TO: Citizens Redistricting Commission

FROM: Karin Mac Donald

DATE: July 12, 2011

RE: Deferral and Numbering System for Districts

Determining Deferral

Deferral is a Senate specific issue that occurs when people scheduled to vote in 2012 are shifted to a district that does not vote until 2014. This will occur to people shifted from odd-numbered districts to even-numbered districts.

Step I:

The following process outlines how the number of people deferred will be statistically minimized:

1. Q2 will develop an overlap report that compares the current Senate districts to the proposed Senate districts.

2. The number of people that will move from a current, odd-numbered district will be calculated for each proposed Senate district.

3. The 20 proposed Senate districts with the most people currently in an odd-numbered district will be assigned to the "odd number pool" of districts. The remaining 20 districts will be assigned to the "even number pool" of districts.

Please note that there is a possibility that none of the districts on the Oregon border may be assigned the number 1 if all the districts along the border fall into the pool of 'even' districts. There is also a possibility that people in counties covered by Section V of the Voting Rights Act may be deferred. Neither of these would occur under the 1st draft maps. However, the Commission may consider whether this would be an acceptable outcome or whether there should be exceptions to the rule. An example for an exception may be the case in which the CRC may need to determine whether it is more important to number a district on the Oregon border with 1 or to minimize deferral.

Numbering of Districts

Step II:

After the above process has been completed, the CRC must assign numbers to the districts. Below we outline two basic ways for numbering the districts, and third system that combines the both. All three methods use objective criteria for numbering. Under all three systems the Commission would repeat the same process twice for the Senate, once for the districts in the odd pool and once for those in the even pool.

Option 1: Geographic – not considering current numbering of districts

Once the odd and even pools have been established, this system would use a geographic measure and would not consider the assigned number of the current Senate Districts.

Starting with the odd pool, first the districts that border Oregon would be numbered. The Commission would provide direction on whether to go from west to east or east to west. There does not seem to be a consistent system in the current Senate map numbering scheme for the Commission to use as a guide.

The process would then move south until reaching the most northern point of any unnumbered district in the odd pool and assign it the next sequential number. This process would be repeated until all districts have been numbered.

This process would then be repeated for the 'even' pool. This system seems to represent the strictest reading of the Constitutional mandate. However, this particular method of assigning numbers may not result in much *consistency in the numbering* between the old and new districts, i.e. this method does not look at all at the existing numbering of the districts so it would be coincidental for any new district that has considerable overlap with an old district to be assigned the same number that the district had before. If the CRC wishes to take consistency into consideration then Option 2 might better achieve that goal.

Option 2: Consistency - Overlap with existing districts

This system would maximize the number of individuals whose district *number* would remain the same between the current and proposed maps:

Using the overlap report as follows:

PROPOSED	CURRENT	OVERLAP
DISTRICT A	DISTRICT 1	60%
	DISTRICT 2	20%
	DISTRICT 3	20%
DISTRICT B	DISTRICT 2	20%
	DISTRICT 3	80%
DISTRICT C	DISTRICT 1	40%
	DISTRICT 2	60%

1. The proposed district with the biggest overlap with a current district would be assigned that number (in the example above District B would be assigned as District 3).

2. This process would be repeated in succession for the next biggest overlap. If a district or number has already been assigned, it would be skipped.

3. After all overlaps have been exhausted in this manner, some districts might still be without a number. This would occur when a district has been "collapsed" and been recreated in another part of the state where there is no overlapping population. In this case, a number would be assigned from those remaining using Option 1 discussed above.

The process would be repeated for the 'even' pool.

This method could result in a district being assigned a smaller number than another district even though all of the geography of the former district is south of all of the geography of the later. The Commission may wish to determine whether this would be an acceptable outcome or whether there should be exceptions to the system.

Option 3: Hybrid

A system could be developed where Option 2 is used but only for districts that meet a certain minimum threshold. For example, if a majority of the proposed district is made up of the current district then it would be assigned the same number. For the remaining districts Option 1 could be used.