 U.S. 782, 788 (2014) (discussing sovereignty of recognized American Indian tribes). Placing discontinuous portions of reservation lands in separate districts does not constitute a division.

The Sachs legislative plan satisfies this principle. *See* Indian Reservation by District and by County Report (Senate); American Indian Tribal Reservations by District and by County Report (House). It ensures that the contiguous portions of each American Indian tribe are preserved.

Beginning in the northwest, the contiguous portion of the Red Lake Nation is entirely contained within House District 2A, along with the entire White Earth Nation. One member of the Red Lake Nation lives in off-reservation trust lands and is in House District 1A. The entirety of Leech Lake falls within House District 2B. Together, these three reservations give Senate District 2 a minority voting-age population greater than 20

percent, greatly increasing the voting power of the Native American communities in northwest Minnesota.

The main portion of the Bois Forte Band of Chippewa Reservation crosses the Koochiching/St. Louis County boundary and is kept whole in House District 3A. The Grand Portage Reservation in the northeastern tip of the state is also within House District 3A. A discontinuous portion of the Bois Forte Reservation in northern Itasca County falls within House District 5A.

The Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Reservation crosses the Carlton/St. Louis County border and is kept whole in House District 6B.

The main reservation lands of the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe falls within House District 11B. Some members of the Mille Lacs Band who live in noncontiguous trust lands fall within House Districts 5A, 5B, and 11A. In addition, some members who identify generally as Minnesota Chippewa live in noncontiguous trust lands throughout this region.

Both the Lower and Upper Sioux Communities are located entirely within House District 17A.

All of the Prairie Island Indian Community falls within House District 21A.

The Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community is contained in House District 55A, except 14 individuals who live in a noncontiguous area. These individuals are in House District 55B and thus still in the same senate district as the remainder of the community.

In short, by keeping all contiguous portions of American Indian reservation lands whole, the Sachs legislative plan satisfies this principle.

IV. Convenience and Contiguity

Districts must consist of convenient, contiguous territory. Minn. Const. art. IV, § 3; Minn. Stat. § 2.91, subd. 2 (2020). Contiguity by water is sufficient if the body of water does not pose a serious obstacle to travel within the district. Districts with areas that connect only at a single point will not be considered contiguous.

The Sachs legislative plan satisfies this principle. *See* Contiguity Report (Senate); Contiguity Report (House). All districts are contiguous, and all districts are conveniently structured.

Notably, the Sachs Plaintiffs' proposed Senate District 34 fixes an issue with current House District 36A, which spans both sides of the Mississippi River in an area where there are no bridge crossings, requiring an individual to pass out of the district in order to access the other half of the district. Proposed Senate District 34 includes a portion of the river that has a convenient bridge crossing, making the district traversable.

V. Political Subdivisions

Political subdivisions must not be divided more than necessary to meet constitutional requirements. Minn. Stat. § 2.91, subd. 2; *see also Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 740–41 (1983); *Reynolds*, 377 U.S. at 580–81.

The Sachs legislative plan satisfies this principle. *See* Political Subdivision Splits Between Districts Report (Senate); Plan Components (Short) Report (Senate); Political Subdivision Splits Between Districts Report (House); Plan Components (Short) Report (House). For the senate districts, the Sachs legislative plan keeps intact 54 of the state's 87 counties and 2,692 of the state's 2,741 cities and towns. Only ten cities or towns are split more than twice. With respect to house districts, the Sachs legislative plan keeps intact 37

of the state's 87 counties and 2,658 of the state's 2,741 cities and towns. Seventeen cities are split more than twice.

Before providing a brief overview of each proposed legislative district, including the major political subdivision splits and an explanation for why those decisions were made, the Sachs Plaintiffs begin with some overarching observations.

As the *Hippert* panel noted ten years ago, “[b]ecause respecting political subdivisions is a criterion subordinate to the constitutional mandate of substantial population equality, some subdivision splits are inevitable.” No. A11-152 (Minn. Special Redistricting Panel Feb. 21, 2012) (Final Order Adopting a Legislative Redistricting Plan at 15). Here, various factors contribute to split subdivisions across the state. In Greater Minnesota, the Sachs legislative plan endeavors to keep counties whole as much as possible. However, population losses have forced districts to become larger, pushing southern boundaries of northern districts further south (e.g., Senate District 1) and northern boundaries of southern districts north (e.g., Senate District 28), thus cutting across county lines.

For some regional population hubs, such as Moorhead and Mankato, the Sachs legislative plan generally adheres to the *Hippert* panel's strategy from ten years ago: create one house district with an urban core and a surrounding house district that encompasses the area around the regional hub. This approach ensures that a senate district will reflect the shared interests of the regional economy, while the house districts will protect the disparate interests of the city and its surrounding communities. For other regional population hubs, such as Duluth and St. Cloud, the core city is large enough to create its

own senate district. In those cases, the city is preserved within one senate district and the two corresponding house districts, while the surrounding areas—which have more distinctly rural interests—are placed in other districts. (Rochester, discussed further below, provides a unique case due to its continued growth; many people who work in Rochester live farther away from the city’s core, creating challenges in dividing urban and rural interests.)

