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PUBLIC NOTICE

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT

THE NASSAU COUNTY LEGISLATURE

WILL HOLD A HEARING ON

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2023 AT 6:30 PM

# REGARDING CLERK ITEM NO. 33-23, A LOCAL LAW TO AMEND ANNEX A OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY TO DESCRIBE THE NINETEEN LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS BASED UPON THE 2020 FEDERAL CENSUS DATA, AND ANY PROPOSED AMENDMENTS THERETO 

IN<br>THE PETER J. SCHMITT MEMORIAL LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER THEODORE ROOSEVELT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BUILDING 1550 FRANKLIN AVENUE, MINEOLA, NEW YORK 11501


#### Abstract

As per the Nassau County Fire Marshal's Office, the Peter J. Schmitt Memorial Legislative Chamber has a maximum occupancy of 200 people. Attendees who would like to address the Legislature must submit a slip to the Clerk's office staff. Public comment is limited to three minutes per person. At meetings of the full Legislature, public comment will be heard only during the pre-calendar public comment period and during public hearings that are on the calendar. At meetings of the Legislature's committees, there is no pre-calendar public comment period. Public comment will be heard on agenda items. Public comment on any item may be emailed to the Clerk of the Legislature at NCRedistricting @ nassaucountyny.gov and will be made part of the formal record of this Legislative meeting.

The Nassau County Legislature is committed to making its public meetings accessible to individuals with disabilities and every reasonable accommodation will be made so that they can participate. Please contact the Office of the Clerk of the Legislature at 571-4252, or the Nassau County Office for the Physically Challenged at 227-7101 or TDD Telephone No. 227-8989 if any assistance is needed. Every Legislative meeting is streamed live on http://www.nassaucountyny.gov/agencies/Legis/index.html


MICHAEL C. PULITZER
Clerk of the Legislature
Nassau County, New York
DATED: February 9, 2023
Mineola, NY
Scan the QR code to submit written public comment, which will be incorporated into the record of this meeting.


## PROPOSED LOCAL LAW _ - 2023

## A LOCAL LAW TO AMEND ANNEX A OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT LAW OF NASSAU COUNTY TO DESCRIBE THE NINETEEN LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS BASED UPON THE 2020 FEDERAL CENSUS DATA

BE IT ENACTED by the County Legislature of the County of Nassau as follows:
Section 1. Annex A of the County Government Law of Nassau County (the "Charter"), as created by Local Law 11-1994 and as last amended by Local Law 2-2013, is hereby amended as follows:

```
District 01
    Hempstead NY
        Tract: 406900
        Blocks: 2002 2005-2009 2013
        Tract: 407000
            Blocks: 3000-3001 4000-4004 5000-5007
            Tract: 407101
                Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2012 3000-3014 4000-4015 4019-4024
                4029
            Tract: 407102
                Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2011 3000-3013 4000-4019
            Tract: 407201
            Blocks: 1005 2007
            Tract: 407203
                Blocks: 1000-1006 1016-1019 2000-2022
            Tract: 407204
                Blocks: 1000-1005 2000-2014 3000-3013
            Tract: 407302
                Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2015 3000-3014 4001 4004-4005
                    4009-4010 4013 4015-4020
            Tract: 407401
                Blocks: 1000-1008 2000-2013 3000-3009 4000-4008 5000-5019
            Tract: 407402
                Blocks: 1002 1006-1007 1009-1011 1014-1018 2000-2006
            Tract: 407501
                Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2013 3000-3014
            Tract: 407502
                Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2014 3000-3008 4000-4015
            Tract: 412800
                Blocks: 1000 1011-1012
            Tract: 412900
                Blocks: 1000-1013 2000 2002-2003 2006-2007 2011-2019
                3000-3027
            Tract: 413500
                    Blocks: 2004 2007-2010 3000-3021 3024-3025 4000 4005
            Tract: 413600
```

```
            Blocks: 1005-1006
            Tract: 413900
            Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2023 3000-3015 4000-4019 5000-5013
            Tract: 414001
            Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2008 3000-3006 4000-4010
    Tract: 414002
            Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2016 3000-3017
    Tract: 414100
            Blocks: 3001-3013 3015-3016 3018-3019 4000-4017 5000-5005
                        6000-6005 6008-6010 6013-6023
    Tract: 414201
            Blocks: 1000-1002 1005-1006 1008 2001-2018
    Tract: 414202
            Blocks: 2003 2013
District 02
    North Hempstead NY
            Tract: 304202
            Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2041 3000-3012
            Tract: 304203
            Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2009 3000-3012 4000-4010
            Tract: 304204
            Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2016 3000-3014
    Hempstead NY
    Tract: 405800
            Blocks: 1000-1028 2000-2009 3000-3013 4000-4012
    Tract: 405900
            Blocks: 3000 4000-4011
    Tract: 406100
            Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2014 3000-3014
    Tract: 406201
            Blocks: 1000-1001 1003-1004 2001-2009 3000-3010
    Tract: 406701
            Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2009 3000-3010
    Tract: 406702
            Blocks: 1000-1003 2000-2020 3000-3005
    Tract: 406801
            Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2009 3000-3014
    Tract: 406802
            Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2006
    Tract: 406900
            Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2001 2003-2004 2010-2012 2014-2023
                3000-3014 4000-4013
    Tract: 407000
            Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2009 3002-3008 6000-6008
    Tract: 407101
            Blocks: 4016-4018 4025-4028 4030
    Tract: 407201
            Blocks: 1000-1004 2000-2006 2008 3000-3002
    Tract: 407203
            Blocks: 1007-1015
    Tract: 407301
            Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2035 3000-3061
    Tract: 407600
            Blocks: 5005-5007
    Tract: 407700
            Blocks: 1000 1008-1014
    Tract: 412800
            Blocks: 1001-1010 1013-1035 1040
```

```
    Oyster Bay NY
    Tract: 518900
                            Blocks: 5008-5010 5012-5021
District 03
    Hempstead NY
        Tract: 404800
            Blocks: 2009-2012 2019-2020 3000-3021 4000-4031
            Tract: 404901
            Blocks: 1000-1007 2000-2007 3000-3010 4000-4014 5000-5009
            Tract: 404902
                    Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2008
            Tract: 405000
                    Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2009 2011-2014 3000-3015 4000-4013
            Tract: 405100
                    Blocks: 2001-2009 4001 4003 4005-4013 5000-5013
                    6000-6006 7000-7007
            Tract: 405200
            Blocks: 1005 2000-2006 2018
            Tract: 409800
            Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2021 3000-3014 4000-4018
            Tract: 409900
                    Blocks: 1000-1008 2000-2035 3000-3020 4000-4012 5000-5012
                    6000-6007
            Tract: 410000
            Blocks: 2004-2009
            Tract: 410300
            Blocks: 1000-1011 2014-2015 3000-3012 4000-4011 5000-5018
            Tract: 410400
            Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2026 3000-3012 4000-4013
            Tract: 410500
            Blocks: 3004-3010
            Tract: 410800
                    Blocks: 2017-2021 4003-4004 4010
    Tract: 410900
            Blocks: 1000-1007 2000-2016 3000-3010 4000-4019
            Tract: 411000
            Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2007 3000-3014 4000-4016 5000-5021
            Tract: 411100
                    Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2012 3000-3008 4000-4006
Tract: 411301
                            Blocks: 1000-1003 1005-1026 3000-3016
District 04
    Tract: 411200
            Blocks: 1000-1025 2000-2017 3000-3021 4000-4012 5000-5012
    Tract: 411302
            Blocks: 2005-2022 3000-3021
    Tract: 411400
            Blocks: 1002-1020 2011 2017-2019 3000-3013 4001-4005
                4010 6002-6015
Tract: 411500
            Blocks: 1025-1033 3000-3030
    Tract: 411600
            Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2030 3000-3033 4000-4013 5000-5009
Tract: 416201
            Blocks: 1000-1038 2000-2027 3000-3017
Tract: 416202
            Blocks: 1000-1008 2000-2009 3000-3010 4000-4013
Tract: 416300
```

Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2010 3000-3047 4000-4026
Long Beach NY
Tract: 416401
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2015 3000-3019
Tract: 416402
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2029
Tract: 416500
Blocks: 1000-1007 2000-2009 3000-3007 4000-4008 5000-5009
Tract: 416600
Blocks: 1000-1007 2000-2008 3000-3007 4000-4008 5000-5009
6000-6012
Tract: 416701
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2007 3000-3005 4000-4009 5000-5011
Tract: 416702
Blocks: 1000-1004 2000-2005 3000-3006
Tract: 416801
Blocks: 1000-1005 2000-2014
Tract: 416802
Blocks: 1000-1004 2000-2018
Hempstead NY
Tract: 416900
Blocks: 1004100710221024 1027-1029
1044 1046-1056 1059 1061 1063-1084 1089-1110
1112-1117 2000-2032 3000-3026
District 05
Tract: 412800
Blocks: 1036-1039 2000-2020 3000-3012
Tract: 412900
Blocks: 2001 2004-2005 2008-2010 2020 4000-4020
Tract: 413100
Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2014 3000-3014 4000-4014 5000-5015
Tract: 413300
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2017 3000-3004 3007-3008 3010-3015 4000 4010-4012 5000-5011
Tract: 413400
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2008
Tract: 413500
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2003 2005-2006 3022-3023 4001-4004 4006-4009 5000-5014 6000-6009
Tract: 413600
Blocks: 1000-1004 1007-1012 2000-2016 3000-3015 4000-4023
5000-5013
Tract: 413700
Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2009 3000-3010 4000-4012 5000-5016
Tract: 413803
Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2016 3000-3017 4000-4013
Tract: 413804
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2014 3000-3016
Tract: 414100
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2007 300030143017 5006-5012 6006-6007 6011-6012
Tract: 414201
Blocks: 1003-1004 1007 1009-1015 2000 3000-3008
Tract: 414202
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2002 2004-2012 3000-3009 4000-4004
Tract: 414301
Blocks: 1000-1027 2000-2021
Tract: 414303

Blocks: 1000-1009 2000-2011 3000-3013 4000 4002-4005 4010-4013 4016-4017
Tract: 414304
Blocks: 1000-1010 1012 2000-2004 2006-2007
Tract: 414400
Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2009 3000-3001 3003-3008 4001-4009 4012-4026 5005-5011
Tract: 414501
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2022 3000-3013 4002-4006 4012-4018
Tract: 414502
Blocks: 3000-3010
District 06
Tract: 406202
Blocks: 1000-1020 2000-2023 3000-3029 4000-4012
Tract: 409900
Blocks: 2036-2037
Tract: 410000
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2003 3000-3030
Tract: 410100
Blocks: 1000-1015 201220152017 2021-2034 3000-3010 4002-4023 5000-5015 6000-6014
Tract: 410200
Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2013 3000-3013 4000-4021
Tract: 410300
Blocks: 2000-2013 2016-2017
Tract: 410500
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2015 3000-3003 3011-3028 4000-4018 5000-5022 6000-6015
Tract: 410600
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2010 3000-3013 4000-4019 5000-5017 6000-6023 7000-7019
Tract: 410700
Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2011 3000-3016 4000-4009 5000-5015 6000-6025
Tract: 410800
Blocks: 1000-1021 2000-2016 2022-2026 3000-3013 4000-4002 4005-4009 4011-4032
Tract: 411301
Blocks: 2000-2002
Tract: 411302
Blocks: 1000-1021 5000-5001 5009-5010
Tract: 411700
Blocks: 2000-2027 3000-3008 4000 5000-5005 5008-5010 5012-5014
Tract: 411800
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2017 3000-3024 4000-4013 5000-5012 6000-6021
Tract: 411901
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2009 3000-3024
Tract: 411902
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2014 3000-3025
Tract: 412000
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2020 3000-3023 4000-4026 5000-5024 6000-6022
Tract: 412301
Blocks: 1020
District 07
Tract: 411301

Blocks: 1004 2003-2014
Tract: 411302
Blocks: 1022 2000-2004 4000-4021 5002-5008 5011-5024
Tract: 411400
Blocks: 1000-1001 2000-2010 2012-2016 4000 4006-4009 4011-4012 5000-5012 6000-6001
Tract: 411500
Blocks: 1000-1024 2000-2031
Tract: 411700
Blocks: 1000-1018 3009-3021 4001-4014 5006-500750115015
Tract: 412100
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2012 3000-3014 4000-4029 5000-5023
Tract: 412200
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2022 3000-3012 4000-4014 5000-5023
Tract: 412301
Blocks: 1000-1019 1021-1039 2000-2023
Tract: 412302
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2020 3000-3019 4000-4017
Tract: 412400
Blocks: 1000-1009 2000-2007 3000-3007 4000-4015 5000-5015
Tract: 412500
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2020 3000-3019
Tract: 412600
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2016 3000-3026
Tract: 412700
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2024 3000-3032
Tract: 413001
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2011 3000-3022
Tract: 413002
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2018 3000-3010 4000-4008
Tract: 413200
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2021 3000-3021 4000-4013 5000-5013
Tract: 413300
Blocks: 3005-3006 3009 4001-4009 4013-4014 6000-6011
7000-7017
Tract: 413400
Blocks: 2009-2019 3000-3021 4000-4014
District 08
North Hempstead NY
Tract: 302600
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2023
Hempstead NY
Tract: 404300
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2017 3000-3015
Tract: 404400
Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2017 3000-3021 4000-4013 5000-5014
Tract: 404500
Blocks: 1000-1008 2000-2010 3000-3014 4000-4012 5000-5012
Tract: 404600
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2014 3000-3009 4000-4013
Tract: 404700
Blocks: 3000-3018 4001-4006 4010-4012 4014-4015 5000-5009
Tract: 404800
Blocks: 1000-1025 2000-2008 2013-2018
Tract: 405000
Blocks: 2010
Tract: 405100
Blocks: 1000-1008 2000 3000-301740004002

Tract: 405200
Blocks: 1000-1004 1006-1017 2007-2017 3000-3017 4000-4023
Tract: 405301
Blocks: 1000-1018 2013-2017 3000-3024
Tract: 405302
Blocks: 3007-3010 4001-4011
Tract: 405400
Blocks: 1000-1022 2000-2013 3000-3016 4000-4013 5000-5012
6000-6011
Tract: 405500
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2012 3000-3008 4000-4016 5000-5015
Tract: 405600
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2008 3000-3016 4000-4015
Tract: 405700
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2010 3000-3009 4000-4010 5000-5008
Tract: 405900
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2014 3001-3013 4012 5000-5010
Tract: 406001
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2015 3000-3016 4000-4022
Tract: 406002
Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2013 3000-3012
Tract: 406201
Blocks: 10022000
Tract: 410100
Blocks: 2000-2011 2013-2014 2016 2018-2020 4000-4001
District 09
North Hempstead NY
Tract: 300100
Blocks: 2013
Tract: 301200
Blocks: 2002
Tract: 301500
Blocks: 1000-1002 1004-1024 2000-2028 3000-3015
Tract: 301700
Blocks: 1000-1023 2000-2022
Tract: 301800
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2005 20082010 2012-2015 3000-3014 4000-4016
Tract: 301900
Blocks: 1000-1007 1009-1018 2000-2018 3000-3017
Tract: 302000
Blocks: 1000-1023 2015-2018 2023-2024
Tract: 302200
Blocks: 1002-1016 3004-3008 3013-3017 3021-3024
Tract: 302300
Blocks: 3000-3010 3014-3019
Tract: 302400
Blocks: 1000-1019 1022-1024 4004-4005 4009-4010 5000-5020
Tract: 302700
Blocks: 1000-1011 1013-1018 3000-3019
Tract: 302800
Blocks: 3010-3012 5000-5017 6000-6014 7000-7015
Tract: 302900
Blocks: 2002-2003 2012-2019 3000-3015 4000-4026
Tract: 303000
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2028 3000-3013 4000-4016 5000-5016
Tract: 303203

Blocks: 1005 1019-1020 1023-1026
Tract: 303204
Blocks: 1002-1020 2000-2010 3000-3016 4000-4046
Tract: 303301
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2028 3000-3009
Tract: 303302
Blocks: 1000-1009 2000-2015 3000-3010 4000-4016
Tract: 303400
Blocks: 1000-1027 2000-2024
Tract: 303500
Blocks: 1000-1007 2000-2009 3000-3017 4000-4013 5000-5010 6000-6010
Tract: 303600
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2015 3000-3011 4000-4022 5000-5012 6000-6015
Tract: 303700
Blocks: 1000-1022 2000-2022 3000-3023 4000-4011 5000-5015
Hempstead NY
Tract: 404700
Blocks: 1000-1030 2000-2017 4007-4009 4013 4016-4019
6000-6021
District 10
North Hempstead NY
Tract: 300100
Blocks: 1000-1021 2001-2012 2014-2021 3002-3004 3006-3023 4001-4029
Tract: 300300
Blocks: 1000-1008 2000-2010 3000-3009 4000-4012
Tract: 300400
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2016 3000-3017 4000-4019 5000-5015
Tract: 300500
Blocks: 1000-1020 2000-2014 3000-3016 4000-4019 5000-5034
Tract: 300600
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2021 3000-3027 4000-4018 5000-5021
6000-6023
Tract: 300700
Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2010 3000-3002 4000-4004 5000-5004
Tract: 300800
Blocks: 1000-1028 2000-2019 3000-3012 4000-4012
Tract: 300901
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2015 3000-3024
Tract: 300902
Blocks: 1000-1034 2000-2040
Tract: 301800
Blocks: 2006-2007 20092011 2016-2018 5000-5022
Tract: 301900
Blocks: 1008
Tract: 302300
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2014 3011-3013 3020
Tract: 302400
Blocks: 1020-1021 1025 2000-2014
Tract: 302700
Blocks: 1012 2000-2023
Tract: 302800
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2014 3000-3009 4000-4015
Tract: 302900
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2001 2004-2011
Tract: 303101

Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2013 3000-3025
Tract: 303102
Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2015 3000-3012 4000-4018
Tract: 303203
Blocks: 1000-1004 1006-1018 1021-1022 2000-2018
Tract: 303204
Blocks: 1000-1001
District 11
Tract: 301000
Blocks: 1001-1024 2000-2020 3000-3008 3010-3015 4001-4011
Tract: 301101
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2021 3000-3020
Tract: 301102
Blocks: 1000-1025 2000-2017 3000-3011
Tract: 301200
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2001 2003-2016 3000-3010 4000-4017 5000-5010
Tract: 301300
Blocks: 1000-1008 2000-2007 3000-3008 4000-4004 5000-5014
Tract: 301400
Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2028
Tract: 301500
Blocks: 1003
Tract: 301600
Blocks: 1000-1030 2000-2015 3000-3018 4000-4028
Tract: 302000
Blocks: 2000-2014 2019-2022 2025-2026 3000-3043
Tract: 302101
Blocks: 2004
Tract: 302200
Blocks: 20004003
Glen Cove NY
Tract: 517000
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2010 3000-3015
Tract: 517101
Blocks: 1000-1008 2000-2012 3000-3010 4000-4009 5000-5009
Tract: 517102
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2010
Tract: 517201
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2008 3000-3007
Tract: 517202
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2018
Tract: 517301
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2010 3000-3012
Tract: 517302
Blocks: 1000-1009 2000-2012 3000-3013 4000-4011
Oyster Bay NY
Tract: 517400
Blocks: 1000-1027 2000-2029 3000-3027 4000-4024 5000-5030
Tract: 517500
Blocks: 1022-1024 1026-1029 1031 10332000 2004-2007 2025 3003-3009 3015-3022 3024
Glen Cove NY
Tract: 990200 Blocks: 0001
District 12
Oyster Bay NY
Tract: 520501
Blocks: 1000-1007 2000-2018 3000-3008 4000-4011

Tract: 520502
Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2015 3000-3023 4000-4021 5000-5010
Tract: 520600
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2015 3000-3011 4000-4011 5000-5011
6000-6016
Tract: 520800
Blocks: 1005-1006
Tract: 520900
Blocks: 5003 5006-5009
Tract: 521000
Blocks: 2004-2007 2009 3012-3013 3015-3021
Tract: 521100
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2016 3000-3018 4000-4011 5000-5014
Tract: 521200
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2033 3000-3024
Tract: 521301
Blocks: 1000-1020 2000-2040
Tract: 521302
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2026 3000-3010 4000-4014
Tract: 521400
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2020 3000-3026 4000-4018 5000-5020
Tract: 521500
Blocks: 1000-1025 2000-2017 3000-3015 4000-4017 5000-5027
Tract: 521601
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2019 3000-3014 4000-4029
Tract: 521602
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2017 3000-3011 4000-4017
Tract: 521700
Blocks: 1000-1026 2000-2021 3000-3028 4000-4022 5000-5013
Tract: 521801
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2014 3000-3018 4000-4013
Tract: 521802
Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2019 3000-3020
Tract: 521902
Blocks: 1001-1002 1011 1015-1027 1035-1038 1055-1057 2000-2025 3000-3024 4000-4023
Tract: 522000
Blocks: 1000-1025 2000-2020 3000-3028 4000-4018 5000-5031
District 13
Hempstead NY
Tract: 407302
Blocks: 4000 4002-4003 4006-4008 4011-401240144021
Tract: 407402
Blocks: 1000-1001 1003-1005 1008 1012-1013
Tract: 407700
Blocks: 1001-1007 1015-1016
Tract: 407900
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2012 3000-3014 4000-4008
Tract: 408000
Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2019 3000-3014 4000-4013 5000-5010
6000-6011
Tract: 408100
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2009 3000-3007 4000-4008 5000-5009 6000-6010
Tract: 408200
Blocks: 1000 1003-1016 2000-2014 3000-3013 4000-4013 5000-5015 6000-6018 7000-7013
Tract: 408300

Blocks: 2003 2006-2008 3007-3008 30113018

$$
4010 \text { 4013-4014 5000-5010 6000-6010 7000-7010 }
$$

Tract: 408400
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2013 3000-3012 4000-4011
Tract: 408500
Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2014 3000-3009 4000-4007 5000-5012
Tract: 409600
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2014 3000-3014 4000-4011
Tract: 409700
Blocks: 1000-1008 2001-2006 2008-2009 3000-3008 4002
Tract: 414600
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2010 3000-3009 4000-4008
Tract: 414700
Blocks: 1000-1028 2000-2023 3000-3032
Tract: 414800
Blocks: 1000-1009 2000-2026 3000-3013 4000-4011 5000-5007 6000-6010 7000-7010
Tract: 414900
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2011 3000-3016 4000-4011 5000-5015
6000-6008
District 14
North Hempstead NY
Tract: 303600
Blocks: 5013-5014
Tract: 303800
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2021 3000-3014 4000-4018 5000-5013
Tract: 303900
Blocks: 1000-1024 2000-2020 3000-3015 4000-4022
Tract: 304001
Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2025
Tract: 304002
Blocks: 1000-1024 2000-2016 3000-3004 4000-4021
Tract: 304100
Blocks: 1000-1024 2000-2021 3000-3023
Hempstead NY
Tract: 404700
Blocks: 4000
Tract: 405301
Blocks: 2000-2012
Tract: 405302
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2008 3000-3006 4000 5000-5007
Tract: 406300
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2022 3000-3019 4000-4018
Tract: 406400
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2023 3000-3021 4000-4020 5000-5025 6000-6020 7000-7019
Tract: 406501
Blocks: 1000-1021 2000-2020 3000-3035 4000-4033 5000-5016
6000-6019
Tract: 406600
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2018 3000-3014 4000-4033
Oyster Bay NY
Tract: 518501
Blocks: 1000-1001 1006-1015 1018 1021-1029
Tract: 518502
Blocks: 3011-3012
Tract: 518900
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2006 2009-2017 2021 3000-3018

```
4000-4018 5000-5007 5011
```

Tract: 519300
Blocks: 1000-1025 2000 2006-2009 4000-40144016 5007 5012-5024
Tract: 519400
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2011 3000-3011 4000-4011
Tract: 519900
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2015 3000-3014 4000-4009 5000-5014
Tract: 520001
Blocks: 1000-1025 1033-1034 3000-3004 3006 4000-4027
5000-5023
Tract: 520002
Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2015 3000-3008 4000-4006
Hempstead NY
Tract: 980100
Blocks: 1000-1003
District 15
Tract: 407600
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2011 3000-3011 4000-4011 5000-5004 5008-5011 6000-6010
Tract: 407700
Blocks: 2000-2013 3000-3013 4000-4015
Tract: 407801
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2017 3000-3019 4000-4013
Tract: 407802
Blocks: 1000-1001
Tract: 408200
Blocks: 1001-1002
Tract: 408300
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2002 2004-2005 3000-3006 3009-3010 3012-3017 4000-4009 4011-4012
Tract: 408600
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2022 3000-3021
Tract: 408700
Blocks: 1000-1008 2000-2008 3000-3009 4000-4008 5000-5008 6000-6006
Tract: 408800
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2015 3000-3010 4000-4009 5000-5017 6000-6029
Tract: 408900
Blocks: 1000-1009 2000-2010 3000-3010 4000-4012 5000-5019
Tract: 409000
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2017 3000-3012 4000-4014 5000-5010
Tract: 409100
Blocks: 1000-1009 2000-2009 3000-3009 4000-4015 5000-5022
Tract: 409200
Blocks: 1000-1008 2000-2009 3000-3008 4000-4008 5000-5019 6000-6012
Tract: 409300
Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2011 3000-3008 4000-4014
Tract: 409400
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2017 3000-3020
Tract: 409500
Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2018 3000-3014
Oyster Bay NY
Tract: 519000
Blocks: 2000-2015 4000-4010 6010-6015
District 16

North Hempstead NY
Tract: 302200
Blocks: 1000-1001 2001-2017 3000-3003 3009-3012 3018-3020 4000-4002 4004-4020
Tract: 302400
Blocks: 3000-3014 4000-4003 4006-4008
Tract: 302501
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2026
Tract: 302502
Blocks: 1000-1045 2000-2036
Oyster Bay NY
Tract: 517705
Blocks: 1019-1024 1028-1029 1035-103910431045
Tract: 518204
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2026 3000-3017
Tract: 518501
Blocks: 1002-1005 1016-1017 1019-1020 1030-1033 2000-2048
3000-3024
Tract: 518502
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2019 3000-3010 3013-3016
Tract: 518600
Blocks: 1000-1021 2000-2028 3000-3011 4000-4012
Tract: 518700
Blocks: 1001-1002 1004 1006-1010 2007 3000-3002 30053007 3009-3010 3012-3015 4005-4009 5003-5004 5007-5008 6007 6012-6014
Tract: 518800
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2027 3000-3012
Tract: 519300
Blocks: 5000-5006 5008-5011
Tract: 519500
Blocks: 1000-1024 2000-2016 3000-3016 4000-4020 5000-5014
Tract: 519601
Blocks: 1000-1020 2000-2015 3000-3011 4000-4016
Tract: 519602
Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2016
Tract: 519702
Blocks: 1000-1036 2000-2010 3000-3017 4000-4022
Tract: 519703
Blocks: 1000-1021 2000-2023 3000-3021
Tract: 519704
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2015 3000-3011
Tract: 519801
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2018
Tract: 519802
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2017 3000-3019 4000-4017
Tract: 520100
Blocks: 2000-2009 3000-3013 4000-4021 5000-50065008
Tract: 981100
Blocks: 1005-1006
Tract: 982100
Blocks: 1001 1003-1009 1011
District 17
Hempstead NY
Tract: 409700
Blocks: 2000 2007 2010-2011 4000-4001 4003-4010
Tract: 415500
Blocks: 1000-1026 2000-2016

## Oyster Bay NY

Tract: 518900
Blocks: 2007-2008 2018-2020 2022 6000-6030
Tract: 519000
Blocks: 1000-1022 3000-3010 5000-5012 6000-6009
Tract: 519100
Blocks: 1000-1023 2000-2009 3000-3012 4000-4014 5000-5010 6000-6015
Tract: 519200
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2011 3000-3013 4000-4015 5000-5014 6000-6011
Tract: 519300
Blocks: 1026-1049 2001-2005 2010-2018 3000-3030 4015
4017-4024
Tract: 520001
Blocks: 1026-1032 1035-1047 2000-2019 3005 3007-3018
Tract: 520002
Blocks: 1013-1023 4007-4026
Tract: 520100
Blocks: 1000-1012 2010-2014 5007 5009-5032
Tract: 520200
Blocks: 1000-1005 2000-2015 3000-3015 4000-4012
Tract: 520300
Blocks: 1000-1015 2000-2010 3000-3013 4000-4011 5000-5014 6000-6009 7000-7012
Tract: 520401
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2021 3000-3016 4000-4011
Tract: 520402
Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2017 3000-3020
Tract: 520700
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2020 3000-3024 4000-4017
Tract: 520800
Blocks: 1000-1004 1007-1014 2000-2011 3000-3013 4000-4010
Tract: 520900
Blocks: 1000-1014 2000-2010 3000-3008 4000-4017 5000-5002 5004-5005
Tract: 521000
Blocks: 1000-1022 2000-2003 2008 2010-2018 3000-3011 3014 4000-4017 5000-5020
Hempstead NY
Tract: 522700
Blocks: 1000-1024 2000-2009 3000-3025 3028
District 18
North Hempstead NY
Tract: 302101
Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2003 2005-2014 3000-3020 4000-4023
Tract: 302102
Blocks: 1000-1023 2000-2033 3000-3021 4000-4014
Oyster Bay NY
Tract: 517500
Blocks: 1000-1021 1025 10301032 2001-2003 2008-2024 3000-3002 3010-3014 3023
Tract: 517600
Blocks: 1000-1019 2000-2027 3000-3018 4000-4013
Tract: 517701
Blocks: 1000-1032 2000-2035 3000-3036 4000-4025
Tract: 517705
Blocks: 1000-1018 1025-1027 1030-1034 1040-1042 1044

Tract: 517801
Blocks: 1002-1030 2000-2030 3000-3024
Tract: 517802
Blocks: 1000-1016 2000-2019 3000-3017
Tract: 517901
Blocks: 1000-1028 2001-2030 3000-3016
Tract: 517902
Blocks: 1007-1057
Tract: 518000
Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2010 3000-3010 4000-4012 5000-5015
6000-6016
Tract: 518100
Blocks: 1000-1018 2000-2012 3000-3013
Tract: 518201
Blocks: 1001-1040 2000-2022 3000-3019
Tract: 518203
Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2010 3000-3010
Tract: 518300
Blocks: 1000-1020 2000-2024 3000-3018 4000-4020
Tract: 518400
Blocks: 1000-1007 2000-2010 3000-3015
Tract: 518700
Blocks: 1000 10031005 2000-2006 2008-2013 3003-3004 3006 3008 3011 4000-4004 5000-5002 5005-5006 6000-6006 6008-6011
Tract: 981100
Blocks: 1000-1004 1007
Tract: 982100
Blocks: 100010021010
District 19
Hempstead NY
Tract: 414303
Blocks: 4001 4006-4009 4014-4015
Tract: 414304
Blocks: 10112005 2008-2010
Tract: 414400
Blocks: 3002 4000 4010-4011 5000-5004 5012-5025
Tract: 414501
Blocks: 4000-4001 4007-4011
Tract: 414502
Blocks: 1000-1020 2000-2013
Tract: 415000
Blocks: 1000-1021 2000-2019 3000-3007 4000-4013 5000-5019
Tract: 415101
Blocks: 1000-1028 2000-2025
Tract: 415102
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2010 3000-3011 4000-4010 5000-5026
Tract: 415201
Blocks: 1000-1024 2000-2028 3000-3027
Tract: 415202
Blocks: 1000-1010 2000-2011 3000-3010 4000-4016
Tract: 415300
Blocks: 1000-1011 2000-2008 3000-3014 4000-4011 5000-5010 6000-6011
Tract: 415401
Blocks: 1000-1025 2000-2026 3000-3031 4000-4023
Tract: 415402
Blocks: 1000-1023 2000-2016 3000-3014

```
Tract: 415600
    Blocks: 1000-1013 2000-2012 3000-3020 4000-4010 5000-5015
    6000-6026
Tract: 415700
    Blocks: 1000-1024 2000-2032 3000-3024 4000-4019
Tract: 415802
    Blocks: 1000-1012 2000-2023 3000-3010 4000-4023 5000-5016
Tract: 416000
    Blocks: 1000-1024 2000-2013 3000-3013 4000-4019
Tract: 416100
    Blocks: 1000-1017 2000-2021 3000-3017 4000-4015
Tract: 416900
    Blocks: 1003
Tract: 522700
    Blocks: 3026-3027
```

§2. Any conflict or deficient written description of the boundaries of the nineteen legislative districts contained in Annex A of the Charter shall be resolved in favor of the map contained in Annex A of the Charter as interpreted by the digital equivalency file, created using Caliper Corporation's "Maptitude for Redistricting Version 2022 Build 5015" using their 2020 New York Prisoner Adjusted Final Redistricting Data, filed with the Clerk of the Nassau County Legislature with this Local Law.
§3. Severability. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, section, or part of this law or the application thereof to any person, individual, corporation, firm, partnership, entity, or circumstance shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid or unconstitutional, such order or judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, section, or part of this law, or in its application to the person, individual, corporation, firm, partnership, entity, or circumstance directly involved in the controversy in which such order or judgment shall be rendered.
§4. It is hereby determined, pursuant to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act, 8 N.Y.E.C.L. section 0101 et seq. and its implementing regulations, Part 617 of 6 N.Y.C.R.R., and Section 1611 of the County Government Law of Nassau County, that
this Local Law will not have a significant effect on the environment, and that no further review is required.
§5. Effective Date: This Local Law shall take effect immediately upon the filing of the law with the Secretary of State pursuant to Section 27 of the New York State Municipal Home Rule Law.



| 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | *** |
| 3 | LEGISLATOR C. WILLIAM GAYLOR, III |
| 4 | 6th Legislative District |
| 5 | *** |
| 6 | LEGISLATOR JOHN J. GIUFFRE |
| 7 | 8th Legislative District |
| 8 | $\star * *$ |
| 9 | LEGISLATOR MAZI MELESA PILIP |
| 10 | 10th Legislative District |
| 11 | *** |
| 12 | LEGISLATOR DELIA DERIGGI-WHITTON |
| 13 | 11th Legislative District |
| 14 | *** |
| 15 | LEGISLATOR JAMES KENNEDY |
| 16 | 12th Legislative District |
| 17 | *** |
| 18 | LEGISLATOR THOMAS MCKEVITT |
| 19 | 13th Legislative District |
| 20 | *** |
| 21 | LEGISLATOR LAURA SCHAEFER |
| 22 | 14th Legislative District |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |


| 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | LEGISLATOR JOHN FERRETTI, JR. |
| 3 | 15th Legislative District |
| 4 | *** |
| 5 | LEGISLATOR ARNOLD W. DRUCKER |
| 6 | 16th Legislative District |
| 7 | *** |
| 8 | LEGISLATOR ROSE MARIE WALKER |
| 9 | 17th Legislative District |
| 10 | $\star * *$ |
| 11 | LEGISLATOR JOSHUA LAFAZAN |
| 12 | 18th Legislative District |
| 13 | *** |
| 14 |  |
| 15 | MICHAEL PULITZER |
| 16 | Clerk of the Legislature |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 | $\longrightarrow$ <br> TOP KEY COURT REPORTING, INC. |

A L S O A P P E A R E D:

Misha Tseytlin, ESQ.
TROUTMAN PEPPER

PUBLIC COMMENT:
Angel Cepeda
H. Scottie Coads

Stephanie Chase
Jeffrey Daniels
Perry Grossman
Casey Marlow
Barbara McFaddan
Meta J. Mereday
Dave Mejias
Karen Montalbano
Karen Moskowitz
Doris Newkirk
Lisa Ortiz
Chris Jacobs
Pearl Jacobs
James Jacobs
Cristina Arroyo
Matthew Pasternack
Cheryl Ingram
Larry Weiss
Paul Beuer
Charlene Thompson
Patt Terrelongue
Barbara Kremen


PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All
right. I would like to call this hearing of the Nassau County Legislature to order. And to start things off, I will ask Legislator Colonel Bill Gaylor to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the Pledge of
Allegiance is recited.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mike, could you please call the roll?

CLERK PULITZER: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

Roll call. Deputy Presiding Officer Howard Kopel?

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Alternate Deputy Presiding Officer Denise Ford?

LEGISLATOR FORD: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Siela Bynoe?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Carrie A. Solages?


> LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Here.

CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Debra
Mule?
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: She is
attending. She has the flu. She wanted to attend via Zoom, but she is here, listening.

CLERK PULITZER: Thank you, Kevan.
Legislator C. William Gaylor, III.
LEGISLATOR GAYLOR: Present.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator John
Giuffre?

LEGISLATOR GIUFFRE: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Mazi Pilip?
LEGISLATOR PILIP: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Delia
DeRiggi-Whitton?
LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator James
Kennedy?
LEGISLATOR KENNEDY: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Thomas
McKevitt?
LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: Here.


CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Laura
Schaefer?
LEGISLATOR SCHAEFER: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator John
Ferretti?
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Arnold
Drucker?
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Thank you.
Legislator Rose Walker?
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Legislator Joshua Lafazan?

LEGISLATOR LAFAZAN: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Minority Leader
Kevan Abrahams?
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Presiding Officer
Richard Nicolello?
LEGISLATOR NICOLLELO: Here.
CLERK PULITZER: Thank you. We have a quorum, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank

you very much.
We will go right into the hearing. But first, anyone member of the public who's here, who would like to speak in the public comment portion, please come to the Clerk's table, submit a slip, and the slip will be brought up and we will call you in turn.

Mike, let's call the hearing.

CLERK PULITZER: Thank you. Please
take notice the Nassau County Legislature will hold the hearing on Thursday, February 16, 2023, at 6:30 p.m.
regarding Clerk Item 33-23 a Local Law to Amend Annex A of the County Government Law of Nassau County to Describe the 19 Legislative Districts based upon the 2020 Federal Census Data and any proposed amendments thereto.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you. Motion by Deputy Presiding Officer Kopel, seconded by Legislator Ford to open the hearing. All in favor of opening the hearing signify by saying, "Aye".

(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislature respond in favor.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those opposed.
(Whereupon, no verbal
response.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: The hearing is open.

I'm going to have some brief remarks, the Minority Leader will then follow with remarks, and then we will have a couple of presentations. Today's hearing relates to the drawing of new district lines for the 19 seats on the Nassau County Legislature. The County is required to redistrict every ten years following the completion of the Census.

Pursuant to the Nassau County Charter, a Temporary District Advisory Committee was created last April. The Commission held a total of 12 hearings, taking testimony from numerous residents
and others. The members of the Commission ultimately were unable to come to a consensus on a map. The Majority and Minority members of the Commission each submitted separate maps for the consideration of the Legislature, which went before the Rules Committee in January. Based on advice we received from Counsel, who I will bring up in several moments, neither map advanced by the Commission complied with applicable law. We worked with Counsel to produce a map that complies with all constitutional and legal requirements, including the Voting Rights Act and the John Lewis Act Municipal Home Rule Law.

The map that we introduced today
complies with all Federal and State legal requirements. It incorporates many of the issues raised by legislators and the public. As much as possible, the proposed map provides for compact districts, protects communities of interests, and minimizes the division of villages and
hamlets. Is the map perfect? No. But perfection in drawing district lines is impossible.

However, as stated above, the Mac complies with all legal requirements. It provides for equal representation and for legislative districts that either side can win. I would now like to turn things over to the Minority Leader for opening remarks.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Good evening. So what we are part of today and what the Presiding Officer had mentioned is, obviously, the two sides tried to present a map. They tried to have some type of continuity in terms of that map action being able to go forward and the Commission was not able to accomplish that. So, basically, tonight, my colleagues, the Republican Majority, have put together a map.

Unfortunately -- and there's eight points that I'm going to go through -the map that they are presenting to the
public is still illegal. The map still violates many of the Federal and State laws. But then most importantly, the most important criteria for any particular map, is that it's a partisan gerrymander. And what does that mean? And you're going to hear a little bit more about that tonight because that term gets thrown out a lot. But it's clear that this map still violates that.

That being said, this map continues to perpetuate what we saw in the previous map that was put together by the Republican Commissioners. It dilutes Minority votes. It clearly does that.

We're seeing that Hempstead is not split in two districts, but it's split in three districts. One district that it is split in does not have the same level of community interests that exists. That's clear as day. We're also seeing that the Lakeview community is also placed into a district which it does not have very similar interests, doesn't have any
similar interests as it pertains to to community interests and to interest in terms of levels of the school district. Nothing, nothing at all.

Where this map also fails is where whenever you have to basically redraw a map, and one of the tenets that's in the John Lewis provision, basically when possible, you have to be able to draw five Minority/Majority districts. The map that has been put forward by the Republican Majority only has four.

Fifth, in the Freeport Community Community, which basically is represented by two legislators, a very diverse, beautiful community. That community, part of it in the Northeast and Northwest sections, have been placed into a district that, again, does not have similar interests.

Six. In the previous map. One of the things that the Republican Commissioners did, they basically created an Asian influence district, and the Democrat


Commissioners also tried to do that. This map that's before us tonight splits the Asian community into three different ways, which also further dilutes their vote. I can't think how it's conscionable that we would think that a map is legal when it dilutes minority votes in Hempstead, Lakeview, and splits Asian votes throughout North Hempstead. It doesn't seem to make any sense.

The map also, without going into great detail, disfavors incumbents, which is a tenet also of the John Lewis provision.

And then last but not least, one of the things that the Republican

Commissioners had mentioned was that they felt that the Democratic Commission map violated district cores. District cores are basically when you basically adhere to some of the previous lines in a previous map versus where it goes into the new map. Well, if you look at this map, the district cores, as it pertains
to some of the Minority communities have been completely revamped. So that argument that was perpetuated by the Republican Commissioners -- which I have to say is a pretty weak argument. But my colleagues in this partisan gerrymander tonight didn't even follow the district core principle that their Republican Commissioners perpetuated in the earlier versions of the maps that they put out. Look, ultimately, we feel as a Legislative Minority, that without significant changes, it is very hard for us to vote for anything that's illegal. Basically, this map because of what I stated tonight and what we're going to go through also also with the $Q \& A$ and the questioning from from experts as well, is illegal. It's a partisan gerrymander. It dilutes Minority votes. Those are clear Federal Voting Right problems. And from our standpoint, we cannot participate and we cannot be a witness to see anything like that happen.


```
You ask yourselves in the public tonight one simple question as it pertains to protecting Minority votes here in this county, why would we be splitting the Village of Hempstead? Why would we be putting Lakeview into a district that does not have the same
``` community interests? And then when all is possible, we should be trying to elect more minorities to government and when possible, abhorrent to the John Lewis provision. We have to be able to draw lines that covers five Minority/Majority districts. This map tonight, unfortunately, fails in many of those aspects. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Minority Leader.

The hearing will proceed as follows:
- We will be having a presentation from Misha Tseytlin of Troutman, Pepper, Hamilton and Sanders regarding the proposed map;
- at the Minority's request, we will
have a presentation by an individual
retained by the Democratic members of the TDAC;
- and then we will proceed to public comment.

It's my privilege to introduce Misha Tseytlin. He was the lead counsel in the Harkenrider versus Hochul case and was instrumental in defeating the gerrymanders of both the New York Congressional and the New York State Senate maps, as well as establishing precedent that all New York State counties must now follow.

I have asked Mr. Tseytlin to provide testimony today to the Legislature on the proposed map and the floor is yours.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Thank you, Presiding Officer. Thank you, Minority Leader. Thank you for having me here today.

As the Presiding Officer noted, the Presiding Officer consulted myself and my law firm when the two maps that were submitted by the TDAC, there was no
agreement. And we analyzed those two maps using the expert Sean Trende, the same expert that was the lead expert for the the plaintiffs in the landmark

Harkenrider case. And we, unfortunately, concluded that both those maps were illegal in multiple respects.

The challenge then became how to present a map that was legal. And we worked with the Presiding Officer and Sean Trende, the expert from Harkenrider, to come up with a map that satisfies all legal criteria.

Now, what we did here is we put together a memorandum, which we handed out to you all and there are copies available there for the public, that goes through each legal criteria and explains why the map is legal. This map is for your consideration. And I'm going to try to explain to you all today why the map is legal in every respect. The memorandum is fairly detailed. It has a lot of legal citations, citations to the record in
front of the TDAC, and things of that sort. I'm not going to read through every word of the memorandum, but I am going to try to summarize each aspect of it. And I will be going in the order of the memorandum, so both the legislators and the public can follow along if they so wish.