In the Twin Cities metropolitan area, county lines are much less relevant, as many cities themselves cross county boundaries. The Sachs legislative plan strives to keep political subdivisions whole as much as possible, but unsurprisingly, densely packed cities must often be divided. Even faced with these difficulties, however, the Sachs legislative plan splits only ten cities more than twice between senate districts. Moreover, communities in the metro area often blur across city and county boundaries. In these cases, the Sachs legislative plan relies on the public testimony in drawing districts that keep similar cities and communities together.

A. Greater Minnesota

Starting in the northwest corner of the state, Senate District 1 contains the same six counties as it currently does: Kittson, Roseau, Marshall, Pennington, Red Lake, and Polk Counties. To account for population loss, the Sachs legislative plan also adds all of Lake of the Woods County and a portion of Norman County, which is split with Senate District 4. House Districts 1A and 1B also adhere to the current map, with the addition of Lake of the Woods County to 1A and part of Norman County to 1B, again to make up for population losses.

As discussed above, Senate District 2 has been drawn to keep the reservations of Red Lake, White Earth, and Leech Lake whole and to increase the voting power of those tribes in the Senate. House District 2A covers Clearwater and Mahnomen Counties and portions of Becker and Beltrami Counties, and also contains the entire Red Lake and White Earth Nations. House District 2B contains the rest of Beltrami County, which includes Bemidji, as well as the Leech Lake Reservation, which crosses the boundaries of Beltrami, Cass, Hubbard, and Itasca Counties.

Senate District 3 follows similar lines to the current map, with additions for population losses. It contains all of Cook, Koochiching, and Lake Counties, and part of St. Louis County. House District 3A covers the arrowhead east to Koochiching County and contains the Bois Forte and Grand Portage Reservation lands. House District 3B forms a ring district around Duluth, containing the rest of Lake County, part of St. Louis County, and Hermantown. See Written Comments 65 (testimony of Mayor and City Council of Hermantown); Duluth Public Hearing Transcript (“Duluth Tr.”) 24:16–26:22 (testimony of G. Hauschild).

Senate District 4 encompasses the Moorhead area. House District 4A covers most of Moorhead and Oakport Township, which Moorhead annexed in the past decade. House District 4B covers the area surrounding Moorhead, including the rest of Norman and Clay Counties as well as an arm of Becker County that encompasses Detroit Lakes, which is similar to the current map. Detroit Lakes is the first major city in the area traveling east from Moorhead and is connected to Moorhead by Highway 10, which is an important transportation corridor between the cities. See Moorhead Public Hearing Transcript

(“Moorhead Tr.”) 15:3–18:4 (testimony of P. Harris); *id.* at 18:9–21:6 (testimony of L. Wohlrabe).

Senate District 5 covers the rest of Aitkin, Cass, Itasca, and rural Crow Wing Counties, north of Brainerd. House District 5A is based in Grand Rapids, and 5B is based around the City of Aitkin.

Senate District 6 preserves the Iron Range cities and townships as well as the Fond Du Lac Reservation. The townships fall primarily in House District 6A, somewhat similar to the current map, but 6A is contained entirely within St. Louis County. The reservation falls into House District 6B; as noted above, 6B cuts across the St. Louis/Carlton County line to the south in order to keep the reservation whole.

Senate District 7 is the Duluth district. Like the current map, House District 7A covers the city and its northeastern suburbs—although, as noted, it carves out Hermantown—and 7B serves the core of the city and its southwestern suburbs.

Senate District 8 has been drawn to keep Otter Tail County together, per the request of the Otter Tail County Board of Commissioners. *See* Written Comments 34 (testimony of Otter Tail County Board of Commissioners). House District 8A contains part of Otter Tail County and part of Becker County, and 8B contains the rest of Otter Tail County and all of Grant, Traverse, and Wilkin Counties.

Senate District 9 serves Hubbard, Wadena, and Todd Counties, as well as portions of Cass County and rural northern Stearns County. *See id.* at 155 (testimony of A. Perish). House District 9A contains most of Hubbard County, all of Wadena County, and portions

of Staples in Todd County. House District 9B contains the rest of Todd County and part of Stearns County.

Senate District 10 serves Brainerd, plus Crow Wing and Morrison Counties. House District 10A is located entirely within Crow Wing County and contains Brainerd and the resort areas. House District 10B contains the rest of Crow Wing County, all of Morrison County (curing the split in the current map), and the other resort cities in Cass County like East Gull Lake.

Senate District 11 preserves Kanabec, Mille Lacs, and Pine Counties. House District 11A keeps Pine County whole, along with the southern portion of Carlton County and part of Kanabec County. House District 11B contains all of Mille Lacs County, including the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe, as well as the rest of Kanabec County and two townships and Braham City in Isanti County, for population reasons.

Senate District 12 is a large district in western Minnesota, which has had to expand further to make up for population losses. House District 12A contains Douglas County and most of Pope County. House District 12B contains the rest of Pope County, plus Big Stone County, Stevens County, Swift County, and most of Chippewa County. All of Granite Falls is kept whole in 12B. *See id.* at 239–40 (testimony of D. Smiglewski).