So the memorandum goes in order of of importance in terms of our constitutional system. First, we start off with the US Constitution. That's the highest law in the land. Then we start with the Federal Voting Rights Act.

That's a federal law, that's the second level. And then we go on to state law and we'll talk about why in my submission, the map complies with all of those requirements.

Now, we're going to start with the US Constitution. The US constitutional provision that's most relevant here is the Equal Protection Clause, and it has two elements that are relevant here, and
the map complies with both elements.
First, as interpreted by the US Supreme Court, the Equal Protection Clause requires local redistricting to comply with the one person, one vote principle, and the US Supreme Court has basically said that as far as the US Constitution is concerned, there's a 10\% give and take between the largest and the smallest district for a local redistricting law to comply with the equal protection clause.

So our map, the difference between the biggest and the smallest district is 2.65\% -- 2.54\%, which is obviously much lower than \(10 \%\) and lower than deviations that have been upheld by the New York Court of Appeals. So that's pretty straightforward.

The next equal protection principle that is important here is the US Supreme Court's prohibition against racial gerrymandering. And what the Supreme Court has said is that where racial
```

considerations predominate over
traditional redistricting criteria, that
is unconstitutional, that violates the US
Constitution, unless you can survive the
highest level of proof in this country,
which is strict scrutiny. Put another
way, if race is the predominant factor
motivating the Legislature's decision to
place a significant number of voters
within or without a particular district,
the decision to place that number of
voters within that district is
unconstitutional unless you can satisfy
strict scrutiny. And that's a direct
quote from Miller versus Johnson.
In Shaw versus Reno, the United
States Supreme Court explained that
racial gerrymandering can injure voters,
whether or not it dilutes a racial
group's voting strength. That is because,
as the Supreme Court clarified, drawing
districts based upon racial
considerations -- and this is a quote
from the US Supreme Court -- reinforces

```
racial stereotypes and threatens to undermine our system of representative democracy by signaling to elected officials that they represent a particular racial group rather than a constituency as a whole. Thus far, the US Supreme Court has only recognized one justification ever for drawing districts based on racial considerations. That's compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. And while the Supreme Court has not definitively ruled out whether any other justifications could ever justify drawing districts based on racial considerations, Justice Kennedy, in his controlling opinion in LULAC versus Perry, warned against any approach that would unnecessarily infuse race into virtually every redistricting as raising serious constitutional concerns. More recently, the Supreme Court has shown a special great skepticism towards race-based districting. That's in the Cooper versus Harris case, a unanimous

opinion written by Justice Elena Kagan and the Wisconsin Legislature case. In both of those cases, the relevant Legislature, or even a court in one circumstance, had drawn districts to hit a particular racial target, \(50 \%\) of \(a\) particular racial group or more. Because Section 2 of the Voting Rights Voting Rights Act did not strictly require those districts, the US Supreme Court struck down those maps. In the North Carolina Cooper case, it was 9:0 even though that map had been supported by the Minority Black Caucus in North Carolina. In Wisconsin Legislature, it was a court drawn map. So the Supreme Court is taking this principle against racial gerrymandering very seriously. Now, with that background in mind, the proposed map is not a racial gerrymander. It does not support traditional redistrict criteria to racial considerations. Rather, as explained in in our discussion here and in the
```

appendix to this memorandum which you
have before you, the map is focused on
traditional criteria; such as, ensuring
district compactness, contiguity,
reflecting population shift, maintaining
political equality, and so on.
Unfortunately, both the maps of the
Democratic commissioners and the
Republican commissioners fail this equal
protection principle. The Republican
commissioners map, as pointed out by the
New York ACLU in its comment letter,
specifically drew one of the districts to
a racial target. That was pointed out by
the New York ACLU to the Republican
commissioners. They offered no
substantive response. So it appears, an
unconscionable racial gerrymander.
Similarly, the Democrat
Commissioners' map drew multiple
districts focused on racial
considerations, moving numerous voters
into districts based on their race, and
proudly so. Even though their memorandum

discusses a lot of legal authorities, they did not even attempt to square that with the US Supreme Court's decision in Cooper, the Wisconsin Legislature or the other precedents that I've discussed.

As a result, unfortunately, both of the maps proposed by the Democrats and the Commission and the Republicans Commission violate the Equal Protection Clause.

Now, I have in hand, right before this presentation, a supplemental report from the Democratic commissioners. That report is even more clear that what the Democrat commissioners were doing was violative of the equal protection clause. They criticize the map that the Presiding Officer and we propose for dismantling the racial gerrymander that the New York ACLU said that the Republicans had adopted in District One.

Further, this memorandum lumps
Minority groups together in its discussions in exactly the way the US


Supreme Court said is inappropriate. It does not add Asians with Hispanics and blacks sometimes; other times it does. It is just exactly kind of the poster child for racial gerrymander. And that's why both those maps are unconstitutional. Now, moving on to the next level after we get past the Constitution, that's the Voting Rights Act of 1964. Section 2 of that Act has some broad prohibitions against hurting the voting power of Minority voters. And the way the US Supreme Court has operationalized their broad approach is by something called the Gingles Preconditions, which means that there is a violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act only if those who are urging that violation has occurred can make three preconditions showing:

One, a Minority group has a sufficiently large population within a single area to form a Majority over that of that district.


Second, that Minority group must vote together.

And third, the white or the majority in that area must generally vote to defeat that minorities preference. Even if one gets past those preconditions, there is then an "All Things Considered Inquiry" to determine whether a Majority/Minority district must be drawn.

We had Sean Trende, who was the lead expert in Harkenrider, conduct a Section 2 VRA analysis, and he concluded that there was no justification for drawing any additional districts based on race. In light of the prior principles that we just talked about, that it is
unconstitutional to draw districts based on race when not required by Section 2 of the VRA. We, therefore, did not consider race any further in redistricting because that would have been unconstitutional under the precedents that I outlined.

Now that we're past federal law, let's talk about state law. Here we were

talking about the Home Rule Law as modified by the John Lewis New York

Voting Rights Act. Now, these provisions have seven conditions that need to be satisfied. And I'm going to go through all seven of those conditions and discuss why our proposed map today complies with all seven of those conditions.

First, the proposed maps must be nearly equal in population as practicable. That's similar to the requirement that we talked about in the first principle of the Equal Protection Clause, if folks will recall. The difference is the New York law doesn't give the $10 \%$ buffer that the US

Constitution does on the Equal Protection Clause; it gives only a 5\% buffer. So you can, for example, a map that had a 7\% deviation that would comply with the US constitutional requirement, but that wouldn't comply with New York law. Our map has a 2.54 deviation, so it complies with that principle.

Second, the proposed map must not include any districts that have "been drawn with the intent or result of denying or abridging the equal opportunities of racial minorities or language minority groups to participate in the political process". This is very similar language to Section 2 of the VRA. Now, Section 2 of the VRA obviously has a lot of case law behind it. We talked about the Gingles, preconditions. We talked about the additional analysis. There isn't any case law yet on the John Lewis Act in that language. That language has certain additional elements that are not explicitly in the Voting Rights Act. But what's important to recognize is the New York Constitution in New York law and the federal Constitution have a principle that no state law can require what violates the Equal Protection Clause or any federal constitutional provision. So we think it is important to read the John Lewis Law consistent with the US Supreme

Court's precedent against racial
gerrymandering. Any other conclusion that would read the John Lewis Law as a requirement for infusing race into every redistricting decision in the US Supreme Court's interpretation of words would render the John Lewis Law unconstitutional, and we definitely don't want to do that.

So what we did is we looked at the same Section 2 voting rights and analysis that Sean Trende had done. There was no requirement to create a race focused district there, and we did not interpret the John Lewis Law as requiring unconstitutional racial gerrymandering.

Third, the proposed districts have to have contiguous territory. Obviously, that's pretty easy to understand. Our map is contiguous. I'm not going to waste your time with that.

Next, the map must be as compact as practicable. In the memorandum, we discuss a series of different compactness
metrics the courts have used. We then have a chart on page eight that goes through the compactness of of the district based on a couple of these scores. And then we explain that our map performs well on the compactness score, performs comparably to the Democrat legislators' proposal, performs better than the Republican legislators' proposal. So I don't think that I'm going to belabor that point further.

The next point, I am going to speak a little bit about longer because it's very important and I'm concerned that the Body has gotten some incorrect and inaccurate information from an expert presented by the the Democrats on the Commission. The proposed map does not draw any districts to discourage competition or for purposes of favoring or disfavoring incumbents or any other particular candidate or political parties. Now, I know a little bit about this language because $I$ was the lead
counsel for the individual voters that challenged the gerrymandered maps drawn in Albany, especially with regard to the congressional districts. What the Court of Appeals, our state's highest court, held in the Harkenrider versus Hochul case is that we successfully relied on the expert testimony of Sean Trende to establish an inference of invidious partisan purpose by the Legislature in Albany. Sean Trende's opinion and supporting simulations were crucial to our victory, both at trial and on appeal. Trende used -- and this is quotes from the Court of Appeals -- "a state of the art program repeatedly accepted by other courts to create a map ensemble which performs comparably to the enacted plan in terms of compactness Majority/Minority county lines". His simulations, "revealed that the enacted map was an extreme outlier that likely reduced the number of Republican congressional seats by packing Republican voters into four districts,
etc., etc., etc.
Now, cognizant of the prohibition against partisan gerrymandering as well as the Harkenrider case, the proposed map was not drawn with a partisan goal at all. But to avoid even the perception of partisanship, the Presiding Officer asked us to retain Sean Trende, the very same expert that that we retained in Harkenrider to analyze the map. And I'm going to put up his results here for the Legislature's review and I will talk about them. I also want to show it to the people just so the people can also understand what I'm talking about.
(Whereupon, Graph is
displayed and referred to.)
MR. TSEYTLIN: I do apologize for the people. I will show you afterwards. I just can't. There's not two sides of this.

So this is the type of analysis that Mr. Trende did in the Harkenrider case(referring). This is the ensemble

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { methodology plus the gerrymandering } \\
& \text { index. These are the same exact charts } \\
& \text { that he created that were victorious in } \\
& \text { the Harkenrider case. } \\
& \text { And so I'm going to tell you what } \\
& \text { these lines are. This line, this red } \\
& \text { line, this is the Republican Commission's } \\
& \text { map (referring). It is far off skewed } \\
& \text { from what you would expect from a neutral } \\
& \text { drawn map. See how far over it is. This } \\
& \text { is the Democrat Commission's map } \\
& \text { (referring). So that's pretty far over as } \\
& \text { well. And then this is the proposed map, } \\
& \text { right in the meaty part of the bell } \\
& \text { curve, right there. } \\
& \text { fepublican Commission map were anywhere } \\
& \text { like that. But as you can see, they are } \\
& \text { with in Albany when we litigated this } \\
& \text { case last year was a map that was like } \\
& \text { right here (indicating). It was so } \\
& \text { extremely gerrymandered that it was } \\
& \text { almost like, off this. So I'm not saying } \\
& \text { now, will say what we were dealing }
\end{aligned}
$$

far off in the distribution. Whereas, on the Trende analysis, our map is right in the middle. And if I may, I'd like to show the people as well just so they can see what. I'm talking about.
(Whereupon, Graph is displayed to the Audience and referred to.)

MR. TSEYTLIN: So this red line right here, that was the Republican Commission's proposal. This blue line, that's the Democrat Commission's proposal and then this green line, that's our proposal (indicating).

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: He is not taking questions, but I'll let you know that the memo is available over there and on page ten in the memo is a copy of the map that he was just showing you.
(Whereupon, audience interruption.) PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Continue.

MR. TSEYTLIN: So that is the exact same analysis that we did in Harkenrider. Mr. Trende did it the exact same way, and this is the results he got.

Now, there might be some surprise from folks because they've seen a report in our supplemental report submitted by Professor Magleby who claims to have done the same Harkenrider analysis. That is just absolutely not true. He did not do anything like the Harkenrider analysis. The only thing that was similar is he used in ensemble approach to create a bunch of maps. The core of the Trende Harkenrider analysis was the gerrymandering index, which is what's up here before you, which shows how far askew the map is from what you would expect from a neutral draw. What Professor Magleby does is he used something called a mean median score. He just definitely did a completely different analysis, which was not presented by any expert in Harkenrider,
has not been opined upon, has not been blessed by the New York Court of Appeals. Further, he selected his base races in a methodology entirely different from Mr. Trende without pointing to any academic literature to state that selection of races was appropriate.

So as a result, obviously, the
Legislature can decide to listen to
Professor Magleby or it can decide to listen to Mr. Trende. I would respectfully submit that the expert who was the one whose methodology was approved by the State's highest court, who also has been a bipartisan district expert, he was one of the two experts that was retained to successfully draw the maps in Virginia, is the more credible one to determine what map is and isn't a partisan gerrymander. And again, I will reemphasize this is the exact same methodology that he did in Harkenrider. And you can see the results clear as day in that chart.

Now, I'd like to make one other kind of observation based on some remarks by the Minority Leader and the memo that we received about the treatment of incumbents and and things of that sort. In the Harkenrider case, after we won at the Court of Appeals, it went to a neutral special master. And if those of you all who were following that case at all, remember that neutral special master, because he was drawing a fair map, it just happened to pair some incumbents. It happened to make some incumbents unhappy. That is what happens when you draw a map neutrally consistent with Mr. Trende's principles. You're not going to have all legislators be happy. In fact, it would be more surprising if everyone was happy with a neutral drawn map.

Now, sixth, as outlined in the attached appendix to the memo, which I will not go through that appendix, you all can read it later. The proposed map
maintains, protects, respects the cores of existing districts, preexisting
political subdivisions and communities of interest. Each of the proposed districts, in our proposed map was drawn as best practicable to show respect for political subdivisions. And you can see that in Appendix A, and that goes through in detail.

Now the maps proposed by the Democrat members of the Commission and the Republican members of the Commission unfortunately fail this test in at least one respect. And that's with regard to their treatment of cores of existing districts. That is a mandatory criteria, but only one. What the Republican Commissioners did is they made that the highest criteria above other criteria as as the Minority Leader pointed out, we agree that was problematic. But what the Democrat Commissioners did is they give no weight at all to the statutory factor, no weight at all, even for districts that
there was no argument that there was a gerrymander before. So both of those extreme approaches we rejected and we gave this consideration due weight as the New York law requires.

The seventh and final criteria of state law is the proposed map must contain districts that have been formed so as to promote the orderly and efficient administration of elections. We accomplished that in spades.

So those are all the legal criteria that are in the Federal Constitution, Federal Law and State Constitution. And I would respectfully submit that the proposed map complies with all of those criteria.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Mr. Tseytlin, for that presentation. Very much appreciate it. And I'm going to open up, if our legislators have any questions for you, I'm going to open up the floor to that. Any legislators? Minority Leader?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yes. I have a bunch of questions. I'm sorry. I didn't catch your name.

MR. TSEYTLIN: My name is Misha Tseytlin.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sorry, I'm mispronouncing your name. And you are an attorney at Troutman and Pepper, I'm guessing.

MR. TSEYTLIN: That's right.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And we just received your memo. We appreciate your memo, but we just received your memo probably five minutes before the meeting started. Oh, well, the Legislature just got your memo just five minutes before. I don't know if you prepared it well in advance.

But I do have some questions in regards to -- you had mentioned the analysis that Mr. Trende did, and I do have some questions in regards to how the map was put together.

But let's start with Mr. Trende. If

I'm looking at your analysis correctly and remembering what happened and occurred when Mr. Trende provided testimony just last year as it pertains to the case that was before the court of Appeals, Mr. Trende did the same analysis that he provided for the Republican voters that were suing, he provided the same analysis here?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes, except the only difference here is that he did 50,000 simulations rather than the five and 10,000 he did there, because that was one of the criticisms in the Harkenrider case. They wanted more simulations, so he did 50,000.

The other wrinkle is there is that requirement in the Home Rule Law about not splitting certain towns that are less than $40 \%$, so he coded that in. So those were two differences; otherwise, the analysis, the same analysis.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: The analysis
is the same?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And in that in that analysis, who actually drew the map that's before us today? Did Mr. Trende draw the map? Did yourself draw the map? Who actually put together the map? I understand you analyzed the map. Who drew map?

MR. TSEYTLIN: We worked together with the Presiding Officer to put together the map.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So yourself and Mr. Trende put together the map?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Counsel worked together with the Presiding Officer to put together the map.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm sorry. Who actually sat at a computer and drew the map?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I answered your question.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, no, you haven't, actually. You said that. You said that you worked together with the


Presiding Officer to draw the map.
MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Someone has to sit at a computer and actually draw the map. Was it Mr. Trende?

MR. TSEYTLIN: No.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: It was
yourself?
MR. TSEYTLIN: My law firm drew the map with consultation of the Presiding Officer.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Let me start over. Maybe I'm being unclear. When the Republican map was presented to the Legislature, Mr. Schaefer got up and said, I drew the map. He was able to say that, unequivocally, he had put together the map. We asked him very pointed questions as it pertained to the map that he presented. Now you're telling me that the entity of Troutman Pepper put together the map. Which one is it? Is it Troutman Pepper that put together a map? A whole bunch of people got in a room and

put together the map?
MR. TSEYTLIN: I'm going to try this
one more time. Troutman Pepper working with the Presiding Officer, put together the map.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So that
entity. So there's no individual person.
There's multiple people that put together the map? That's my question.

MR. TSEYTLIN: I answered the
question to the best of my ability.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So multiple people put together the map. Good.

Tonight, Troutman Pepper is paid for by the Republican Majority?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Troutman Pepper was retained by the Presiding Officer pursuant to the Nassau County Charter.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So they've
been -- so can you answer that, sir?
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I just
answered it for you. I retained Troutman Pepper.


LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Just for the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay. He can answer it as well.

MR. TSEYTLIN: That's my understanding.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: All right.
And. If I'm understanding the analysis correctly, that was presented before us, you had mentioned that yet that you disagreed with some of the components of Dr. Magleby's analysis, correct?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Dr. Magleby claimed that he did the analysis that was done in Harkenrider. His analysis has no plausible basis to claim that it's anything like the Harkenrider analysis. He did a completely different analysis, which, as far as I know, has never been presented in any court, and certainly it was never presented in Harkenrider.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And you
reviewed Dr. Magleby's?
MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes, yes.


LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You reviewed it?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And you ran it through the same computations that Mr. Trende did?

MR. TSEYTLIN: He did a completely different analysis. While he did run simulations, instead of doing a gerrymandering, he did something called a mean median analysis.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You're saying he did a different analysis, but you're saying -- Mr. Trende is saying that you ran a different analysis or you're saying that he ran the analysis? Because Mr. Trende did this analysis that's before us today with the bar graph and the black up and down graphs, but you didn't do that, Mr. Trende, did that.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Mr. Trende did that analysis, yes.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So, basically, you just analyzed with Dr. Magleby did.

MR. TSEYTLIN: I read his report as as an expert in redistricting. I have litigated redistricting cases all over the country. I represented independent commissions. I represented individual voters. I read his report, and it's clear, if you read his report, he does not do the Harkenrider analysis at all. He does a completely different kind of analysis.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So it sounds like to me that you're giving testimony that you are an expert demographer.

MR. TSEYTLIN: I'm not giving that testimony, no.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But you're analyzing Dr. Magleby's criteria as well as his analysis as if you were.

MR. TSEYTLIN: That's not correct.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: How is that not, sir?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I am telling you -LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You're a litigator.


MR. TSEYTLIN: As the litigator who litigated Harkenrider --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So you're a litigator, but you're a part time demographer.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Objection.

MR. TSEYTLIN: I was lead counsel in the Harkenrider case, having successfully litigated Mr. Trende's --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But, sir. But, sir, you're counsel. You're not a demographer.

MR. TSEYTLIN: And I presented the analysis of Mr . Trende successfully to the Court of Appeals.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But then Mr. Trende should be here in terms of criticizing or critiquing what Dr. Magleby did, not yourself.

MR. TSEYTLIN: I'm here --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Why isn't he here?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I think so far have
answered all of your questions, and happy to explain to you how Dr. Magleby's analysis is just different from Mr. Trende's. I know he's going to be testifying later, and I doubt that he's going to claim that he did the same analysis as Mr. Trende, given that Mr. Trende does a gerrymandering index off of his ensemble; whereas, Dr. Magleby does a mean median off of his ensemble.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. So let's let's get into the criteria of the map because you talked a little bit about that tonight. So let's get into that.

You tried to present a rationale for Hempstead being split into three districts. I like to hear that again. MR. TSEYTLIN: That is not part of what I articulated. No.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. Let's start over. Is Hempstead split into three districts?

MR. TSEYTLIN: It is.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. So,
basically, I'm trying to understand. You are defending the map that's before us tonight, correct?

MR. TSEYTLIN: That's correct.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Let's try it over again. Let's start again. So basically, Hempstead is split into three districts. You are defending that map. Can you give us the rationale on why Hempstead is split into three districts?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Well, first of all, Hempstead is above the $40 \%$ threshold, so it can be split.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yes.
MR. TSEYTLIN: And in order to
balance their district criteria, as the Presiding Officer said, there is no perfect map. Certainly two splits is better than one. But then you have to make other compromises. You have to achieve all those legal requirements. Of course --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And is there any other village that can be split by

your criteria, that was split three ways? MR. TSEYTLIN: There were not.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So the Village of Hempstead was special?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I'm going to revise.
I'm not sure if any others were split in three ways.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Mr. Tseytlin, let's back up. You drew this map with the with the Presiding Officer, correct?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But you just said that you weren't sure if any other village was split three ways.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Not sitting
here this moment, but $I$ will say that in Appendix A of our memorandum, which I didn't read through, talks about the features of each individual district. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Are you confident of what you presented tonight? MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So let's start over again. The Village of Hempstead was
split three ways.
MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: That is the only village, to your recollection, has been split three ways; can you say that definitively? I can.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Okay.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But you can't.
But you drew the map. Got it.
So again, the Village of Hempstead is split three ways, one of which is located in District 14. Now, one of the things, one of the tenets that is tied to the principles that we follow is that there has to be communities of interest. Can you explain to me the communities of interests as it pertains to the Village of Hempstead, that the village is in?

MR. TSEYTLIN: The memorandum in
Appendix A, it talks about all the communities of interest. I'm going to let the memorandum speak for itself.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Well, sir, just to be fair, we didn't get a chance to read your
memorandum until five minutes before the meeting.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Do you want me to just read the District 14 description to you?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You could read it to me, but I'd rather hear your analysis because you had indicated that you had put together the map.

MR. TSEYTLIN: What I indicated is the law firm of Troutman Pepper worked with the Presiding Officer to put together the map. The descriptions are there in the Appendix, and I can either read the descriptions to you or you can read them yourself.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: What I'm trying to find out is the rationale for why it was done.

MR. TSEYTLIN: The rationale for why it was done is everything that I talked about. You have to comply with all those various criteria and no map is going to be perfect. You're going to have splits.

In the ideal map and the ideal world, you would have no splits, but then you would not be able to comply with all those legal criteria, including population deviation, including the prohibition against racial gerrymandering, and all the rest. That's why any split here would have happened, because fundamentally it is because of the equal protection requirement of equal population, but more particularly the other requirements as well.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So let's just move on because I'm not too sure I understand your point.

Lakeview, also in District 14, correct, as proposed map?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Are you sure? MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Lakeview is also in the proposed map. Lakeview has community interests that I guess you're your proposed map that you propose you
put up tonight actually has some level of community interests with other parts of District 14.

MR. TSEYTLIN: That's correct.
That's correct.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: How so? Are you familiar with Lakeview?

MR. TSEYTLIN: My understanding is that Lakeview shares a school district with other areas of District 14. That's my understanding.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And what's the racial makeup of Lakeview?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As I explained to
you, I explained earlier, racial
gerrymandering is unconstitutional under the US Constitution, and, therefore, we did not analyze race of the map after Mr. Trende concluded that there was no VRA Section 2 district. In fact, I feel quite uncomfortable speaking about the racial makeup of districts in light of the US Supreme Court's very specific instruction, which is that racial
gerrymandering is unconstitutional.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So how would you define communities of interest?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Communities of
interest are people who share political, economic, social or religious ties.

That's how the Supreme Court defines communities of interest.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I would define
it the same way. So explain to me the ties between Lakeview and the surrounding parts that that district that they're supposedly in. You put together the map, right?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As I've said five times now, Minority leader, we worked with the Presiding Officer to put together the map. Appendix A speaks for itself with regard to the communities of interests that are considered.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, no. What are the tenets? You're saying that Lakeview has communities of interest to those communities that is surrounding it

in Legislative District 14? Explain to me those tenets that are similar.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Again, I will point you to Appendix A.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sir, if you can't do it, just say you can't do it. MR. TSEYTLIN: I can do it. I did it in Appendix A, I will refer to that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But your
appendix -- well, you know what? Since you reference it so much, let's read it, because it doesn't talk to that, but let's try it.

MR. TSEYTLIN: You want to look at A3, which talks about District 14. If you want to read that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yeah, I'll read it into the record.
"Proposed District 14 includes East Rockaway, Lynbrook, North Lynbrook, Malverne, Lakeview, West Hempstead, and portions of Hempstead. The district unites similar incorporated villages that are strong religious communities -- I'd
like to understand what you mean by that -- as well as including the synagogues and churches that serve their residents, right?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Proposed District 14 Unites Malverne and Lakeview, which share a school district, as well as keeping together the entire West

Hempstead School District. This district also combines several train stations along -- train stations. Those are communities of interest?

MR. TSEYTLIN: According to the US Supreme Court, transportation links are communities of interest, Minority Leader.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Good to
know -- along the South line of the Long Island Railroad that serve their communities for commuting to and from the city. Now, there are people here from Lakeview tonight. I'm not too sure they would agree with you in terms of the paragraph that -- you wrote this
paragraph, correct?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As I've now said, for the sixth time, we worked with the Presiding Officer.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sir, who wrote the paragraph? Who wrote the memo?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Presiding Officer, do I have to answer the same question seven times?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Why can't we? Someone sat at a computer and wrote this memo. Why can't you tell me who did that?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Is it a work product of your law firm?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes. Working with the Presiding Officer's office.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So it was multiple people?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As I have now said eight times, yes, it was.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But you can't tell us anybody other than yourself that was one of those multiple people.

MR. TSEYTLIN: You want me to

> identify the associates at my law firm, Minority Leader?
> LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I can't believe that the associates would need more than one person to write this memo. I don't know what you're hiding. I really don't.

But that being said, there are
people here tonight that are from
Lakeview. They would submit tonight that what you wrote in this paragraph does not define communities interests.

Now, I'm going to ask you the question again, but now I'm going to break it down based on what you actually wrote. You said that the district unites similar incorporated villages and strong religious communities, correct? What are the religious communities that you identified in Lakeview?

MR. TSEYTLIN: The memorandum speaks for itself, and the Appendix speaks for itself.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sir. Sir. Sir.

Sir. Sir. Sir. Sir, you told me multiple times you asked me to read your appendix as it pertains to District 14. I just did so.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Minority Leader, I have nothing to add beyond what's there on the Appendix.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So you don't know?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I have nothing to add beyond what I --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But you want to profess that you did an incredible analysis, but you didn't even do an analysis to determine what the strong religious communities are in the town of Lakeview, correct?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As I've now said for the eighth time --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You know what, you're going to say for the 15 th time, because ultimately you're not giving any responses that these folks tonight can rely on. I just asked you a very pointed
question. You said that there are strong religious communities, one of which
includes the town of Lakeview. I asked you a very pointed question. Tell me what those religious communities are.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All right. He has answered that. You don't like his answer; we understand that. But let's move on to another question.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding
Officer, what was his answer?
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: He said the answer was he was relying upon the appendix in the memo, and that was his answer. So move on to something else.
(Whereupon, off the record
discussion held.)
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: What my colleague is saying, folks, the packet, if you want to be able to read the appendix is over there on the high table.

Next component. If I remember correctly, the Republican TDAC Commission members actually presented or proposed,
and I believe it's also in the Democratic
map -- I might be confused about the
Republican TDAC map -- an Asian influence district, correct?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Creating a racial --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: District that had an Asian influence.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Creating on purpose, a racial influenced district would violate the Equal Protection Clause of the US Constitution.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, I guess that's not what I asked you. What I asked you was, did those maps do that?

MR. TSEYTLIN: The maps presented a district that you can describe as you will. What I'm saying is if they did that on purpose, that would be unconstitutional.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Can you answer the question?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: He just did.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No. I asked
you, did those maps do that? You had analyzed the maps, correct?

MR. TSEYTLIN: The notion of an Asian influenced district as used in the case law would be a district drawn on purpose for the purpose of having a minority racial group influence the district. If that was done on purpose, it would be unconstitutional if it was done by accident or to further out of the communities considerations, then it would not be legally relevant category.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Did the
Republican TDAC map do that? Did the Democratic TDAC map do that?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Presiding Officer, I'm attempting to answer his questions.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm asking you a very pointed question of whether or not those maps included it or not. You said you analyze the maps, sir.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Do you want me to repeat what $I$ just said? Which is that --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay, so I

guess what you're saying is you didn't analyze that aspect of the maps.

MR. TSEYTLIN: We looked at that aspect of the map. And what I'm saying is to the extent that was done on purpose, which neither of them said they did it on purpose, certainly the Republican side didn't say did it on purpose, that would be a violation of Equal Protection Clause. However, if it was done because of community interest considerations, then it would be fine. But then it wouldn't be in the legal parlance, an Asian influence district. It would be a district drawn based on legal criteria and communities of interest. It wouldn't be deemed, it wouldn't be termed properly in Asian influence district.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Well, we'll agree to disagree, sir.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Fair enough.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Let's move
into Freeport. Should I read your synopsis again?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Sure.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Proposed
District 5 includes North Merrick, Merrick, most of Freeport and portions of North Bellmore. The inter-connected communities share numerous communities of interests, have inter municipal aid services for fire departments and ambulatory services, as well as sharing schools. Consistent with the level of inter municipal cooperation, these communities previously crafted common federal applications and aid after Hurricane Sandy. Beyond government operations, these communities share extensive business interests with Merrick and North Merrick even sharing a common chamber of commerce.

Finally, these communities share the same rail line and economic corridor that runs along the Sunrise Highway in Merrick and have common interests related to both public transportation. Did I capture everything?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Let's start with the last point that you mentioned. They share a common chamber of commerce. What's the name of that chamber of commerce?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I'm going to again repeat, I'm going to rely upon the Appendix. And I will also say further, that this provides far, far more detail than the information provided by either the Democrat Commissioners on their various districts or the Republican Commissioners on the various districts. So we have provided more information to --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Let's --
MR. TSEYTLIN: May I finish?
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

MR. TSEYTLIN: With regard to
communities of interest, while you clearly want more specificity, we have provided this Chamber far more
specificity with regard to communities of interest in this Appendix than anything found in the Republican Commissioners or the Democrat Commissioners' submissions. Now, I know you are wanting more details, but this is significantly more details than they provided, and I didn't remember any questioning of this level of detail, this unhappiness when the Democratic Commissioners were up before the Committee or the Republican Commissioners were before the Committee.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I don't -- I stand to differ on that. But let's go. Let's try it. Because now you're defending the proposed map that's before us tonight. And this is your paragraph. I didn't make that up. This is what you had written, or an ensemble of people have written.

That being said, let's try again. The common chamber of commerce. I would like to know the name of that chamber of commerce.


PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You know, this is going a little bit too far. All right. You can ask the general questions, but this is not so --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. There is no common chamber of commerce that covers the North Merrick, Merrick and Freeport area. I'd like to know where it is. I've lived there. I'd like to know where it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: This is not a gotcha session, so you can ask a question. But if you're going to drill down to the nitty gritty to try to get Mr. Tseytlin because of one or two particular communities, it's not going to happen.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Why do you feel you -- I'm sure you guys had conversations before this. Why do you feel the need to defend him? I asked him a very pointed question. He wrote --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: What I

feel the need to do is to stop you from playing games.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer. No.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You're playing games. You want the name of specific chambers of commerce. That's not going to happen tonight. You can ask general questions. That's fine. You're not playing gotcha with this --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, you're not playing gotcha.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Yes, you are. You know you are.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Gotcha would
be basically if I presented something and then $I$ try to get him on what I said. He wrote this in his memo. He wrote that -Folks, you could read it for yourselves.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You're trying to get him. But he's not answering that question. You can move on.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So basically, the Presiding Officer is going to come to

your defense.
You mentioned again that there --
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: There's a level of fairness here and I'm going to enforce it.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay. All
right. So the record remains that I have not heard the shared chamber of commerce. I would like to know what it is.

Anyway, let's move on. You mentioned that in your opening statement as it pertains to communities of interest, that that you looked at tenets of religious transportation lines, Long Island railroad lines, so on and so forth. Did you look at any other demographic or socioeconomic statuses?

MR. TSEYTLIN: We considered all
communities of interest that are legally permissible. We did not consider racial groups as such because of the precedent that I relayed to you. But we considered what we've talked about before, which is religious, political, economic, social

ties, district ties, those kinds of things.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So are you
familiar with, as it pertains to District
5, there is a section in District 5 that
is that is presently called Northeast Freeport. Are you familiar with that portion of Freeport?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Again, with regard to any specifics of districts, I rely on the Appendix.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sir, I'm going to have to tell you, honestly, and I'm not trying to be confrontational, Presiding Officer, but the fact remains here you are proposing that this map -and you put together a nice graph, a nice chart -- that you're saying tonight that this map passes all the tests in the John Lewis Provision and the Federal Voting Rights Act and everything else. But then when we ask you details about the map, you can't even present them. You're punting them. Which one is it? Do you
know the map? Again, did you draw this map?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Let me answer the question the 11 th time --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I know. I
know. You did it with consultation of the Presiding Officer. But when I'm asking you very detailed questions about the map, you should be able to answer the questions about the map.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: No, no. You know, actually, what you're trying to do is getting down to such minute, granular detail that try to trip up the witness that you are actually going far astray from what the purpose of this hearing is.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We have presented a map that involves 1.4 million people with 19 districts.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding
Officer --
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: And
various other requirements. If we're going to drill down to the granular --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm not too sure why you feel --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Street
by street and catch him on a specific wrong, wrong name of a chamber of commerce, then it's then there's no purpose to this other than, gotcha.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, I am not --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:

There's no individual who would know this county to that extent.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I think the 19 people here do.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: They know each other's districts? You don't know enough about my district.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: How do you
know that? Are you assuming $I$ don't know anything about your district?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: No, no, I'm sorry. That's not true. Obviously, we

all know things about each other's district, but nobody knows our districts like we do. And there are civic associations -- example: What civic associations handle new Hyde Park? (Whereupon, no verbal response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Of course, you don't know, right? You wouldn't know. You wouldn't know.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: There are plenty.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You wouldn't know, but you're willing to say, Oh, this is impartial. This is a terrible gerrymander. So, therefore, by --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: -your own own standards, you're not qualified to make that judgment.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding
Officer, I know your district very well, as you know.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I know you. You actually do know my district. That's true.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: But the bottom line is, for some reason, you are coming to the defense of the witness. I don't know why. I mean, maybe because you hired him. But the bottom line is, from our standpoint, I'm asking you very direct questions. You're claiming that these districts do meet the criteria of having communities of interest. I'm asking you questions like, well, how did you come to that conclusion? Because I'm looking at sections, as we talked about with Lakeview, as we're talking about with Northeast Freeport, what we're talking about with Hempstead that do not meet that criteria to have communities of interest. So I'm asking him very pointed questions on why he believes that section of Hempstead that is in District 14, that area of Lakeview, that is in District 14, I'm asking you very pointed questions on
why you believe those areas have communities and interest of the surrounding areas in that district. Obviously, it doesn't seem like you can answer them, because I'm asking you questions about things that you wrote. I didn't write this. He wrote it, but you can't answer them. Am I understand that correctly?

MR. TSEYTLIN: My answers to the community of interest considerations are found in Appendix A. There are other legal considerations that also cabin how much you can unite communities of interest, which were the discussion that I had for about 30 minutes. It is not possible to unite every community of interest. Every single map ever adopted in the United States splits some communities of interest, unites others. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Where does communities of interest rank in terms of the principles that we should be following?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Communities of interest is the sixth -- is one of the things listed --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No. Where does it rank?

MR. TSEYTLIN: No --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You're saying one of the six.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Minority Leader, I was answering your question.

The top criteria is the US Constitution. Second is the Federal Voting Rights Act. Then there's a Home Rule Law and it has seven different criteria within and the communities of interests are one of the subparts of the sixth criteria, and it says you need to consider --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Which sub part, what number?

MR. TSEYTLIN: It's Municipal Home Rule 10 1a(13)a.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, no, no. What I mean is when you start to break
down the sub parts, which sub parts are ahead of it and which parts are below it?

MR. TSEYTLIN: In the Home Rule Law:
First, districts shall be nearly as equal population as practicable;

Number two, districts shall not be drawn with the intent or result of denying or abridging equal opportunity of racial language, minorities, etc., etc.;

Number three, districts shall be consist of contiguous territory districts;

Four, districts shall be compact in the form of practical.

Five, districts shall not be drawn to discourage competition or the purpose of favoring or disfavoring incumbents or other candidates or political parties;

Number six, the maintenance, of course, of existing districts or existing political subdivisions, including cities, villages and towns and of communities of interest, shall be considered and to extent practicable.

So it's in that list. In number six, it's like the fourth one in number six.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Communities of interest.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes, the fourth one in number six of the Home Rule Law.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: That's what
what $I$ was driving at.
MR. TSEYTLIN: Yeah.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So, basically,
if I'm going back to your tenets again, and let's go back to Freeport, if we can. And I don't want to take too much time tonight because $I$ want the public to be able to get a chance to speak. And I'm sure other Legislators have questions for you. The Northeast Freeport section, I know you said that you did not examine any socioeconomic, you just basically went based off of what you wrote tonight as the criteria on why the northeast section of Freeport, when you decided to split Freeport, was credible to split it where you split it.
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MR. TSEYTLIN: As I've explained
many times, in balancing the many
criteria, some of which I just
articulated and the other ones I
articulated earlier, some communities of
interest had to be split. It is
impossible, Minority Leader, to draw any
redistricting map in any place in this
country that doesn't split some
communities of interest. That's why in
the list it is subpart three of six and it is a consideration that needs to be taken into account. It is one of the many, many considerations, many of which, including the US Constitution and the Voting Rights Act, are of higher criteria. And a lot of the splits in the majority of the splits in any district map, not just the counties, is driven by the Equal Population Requirement. That's why you've got to split every single -if you were to interrogate the the Democrat Legislative map, the Republican Legislative map, you will find
communities of interest that are split
there as well. And as I've said, we
provided many more details of communities
and considerations for this Legislature
than either of those two delegations
provided to you.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You don't have
to defend your map by criticizing theirs.
I'm asking you, can you stand on your
own?
MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You keep
referencing the Democratic map. Yes, the
Democratic map wasn't perfect. The
Republican map wasn't perfect. We get
that. But you keep defending that by
saying, well, I did more than them. Well,
maps are illegal. We give you a legal
if they did little and you're doing
little, but you're doing a little bit
more than them, I don't understand why
you keep saying that as a valid point.
map. If there are specifics of this map that this Body wants to change. If you want to have Hempstead split two instead of three, these are changes that you all can make. I'm just giving you a map that is legal, which is the first map that's legal that you've been presented. The two maps on the table, if the Legislature adopts them, the Legislature will be sued and they will lose. So what I'm doing is I'm presenting you a legal map. It's not perfect. No map is perfect. These individual adjustments to communities of interest, to the extent the Body agrees, they can be done. But what $I$ would say when you do that, make sure you stay within the population limits, make sure you don't racially gerrymander, make sure you don't violate the Voting Rights Act, make sure you keep it contiguous compact. With regard to individual adjustments, you want to you want to split one community of interest, but unite another, as long as you're complying with those
other criteria, this Body can do that. But what you can't do is you can't do what the other two maps that have been given to you and which is to violate the law. You can't do it.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So I'm going to wrap up with this, Presiding Officer, and I want to thank you for your testimony tonight. Can you specify with your map -- I talked about some areas that that needed to be addressed. I talked about Freeport. I talked about Hempstead. I talked about Lakeview. Can you specify in your map what other communities of interests have been separated from other districts that have similar community interest to them?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I'm sure there are many. And the reason for that is in every sense --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Well, identify
something than the ones that we talked about tonight. I'd like to hear it.

MR. TSEYTLIN: As I've said multiple

times, whenever you draw any map, because of how communities of interest are --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sir, I'm not going to let you just go on. I asked you a very -- Presiding Officer, I asked him a very pointed question. I can't get more pointed than that. I just identified three areas that have communities of interest that I don't believe have the same communities interest in the district that are drawn in. I asked you a very pointed question, sir: What other parts of the county have those community interests that are not tied to those districts that they're in? I asked you very pointed question. You drew the map, right?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As I've said now, 12
times --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So, so
basically -- Sir, it's okay to not know.
It's okay, you could say, Minority
Leader, I don't know the answer to the question. It's fair. I would accept that.

But you're continuing to ramble and try to think like you're fooling us, but you're not. Again, I'm going to ask you a very pointed question. Do you know whether or not there are other splits in this map that you drew that exists outside of Lakeview, North Freeport, and Hempstead? If you don't know, just say you don't know.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Because of the way communities of interests are defined, which are these broad categories, there are many splits in every map possible.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So give me a specific to one to this map that you drew. Not talking about many maps. I'm not talking about Wisconsin, not talking about Michigan, places that you may have litigated, cases. You drew this map with the Presiding Officer. So you should be able to tell me where those splits are.

MR. TSEYTLIN: The easiest way to do that is just to look at the various areas that -$88=$

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You drew the map -- -

MR. TSEYTLIN: I'm going to ask you a question, if you would let me.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Give me the areas.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Every single one that split every, single town that's below the $40 \%$, that would be a community of interest split. Every single map will have that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No.
MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes. Every single map will have many community splits.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No. So,
basically, now you're saying the community interest that you're holding that criteria to is based off of zip code and town?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: He didn't say that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No. I'm just trying to figure out which one it is.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You're

not going to paraphrase that and put it in his mouth.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Then, please, clarify what you just said, because I don't think I understood.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
mean, it's clear. He said it. I mean, and everyone in this room knows this. Every time you draw a map, there's going to be a community of interests that gets separated and you have to try to minimize that. Of course --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, let me ask you the question. I guess you consulted --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Of course there's going to be splits.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So --
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It's not possible not to do that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Got it. Got it. There are many splits, we understand. Presiding Officer, since you drew the map with the gentleman, can you tell me where