Moving into central Minnesota, Senate District 13 covers the portion of Stearns County surrounding St. Cloud. House District 13A covers Stearns County west of St. Cloud and 13B covers northern Stearns County and part of Benton County to encompass Sauk Rapids, similar to the current House District 13B.

Senate District 14 is the St. Cloud district. As in the current map, lines around St. Cloud are difficult to draw cleanly because the city has many noncontiguous portions. Three county corners (Benton, Sherburne, and Stearns) are contained in Senate District 14 in order to keep St. Cloud whole. Much like the current map, St. Cloud is split between two house districts because of population growth. House District 14A is fully contained in Stearns County and stretches west to cover Waite Park and St. Joseph Township. *See id.* at 20 (testimony of D. & D. Kasper). The proposed map keeps the St. Cloud State University campus together in House District 14B instead of splitting it between districts. *See id.* at 82 (testimony of J. Foster); *id.* at 93 (testimony of B. Mikkelsen); *id.* at 212–13 (testimony of M. Haider).

Senate District 15 contains the rest of Benton and Sherburne Counties, with Sherburne County split between House Districts 15A and 15B. House District 15B keeps the Wright County exurbs together, including Big Lake, Elk River, and Zimmerman. In addition, this proposed district cleans up the lines in this region and splits Sherburne County less than the current map.

Moving to the southwest, Senate District 16 starts just south of the Minnesota River and extends all the way to the southern border. House District 16A contains all of Lac qui Parle and Lincoln Counties, some of Yellow Medicine County, most of Lyon County, and half of Pipestone and Murray Counties, as well as Marshall. House District 16B contains the rest of Pipestone and Murray Counties, all of Rock County, and a portion of Nobles County, with an arm reaching to Worthington for population reasons. (This is similar to

the arm described above in proposed House District 4B that stretches from Clay County into Becker County, to pull in Detroit Lakes.)

Senate District 17 contains more of the counties along the Minnesota River. House District 17A contains the remainder of Yellow Medicine and Lyon Counties, part of Chippewa County, and all of Redwood and Renville Counties, and includes both the Upper and Lower Sioux Communities. House District 17B contains most of Kandiyohi County, including Willmar. Kandiyohi County is slightly too large for one house district, and thus a portion is in House District 17A.

Senate District 18 centers on Hutchinson. The city is split between House Districts 18A and 18B, similar to the current map. The rest of House District 18A contains all of Meeker County, the western portion of Wright County, and part of McLeod County, also similar to the current map. House District 18B contains the rest of McLeod County and all of Sibley County.

Like its current counterpart, proposed Senate District 19 contains all of Nicollet County and portions of Blue Earth and LeSueur Counties, in order to preserve Mankato in one senate district. While Mankato does not fit into its own house district, it is split into two districts—similar to the current map—with House District 19B encompassing the core of the city within Blue Earth County and 19A encompassing the northern portion of the city in Blue Earth and LeSueur Counties and the rest of Nicollet County.

Senate District 20 includes portions of Rice and Dakota Counties and one township in Le Sueur County. House District 20A encompasses Northfield—including the Carleton College and St. Olaf College campuses—and stretches west to the border of Rice County,

including Lanesburgh Township and New Prague in Le Sueur County. House District 20B encompasses Farmington and Vermillion in Dakota County.

Senate District 21 is situated along the Mississippi River. House District 21A contains most of Goodhue County and Red Wing, part of Dakota County, as well as the Prairie Island Indian Community. House District 21B follows the river south and then stretches west to cover the remainder of Goodhue County, and portions of Dodge, Wabasha, and Winona Counties. Like current House District 21B, it is an elongated district, but that is due to the configuration of Rochester's districts to the south.

Moving back west, Senate District 22 stretches along the southern border and north to the Minnesota River, keeping whole Brown, Cottonwood, Jackson, Martin, and Watonwan Counties. House District 22A contains Cottonwood County, Jackson County, part of Martin County, the rural part of Nobles County. House District 22B contains Brown County along the river, including New Ulm, as well as Watonwan County, part of Blue Earth County, and four townships in Martin County for population.

Senate District 23 covers all of Faribault and Waseca Counties and the remainder of Blue Earth County outside Mankato, as well as small portions of Rice and Steele Counties. The City of Waseca is split between house districts, with the western half of the city contained in House District 23A along with Blue Earth and Faribault Counties, and the eastern half in 23B, which also contains Owatonna. (The top of House District 23B is carved out in order to keep Faribault whole in 24B.)

Senate District 24 covers the rural portion of Scott County, plus Le Sueur County. House District 24A is similar to the current House District 20B and keeps together Belle

Plaine, Elko New Market, Jordan, and New Prague. As noted, proposed House District 24B contains Faribault and stretches west into Le Sueur County.