```
the other splits are?
```

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Of
communities of interest?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Presiding Officer --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Oh, are you defending him now?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I'm trying to be respectful, but let me let me explain to you why your question is frankly silly.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So now I'm silly.

MR. TSEYTLIN: That question is silly. Let me explain why. The way communities of interest are defined, all of Nassau, if you are doing a larger map, would be a community of interest. So the Nassau community of interest is split 19 ways. That's why the --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Let me explain.
MR. TSEYTLIN: That's why the question is silly.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sir, let me explain.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Communities of
interest can be defined in a broad manner or --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sir, let me explain, because maybe you have to lower yourself to insults to be able to make your point. I don't need to do that. But maybe you need to do that. I don't know. But that being said, I asked you a very pointed question. It doesn't seem like you can answer the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I will answer that. Put it to me -- -

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: The community of Oceanside is split, community of New Hyde Park is split -LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: The community of Manhasset is split from Port Washington. We could -- if you asked every legislator here about their district --


LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Wait, wait, wait. No, no, no. I'm answering your question.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, no. I was making my point.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You had asked a question of me. He had interrupted. I'm answering you. Every legislator here, your side, our side, every one of us can look at this map and tell you there's community of interest splits in each district. Multiple: Oceanside, I can tell you new Hyde Park has been split, East Williston, Williston Park has been split. Multiple. Levittown has been split.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So, so.
Presiding Officer --
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: The point is that the answer to your question --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding

Officer, what you're stating is the obvious. We know unincorporated areas could be split. What I'm talking to in regards to Hempstead and to Freeport, Hempstead and Freeport are incorporated villages that meet a criteria to be split. So I'm asking the question, you're bringing up every single town --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: That's what you asked.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, you're misinterpreting what I'm asking the question, and it hinges on Hempstead and Freeport is how did you determine the split in those particular areas? He couldn't answer the question. So then I elaborated the question to get the point that you just made in regards to what other towns that were split. Now, if we were to examine those towns, I would like to see the breakdown and analysis that shows me that those towns have separate or different community interests than the districts that they could have been in or
not in. I haven't seen that. This is his map. So I'm asking very pointed
questions, but for some reason we keep feeling the need to defend him. And then he comes to your defense. I don't know why. But the point I'm trying to make is, I need to understand why we made those splits. The folks behind you want to know why you made those splits. You can't come up with a reason on why. You just say a more general -- I understand what you're going to say -- to paraphrase. You're just continuing to say that, well, in any large county, you're going to have to have splits. Splits are going to happen, community interests are going to split. But you did that based on not even hearing from these folks tonight.

MR. TSEYTLIN: When this map was being drawn, we looked at all of the testimony in front of the TDAC. We looked at all the public testimony. We looked at the recommendation from both sides of the TDAC. We talked to the Presiding Officer.

And in Appendix A --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sir, that is impossible.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You keep interrupting him.

MR. TSEYTLIN: We talked --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sir --
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Because you don't like his answer.
MR. TSEYTLIN: I read every single word of the --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Either you're --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: This is a monologue.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Sire, either you didn't read through the transcript properly or you're just flat out just wrong. Because one, because I could tell you unequivocally there were people here from the Village of Hempstead that asked for their village to be made whole, unequivocally. So if you're telling me that they were okay with a split, either
you read the transcript wrong -- we could go through the transcript because I'm willing to bet that that transcript does not reflect that they said that this village could be split three ways.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You do not have to respond to that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Yeah. Because we know the truth. Nothing further.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: He didn't want answers. He wanted to give a monologue.

Anyone else in the Minority want to ask any questions? Who's next?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So thank you for your testimony thus far. I do have some questions, and $I$ was going to allow some air to get between myself and the Minority Leader because I, too, want to discuss the communities of Hempstead and Lakeview.

Before we talk about those
communities, $I$ wanted to talk about the difference in what you say, the process
that was undertaken by the Democrats, which was a median and mean or mean median simulations. Is that what you stated earlier?

MR. TSEYTLIN: So what do you want me. Do you want me to just yes or no? Do you mean explain?

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I want to hear you. Yeah.

MR. TSEYTLIN: So what Mr. Trende did in Harkenrider is he ran simulations. And then what he did is you create something called a gerrymandering index, which helps you tell how the map that was adopted performs compared to maps that were drawn without political considerations. That is what you see here. What was done.

What Dr. Magleby did is he did a simulation, but then he didn't do a gerrymandering index. He did something called a mean median approach. He didn't explain why he did mean median instead of some other partisan symmetry calculation,
which is all different from the gerrymander index. He also didn't disclose in his report that what he was doing, regardless of whether in his academic literature he prefers that approach, that it was entirely different from Harkenrider. What you see in his report is he says, I'm doing the

Harkenrider thing. Well, we went and we retained the Harkenrider expert and he did the actual Harkenrider thing. And you get them you get a showing that our map is in the middle of the bell curve, whereas both the Republican Commission map and the Democratic Commission map are off the bell curve. But again, as I said, they're not as far off as the congressional map that the Albany Legislature drew, but they're pretty far off. And ours is right in the middle on the gerrymandering index analysis that was successful in in Harkenrider.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And then at some point you gave a number for the
simulations. The enumeration of this simulations. How many --

MR. TSEYTLIN: Mr. Trende ran 50,000
simulations in the circumstance, I
believe. Dr. Magleby ran 10,000. Now as we talked in Harkenrider, when you have this number of simulations, once you get about 5000, you're likely just going to end up getting the same results. But Mr. Trende ran 50,000 just because in Harken Ryder he was criticized for only running 10,000, which is --

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: The next question. Thank you for answering that. Thank you.

So I want to shift now specifically
to the communities of Hempstead and Lakeview, and I wanted to talk a little bit about the split and how parts of Hempstead and Lakeview then end up in District 14. And specifically, I wanted to talk about the Municipal Home Rule Law where it gives the priorities and it's the population, right? Then second is not diluting the votes of racial and language
minority groups, correct?
MR. TSEYTLIN: Right, Legislator.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So. Please reconcile how you can protect those groups rights without taking race into consideration. Because you said a few times you don't take race into consideration.

MR. TSEYTLIN: What the US Supreme Court has said is that moving any sizable number of people into a particular district based on race is unconstitutional unless you satisfy the highest standard in law, which is strict scrutiny. The US Supreme Court has thus far only recognized one basis in redistricting that would satisfy strict scrutiny. That is, strict compliance with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, the Federal Voting Rights Act. Because we did not want to read the John Lewis Law to violate the US Constitution, we interpreted it consistent with Section 2 of the VRA. And as I noted, Mr. Trende
did a Section 2 VRA analysis under the Gingles factors, and he informed us there were no districts that needed to be drawn to comply with Section 2 of the VRA. That satisfies then that provision of state law. Because that provision of state law is read consistent with other provisions of state law which say that nothing in any of the law can require violation of the US Constitution. And of course, that makes a lot of sense because under the Supremacy Clause of the US Constitution, the US Constitution stands higher than the federal legislation and it stands higher than state legislation, which is why that is, I think, a sensible reading of the John Lewis Law. Now I will say that John Lewis Law has never been litigated. This was just enacted. This is the first cycle. Perhaps, there will be a test case here coming up. But we have to do our best to reconcile this new law with something the US Supreme Court has been very firm about. You know, the

Cooper case was written by Justice Elena
Kagan. The Wisconsin state legislature case recently came out and the US Supreme Court has been very harsh on either state legislatures or even state supreme courts who draw districts based on race. And we were very concerned that both the Republican Commission's map and the Democratic Commission's map did not heed those instructions, did not discuss those instructions. And we were trying to comply with the US Constitution. And we believe that John Lewis Act was not intended to be in violation of the US Constitution.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: So that was a lot.

MR. TSEYTLIN: It's a complicated legal area.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Yeah, it is. And I'm not going to profess -- I'm not a lawyer, I'm not a practitioner. But I can't I still can't reconcile to how the Municipal Home Rule specifically states
that you have to meet these priorities. And they go in order. There's a preference. It's a priority order. And the second one being the most important and it's not diluting those individuals voices. And I don't know how we do that without considering race. So I personally can't reconcile to that. And I'll tell you that those communities to which may share school districts, they may share train lines, but one of the other things that it's supposed to really take into consideration, and as far as I understand it, is that there has to be a commonality in policy, policies that would impact the communities of interest. And I would argue that the policies that would impact Lakeview versus what policies might be impactful or of consideration or of paramount importance to the folks in Malverne and Lynbrook are significantly, significantly different.

And I'm going to tell you that the communities of Hempstead and -- and

Lakeview is a very small, small
community. Lakeview proper is, I think, somewhere around 5700 people. But, folks who know that community know that when we say Lakeview, we're also referring to the unincorporated portion of Rockville Centre, and we're also referring to a portion of West Hempstead. So if we were to combine all of those communities, they're not a large group of people. And but if I specifically just peel off Lakeview, Lakeview is a community that does not have its own school district. It's a community that does not have its own community center. And because of that, it is not uncommon to find folks from Lakeview in that greater area, because they're all clustered right together, to find them in Hempstead at Kennedy Park. It's not uncommon to find them in other parts of the community, whether it be Baldwin or Roosevelt and other parts of the community, to meet their cultural needs and to discuss
things of great paramount consideration for them regarding policy. I implore this Body to reconsider where Lakeview is placed.

And when we start talking about
Hempstead, where it's a very large population of individuals, there are subsets in different parts of that community, The Heights this and that -to split it three ways -- and I know that it had been split three ways before -- it presents a challenge for some of those communities as well. Because when we talk about policies, policies that would bind those groups together to want to be able to identify a pool of candidates that they want to elect and be able to have those individuals represent them, to split them off as a disenfranchisement. And that's why that second part of that municipal Home Rule Law says you must, you must consider racial language groups. And that's why when we get down the list and we get to communities of interest,
it's not the last thing on the list because it is important. It's not the last thing.

So I know we talked about train
lines and I know we talked about, you know, schools and school districts, because I think school districts can be important. But the one thing that I didn't hear anybody talk about today is the commonality of where folks stand on issues and policies and having their voices and their concerns represented by somebody who they can choose. And so I'd like you to revisit that map and consider that small little -- they call it "Little Lakeview" and consider a Little Lakeview. And I would ask you to consider the good people of Hempstead as well. Thank you. Great.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you, Legislator Bynoe. And of course,
your points with respect to Lakeview and Hempstead, they're valid. We understand the points that you're making and the
concerns that you have and members of the public have. But we did make efforts as much as possible to incorporate what was said during our Committee and during the TDAC process. We were able to get Westbury and New Castle back together. We were able to get Uniondale whole. We were able to get the Five Towns together, which were all things that were raised during the the TDAC process and Committee process. But it's a difficult thing to do because you still have to make sure that what you arrive at at the end is something that's going to survive a lawsuit. So we have to make sure --

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: Presiding Officer?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Yes. LEGISLATOR BYNOE: I'm sorry, I'll let you finish.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I'm basically done.

LEGISLATOR BYNOE: And I want to acknowledge that you did hear the voices
of Little Lakeview very early on in the process, in so much that Lakeview was split into three different districts and they were then bought back whole. And I do acknowledge that you heard testimony from even Legislator Mule regarding portions of her district, $I$ think it was Freeport, the portion of Freeport. And I will acknowledge Westbury/Newcastle have been put together whole. But this is an opportunity for me, yet again. You know, I'm always going to push the envelope. This is an opportunity for me again to advocate for the community of Lakeview and advocate for some possible changes that could be made into moving around some things so that we do our very best to protect those communities.

Thank you.
LEGISLATOR BYNOE: As always, your advocacy is very effective and very heartfelt and we understand.

Legislator Solages, then Legislator Drucker.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you. In the same spirit, I'm here also to advocate for the Third Legislative District. I'm here also to advocate for the interests of a part of the Third Legislative District known as Millbrook. And it is an unincorporated part of Valley Stream known as Millbrook, and has been removed from the Third Legislative District. I'd like to know what were the justifications for splitting this part of the Third Legislative District?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As I said to Minority Leader, we needed to comply with the law. That was the first and foremost. And as a result of complying with the law, some communities of interest had to be split and that may be one of them. As the Presiding Officer said at the beginning, no map is perfect. And if there are adjustments that are like that like like the ones that were just mentioned that could be done within the context of a legal map, that's something that the Body
should discuss.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: I implore my colleagues and I implore yourself and your team and Presiding Officer to reconsider, including, once again, Millbrook. They share a commonality with the rest of the district, specifically the Valley Stream, part of the district in terms of a common school district, in terms of a common train station, the Valley Stream train station that they use no more than than a quarter of a mile away to go to work in New York City. In addition, there are parts of Elmont that are not part of the current Third Legislative District that were part of the Third Legislative District in the past, and that is the eastern part of Elmont that was represented before by Legislator Muscarella and currently by Legislator Giuffre. An example of that is a young lady who lives in that part of Elmont, Nefiah, who was a victim of an acid attack and instead of reaching out
to your predecessor, Mr. Giuffre, she reached out to my office, even though I was not her legislator, because I represent Elmont. There are parts of Belmont that are east of Meacham Avenue, that runs north and south, there are only two streets that run north and south of Elmont, and this portion of Elmont has no difference from other portions of Elmont.

And it is very diverse in terms of a very large South Asian population and also a Caribbean population. And I implore my colleagues to reconsider this map to keep Elmont truly whole, because there are issues that affect not just one part of Elmont, but all of Elmont.

You know, again, there was a lot of discussion as to who drew the map. Are there any other persons who are responsible for drawing the map who are here tonight?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Nobody from my law firm is here no. Just me.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Like Legislator

Bynoe and Legislator Kevan Abrahams, I share the concern of whether or not race was used. It's almost like a paradox to say that you did not consider race. Where perhaps race of other communities where we're considered. I mean, we have several other communities that may not be considered Minority/Majority communities and their cores were kept intact; whereas, other core communities that are minority communities were not kept intact, such as Legislator Kevan Abrahams.

You know, I'm concerned that we have two Minority/Majority communities represented by minorities, myself, Legislative District Three, and Kevan Abrahams, Legislator of District Three (sic), and these communities are being split. Do you have any concerns about these these communities being split?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Certainly every community of interest split is ideal to avoid. The problem is that you have to