Senate Districts 25 and 26 surround and encompass Rochester, which is still expanding rapidly. Ten years ago, the *Hippert* panel split the city into two senate districts, with two inner house districts encompassing the core of the city. The Sachs legislative plan adjusts the proposed map to split Rochester into three house districts, which allows more voters in Rochester’s suburban areas to vote with the city residents. This reflects the fact that many people who work in Rochester, including substantial minority populations, now live outside of it due in part to a lack of affordable housing in the city.⁴ *See* Rochester Public Hearing Transcript (“Rochester Tr.”) 46:1–47:15 (testimony of A.M. Adan); *id.* at 48:15–50:22 (testimony of M.L. Alvarez); *see also* Written Comments 85 (testimony of Hispanic Advocacy and Community Empowerment through Research), *id.* at 206 (testimony of M.L. Alvarez). Redrawing Rochester’s districts similarly to how they are currently enacted would split off what are essentially bedroom communities from the city, pairing them with more rural interests to the south. The Sachs Plaintiffs thus propose Senate District 25, which is the more urban district, encompassing the western portion of Rochester and stretching far enough south to include these commuter communities. House

⁴ The competitiveness of the Rochester housing market and the need for more affordable housing opportunities in the region have been reported in the media. *See, e.g.,* Isaac Johns, *Seller Holding All the Cards in Rochester’s ‘Absolutely Crazy’ Housing Market*, Med City Beat (Feb. 12, 2021), <https://www.medcitybeat.com/podcast/2021/state-of-the-rochester-housing-market>; Miguel Octavio, *Study: 18,000 New Housing Units Needed in Olmsted County by 2030*, KAAL (Oct. 12, 2020), <https://www.kaaltv.com/rochester-minnesota-news/affordable-housing-need-olmsted-county/5892972/>.

Districts 25A and 25B are split north and south. Senate District 26 encompasses more of the surrounding rural communities. House District 26A captures the northeastern portion of the city and stretches north to the Olmsted County line. House District 26B captures the western portion of the city and includes the rest of Olmsted County, as well as four townships in Wabasha County for population. The Sachs Plaintiffs assert that this type of split better accounts for the growing population center and preserves the different interests of the urban versus rural communities around Rochester. *See* Rochester Tr. 43:9–45:9 (testimony of K. Swenson); *id.* at 46:1–47:15 (testimony of A.M. Adan).

Senate District 27 follows county lines as much as possible. House District 27A contains all of Freeborn County, plus small portions of Steele and Dodge Counties. House District 27B contains all of Mower County, plus two townships in Dodge County that are already part of the district in the current map. This configuration keeps the Latinx communities of Austin and Albert Lea together in one senate district. *See* Written Comments 120–21 (testimony of J. Fransico).

Senate District 28 covers the southeastern corner of the state. House District 28A is a river district that keeps all of Winona County together, as well as La Crescent and La Crescent Township, both of which cross the Houston/Winona County border. *See* Rochester Tr. 12:12–16:1 (testimony of T. O’Donnell-Ebner). House District 28B covers the rest of Houston County and all of Fillmore County, similar to the current House District 28B, and also adds some Winona County townships in order to achieve its needed population.

B. Twin Cities Metropolitan Area

Moving back toward the center of the State, Senate District 29 is contained within Wright County and follows the Wright/Hennepin County border. Similar to the current map, House District 29B is the compact inner-district that contains the more populated cities of Buffalo and Monticello. House District 29A wraps around 29B, preserving more suburban and rural communities of interest.

Senate District 30 crosses the Wright/Hennepin/Sherburne County borders. This keeps Dayton whole within the senate district, although it is split between House Districts 30A and 30B. House District 30A keeps whole the cities of Hanover and Rogers, as well as Albertville and Saint Michael. House District 30B contains the rest of Dayton and Otsego and part of Elk River.

Senate District 31 is primarily contained in Anoka County and, in contrast to the current map, avoids drawing in southern Isanti County. House District 31A contains all of Bethel, East Bethel, Oak Grove, Saint Francis, and Wyoming (in Chisago County), plus Linwood Township. House District 31B contains all of Columbus and Ham Lake, as well as part of Andover.

Senate District 32 is based in Chisago and Isanti Counties. House District 32A contains 14 Isanti County and three Chisago County subdivisions. House District 32B is wholly contained within Chisago County and centers on Lindstrom in the south and Rush City in the north. This configuration keeps more rural Kanabec County whole in Senate District 11 to the north.

Senate District 33 is primarily an Anoka/Hennepin County district. House District 33A contains Nowthen, part of Andover, and part of the City of Ramsey. The remainder of Ramsey is in House District 33B, along with the City of Anoka and most of Champlin.

Senate District 34 now encompasses all of Coon Rapids and part of Brooklyn Park. There was significant public testimony in favor of keeping Coon Rapids whole and in a separate district from Champlin, across the river. *See* Zoom Public Hearing Tr. 19:18–22:25 (testimony of B. Ortler); *id.* at 23:7–25:22 (testimony of C. Kurdziel); *id.* at 26:2–30:16 (testimony of C. Geisler). House District 34A is entirely within Coon Rapids, while 34B contains the remainder of Coon Rapids and part of Brooklyn Park. This configuration cures an issue in current House District 36A, which spans both sides of the Mississippi River in an area where there are no bridge crossings. *See id.* at 28:18–29:19 (testimony of C. Geisler).

Senate District 35 contains Blaine and Spring Lake Park, both of which cross the Anoka/Ramsey County border. House District 35A contains much of Blaine and all of Spring Lake Park—which is no longer split between districts—plus one Shoreview precinct with zero population. House District 35B contains the rest of Blaine, as well as Circle Pines and Lexington.

Senate District 36 crosses several county lines in the north metro area but keeps many cities whole. House District 36A contains Centerville, Lino Lakes, Hugo, and part of Forest Lake. House District 36B runs along the Wisconsin border, beginning just north of Stillwater and encompassing Dellwood, Grant, Mahtomedi, and the remainder of Forest Lake.

Senate District 37 is an inner-ring suburban district, containing Columbia Heights, Fridley, New Brighton, and St. Anthony. Both house districts present strong opportunities for minority representation: House District 37A has a minority voting-age population of approximately 32 percent and 37B has a minority voting-age population of 34 percent. Both districts have total minority populations of 40 percent.

Senate District 38 covers the area around Highway 96. House District 38A contains all of Arden Hills, Mounds View, and part of Shoreview. House District 38B contains the rest of Shoreview, part of Roseville, all of Little Canada, and part of Maplewood.

Senate District 39 covers the area east of Senate District 38, and uses the northeast corner of Ramsey County as the border. House District 39A covers all of Gem Lake, North Oaks, White Bear Township, Birchwood Village, and part of White Bear Lake and Vadnais Heights. Senate District 39B covers the rest of White Bear Lake, Vadnais Heights, Maplewood, and a few North Saint Paul precincts.

Senate District 40 lies within Washington County along the Wisconsin border. Stillwater is kept whole in House District 40A—as requested by numerous members of the public, *see* Written Comments 7 (testimony of S. Riley); *id.* at 32 (testimony of S. Larson); *id.* at 36 (testimony of N. McLean)—and the district also includes Bayport, Lake Elmo, Oak Park Heights, Pine Springs, and a few Woodbury precincts. House District 40B continues south along the border and reaches west into Woodbury for population.

Senate District 41 lies within Washington County and includes all of Oakdale and Landfall Township, approximately one-half of Woodbury, and portions of North Saint Paul. Oakdale is split between House District 41A, which covers the southern half of the

senate district and includes portions of Woodbury and Landfall Township, and House District 41B, which also includes portions of Maplewood and North Saint Paul.

Senate District 42 is located in Dakota and Washington Counties and follows the Mississippi River from South St. Paul to Hastings. The senate district includes portions of South St. Paul and Woodbury and all of Cottage Grove, Hastings, and several other townships. House District 42A includes the eastern portion of the senate District, encompassing all of Hastings and Denmark Township and portions of Cottage Grove and Woodbury. House District 42B covers the remainder of Cottage Grove and other political subdivisions along the river, including a portion of South St. Paul for population.

Senate District 43 follows the arc of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers in northern Dakota County from Eagan to Inver Grove Heights. It includes the entirety of Inver Grove Heights, Lilydale, Mendota, Mendota Heights, Sunfish Lake, and West St. Paul, together with a section of Eagan for population. House Districts 43A and 43B are divided by a line that extends east-to-west along the northern border of Inver Grove Heights and divides Mendota Heights in half.

Senate District 44 includes portions of Hennepin and Dakota Counties, encompassing the portions of Bloomington, Burnsville, and Eagan that share the Minnesota River corridor from Highway 169 to Interstate 494. *See* Woodbury Public Hearing Transcript (“Woodbury Tr.”) 15:8–16:21 (testimony of J. Johnson); Minneapolis Public Hearing Transcript (“Minneapolis Tr.”) 20:9–21:19 (testimony of M. Collins); Saint Paul Public Hearing Transcript (“Saint Paul Tr.”) 19:9–22:13 (testimony of J. Blerlein).

The Minnesota River divides the house districts, with Bloomington included in northern House District 44A and portions of Burnsville and Eagan included in southern 44B.

Senate District 45 crosses the Dakota/Scott County line to include much of Burnsville and Savage in a single senate district. House District 45A includes portions of Burnsville and all of Savage. House District 45B consists entirely of portions of Burnsville.

Senate District 46 falls entirely within Dakota County and includes Rosemount, portions of Apple Valley and Eagan, and a small section of Burnsville that is part of the Apple Valley-Eagan-Rosemount school district. House District 46A includes all of Rosemount and an adjoining portion of Eagan, while House District 46B extends west across Apple Valley, Eagan, and the small portion of Burnsville.

Senate District 47 is located entirely in Dakota County and includes the southern portion of Apple Valley and all but the southeastern corner of Lakeville. House District 47A encompasses the northern portion of the senate district and is split between Apple Valley and Lakeville. House District 47B is exclusively a Lakeville district.

Senate District 48 crosses the Hennepin/Carver County border, covering many of the western suburbs in the area. House District 48A is entirely located within Hennepin County and keeps ten cities intact. House District 48B crosses the border into Carver County and contains the lake cities of Long Lake, Minnetonka Beach, Orono, Shorewood, Spring Park, Tonka Bay, and most of Chanhassen.

Senate District 49 is contained within Carver County. House District 49A is the inner-ring district, containing the rest of Chanhassen and all of Chaska and Victoria. House

District 49B is the outer-ring district, tracking county lines on the north, west, and south and containing 18 cities in western Carver County.