```
comply with what the US constitutional
requirement and then the even more
stringent state law requirement of equal
population. And there is no way to split
a sizable area like the county into 19
parts without splitting communities of
interest.
```

    LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: But currently
    Legislative District Three is represented
by a Majority/Minority. Under the new
map, it is no longer represented by a
Minority/Majority. My residence is no
longer in that district. Did you take
political considerations in making these
maps?

MR. TSEYTLIN: No, not at all,
Legislator. That's the first time I'm hearing about that. And what happened after we won the Harkenrider case at the Court of Appeals, the Special Master drew a map. And I don't know if I mentioned this earlier, there were certain
incumbents that were paired, folks that
ended up running --

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: I'm very
familiar with that decision. I mean, but in that decision that involved multiple counties Queens, Nassau, Suffolk County. Here, this only involves this one county. That's a key difference. We can't just use that case law as example, as gospel, when there are clear distinctions.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Well, New York's congressional districts had to be divided into 26. The County has to divide it into 19. Obviously, 26 is bigger than 19. But it shows when you draw a map not to advance a political agenda, but to draw a map that -- look, the proof is in the pudding right there. We had the same expert analyze our map and it's right right in the bell curve. This is a fair map. This is just like people who were paired from the Harkenrider decision were obviously unhappy. They were all over the press, attacking judges and things of that sort. But when you have a map that's drawn fairly, that's not drawn to favor
or disfavor any incumbent, then you might have, unfortunately, some incumbents that are less happy with that process. But
know the reason that the Legislature adopted the Home Rule Law and the prohibition against partisan gerrymandering, mirroring what the people did in 2014, is they didn't want any more partisan gerrymandering. They didn't want any more incumbent protection gerrymandering. And that has consequences.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: But there are multiple Democratic legislators who are no longer in their district due to your map.

MR. TSEYTLIN: I was not aware of that until this moment.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Did the map maker conduct an analysis of the weather as to whether there is racially polarized voting in Nassau County?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: And did that
occur for the Third Legislative District in the current map that you propose?

MR. TSEYTLIN: There is some racially polarized voting in some parts of Nassau. Yes.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: What parts of Nassau County?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I do not have those numbers in front of me. But what I would say is, the Gingles precondition has three parts and Mr. Trende analyzed three parts. It has not only the racial polarization of the voting, but also whether the minority group, a single minority group, has their candidates of choice --

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: But Mr.
Schaefer, when he came here before, did describe that his map did conduct a racial polarized analysis. Does your map do that?

MR. TSEYTLIN: No. Mr. Schaefer, in fact, who testified that he had done no racially polarized analysis whatsoever.

That's what Mr. Schaefer testified to. Mr. Trende did do that analysis. He also he analyzed all three Gingles Preconditions, and he determined no VRA districts were mandated. So, whereas, Mr. Schaefer -- and this is one of the problems with what Mr. Schaefer had done, which mirrored one of the problems in the Democrat TDAC Commission, is he drew a District One based on race without it being grounded in Section 2 of the VRA. And so that was one of the reasons that we concluded that that map was unconstitutional. And similar problems abound in the Democrat proposal. In the memorandum that was submitted earlier today by the Democratic members of the TDAC and the accompanying report they submitted from the other expert, that I take it will not be testifying, shows that they are not taking into account the US Supreme Court case law against racial gerrymandering.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: The 2013 map

at all. So the cores of existing
districts were taken into account, but
they were not made the predominant
consideration as they were under the
Republican TDAC's proposal.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: So you did
consider the cores of the Third
Legislative District and also District
One?

MR. TSEYTLIN: We considered all of
the cores. It was one of the many
criteria that we did consider. We did not
do either extreme. What happened at the
TDAC level was that the Democratic
members said, we're going to give zero
weight to the cores, even though the
statute says you have to give weight to
the cores. And then the Republicans said
we're going to give predominant weight.
What we did is we gave some weight.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: You made
reference to Mr. Trende's analysis. Did
did Mr. Trende provide a racially
polarized analysis?

MR. TSEYTLIN: He conducted one, yes.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Can you provide -- is that part of your memo?

MR. TSEYTLIN: No, he conducted one.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: But are you relying upon that analysis?

MR. TSEYTLIN: We are relying upon his conclusion that we did not have to draw any other districts to comply with Section 2 of the VRA, yes.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Can you please provide his analysis?

MR. TSEYTLIN: That was the bottom line.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: You still considered his analysis, nevertheless. So, therefore, for your conclusion, can you please provide that to this Body?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I provided to this Body the bottom line conclusion that he analyzed it.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: So you're not providing the analysis from Mr. Trende?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I am providing his bottom line conclusion. That is what I'm providing.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Can you please provide his analysis?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I think he's answered the question. He's providing the bottom line analysis, and that's --

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: He's relying upon the conclusion, but not upon the analysis. But the analysis determines the conclusion; therefore, we are entitled to the analysis.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Therefore, no, you're not. He's given you an answer, and that's the answer that you have.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: There was no answer, just to be clear.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: He
was. He basically said that he's providing a bottom line analysis and that's all that he is providing.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: He's refusing to provide an analysis that he relying on the conclusion that came from that analysis.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It is what it is.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: On your report on page four, you describe Section 2 of the VRA. It states in relevant part, "relying upon Cooper, traditional criteria such as ensuring district compactness and continuity, reflecting population shifts, maintaining population equality". Is your conclusion today that the John Lewis Voting Rights Act is inconsistent or contradicts the US Constitution?

MR. TSEYTLIN: No. Our interpretation of the law that has not been yet interpreted is the law should be interpreted so as not to require a consideration of race that would violate the US Constitution's Equal Protection Requirement. That is an issue that has
not been litigated. The courts may decide that the John Lewis Law is in line with Section 2 of the VRA, and then there would be no constitutional problem. If the courts conclude that the John Lewis Law requires an over emphasis on racial redistricting, then the unfortunate result would be the John Lewis Law would be declared unconstitutional. I would hope that the courts would not read the John Lewis Law like that, but rather read it under the principle of constitutional avoidance to avoid that result. Because I do not think the Legislature was intending to violate the Constitution. LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: There was reference made to Dr. Megan Gall's analysis that there should be five Majority/Minority districts.

Unfortunately, we do not see that. Why the difference from 5 to 4? Why are you only relying upon for Minority districts? MR. TSEYTLIN: We're not relying on any Majority/Minority districts,

Legislator. As I said, we concluded that there was no need to draw any VRA districts. The fact that we do have four was based was the result entirely of taking communities of interest into account. Of course you can have a Majority/Minority --

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: But did you consider Dr. Gall' conclusion?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes, we did.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: And why not
incorporate it in your analysis?
MR. TSEYTLIN: Dr. Gall's conclusion and her analysis was contrary to the US Supreme Court's case law under the Equal Protection Clause. And since the US Constitution is the predominant law in this land, to the extent that she was making recommendations and she does make recommendations that this Body violate the equal protection clause of the Constitution, I would urge this Body not to heed those recommendations.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: I respectfully
disagree, legally speaking.
But going back to Mr. Trende, can he provide a memo or any information regarding his racially polarized analysis?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: No. You have his answer. You have his answer.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Why is it such a secret? I mean, this process should be transparent.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: This is not litigation. This is a hearing -- -

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Unfortunately, this will lead to litigation.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Well,
right. If that's what it takes in litigation, then that's what it takes, the litigation. But this is a hearing --

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Nassau
taxpayers can't afford that.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You're presented with this information and this is what you have.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Is there any
reason why Mr. Trende is not here tonight?

MR. TSEYTLIN: The request was someone that could could testify to all the legal requirements; that is the map. Mr. Trende provided analysis on two of the nine legal requirements. I'm able to talk about his analyses. Those two and I'm able to talk about the others. So it seemed that that made more sense.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: We talked about Dr. Gall, also we're going to hear from Dr. Magleby. He considers your map to be an extreme example of gerrymandering. What is your response to that?

MR. TSEYTLIN: My response was upon
taking his criticisms in his report of the Republican TDAC proposal seriously, we retain -- and he said in his report, I'm doing this because the New York Court of Appeals said this is the kind of analysis you need to do. So what do we do? We retained the expert in Harkenrider to do the exact same analysis. There you
have it. Our map is right in the bell curve. The two TDAC maps are off. Now they're not off anywhere as egregiously as the Democrat gerrymander in Albany last year. I don't want to be impugning either map to that extent. But it is very clear that under the actual analysis in Harkenrider, not this entirely different mean median analysis that Dr. Magleby is doing, that our map scores extraordinarily well.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Mr. Trende's conclusion for the racially polarized analysis, what election cycles did that analysis rely upon?

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: I do not know the answer.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Did it rely upon 2021?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: He just told you he doesn't know the answer.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: He could answer no to that question. You can answer no to 2019. You can answer no 2017.

MR. TSEYTLIN: I do not know the answer to which ones he analyzed.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Why is that information secret? I mean, if you're relying upon his conclusion, shouldn't it be based upon some empirical data?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr. Tseytlin, that's not a question. You can go to the next question.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: I will allow Mr. Drucker to answer questions about his district, but the map clearly rips him out of his district, and I share his concern. Now I'm in Legislator Kopel's district. Are you sure no consideration considerations were made?

MR. TSEYTLIN: We can not take into account -- the first time I'm hearing about any --

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Just like you can't take race in consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You
don't have to answer that question. Go ahead. Next question.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: You mentioned villages. And in the Third Legislative District, we see the Village of Valley Stream. Is the population of the Village of Valley Stream, greater or lesser than 40\% of the Third Legislative District?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I have not memorized all the population sizes here today.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Understood. But you are relying upon an analysis as to whether or not specific villages are being broken up.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Every village that is broken up is higher than the $40 \%$ threshold.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: So is it safe to say that the threshold is established in the Third Legislative District with respect to the Village of Valley Stream?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As I said, I did not memorize the population of every district, but I did have my team confirm that every single village that is split is in compliance with that $40 \%$ rule.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you.
I implore my colleagues to please keep Elmont whole and also to include Millbrook once again in the Third Legislative District.

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you.

Legislator Drucker.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

I don't want to belabor or kick the dime or kick a horse, whatever the expression is.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Beat a dead horse.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Beat a dead horse. I'm getting tired, Presiding Officer. Thank you.

How familiar are you with the particular characteristics of the 19 legislative districts? Personally familiar.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Personally, that is
not my core competency. That's why that's why I consulted with the -LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: It's a yes or no question. Are you personally familiar with the characteristics of the 19 districts?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I'm certainly not an expert on that. I am not an expert on that. I'm not claiming to be.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Yes. So, some of my questions, just like with the Minority Leader and others on my caucus, you might not be able to answer that.

But, I mean, you know, everyone agrees that tragically, Nassau County has de facto racially and ethnically and culturally segregated communities. It's it's tragic, but it's the reality and the maps have to understand that.

I represent Legislative District 16.
It just so happens that this map that you're proposing, the line is drawn on my front walk of my house and I am now in Legislator Ferretti's district.

Legislator Ferretti, I love Legislator Ferretti. John, you listening? I love Legislator Ferretti, but probably the only thing we have in common is we're both diehard Mets fans.

But to put a point, my district now under this new map, you cut in half

Plainview. Plainview/Old Bethpage, are you familiar with this district at all?

So Plainview/Old Bethpage is one
contiguous compact, ethnically,
culturally similar, politically similar communty. The school district is called the Plainview/Old Bethpage School

District. The library is the
Plainview/Old Bethpage Library. The
Chamber of Commerce is the Plainview/Old
Bethpage Chamber of Commerce, The Plainview/Old Bethpage Community Pool.

The Houses of Worship. Everything is
Plainview/Old Bethpage. I live within one mile -- it's kind of sad -- of where

I lived my entire life. I haven't gone very far. So $I$ know the community like
the back of my hand, and Plainview and old Bethpage are joined at the hip in all respects. And now I have to be able to understand how this map all of a sudden takes a community that's been together since inception, and the boundary line is where I live. And I live in a condominium complex over the last couple of years. The condominium complex is called Country Pointe Plainview. My mailing address is Plainview. Most of the people in my community have a Plainview mailing address. There's a really small section in the back that actually has an Old Bethpage mailing address. So this now map is going to cut that in half and remove an entire community. I don't know how that's possible to do that. We've been together forever.

You talk about one of the criteria under the Municipal Home Rule, "the maps can't discourage competition for the purpose of favoring or disfavoring an incumbent". Well, I can't think of any
other map that disfavors me because the line is at my front door, coincidentally.

And how many other -- are there any guys on the other side of the aisle, do you know, who now the line pulls them out of their district? On our side, we have myself, the Minority Leader and Legislator Solages. So that three out of seven that's I think $40 \%$ of our caucus is now out. I don't know how that's justifiable in any world. Can you talk about that?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As as I responded to your fellow legislator, I had no idea about any incumbent locations until I was
-- like I said, I got the memo earlier today from the the Democrats on the TDAC.

You know, to the extent that something like that occurred, it seems almost déjà vu to what happened when the special master drew the the remedial map and the Harkenrider case. It was all over the news. Everyone knows there were primaries of folks and they were unhappy about it.

But that's what happens when you don't do business as usual. What was business as usual before was drawing maps that took into account these things. Now you're not supposed to be favoring political parties or incumbents.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: So there's no political agenda with regard to these maps?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Legislator, the proof is in the pudding. We retained the same expert that analyzed the partisan fairness. In the New York Court of Appeals landmark decision Harkenrider, we asked him, does this pass the test? It passes it with flying colors.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Right. So you drew the maps with the Presiding Officer with no political agenda involved. But 40\% of this caucus is now out, and any other on the other side?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As as I said, Legislator, you're saying certain things about about --

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: The answer is no. The answer is no.

MR. TSEYTLIN: You can answer your question, but $I$ have no idea.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Shouldn't you have an idea?

MR. TSEYTLIN: No, I should not. For the same reason that the Special Master was criticized. In the proposed map in Harkenrider, the Special Master drew some incumbents into the same districts and he was criticized in that the proposal stage saying, how could you do this? And he wrote it in the final report. I'm not allowed by the New York Constitution to take these things into account. And that was exactly correct. And we were following that precedent.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I want to let these people speak, so I'm not going to beat a dead horse. But Old Bethpage, although it sounds like Bethpage is so completely different in every aspect than Old Bethpage, Old Bethpage and Bethpage,

I mean from the school districts, from politics, from religion. I mean, you know, I don't want to say there was any sort of attempt to do this with religion in mind, but once you cross over Old Bethpage into Bethpage, there's a difference, and Farmingdale there's a difference. But that's just the way Nassau County is, tragically. It's sad, but that's what we have and we need to do better.

So this map doesn't do it for me, although I get to be in Legislator Ferretti's district.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay,
Thank you, Arnie. I think the Minority
Leader had some follow up questions.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Follow up and then obviously we can move on.

I was listening to some of the question and answering by Legislator Solages to you, Mr. Tseytlin. I understood when you were going back and forth with me that you had a very
comprehensive knowledge of what Mr.
Trende had done, but when Legislator
Solages asked you in regards to what
criteria in terms of determining this was not a partisan gerrymander, what years did he use, the years that he uses, is that a criteria?

MR. TSEYTLIN: No. Legislator
Solages was asking me the years that he used for his racial polarizing analysis.

What you're asking for is this. And he used the exact same races and the exact same years that he used for the analysis that he did in Harkenrider, which is the statewide elections in the state of New York from 2016 to 2020, the gubernatorial, the senate, and the presidential elections, those are the ones he used for that. He may have used the same ones for the racial polarizing analysis. I just don't know. That's why I was answering. But $I$ know for --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I guess, what I'm driving at and also going to ask you
-- not to cut you off, I'm sorry. Just trying to start a new -- what he used as that criteria to come up with that, that's the appropriate criteria to use here in Nassau, even though the criteria used for that is a different election cycle?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes, absolutely. The
academic literature is that statewide races are the the best way to establish a baseline of partisanship. I will note that in the report of Dr . Magleby, the longer report, not the short one today, he says that he tries to explain why he used countywide races and his
justification was that individual
congressional races and individual
legislator races are not appropriate, which we agree with. And then he says countywide races has been found to be reliable. But he cites nothing for that. There's no citation in this report for that. In fact, so far as $I$ know, in every case that has used simulation analyses,
the races that were used for that analysis were statewide races, because those are the best ones to abstract away from individual candidate quality, spending disparities, and other idiosyncrasies that could make a low name ID race or a low, low money race or a high money race on one side and the other not representative.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Every single case?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I am not aware of any case that has ever used local races to set the baseline for a simulation analysis. Maybe there's some somewhere in the country, there's obviously more and more simulation analysis being done. But so far as I know, and the leading practitioners of this methodology, including Dr. Imai, who was kind of the The Godfather of this analogy, uses statewide races.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Got it. MR. TSEYTLIN: Now, that was not the
biggest mistake, in my judgment, that Dr. Magleby made, that was not doing the gerrymandering index, but rather using the mean median difference. But that is another compounding factor that I think was unfortunate in his analysis and not supported by any academic literature that he cited, at least, in his report.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: If you can refer your attention to page three of your analysis, and this is going to be quick because I'm trying to reconcile the numbers and I'm not coming up with it. You mentioned in your analysis that the mean number -- again, this is your analysis, right? Just want to make sure that. You mentioned in your analysis that the mean number is 73,521 based off of a population adjusted population of 1,396,897, correct?

MR. TSEYTLIN: That's what the numbers say. Yes.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Are you aware that the adjusted population is

1,396,925?
MR. TSEYTLIN: I'm not, but I can I can look at the numbers afterwards. And if there's a slight correction, I'm sure that can be made. I don't know those numbers --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Let's just establish for the record because I was looking at your map and I notice -- and my eyes are not the best, I'll admit that getting older with age. But $I$ noticed in your map that in District 14 or District 7, it looks like there's a zero in between the two maps. What is that zero?

MR. TSEYTLIN: I don't know.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm sorry.
MR. TSEYTLIN: I don't know.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Okay, So
there's a zero there -- you drew this map, correct?

MR. TSEYTLIN: As I said, I think 12 times before, it was done --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: It was done in consultation.

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes. And so that zero would have been spit out by the program.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: So it was spit out by the program. So that zero, does that have any significance?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Not that $I$ know of.
MR. TSEYTLIN: Well, based on what
I'm seeing, it does have some
significance. Would you like to hear what it is?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Sure.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You left out a census block of 28 people. That's why the your number is off. Your number is off by 28 people. So in essence, your mean population for all districts should not be 73,521; it should be 73,522 . But again, you're contending that this map is legal. Again, you're attending, that you put together this map. And again, I'm going to attest that this map is sloppy, but thank you. Nothing further.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: So let
me let me see. Legislator Ferretti has a question. Let me see the point here. Apparently, an error was made with 28 people being left out and, therefore, the mean population should not be 73,521 ; it should be 73,522. And the conclusion that my colleagues have drawn is this map is sloppy. All right. You can have that point. See if anyone else buys that. LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Where else, Presiding Officer, is it sloppy? I just found this in the last 20 minutes. I'm sure if you give me more time, I can find more.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You
found a variance of 28 people in a population of over 1.3 million. So, I mean --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: In 20 minutes. Yeah, I did.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I started this by saying it's gotcha moments, and you finished it with a gotcha moment. So, gotcha.

Legislator Ferretti.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: So I just
wanted to thank you for your testimony. I was blown away by a lot of it. I think we all got a pretty good education tonight in this redistricting, which I find fascinating. I watched all the the hearings with the two commissions. And, you know, I think that especially in your introduction, when you explain the whole process, you got so much out there in a pretty short period of time on a pretty complicated issue. So thank you for that, very informative.

There was one question that was
asked of you that you began to answer when you were being questioned earlier about communities of interest and you were kind of cut off from answering. I don't remember exactly what the question was, but just to refresh your recollection, you began to talk about in a certain situation, Nassau County as a whole would be treated as a community of
interest, and then you were kind of cut off from further explaining as to how that would be. So would you can you explain that?

MR. TSEYTLIN: Yeah. So thank you so much. So I was asked by the Minority Leader what other communities of interest at all are split. And what $I$ was trying to say was that communities of interest are defined so broadly that if you're talking about a bigger map, let's say a congressional map, the County itself, it has commonality, it has political interest, is represented by this Body, it would fairly be termed as a community of interest. And obviously that community of interest has to be split 19 ways for you all to be here. So the point $I$ was trying to make and maybe I shouldn't use the word silly and I apologize for that. The point I was trying to make is the question was poorly framed. The reason for that is every map, by drawing even two districts in a map, you're
automatically going to split communities of interest. And when you have to draw a community -- this is a community of interest, it's got political commonality being represented by this Body, it's a community of interest. So to draw these 19 districts, we had to divide the community of interest 19 ways. And every single, as the Presiding Officer said, gotcha question, really founders on that very core premise, which is that whenever you draw any one district line, by definition, you're going to split a series of communities of interest. And what a legal map does is it complies with all legal requirements, and does its best to divide less communities of interest, to respect cores of existing districts to the extent possible, to respect all of the other considerations. And that's the point I was really trying to make with regard to that comment.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you. I appreciate it.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All right, Mr. Tseytlin, thank you very much for your testimony. We appreciate it. And we're going to move on at this point.

I'm going to offer the Minority Leader an opportunity to introduce a speaker.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Thank you, Presiding Officer. I would like to bring up Dr. Magleby and Chairman Mejias at this time. They had conducted an analysis of the proposed map that's before us today.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Let me be clear about this. We'll hear from Dr. Magleby. Dave Mejias, my good friend, this is not your time to speak. If you want something to speak, you, like all of us, eventually, will have an opportunity for three minutes with the rest of the public.

MR. MEJIAS: I'm sorry, but I don't believe Mr. Tseytlin is an expert. He's not a demographer. He's not an expert on

RPV analysis. He's an attorney. I'm an attorney. So the Minority Leader has asked an attorney who, after literally
hundreds of hours of sitting through hearings, researching the law, I'm now an expert on redistricting, racially polarized voting and partisan
gerrymandering. So if you're allowed to bring an expert in to talk about the law, a legal expert, then the Minority caucus should be allowed the same respect, especially in light of the fact that the hyperbole that we just heard is belied by the facts and the law.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you, Mr. Mejias.
MR. MEJIAS: I would like the same
opportunity that your expert had to talk about the law.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr.
Tseytlin was brought here to present the map. We offered the Minority an
opportunity to have their expert, Mr.
Magleby, come and speak as well. You were
a member of the Commission. You served with distinction.

MR. MEJIAS: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: That service is over.

MR. MEJIAS: It's not, actually.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You
are, again, a member of the public and i will invite you up to speak. I have your slip and you will have an opportunity to speak as everyone else will.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm not too sure I understand your rationale, Presiding Officer. He's part of the analysis and the expertise that we're relying on. Why are you disallowing? PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr. Mejias is a gentleman who I served with for years. He is not an expert that we have called. Mr. Magleby is an expert on the map. We do not want to hear from Mr. Mejias and his partisan approaches.

MR. MEJIAS: Respectfully, Mr. Tseytlin is not an expert either.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Understand this. I spoke about this with the Minority earlier, but that is our position; the Majority. This is how we structured the hearing. We would have someone in to present the map. We would allow the Minority to have an expert. You're not an expert, so please step away from the podium and let Mr. Magleby proceed.

MR. MEJIAS: I just want to be clear as to what you actually define as an expert. You had an attorney who is not an expert on what our -- by the way, you didn't have your expert up here. You did not have your cartographer --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All
right. Thank you, Mr. Mejias.
MR. MEJIAS: Your expert on polarized voting and gerrymandered.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr. Mejias, would you please step away from the table?

MR. MEJIAS: I can understand. I can
understand --
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr. Mejias, this is not a dialogue. You are out of order. You stepped up into the well, you are not invited. You are not part of the program.

MR. MEJIAS: I was invited. I was invited by the Minority Caucus.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It doesn't matter.

MR. MEJIAS: I can understand --
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Understand this. They had the opportunity to invite whoever they want. We had an agreement that they would invite their expert. He's here. We want to --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Which includes Mr. Mejias.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr. Mejias, you are not the expert. Have you ever testified in a case? Have you testified in a case with respect to --

MR. MEJIAS: Has Mr. Tseytlin?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: No, no, no, no.

MR. MEJIAS: No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. Is very good question, Presiding Officer. That's an excellent question. Mr. Tseytlin said he was the attorney. As an attorney --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr. Mejias.

MR. MEJIAS: I would imagine in redistricting cases, he's prevented from testifying --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr. Mejias, we are either going to have to remove you or you'll leave voluntarily.

MR. MEJIAS: I want to be very clear. I want to be very clear. I can completely understand why you would not want a competent, qualified trial attorney who, after sitting through hundreds of hours of listening to experts, is probably actually better informed than your expert because he blatantly misrepresented the law. But I
can understand why you would not want a counterpoint and a counterargument to your expert. This is very similar -- you know what this seems like? This is similar to the time when my father was put on trial in Cuba. It was only a prosecution, there wasn't a defense. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr. Mejias, you have very high opinion yourself; that's fine.

MR. MEJIAS: You're welcome to shoot it down.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, I would like to--

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We would like to hear from the expert.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And you will.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: If Mr.
Mejias is going to boycott this, then we're not going to hear from either and we're going to go out to the public; your choice.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding Officer, I would like to hear where
you're citing either in the Rules of Procedure or in the Charter that identifies that you could dictate to us who our witnesses are at this dais. Please. I would like to hear where --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We had an agreement, Minority leader. We had an agreement --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: We had an agreement that we would bring our experts, which Mr. Mejias is one of them.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We did not have an agreement that you were going to bring a political operative to speak at this hearing. So. Mr. Mejias, would you please leave?

MR. MEJIAS: Hold on a second. Are you telling me that Mr. Tseytlin is not a political operative?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr.
Mejias, would you please leave?
MR. MEJIAS: Okay. You are the
presiding officer and I do respect you tremendously. I don't want to get into an
argument with you. When we did serve with distinction.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I do respect you as well.

MR. MEJIAS: I just do want to say for the record that $I$ do disagree that the Minority does not have the opportunity to have an expert of their choosing --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: They do.

MR. MEJIAS: -- recite the law when the Majority had an expert come and talk about the law and actually make blatant misrepresentations about what the federal law and the Constitution is, because the Supreme Court does not say what he says.

So having said that, I don't want to get I don't want to get into an argument or fight with you. I just want the record to be clear that the Minority was denied the opportunity to have their expert, an expert, provide a counterpoint and a
legal analysis to your attorney, because
he's not an expert in this, to your lawyer. So usually in America, there's your plaintiff, a defendant, a
prosecution, a defense. There's two sides of an issue. And considering the fact that, from what I've heard, we are going to be in litigation and you're guaranteeing that. But you are now on notice that prevailing party applies and you will be paying millions of dollars to somebody, because this map, the map that you presented, is completely illegal.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you. We've actually just heard from the voice of Jay Jacobson. We appreciate you being here, Mr. Mejias.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: It's
unbelievable.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I
mean, come on. Come on. You just
threatened us with a lawsuit. Would you please step away from the podium?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Presiding
Officer, if I may. Mr. Mejias, before
you leave, if I may. I just asked that, Dr. Magleby, are you an attorney by law? DR. MAGLEBY: I'm not an attorney by law.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You're not attorney by law. If there are legal questions that are presented to Mr. Magleby, can Mr. Mejias at least be sitting next to Mr. Magleby.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: No.
No. This is not a legal -- Mr. Mejias is a well respected --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I got it. I got it.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Extremely talented litigator, served with distinction for many years, but he's not here as an expert. And we would ask you to step away. And I'm not going to take away your three minutes later on when you get up to the microphone.

MR. MEJIAS: Thank you, Presiding Officer. I appreciate that small gesture. Thank you.
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LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Anyone appreciate the perception here? We have black and brown communities being cracked and packed and now a Latino male who's going to testify is not even allowed to speak. I mean, come on. I mean, come on here. Look at the perception. Let the record reflect that. This is disgusting. This is not America.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr. Magleby, go ahead.

DR. MAGLEBY: Thank you, Mr.
Presiding Officer, Minority Leader, Legislators, it is a pleasure to be here tonight. Genuinely.

I'm a professor of political science and economics at SUNY Binghamton. My research expertise is in elections, election geography and legislative politics. And I have to tell you, having a front row seat to see how this

Legislature works is exciting. I'm not sure it's like this every time, but if it is, you're missing out on an opportunity
for high ratings TV. This has been good.
I'm going to briefly summarize what
I found in my analysis of the February 9th Republican proposal. And then, if $I$ may, I know that you asked me to limit my remarks to five minutes, but if I could beg some indulgence --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm sorry, Dr.
Magleby, you don't need to adhere to your comments to five minutes.

DR. MAGLEBY: Okay. Because there were quite a few points that were leveled by your expert that are worth addressing, some of which were rather personal. And I would like the opportunity to address them point by point, if I may.

So we had a brief overview of the legal definitions and the supremacy of the Constitution from the Republican's witness. I won't repeat any of that, but let me delve in for just a moment into what a gerrymander is. And to do that, I'm going to quote a great New Yorker, Antonin Scalia, who, in the case Veith
versus Jubelirer, cited Black's Law dictionary when he defined gerrymandering as -- this is the quote directly from the decision -- the term political gerrymander has been defined as, "the practice of dividing geographical areas into electoral districts, often of highly irregular shape, to give one political party an unfair advantage by diluting the opposition's voting strength".

Vote dilution can occur through two processes what's called cracking. That's the distribution of a particular group of voters, frequently minority voters or members of a minority group across multiple districts in order to inhibit their ability to affect the outcome of an election. An alternative form of gerrymandering that is related to cracking is called packing, and it occurs when you over concentrate voters of a particular group in order to limit their influence in this system of electoral districts.

The map that was proposed on February 9th does both things. It both cracks, and it packs partisan voters. The way that $I$ know this is by doing the analysis that $I$ have done time and time again in peer reviewed research, and as an expert on behalf of plaintiffs, challenging maps, unfair electoral maps, throughout the country.

Unfortunately, your expert wasn't aware of my work, and that's fine. I wasn't particularly aware of his work or his role in the Harkenrider case, but now

I know more. The methodology I propose has been accepted by courts throughout the country. So what I did is I used a computer with software that $I$ wrote with a resident of Nassau County at the time, he was a student of mine at SUNY

Binghamton. We wrote software that would randomly draw districts in a political
jurisdiction a large number of times, and it did it without reference to partisanship, but it did include all of
the relevant criteria from the New York Municipal Home Rule Law. What we found was that the map proposed -- what I found was, is the map proposed on February 9th is an extreme partisan gerrymander.

Now, you've seen some methodology here that's different, slightly different, from the methodology that I used in my report. And I want to address that. Let me come back to that in one second. But if I could just point out that this might sound familiar, multiple legislators have said that they watched the proceedings of the Redistricting Commission. And it is true that

Republicans time and time again proposed maps that were extreme partisan gerrymanders. By contrast, the Democratic map, when it's subjected to exactly the same methodology, does not show itself to be a gerrymander. It shows itself to represent voters in the county fairly, whether they're Democrats or whether they're Republicans. All voters were
treated equally under that proposal.
Now, I know that we had some challenges remembering you're your attorney's name. I'm sorry, I don't I tried to write it down while I was also writing down --
(Whereupon, Mr. Tseytlin's name is established.)

DR. MAGLEBY: Mr. Tseytlin says that Magleby has no plausible claim that I did a Harkenrider analysis. I find this curious, because Mr. Tseytlin and his expert also didn't do the same exact analysis that they did in the Harkenrider case. They presented a particularly problematic metric, but they neglected to do additional analysis, what's often called a Mattingly analysis, that is a district by district analysis of whether partisanship of those districts are themselves individually outliers. I was confused by this because I have read Mr. Trende's report and it turns out that on page 15 and page 21 of his expert report
offered in court in Steuben County, he does exactly the same analysis, precisely the same analysis, that $I$ do on page 27, page 36, page 46, and page 55 of the report that I offered the Redistricting Commission. I don't know why he decided to leave out that analysis in his
description of the map that he drew. I suspect that if he did exactly the same analysis that his expert did in the Hakenrider case, that he would find exactly what $I$ found, that the map he drew in consultation with the Presiding Officer, is itself a partisan gerrymander.

Now, let me address his criticism of the median mean. It's been pointed out time and time again, he frequently retreated to the point that he's not an expert. He himself is an attorney. So it's fine that he's not familiar with the expansive scholarly literature on methods for measuring partisan gerrymanders. And let me tell you something, if you go
through that literature in detail, go to Google Scholar, like I tell all of my students at Binghamton to do, and look up Gerrymandering Index, Sean Trende, you will find zero citations. It is not a method that has been subjected to peer review. It is not a method that has been evaluated by scholars and found to be a rigorous and robust way of evaluating the partisanship of maps.

On the other hand, the median mean analysis has won awards from nonpartisan groups, suggesting that it is the appropriate way of measuring partisan gerrymandering. If you look me up and find my scholarly record on the median mean, you will find multiple citations. Not only that, you will find that my work has been cited over and over and over again, not just by courts and attorneys and experts, but by other scholars who know what they're doing.

Now, I don't know. It's frustrating to me that he suggests that this is the
methodology that the Court accepted in Harkenrider. So I was sitting there and I was thinking, you know, I read the Harkenrider decision and I don't remember Trende's gerrymandering index appearing anywhere in the Harkenrider decision. It turns out technology in the Internet is useful. You can bring up the Harkenrider decision and you can see that in the Harkenrider decision by the Court of Appeals, not once do they measure any gerrymandering index. They do, however, measure ensemble analyses. They do reference the fact that we should look for outliers in terms of partisan bias. That is exactly what $I$ did. Exactly. And if he wants to be disingenuous and somehow impugn my ability to do this analysis or even my character, I'm sorry, he needs to do more homework than he did tonight.

Let me point out some problems, some problems with the analysis. I'm interested in why Republicans -- you paid
a lot of money for this guy to come here and tell you about this and why you're not asking more questions about the kind and quality of analysis that you paid a lot of money for. Or maybe you paid for the map and didn't care what the analysis said, as long as it pointed in a direction that you liked. But I don't know. It's hard to say, Mr. Nicolello -PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Are you going to give a presentation or you're going to speak about our motives --

DR. MAGLEBY: Mr. Nicolello, I'm sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Are you going to tell us about this map?