Senate District 50 is a Hennepin County district containing the western suburbs. House District 50A contains all of Deephaven, Excelsior, Greenwood, Wayzata, Woodland, and some of Minnetonka. Part of Eden Prairie is in House District 50A and the rest is in 50B, which is exclusively an Eden Prairie district.

Senate District 51 is primarily a Brooklyn Park and Brooklyn Center District. This is a majority-minority senate district with a minority voting-age population of 57 percent. House District 51A contains all of Brooklyn Center and part of Brooklyn Park, while House District 51B includes Brooklyn Park and a few Champlin precincts. Both of these districts are majority-minority voting districts: House District 51A has a minority voting-age population of 60 percent and 51B has a minority voting-age population of 54 percent.

Senate District 52 contains all of Maple Grove and Osseo, as well as a portion of Brooklyn Park, using the I-694 corridor to connect this portion of Brooklyn Park to Maple Grove. House District 52A is made up of the western and northern portions of Maple Grove. House District 52B covers the remainder of Maple Grove, all of Osseo, and part of Brooklyn Park. House District 52B is another minority opportunity district, with a minority voting-age population above 30 percent. Notably, keeping Osseo intact preserves the Latinx population in that city. *See* Waite Park Public Hearing Transcript (“Waite Park Tr.”) 10:3–11:24 (testimony of B. Sanchez).

Senate District 53 contains the rest of Brooklyn Park and all of Crystal, New Hope, Golden Valley, and Robbinsdale. House District 53A contains all of New Hope and a

portion of Crystal and presents another opportunity for minority representation: the district has a minority voting-age population of more than 33 percent and a total minority population of almost 40 percent. House District 53B contains the rest of Crystal, plus all of Robbinsdale and Golden Valley.

Senate District 54 centers on Plymouth. House District 54A is exclusively within Plymouth, while 54B contains the rest of Plymouth, Medicine Lake, and a small portion of Minnetonka.

Senate District 55 is a Scott County district, containing Shakopee, Prior Lake, and several townships. House District 55A covers most of Shakopee and includes the entire Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Nation. *See* Shakopee Public Hearing Tr. 44:11–21 (testimony of M. Valdecantos). House District 55B contains the rest of Shakopee, all of Prior Lake except the portion that constitutes the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Nation, and some townships in the region.

Senate District 56 contains the rest of Minnetonka, all of Hopkins, and some of St. Louis Park. House District 56A is the ring district, with the less densely populated Minnetonka precincts and one St. Louis Park precinct. House District 56B is the core district with the more densely packed Hopkins and the northern portion of St. Louis Park.

Senate District 57 contains the rest of St. Louis Park, all of Edina, and a portion of Bloomington west of Highland Park, which creates a natural dividing line. House District 57A includes St. Louis Park and northern Edina, while House District 57B covers southern Edina and the portion of Bloomington.

Senate District 58 is a Bloomington/Richfield district. House District 58A consists exclusively of central Bloomington. House District 58B contains all of Richfield and a portion of Bloomington. Both districts have minority voting-age populations above 30 percent.

C. Twin Cities

1. Minneapolis

Senate Districts 59 through 63 are all Minneapolis districts. Together, these districts manage to keep all Minneapolis residents together in five senate and ten house districts, rather than combining Minneapolis with surrounding cities. The Minneapolis lines were drawn with an eye to both the current district lines and the city's ward system. *See Minneapolis Tr. 31:14–32:7* (testimony of D. Brady).

Senate District 59 covers North Minneapolis and most of downtown. This is a majority-minority senate district, with a minority voting-age population of 56 percent. House District 59A, which covers the area west of the river, includes all of the current Ward 4 and has a minority voting-age population greater than 60 percent, including a Black voting-age population of 33 percent. House District 59B covers the Warehouse District and most of downtown. It has a minority voting-age population greater than 50 percent, including a Black voting-age population of 30 percent.

Senate District 60 covers Northeast Minneapolis and the University of Minnesota campus. House District 60A is nearly identical to the current 60A. House District 60B covers most of the University of Minnesota campus (the remainder is in 60A) and the shopping and residential areas just north of the river. The Cedar-Riverside community, on

the west bank of the river, is also contained within this district. *See* Minneapolis Tr. 22:1–24:17 (testimony of W. Dirie). House District 60B has a minority voting-age population of almost 40 percent.

Senate District 61 covers the Chain of Lakes and Southwest Minneapolis, similar to the current district. House District 61A is the northern house district covering the Lakes, while 61B is the southern house district, using Highway 62 as its southern border and following current precinct lines where possible on the eastern border. As noted, this district is drawn to avoid crossing into (and thus splitting) Edina.

Senate District 62 covers the eastern part of downtown, including U.S. Bank Stadium, and South Minneapolis east of the Lakes. House District 62A covers downtown and the area just south of downtown, with Highway 35W and Hiawatha forming the eastern boundary of this district. House District 62A has a minority voting-age population above 40 percent. House District 62B is directly south, using Hiawatha as an eastern border and following current precinct lines as much as possible. House District 62B is also a majority-minority district, with a minority voting-age population greater than 55 percent.