DR. MAGLEBY: I sat in the back of the room and I heard your expert impugn my impugn my research, my character and my integrity.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I understand and you have an opportunity and you're very well speaking
your case. When you start to talk about our motivation, you've gone over the line. So either speak about the map or don't.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: In all due respect, and, Rich, $I$ say this as a friend. I let Mr. Tseytlin speak for 20 minutes, uninterrupted for a long period of time until we got to the Q\&A. Dr. Magleby has only spoken for seven minutes before he gets interrupted. By the way, his character, his work has been insulted, which he has a right to defend. So I don't understand why we have to interrupt him. We take a lot more heat than than what Dr. Magleby is saying from the chair. I mean, we can't get offended based off of what he just said. We take a lot. Where is Meda Mereday? She says a lot more worse things to us. DR. MAGLEBY: Mr. Nicolello. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. I'm going to respond to the Minority leader.

Look, he could speak and go into this whole program and try to restore his credibility, etcetera, that's fine by me. But when he starts to talk about our motivations, you crossed over a line and we're not going to let you cross over that line, sir.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I would just ask that Dr. Magleby be able to continue his presentation without being interrupted. I did not interrupt Mr. Tseytlin, even though he said somethings --
(Whereupon, public
interruption.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You're out of order (referring to public interruption).

You can proceed. But if you start talking about a motivation, I'm going to step in again. And by the way, the Minority Leader interrupted almost every answer that Mr. Tseytlin spoke --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Oh, no, no,
no. I'm talking about his opening presentation. Come on, guys. You know the truth.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Well, he never spoke about you, did he? Did he say a word about the Minority members of this Legislature? Did he?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Guys, are we that thin skinned? Are we serious?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: No, no, no, no.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Are we that thin skinned?

DR. MAGLEBY: If I may, Mr.
Nicolello. Your point is well taken.
Your point is well taken.
I want to circle back to your concern about motivation, if I may, because this is actually a methodology that allows us to figure out what kinds of motives went into maps. So if I may, I'm going to double back to that. But you're absolutely right. I do have questions about why we're not actually
seeing the Harkenrider analysis from the lawyer who made the argument before the Court of Appeals and has willingly, intentionally, left out major elements of the same analysis that carried the day in Harkenrider. That analysis is in my report. And it shows exactly what he argued before the Court of Appeals, that the congressional map in New York was a gerrymander. Using that same methodology, the map that has been proposed here that he helped draw in consultation with you is a partisan gerrymander, not just a partisan gerrymander, an extreme partisan gerrymander. The probability of arriving at the map that you proposed, if the map was drawn neutrally without the intent of advantaging a particular party, is less than one in 10,000 . So I can't say why you decided to leave out particular critical elements of the analysis of the map. But I can say confidently, that you would not arrive at this particular map unless you were very consciously trying
to dilute the votes of Democratic voters and enhance the influence of Republican voters, the result of which is going to be a perpetuation of a Republican Majority, that in a county that is highly competitive in off year elections, would turn into a solidly entrenched Republican Majority.

Now, I want to say one more thing about the methodology, because it's not clear from their report. And I have to tell you, my day job is as a professor. And so I spend a lot of time reading papers and this one gets, I don't know, a B minus. It is missing -- he talks about citations. He says, I never include a citation. That's not true. If you read my report, I cite my own work. You can follow the citation trains to all of the other work that cites my work. Here, he references Trende's gerrymandering index. He doesn't talk about which elections were used. Under questioning, he says he uses statewide elections. Okay. Well,
this is something that $I$ know something about because unlike Mr. Trende and unlike your expert, who with whom I'm not familiar because he doesn't do this kind of work outside of his legal practice. In this particular case, we use the elections that represent the level of competition in the elections that will be used to elect representatives to the assembly that we're considering. Let me say that again, maybe in different terms. When we're considering congressional elections, we use elections that happen in even year elections. That's why we use gubernatorial races and senate races and other statewide races. In this instance, the appropriate elections to use are the elections that were where you all were elected in years like 2017, 2019 and 2021. Those were excluded from his analysis. That turnout and competition in statewide elections in New York is very different. It is very different than the kind of competition that leads to the
election of a county executive, a county
district attorney, a county clerk, a
county comptroller, or any single one of
you, because you don't get elected when
those folks are on the ballot. So to use
those elections is a miscarriage of the
methodology. It's a misapplication that
is a rookie mistake made by a set of
analysts who aren't familiar with this
methodology, who haven't subjected their
work to peer review, and have not had to
face their peers and had their
methodology evaluated in the same way
that someone like me or other experts who
have published in this field have. So
he's absolutely wrong. He's absolutely
wrong to come here and use an analysis
that hasn't been subjected to peer
review, using the wrong data, and
pointing out that it tells you something
that I have no idea what this figure
actually means. And I read papers about
this every single day. I see all sorts of
malarkey, and I can make sense of it. I
don't know what this means.
I think I have more. I am very
interested in hearing what your questions are and having the opportunity to respond to any criticism of the report that I produced late last year, or the analysis that I shared earlier this week of the map that was circulated late last week. I'm at your disposal.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Questions? Any legislators?
Go ahead, Minority Leader.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

How are you, Dr. Magleby?
DR. MAGLEBY: I'm well, thank you.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Good, good,
good. I just have more of a general
question. I know your expertise is in the analysis of gerrymandering districts, but I brought up the point and I got criticized for being more of a gotcha moment. How else would one be able to describe what we saw tonight with this
map? The attorney for this map identified that he couldn't explain what a zero was on the map. He couldn't explain why the adjusted population wasn't right. I used the word sloppy. I got criticized for that. In your experience, based on what you've seen, have you seen at this level someone that would present a map that is off by a certain amount of population of people? DR. MAGLEBY: I haven't. That's usually sort of the first thing we check in any simulation that we do, in any analysis of an actual map, it would certainly be something we do. I drew hundreds of thousands of maps to develop the ensemble that is represented in the report that I provided to the Commission. Over and over again, I've drawn millions of maps in my career in doing this kind of analysis for academic research and in helping redistricting commissions and courts decide what to do in redistricting scenarios. It's very unusual to proceed
with a map without double and triple checking that everything adds up. It's actually one of the simplest things to do is just to add up the population of each district. And if it's not right, you know, something went wrong.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: And I don't
know if you remember and if you don't recall, that's okay. When it pertained to the Republican TDAC map and the Democrat TDAC map, I'm assuming their adjusted populations added up. If you don't remember that's fine.

DR. MAGLEBY: I don't remember off the top of my head. I know that all of the simulations I used to evaluate those maps added up. It's so routine that I wouldn't it wouldn't stand out in my memory if it was correct. If it wasn't correct, I probably would have sent an e-mail to someone or made a call saying, Why is this off? But I have no recollection of seeing a red flag like that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Well, now
let's get into the meat of it, because I think Mr. Tseytlin made the point about his graph that he put together with the help of Mr. Trende, and if $I$ understand what he's saying correctly and based on what your analysis also is, Dr. Magleby, is that the Democratic map and the Republican map he draws -- if we don't mind if someone could just put that up so the public can see it again.
(Whereupon, Mr. Tseytlin's Graph is displayed to public and referred to.)

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: What Mr.
Tseytlin described was that the line that you're looking at, that's all the way to the left or somewhat in the middle, that line represents the Republican map. However, Dr. Magleby, you had said that the criteria that they used or the criteria that Mr. Tseytin had used, that he testified earlier this evening, was that he used gubernatorial years or
presidential years. And I noticed in your analysis you did not use that. Can you elaborate? Because you would get a much different result if you're using gubernatorial versus elections that actually this Body gets elected in.

DR. MAGLEBY: So if I were to see this graph come across my desk as a professor -- and I see graphs like this in papers, editors send them to me to offer peer review, I would raise a few red flags about it. So number one, he's using the wrong elections to diagnose gerrymandering in a county setting. So using statewide elections here introduces a whole bunch of confounding variables that call into question any inference that we might want to make based on these data. So, for example, when a president is running for election, the electorate in Nassau County is different than the electorate is when people show up to elect folks like you. And so we have these differences in turnout and that
would lead to potentially different patterns.

The second problem here, and this is something that maybe not as egregious, but the idea that we're collapsing all elections into one single graph also masks some of the dynamics we might observe in instances where Republicans did a little bit better than they otherwise do in statewide elections in New York. So what we're seeing here are instances where Republicans ran weak statewide candidates for governor, for attorney general, for comptroller or other offices. And we're not actually seeing the strongest Republican candidates. In New York what we often find is that at the county level, we get strong candidates who are connected to their districts. People want to vote for them. Some of you may have aspirations to run for governor someday. We have a strong tradition of Republican governors from Nassau County. That could be in
your future. And in that case, it would make sense to see how a Republican candidate running for governor would fend when facing down a Democratic opponent. We don't know that from this analysis. So the technical term for this is a confounding variable, and he hasn't allowed us to control for or see how that confounding variable might unfold. And there's two confounding variables that this index and this score is collapsing, and we can't tell what's going on from this from this chart.

So if $I$ was evaluating this chart,
you generally have a chance to revise and resubmit if work isn't up to snuff, but you think they might be on to something. In this case, if they had to revise and resubmit it, I would ask them, break out every single election. Let's see how this map behaves across multiple elections, across those countywide races, in addition to whatever else. Although it would not be appropriate. I mean, if it
was a statewide race, you could use the gubernatorial race, but to use countywide elections and see how the Republican map proposed on February 9 th performs.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Is that possible, Presiding Officer that we can ask Mr. Tseytlin to provide that analysis for us from Mr. Trende?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: No.
Mr. Tseytlin has made his presentation. He's given us --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, no, no, no, no.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I'm not doing anything further.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, no, no,
no. Dr. Magleby brings up a very good point. It should muster through multiple different types of tests. Is it possible you can ask Mr. Tseytlin to provide that level of test as per what Dr. Magleby is saying for the future? We're not voting on this tonight are we?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: What
you have is a difference of Mr. Trende, who's working with Mr. Tseytlin, and Dr. Magleby about the methodology that's appropriate to be used. So we are not going to adopt his methodology. They're obviously conflicting. So we're not going to say, well, yes, we're going to do it your way, because I think from what I heard in the testimony before is that Dr. Magleby's approach is improper and should not be used. So why would we adopt -LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm not asking for Dr. Magleby's approach to be adopted. What I'm asking for is Dr. Magleby's approach to be side by side with that one, so we can see the difference. Why not?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You
can have Dr. Magleby provide whatever whatever graphs or approaches that he wants.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: He's already testifying what he's already providing tonight. But I would like to see Mr.

Tseytlin, since he's already provided this approach, to provide an approach based off of what Dr. Magleby is saying. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: You didn't hear a word I said?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: No, I did.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Mr.
Tseytlin said his approach is the incorrect approach. And now you're saying, well, why don't you go back and do the incorrect approach so we can look at it? So that is not --

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Now I understand. So, so basically, the Majority has adopted Mr. Tseytlin's approach, just to make sure I'm clear on that for the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Let me be clear about this.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: You haven't adopt that approach?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Let --
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Have you adopted the approach or not?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: What are you going to interrogate me?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm asking you a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Are you going to interrogate me?

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I'm asking you a question, have you adopted that approach or not?

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: I'm going to answer your question again. You're asking Mr. Tseytlin and Mr. Trende to do an analysis following Dr. Magleby's approach, which they already have said is inappropriate way to do this. So, no, we're not going to follow his methodology because we've been told it is the inappropriate way to do the analysis.

DR. MAGLEBY: Mr. Nicolello, if I
may. The challenge with that approach is that Mr. Tseytlin didn't do the analysis he said he did. He came here and he said he did the analysis they did in Harkenrider with the same expert, but he
didn't. He did one part of it. You do half of an assignment in my class, you get an F ; that's 50\% at most. I will respect the fact that I hurt your feelings when $I$ said that it impugns his intentions or your intentions by censoring the analysis in order to avoid doing exactly what he claimed he did. I would like to see if he said -- Sean Trende on his computer has code that could do this just like that. You wouldn't have to pay him more than ten bucks to push "Go" on this. He may have already done it. And in fact, if he already did do it, it's going to come out because it sounds like someone's going to sue you over this map and it's going to come out that you knew that this was a partisan gerrymander before you came forward and that you showed less than all of the analysis that even your expert who came here tonight says, I didn't do it. Well, the fact of the matter is, I read the Court of Appeals opinion. I did what
the Court of Appeals said. I found that it was a statistical outlier using a generally accepted metric, using generally accepted methodologies and the appropriate data. And then $I$ replicated almost exactly two figures that appear in Mr. Trende's analysis on which the Court of Appeals based their decision, and they're leaving that out. They haven't shown you everything that they can and should do. Like I said, I mean, I don't know Long Islanders have a have a reputation for wanting a good deal. I'm not sure you got a good deal here. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Dr.

Magleby, $I$ come from a practice of law, some of us up here do, of personal injury work, and in the case when someone did, they have a plaintiff's attorney that brings a lawsuit claiming injuries.

Plaintiff's attorney will get a doctor and the defendant's attorney will get a doc. Plaintiff's attorney will say this plaintiff is permanently disabled. These
are severe, life altering injuries.
Defendant's doctor will say he has a sprain or strain and there's really not much here. So this is the way I'm looking at your testimony. If we had given you the map that was prepared today and told you that Minority had prepared it, you would be up here saying that map is the best thing since sliced bread. So when you testify, everything you say is coming through that prism.

DR. MAGLEBY: I understand that point of view. And the thing to realize here is my interest in this is that the process works and the process works for the people of Nassau County. Now, the fact of the matter is that when I came, I brought receipts. I did the analysis. I showed it to you. It's in the report. There's additional analysis I didn't have time to write up because of the short turnaround time, because it took so long to draw this map that $I$ only had a couple of days to get you something back. But
the receipts are all there. So what happens -- and forgive me, my experience with a personal injury suit is not as extensive as yours is -- but what I understand is that there's a process of discovery where the notes and the hospital records and all sorts of things become public. They're made public. And what is happening here is there's a suppression of information. A selective suppression of information. And that tells a lot more about the motives of Mr . Tseytlin and the motives of the Republican Majority than it does about mine, because you can replicate what I did.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Well, your use of terms like buzzwords shows us all we need to know about you. DR. MAGLEBY: I'm sorry. What buzzwords was I using? PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:

Suppression, sir? What do you mean to imply with the word suppression?

DR. MAGLEBY: I mean to say that there is an easily conducted analysis, easily done by the people that you are claiming to be experts that they did when they successfully challenged a map. But it isn't here. Why isn't it here? I did that analysis. I know what that analysis looks like. It shows that this is a gerrymander. So if they do the same analysis using appropriate elections, are they going to find that the green line is right where they say it is? I don't know. I would like to see. By suppression I mean that there is information that is available to the Republican Majority and to your experts that they haven't made public.

In addition, your expert claimed over and over and over again that I didn't do the analysis that was in Hakenrider and so you went out and got the expert that did the analysis in Harkenrider and then asked him to do half of the analysis that he did in

Harkenrider. I did all of it. It's a gerrymander.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Ferretti, you have a question.
LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: I wasn't
actually done yet. I had one last question.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: My last final
question: With the map that's before us, which doesn't assign voters to any particular district, which dilutes minority votes, which as you as you put it, gerrymander is based on, party survive a legal challenge?

DR. MAGLEBY: It would not survive a
legal challenge. The February 9th
Republican proposal would not survive a legal challenge using the same logic applied in the Harkenrider case.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Ferretti.
LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you.
Thank you, Dr. Magleby. I appreciate your
testimony. And like I said to Mr.
Tseytlin, $I$ do find this fascinating.
It's a fascinating process.
I did hear in your testimony, and I think the Minority Leader just repeated it, is it true that at your conclusion that this is a gerrymander based on party?

DR. MAGLEBY: It's a partisan gerrymander. Yes.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: And I think at one point you said that it couldn't possibly have been put together without an attempt for one party to succeed over the other. Is that what you said?

DR. MAGLEBY: It couldn't have been
put together in a way that was neutral with respect to party. That's the precise thing I should have said, and that's what my analysis shows.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: I just have one question. Maybe just one question. Are you aware out of the 19 districts in the February 9th proposed map, how many
of those districts have more registered Democrats than Republicans?

DR. MAGLEBY: I don't know what the registration numbers are across the district.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Would it surprise you if I told you that 15 of the 19 have more registered Democrats than Republicans?

DR. MAGLEBY: I mean, I have not looked at the registration data. That's not a typical way that we analyze these maps.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: If, in fact, 15 of the 19 districts had more registered Democrats than Republicans, would that change your opinion that this map was made based on gerrymandering for partisan, or would it maybe switch which side you think it was gerrymandered for?

DR. MAGLEBY: So the appropriate way of evaluating maps is to look at the way people vote. Registration data has generally not been brought to bear in
these questions, both in the academic literature and in court.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Okay. I understand that that's your opinion, but just in terms of registration, you're not aware?

DR. MAGLEBY: I'm not aware. I have not looked at the registration numbers.

LEGISLATOR FERRETTI: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Legislator Solages.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you so much.

There's been reference to the word outliers. Can you define that in this context, please?

DR. MAGLEBY: An outlier is an event or an observation that would be extremely unlikely to happen by random chance.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: So, according to your data, Districts Two, Three and Six are outliers; is that correct?

DR. MAGLEBY: The most Democratic districts in the county under the

February 9th Republican proposal are outliers with respect to party. They are more Democratic than we would expect under a neutral redistricting process.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: And you
mentioned before that this may cause a lawsuit initiated by some party that will be entitled to prevailing award. But in addition to a lawsuit, what else do these processes result in? I mean, do they result in voter confusion? Do they result in low voter turnout? I mean, how does this affect our democracy, which we all love and care about?

DR. MAGLEBY: I appreciate that
question. So my job, as I said, I'm a professor. I'm not a political operative. I spend my day thinking about understanding and explaining democracy and politics to young people. My hope is that by doing that, $I$ inspire them to engage in processes exactly like this. I was very happy to to run into one of my former students tonight in this room. I
feel like Binghamton is an outpost of Nassau County in upstate New York. My hope is that I can help people who come to my class understand how these things work and go back to their communities -very few of them, too few of them stay in Binghamton, I wish we kept more of them up there. You guys have some good people down here -- I hope that they can go back and work to make their communities better.

The problem with gerrymanders and I'm going to try my best not to get animated about this, but the problem with gerrymanders is that they distort the electoral process -- I'm going to try not to use buzzwords because I want to try and be technical about this -- they distort electoral processes. And the gerrymander that the Republicans proposed throughout the Commission process and then again on February 9th, is that it is a gerrymander that systematically underweights the votes of some members of

this community while also overweighting the votes of others. It's a zero sum thing. In this community, Democrats or Republicans, when people go to vote in countywide elections, it's very close to evenly split between Democrats and Republicans. It should be the case that the seat that you're sitting in, Mr.

Nicolello, changes hands over and over and over again. That we can see accountability in a body like this. So when I see a gerrymander -- I do get
animated and I'm trying to avoid buzzwords, Mr. Nicolello --but the problem with gerrymanders is it distorts
democratic processes, it removes
accountability, and it robs people, too
often the most vulnerable people, of
their voice in the democratic process.
And so if I get animated about this
tonight -- and I was told by my wife when
I came down here to stay calm, I'm trying
my best to do that. You've called me back a couple of times, Mr. Presiding

Officer -- It's because I think all of us are invested in a democracy that works for people. But what happens when you have a partisan gerrymander like the one that was passed and, unfortunately, the one that was used to elect all of you and the one that you're proposing to pass again, it's going to rob people of their influence. It's going to make it harder for me to tell my students when I look them in the eye and they come back to Nassau County, that you can go there and make a difference because the map was constructed to keep people from making a difference. And that is what bothers me about this process. And I was told, don't get bothered, but it bothers me. I'll be honest.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: With the lawsuits, with the stays, it will result in voter confusion?

DR. MAGLEBY: Absolutely. People are not going to know where they're going to go to vote. They're not going to know who
their legislator is.
LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Will they know the election date?

DR. MAGLEBY: Well, we certainly hope so. It all depends on how this moves forward in the courts. I'm not a litigator, I'm not a personal injury attorney. I don't know how all of this will -- I'm not a legal strategist. All I can tell you is what the numbers tell me. The numbers tell me that the map proposed on February 9th is going to underweight the votes of Democratic voters, of people of color, of people who are vulnerable in this county, while elevating the votes of others. That's a problem. That's a problem. And we should all see that as a problem.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Thank you, sir. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:

Legislator Drucker, then Legislator Kopel.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

Doctor, the witness, Mr. Tseytlin, stated that he was not aware of any of the particular characteristics of the 19 legislative districts. And would you agree that Long Island or Nassau County, in particular, these 19 legislative districts, they have granular differences? They have a lot of differences racially, ethnically, religious wise, politically. Would you agree with that analysis or that opinion that Nassau County, the 19 districts are very diverse, very different, and not being able to know any of the characters districts of those districts negatively impact on your ability to draw a map? DR. MAGLEBY: So you're asking a tough question. And let me preface this answer by saying that at no point was I asked to consider communities of interest beyond the political communities that are required to be maintained as whole under the Municipal Home Rule Law. To say that Nassau County is diverse as an
understatement. This is an incredibly diverse and dynamic community, and it's full of different, diverse communities. I think it was you, Legislator Drucker, who suggested that we have too much segregation in our community here. I think that goes without saying that segregation of any kind is problematic. The challenge with communities of interest and this kind of analysis is exactly what we saw unfold in a back and forth between you and your colleagues. And that is, what you see as a vital and important community of interest is not to your colleagues across the way here and what the mapmakers suggest are important, those are valuable decisions, and they have huge impact on the kinds of districts we see.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: But do you have an opinion on the fact that Mr. Tseytlin stated that he doesn't know about the differences in the communities and yet that he drew a map; do you have an
opinion on that?

DR. MAGLEBY: I think that in this regard, Mr. Drucker, I'm going to suggest that Mr. Tseytlin was confronted with a very difficult challenge when he drew this map. He didn't know which communities were the important ones, so he was left to figure it out, I guess, on his own.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: You don't
recommend that that's a good thing to do when you're tasked with drawing a map?

DR. MAGLEBY: I think that the process that the Commission followed of going to the communities is themselves. So the Commission went around all of Nassau County and met with people and they spoke to them about their communities and helped them understand. The Municipal Home Rule Law tells us how to think about political communities, which are important communities of interest. There are other communities of interest. The Voting Rights Act requires
that we think about particular
communities, racial communities that have coherent voting patterns like the black community and Latino community on Long Island. So a map that disregards those communities would be enormously
problematic, both from a moral, ethical, but also legal point of view. So yes, he should be familiar with those, but then it becomes whose community is more important? Bethpage, Old Bethpage versus Bethpage. I'm going to reveal something and maybe it's embarrassing to be up here. I don't know the difference. I know Bethpage is where the US Open gets played every once in a while, and it's been a while since it's been there.

That's the limit of my understanding. But
I drew 10,000 maps that followed the Municipal Home Rule Law that maintained minority communities that were politically coherent together, and then compared a map that considered those communities to the map that was drawn by

the Democrats, by the Republicans.
LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: I would have a problem with any expert on either side of the aisle who tried to present a map to us as a Legislative Body and had no familiarity with the characteristics of each of the communities. I just find that problematic no matter who's presenting the map.

DR. MAGLEBY: I appreciate that. I appreciate that. And I can see where you're coming from. There's a joke that we tell among analysts here, that communities of interest are like the meaning of Christmas. It's kind of whatever you want it to be. And so what is an important community to you may not be so important to someone else. And what's challenging about the Municipal Home Rule Law and other criteria that we've been given, is that we don't know how to distinguish between which are the most important communities in which aren't. We don't have an objective single
methodology to apply in that instance, except we do have the Voting Rights Act and we do have the Municipal Home Rule Law. We have the John Lewis Voting Rights Act for New York, which tells us how to think through some of those communities. I agree, Mr. Drucker, it would be very helpful for folks to be forthright about this. There are commissions and legislatures and other redistricting bodies that have tried really hard to figure out which and what communities exist. But a comprehensive encyclopedic knowledge of every community in Long Island is something that is reserved for people who were born and raised on the island. And I don't know where Mr.

Tseytlin is from, I'm not from here. So I would fall into that category.

LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Well, I'm not asking for an encyclopedic knowledge. How about a basic knowledge? He stated he had none.

So anyway, I'm not going to belabor
that point. I just have one final
question. It's getting late. As a follow
up to my friend Legislator Ferretti's question, has party registration ever been used or applied in any of the case law?

DR. MAGLEBY: So it is getting late. Off the top of my head, I am not aware of any cases recently dealing with gerrymandering that have used registration data. We're interested in understanding the actual patterns of competition within these districts, and the countywide elections give us the best view of how competition in county elections occur. That's why we use the countywide elections in the analysis that I did in my report and that $I$ did for the memo that $I$ circulated earlier this week. LEGISLATOR DRUCKER: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Doctor.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Dr. Magleby.
DR. MAGLEBY: Yes, sir.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Good evening.

This has been absolutely fascinating, the back and forth. And the more educated I get, the more confused I become between the two expert opinions. So why don't you help us understand a little bit, please?

It seems like the most critical point of differentiation and correct me if I'm wrong between you and Mr.

Tseytlin, would be the statistical method that each of you have used in order to determine what is the proper map and what is gerrymandering; would that be correct?

DR. MAGLEBY: This may seem like I am grasping at straws, but this is actually a very important distinction. It's not about methodology. This is about a measure. So the methodology is actually the same. So in the Harkenrider decision, the Court of Appeals suggested that we could use computers to draw large ensembles of maps that would represent a neutral counterfactual, alternative, hypothetical maps that follow particular criteria. So in that we agree. Although,

I would nit pick with Mr. Tseytlin's representation of their report and methodology, because at no point does he indicate which algorithm he used. At no point does he indicate any general characteristics or summary statistics with regard to the ensembles that were generated. So there are some questions that remain unanswered that are actually very, very important in understanding if that methodology, that ensemble methodology, was applied appropriately.

I believe, if memory serves, he talked about Kosuke Imai's work on algorithmic sampling of geographic districts in passing in his comments. It's possible that they used that methodology. That's an off the shelf piece of software that you can download and run on your computer. Anybody could draw --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: The thing is that none of us here have any idea what you're talking about. Let's be honest.

DR. MAGLEBY: So let me back up. So the statistical method is the same. Where we are different and where the analysis is different is in terms of measurement. How do we measure how partisan districts are? So the way we generate that neutral counterfactual is indistinguishable. And I personally have done a lot of work in my research life on the different methodologies for using computers to draw districts.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: So we've got a disagreement on methodology, interpretation.

DR. MAGLEBY: No. We have a difference in measurement. He says the appropriate way to measure partisanship in county elections is using statewide races. I say that the appropriate way to measure county elections and partisanship in county elections is using county elections. That's the first difference.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: I understand.
When you say patterns of competition. Can
you define what you mean? Can you explain what you mean by that?

DR. MAGLEBY: Patterns of
competition.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: That's a phrase that you use just a few moments ago.

DR. MAGLEBY: Certainly. So patterns of competition would be how many

Democratic voters and how many Republican voters exist within the boundaries of a district drawn by a legislature and how many Democratic and how many Republican voters reside within the boundaries of districts in these hypothetical maps drawn by computer.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: So that's an excellent point. Because Legislator Ferretti, just a little while ago said to you -- and it's fair enough that you don't have that information at your fingertips, and I'm not asking you that you that you should -- but what he said is that, let's assume that that it's correct that 15 out of the 19 have a
heavier concentration of registered
Democrats than of registered Republicans, let's assume for the moment that that's factual --

DR. MAGLEBY: I'll follow you on
this hypothetical. I don't know for sure, but sure, let's suggest that. Okay.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: No, no. We'll
call it a hypothetical because you don't have it at your fingertips and it's not fair to ask you to know that. So I'm having great difficulty in understanding, if that's the case, how it's possible that you're coming to the conclusion that this is a gerrymander. I don't get it.

DR. MAGLEBY: So registration
patterns are not the same as voting patterns.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: But voting patterns -- I mean, I've got many friends who are Democrats who might vote for Republicans in a given election and vice versa. So voting patterns will change. Voting patterns will change based upon
candidates.
DR. MAGLEBY: Oh. Oh. So there is
there is a longstanding and well understood empirical pattern in voting, American voting, that people vote consistently with one party or the other. So this has been something we've understood. It's one of it's one of the things that's best understood about

American politics. We've known this since the 1940s and the advent of public opinion surveys, that partisanship as manifest in the way that you vote, is remarkably consistent from election to election. So with all due respect --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Isn't it true, though, forgive me, I know I've interrupted you and I don't mean to be rude, but patterns change. That may change as well. And we've seen that again in American history time and time again. I mean, look, just go back to all the working class white people, let's say, who are absolutely traditionally

Democrat, very often vote Republicans. This is all the college educated -- DR. MAGLEBY: Excellent point.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Women who were traditionally Republican now are voting Democrat. Things change.

DR. MAGLEBY: Absolutely. And that's why Mr. Tseytlin and his expert's analysis is not appropriate. They collapse all of that into one single metric. Whereas, if you look at my analysis, $I$ break it out election by election so I can capture some of the dynamics. If this is true, and there is some changes at the margins, what you are suggesting, Mr. Kopel, is exactly why his analysis is not the right kind of analysis.

Now, I wasn't there in the courtroom. I wasn't there in depositions. But if I was, that would have been a question $I$ would have asked of his expert in Harkenrider. The Court of Appeals made a decision based on, apparently, this
very same collapsed metric. But the appropriate way to do it is to try and capture the dynamics that you're talking about, using the appropriate elections. So we break out election by election. So if you look at the memo I circulated, you'll see I've got the election for county executive, I've got the election for county comptroller, county clerk, DA and repeated all over again over time, so that we can say, are these dynamics shifting significantly within the county, Now, even within the same election -LEGISLATOR KOPEL: They do, by the way, they shift within the county. You had you had periods, long periods of Republican control. You had a good long period of Democratic control in the early 2000s. Then you've got Republican again. DR. MAGLEBY: That's right. And so we want to be able use as much data -LEGISLATOR KOPEL: And by the way, $d$ just let me finish that one thought. DR. MAGLEBY: I'm sorry. You've got
me excited about this. This is a great question.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Yeah. But I would point out that the last change over happened using the same map that was used to the last the previous Democrat Administration.

DR. MAGLEBY: I do want to offer an important caveat to this. You're right, over long periods of time, we see secular trends where there is an ebb and flow towards Democrats and towards

Republicans. The dynamic that you reference where you have friends, people you work with, people who live on your street, who are like, I can support so-and-so for county executive, but I cannot vote for so-and-so for DA. So I'm going to vote different ways on those two candidates. Does that happen? Absolutely. Does the methodology I offer capture that? Yes. The methodology offered by the by Mr. Tseytlin does not do that, and that's a big problem. I agree. We talked
about this earlier and we suggested that we weren't going to go back and look at it again using their methodology because it was already signed, sealed and delivered. That's okay. But what you're suggesting is exactly the problem with the approach that was taken by the Republican expert.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: So let's so let's
let's boil it down over here. Taking the most recent Republican generated map. Let's take the February 9th map. So your conclusion is that, notwithstanding the fact that, and, again, $I$ will grant you the hypothetical, notwithstanding, let's say, assuming that it's true, that the great majority of the districts have a have a larger Democratic registration, notwithstanding that this is a gerrymandered map because based upon certain voting patterns which change, which change, you know, change all the time, nonetheless, because of that voting pattern, I guess in the last few
elections, that's going to mean that one party wins and not the other. And that seems, forgive me, but it seems kind of flimsy.

DR. MAGLEBY: Okay. Flimsy. Let's see. So what I'm suggesting, Mr. Kopel, is that a fairly drawn map and, with all due respect, the Democratic proposal from I think it was November 20 th is one that matches the political dynamics of the county extremely well. At some point I will give a lecture where $I$ will recycle figures from the work that I've done here to show students how this actually works.

And the textbook example of a pro
Republican gerrymander are the November 10th, November 20 th and February 9 th maps offered by the Republicans. The Democratic map is one that would swing back and forth. As I said earlier, the Democrats proposed a map --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Assuming that these voting patterns, of course, don't change. That's making that assumption,
which is a great big assumption, which is often wrong.

DR. MAGLEBY: So voting patterns, you're absolutely right. Voting patterns will ebb and flow over time. But the problem with a packing gerrymander, the gerrymander we observe in Nassau County in the 2013 map and in the proposals advanced by the Republican Majority, is that they inoculate the Majority against precisely those ebbs and flows you're talking about, those slight changes. This is a county that's a toss up. But what you are suggesting is we want to take politics out of the campaigns and the elections for county legislature and basically create a buffer that makes it so that Republicans can consistently win. And they do that by relocating or redistributing Democratic voters and concentrating them in a Minority of districts. Particularly -LEGISLATOR KOPEL: In our hypothetical, that's not the case.

DR. MAGLEBY: We must be talking about a different hypothetical.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: No, no, no. We're talking about a hypothetical where Democratic voters have the edge in 15 out of 19.

DR. MAGLEBY: But the problem is, that the --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: On the February 9th map.

DR. MAGLEBY: So if it was the case that voting patterns revealed that there is an advantage for Democrats in 15 out of 19 districts, it would depend a lot on what the distribution of Democrats are across those districts. It's not enough to know that there's a majority of Democrats. If all of those districts, if 15 districts have a majority of $50.001 \%$ Democrats in your hypothetical, a slight change in the electoral dynamics would swing the entire county to Republicans. So we need to be precise about this. But we also -- what you're suggesting is
voting patterns, and that's not this county.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: No, sorry, sir.
Those were your words. I had no idea what you meant by that. I asked you to explain.

DR. MAGLEBY: Registration is not a helpful statistic in understanding what actually happens in these districts.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: If what you're saying is that the fact that a one political party might have won the last several elections is inherently unfair to the other party?

DR. MAGLEBY: No, that's not what I'm saying. What I'm saying is unfair is if a map is drawn in a way that underweights Democratic votes as the February 9th map does, or as the 2013 map does, which we're now conceding to be a problematic map, if we agree that those underweight Democratic votes, Democrats are going to have to work extra hard to turn people out to win elections. So the
reason why the median mean -- he doesn't know a lot about the median mean. He can do some more homework after tonight, perhaps, and learn more about how the median mean works. But the reason why it's --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: By the way, the reason I don't know all these statistics. That's why I went to law school. If I could handle these things.

DR. MAGLEBY: So the median mean difference tells us basically what portion of the countywide vote, what Democrats have to receive in order to carry a Majority of the district --

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: And over come these voting --

DR. MAGLEBY: Overcome the disposition of districts that serve to over concentrate voters, not just registered voters, but voters.

And so what we see is that in Nassau
County, Democrats have to win 53 to 54\% of the vote just to break even in these
countywide races. That hasn't happened. LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay. So you're saying that was done deliberately to favor one party?

DR. MAGLEBY: I'm saying that it was not due to random chance. That it can't have been that a neutral process would have yielded that outcome.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Okay. Thank you very much. As I say, it's been fascinating. I appreciate it.

DR. MAGLEBY: It's my pleasure.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Doctor, you said you used county races, correct?

DR. MAGLEBY: Countywide races, yes. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Which years?

DR. MAGLEBY: 2017, 2019 and 2021.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Did
you use just countywide or also
legislative races?
DR. MAGLEBY: Just countywide. The reason why we do that is because we're