Senate District 63 serves eastern and southeastern Minneapolis. House District 63A follows somewhat similar lines to the current map, although it does not stretch as far west into the city. House District 63B covers the southeast corner of the city, including Lake Hiawatha and Lake Nokomis. This configuration avoids including any part of Richfield, leaving the entire district for Minneapolis residents.

2. Saint Paul

Senate Districts 64 through 67 primarily serve Saint Paul. Senate Districts 64, 65, and 67 and House District 66B are entirely within Saint Paul. House District 66A also includes part of Roseville and all of Falcon Heights and Lauderdale, similar to the current map.

Senate District 64 serves western Saint Paul and includes the campuses of the University of St. Thomas, Macalester College, and St. Catherine University. House District 64A covers most of Ward 4, spanning both sides of I-94. House District 64B covers most of Ward 3 in the southwest corner.

Senate District 65 serves the heart of Saint Paul and the State Capitol. House District 65A uses Lexington Avenue as the western border and contains all of the old Rondo Neighborhood. It then stretches east to include the State Capitol and part of downtown. House District 65A has a minority voting-age population above 70 percent. House District 65B includes the rest of downtown and the area west along the river. It has a minority voting-age population of 35 percent.

Senate District 66 serves the northern half of Saint Paul and the suburbs of Falcon Heights, Lauderdale, and part of Roseville. The suburbs fall in House District 66A. House District 66B maintains the Saint Paul border to the north and stretches from Snelling Avenue in the west to Lake Phalen in the east. House District 66B has a minority voting-age population of almost 60 percent, including an Asian voting-age population of almost 30 percent. This district keeps together the substantial Hmong community in Saint Paul. *See Saint Paul Tr. 9:5–13:7 (testimony of T. Thao).*

Lastly, Senate District 67 covers most of Wards 6 and 7 in eastern Saint Paul. Following the lines of the current map, House District 67A covers the north and 67B the south, skirting the St. Paul Downtown Airport to the west and following the Maplewood city line to the east.

VI. Communities of Interest

Communities of people with shared interests will be preserved whenever possible to do so in compliance with the preceding principles. *See Ala. Legis. Black Caucus v. Alabama*, 575 U.S. 254, 272 (2015) (describing respect for “communities defined by actual shared interests” as a traditional redistricting principle (quotation omitted)); *see also Hippert*, No. A11-0152 (Minn. Special Redistricting Panel Nov. 4, 2011) (Order Stating Redistricting Principles and Requirements for Plan Submissions); *Zachman*, No. C0-01-160 (Minn. Special Redistricting Panel Dec. 11, 2001) (Order Stating Redistricting Principles and Requirements for Plan Submissions). For purposes of this principle, “communities of interest” include, but are not limited to, groups of Minnesotans with clearly recognizable similarities of social, geographic, cultural, ethnic, economic, occupational, trade, transportation, or other interests. Additional communities of interest will be considered if persuasively established and if consideration thereof would not violate the preceding principles or applicable law.

The Sachs legislative plan satisfies this principle. In complying with the redistricting principles discussed above, the Sachs Plaintiffs drew legislative districts that make sense in light of the state’s natural communities formed by shared social, geographic, cultural, ethnic, economic, and other interests. As discussed in the preceding section, much of the public testimony was focused on keeping certain political subdivisions whole or curing certain pairings on the current map that no longer make sense.

In order to further illustrate the reasons for some of the boundaries on the proposed map, the Sachs Plaintiffs have prepared reports to highlight a few regions where communities of interest were factored into the district borders. *See* Communities of Interest by District and by County Report (House); Communities of Interest Report by Census Block (House).

First, the reports identify the student population of St. Cloud State University. Several individuals testified that all of the St. Cloud State University campus and student population should be kept together in a single house district. *See, e.g.*, Written Comments 212–13 (testimony of M. Haider). The Sachs legislative plan unites the St. Cloud State University student population in House District 14B.

Second, the reports identify the Latinx populations in southwest Minnesota, specifically in Worthington, Austin, and Albert Lea. At least one public comment encouraged the Panel to ensure that the Latinx communities in each of these cities were kept together. *See id.* at 120–21 (testimony of J. Fransico). The Sachs legislative plan preserves Worthington’s Latinx community in House District 16B, while the communities in Albert Lea and Austin are joined together in Senate District 27 and each kept whole in House Districts 27A and 27B, respectively. The proposed districts will help ensure that these minority communities have a voice in the political process in southwest Minnesota.

In addition to these communities of interest illustrated in reports, the Sachs legislative plan reflects communities that were identified through other means. As discussed above, for example, the Sachs Plaintiffs drew Senate District 2 in order to keep Native American populations together. During the public hearings, there was significant

and meaningful testimony about the importance of empowering these communities. *See* Waite Park Tr. 12:12–14:4 (testimony of D. Moen); Woodbury Tr. 14:7–22 (testimony of J. Willette). Accordingly, the Sachs legislative plan ensures not only that each individual community is kept whole, but also that the collective voice of these communities will be heard in the Legislature.

Finally, throughout the state, the Sachs legislative plan ensures that other communities of interest are maintained where possible, consistent with the preceding principles. This includes creating majority-minority and influence districts in areas such as Brooklyn Center, Columbia Heights, North Minneapolis, and Saint Paul. This was done in accordance with the Panel’s principle relating to minority representation and numerous public comments requesting that BIPOC communities be respected throughout the state. *See, e.g.,* Written Comments 202–04 (testimony of M. Yang). In addition, the Sachs legislative plan preserves more broadly defined communities of interest by maintaining the distinction between predominantly urban and rural areas in Greater Minnesota, in order to recognize the unique interests of these communities. These communities can be defined by political subdivision boundaries or by examining the minority statistics in each district, as discussed above.

The Sachs Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Panel take all of these communities into account when drawing its legislative map.

VII. Compactness

As a factor subordinate to all other redistricting principles, districts should be reasonably compact. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 916 (1995); *Brown v. Thomson*, 462 U.S. 835, 842 (1983).

The Sachs legislative plan satisfies this principle. *See* Measures of Compactness Report (Senate); Measures of Compactness Report (House).

As requested by the Panel, *see* Order 11, the Sachs Plaintiffs have provided the Panel with five different measures of compactness: Polsby-Popper, Area/Convex Hull, Reock, Population Polygon, and Population Circle. Each of these five measures is a mathematical ratio. The Polsby-Popper test compares a district's area with the area of a circle sharing the same perimeter. The Area/Convex Hull test measures the ratio of a district's area to the area of the minimum convex shape that completely contains the district. The Reock test computes the ratio of the area of the district to the minimum area of a circle sufficiently large to encompass the district (considering the circle to be the most compact shape possible). The Population Polygon test computes the ratio of a district's population to the population of the minimum convex polygon that completely contains the district. And the Population Circle test computes the ratio of a district's population to the approximate population of the minimum enclosing circle of the district. The numerical result of each test falls between zero and one, with one being the most compact.

With respect to the mean ratings of the measures of compactness used by both the *Hippert* panel and this Panel, the Sachs legislative plan matches or nearly matches the compactness of the *Hippert* panel's legislative map. *See* No. A11-152 (Minn. Special

Redistricting Panel Feb. 21, 2012) (Final Order Adopting a Legislative Plan, Appendix D).⁵

Test	<i>Hippert</i> Senate Plan	Sachs Senate Plan	<i>Hippert</i> House Plan	Sachs House Plan
Polsby-Popper	0.41	0.37	0.42	0.39
Reock	0.45	0.43	0.44	0.43
Population Polygon	0.77	0.76	0.75	0.75
Population Circle	0.48	0.44	0.45	0.44

This favorable comparison is particularly striking because the *Hippert* panel placed great weight on compactness, considering it alongside the statutory and constitutional mandates of convenience and contiguity. *See* No. A11-152 (Minn. Special Redistricting Panel Feb. 21, 2012) (Final Order Adopting a Legislative Redistricting Plan at 14). This Panel, by contrast, has designated compactness as “a factor subordinate to all other redistricting principles.” Order 7.

Moreover, the Sachs legislative plan achieves this level of compactness notwithstanding the need to draw larger districts in rural areas where populations are declining, address rapidly growing populations in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, and balance multiple other redistricting principles. This provides significant evidence that the Sachs legislative plan was fairly crafted to ensure effective representation for all Minnesotans.

⁵ The *Hippert* panel did not report the Area/Convex Hull rating for its legislative plan.

VIII. Effects on Incumbents, Candidates, and Political Parties

Districts must not be drawn with the purpose of protecting, promoting, or defeating any incumbent, candidate, or political party. The panel will not draw districts based on the residence of incumbent officeholders and will not consider past election results when drawing districts.

The Sachs legislative plan satisfies this principle. It was drawn to comply with the neutral redistricting principles adopted by the Panel: population equality; protection of minority voting rights; preservation of American Indian reservations and political subdivisions; creation of convenient, contiguous districts; preservation of communities of interest; and compactness. That the Sachs legislative plan satisfies each of the Panel's other principles demonstrates that it was not drawn with the purpose of protecting, promoting, or defeating any incumbent, candidate, or political party.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Sachs Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Panel adopt their proposed legislative redistricting plan.

Dated: December 7, 2021

Marc E. Elias*
Jyoti Jasrasaria*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
10 G Street NE, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 968-4490
MElias@elias.law
JJasrasaria@elias.law

Abha Khanna*
Ben Stafford*
Jonathan P. Hawley*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2100
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 656-0177
AKhanna@elias.law
BStafford@elias.law
JHawley@elias.law

*Admitted pro hac vice

Respectfully submitted,

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P.

s/Charles N. Nauen

Charles N. Nauen (#121216)
David J. Zoll (#0330681)
Kristen G. Marttila (#346007)
Rachel A. Kitze Collins (#0396555)
100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 2200
Minneapolis, MN 55401-2159
(612) 339-6900
cnnauen@locklaw.com
djzoll@locklaw.com
kgmarttila@locklaw.com
rakitzecollins@locklaw.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS FRANK SACHS; DAGNY HEIMISDOTTIR;
MICHAEL ARULFO; TANWI PRIGGE; JENNIFER GUERTIN;
GARRISON O'KEITH MCMURTREY; MARA LEE GLUBKA; JEFFREY STRAND;
DANIELLE MAIN; AND WAYNE GRIMMER**