```
reassigning voters between districts and
we want to make sure we're comparing
apples to apples when we do that. Believe
it or not, voters see all of you
differently. And so a Republican in one
district is not thought of the same way
as a Republican in a different district.
So we want to make sure we're holding
that constant.
```

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: How do
you factor into your equation, when
you're doing on a local level, the effect
of larger issues, such as in the last
election countywide, bail reform, how do
you factor that into your model?
DR. MAGLEBY: So in 2021, bail
reform was a big deal in New York, and
those dynamics would be present in all of
those countywide elections I used to
calculate the partisanship of the
hypothetical districts generated by the
computer algorithm and also the districts
that were drawn by your expert and by the
expert retained by the Republican

commissioners.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: In 2021, the County Clerk in a heavily Democratic county enrollment wise, one way was, I believe, 160,000 vote plurality. So those heavy numbers for Republicans were inserted into your -DR. MAGLEBY: Absolutely. And even with those heavy numbers --

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: But, doesn't that skew? I mean, you're looking at it, the trend is $53 \%$. But doesn't that number skew because the results were so high?

DR. MAGLEBY: So. We absolutely want
to account for that in our analysis. And if you look at my report and, unfortunately, I was taken by surprise by the analysis that the Republicans presented tonight, or I could have brought the analysis that they did in Harkenrider exactly as they did it in Harkenrider to show you that when applied here, even in the presence of those
dynamics, Democrats are at a huge disadvantage because of the location of the district boundaries. Any advantage to Republicans, any advantage to Democrats is washed out and made innocuous by the fact that the places where voters are showing up in those elections and the places where they're staying home are not evenly distributed across the county. It's concentrated in particular patterns in particular districts.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Now, you're saying that -- I'm glad you're talking about particular districts, because you talked about each district should flip. Do you know that we have a legislator sitting to my left who runs in a heavily, heavily Democratic district for 10, 12, 13, 14 years and wins; 20 years? So the Republican numbers in that district are high for that legislator because of who she is. You would think that that district would flip Democratic, but it doesn't. So how do you factor into
your equation and these results the fact of incumbency?

DR. MAGLEBY: So incumbency is not something that $I$ took into consideration in the drawing of any of the hypothetical maps. But Ms. Ford's prowess as a campaigner is something we want to be careful that we don't include as a one of those confounding variables. That's why we use the countywide votes cast in her district. So if we used votes for Ms. Ford, when we relocate the voters that would otherwise support Democrats to another district, I don't know whose district she sits next to in the actual geography of the county, but if you moved those voters across Mr. Kopel's district, it's possible, maybe unlikely, Mr. Koppel seems like a nice guy, but those voters would change their mind and vote for a Democrat in those instances. But that's why we use those countywide races, because when they vote for county executive in Ms. Ford's district, they're
also voting for county executive in Mr. Kopel's district. And so we're comparing apples and apples, whereas comparing Ms. Ford to Mr. Kopel might be comparing apples to oranges.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Just if I may interject, and this is just more of a point of clarity. Mr. Magleby, one thing that the Presiding Officer, which I'm sure he accidentally omitted when he told you this, Legislator Ford has been a registered Democrat, but she runs on the Republican line. That part he did leave out. I don't know if that changes your response. That's why I don't --

LEGISLATOR FORD: I don't believe that would have any impact on the analysis. But but even so, I mean, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to jump in on you, but when you look at the countywide races, the Republican map, actually, the one that was first presented from the TDAC, I was put into Legislative Kopel's district. Then the Democratic map, you
have me skewed over taking me out of a good portion of the district that I've represented for a long time and put me up into Baldwin into an area that I'm not familiar. And like when you were saying about voter confusion, you know, and it's not fair to people when they're looking and they be moved back and forth and everything, you know, so you put me over to there, but then you also change my legislative district number. So I think that in essence, that would probably cause a lot of confusion for the people who live in the district that normally knew themselves as Legislative Four District, and now they're in a completely different numbered district. So I just wanted to point that out, and I'm going to give back to the Presiding Officer. DR. MAGLEBY: And I'm appreciative and sensitive to the concern you raise, Legislator Ford, in fact, the Municipal Home Rule Law has very specific language about not favoring or disfavoring any
incumbent. The problem is we don't know. So this came up in the earlier testimony. What does that mean? How do I know that I haven't unduly treated you? I don't know exactly how to tell. We're told to consider them in order. I was asked to opine on partisan gerrymandering. This is an open question in terms of research about how we should appropriately consider what it means to favor or disfavor incumbents. And you're absolutely right, district boundaries change. They identify with their communities, as Mr. Drucker pointed out. They identify somewhat with their legislator. There are few very motivated people who identify with you all, but most people don't, actually. Most people show up and they think, I kind of like Democrats or I kind of like Republicans. And so the fact that you could show up in a place where people predominantly like Democrats, I don't know the numbers, exactly, that's precisely the kind of
thing, that lurking or confounding
variable, is what we want to remove from the analysis by using countywide races. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Let me let me just mention that Legislator Pilip, who is a registered Republican, ran and won in the Great Neck District, which is a heavily, heavily Democratic district. She won in that district.

Legislator Gaylor who is a Republican for many, many years, has run in a Democratic district and won. And I would say that each of those legislators and many of us up here ran ahead of the county executive in those races. So when you're just looking at the top down and not factoring into the fact that there are incumbents running and their incumbents generating candidates, $I$ think that potentially your local analysis is more skewed than doing a statewide analysis.

DR. MAGLEBY: I think that's a really interesting point. I have lots of ways I want to push back on that.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: That will be less when I make then (laughter).

DR. MAGLEBY: I will say this, and if you want me to opine on this, I'm happy to. I'm a professor, and if you can't tell, I like long answers. And there are a lot of tired people here who want to want to talk to you. And I'm sorry that I have gone on and on here. I appreciate you listening.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We do appreciate.

DR. MAGLEBY: This is an open question in the political science research. The accepted practice in the analysis of redistricting is to use elections that are the most appropriate for the region you're studying that encompass the entire jurisdiction when elections are happening. So considering a gubernatorial race in 2017 is odd because, as you pointed out, 2021 is a different year than 2020 and is a different year from 2022. But what we
want to do is we want to find something that will capture the general competitive dynamics that won't have these lurking confounders of a Denise Ford, who's just super dynamic and charming and persuasive, or whoever else is out there that could show up and change the way votes are cast. I teach politics. I don't think politics is a dirty word. I think that what we should be seeking for is a system that fairly allows political processes to play themselves out, that we have the opportunity for a Denise Ford to go out and campaign in a district that would listen to you and respond to you, and where voters are allowed to evaluate the platform you propose and make a choice. The challenge with gerrymandering, and I'm not sure who objected to this, but the accepted understanding of how gerrymandering works is that it changes the weight of votes cast in an election. Now, that sounds odd because everybody shows up and everyone
has one vote. But if I'm a Democratic voter in the Sixth District in the map that was proposed on February 9th, I'm going to show up -- and there's a lot of Democratic voters in that district -- the marginal impact of my vote is very small. Some of these Republican districts, and I forget the numbers off the top of my head, they've moved around enough on different proposals. I can't keep them straight. And I hope Mr. Drucker won't hold that against me, that $I$ don't have every piece of geography in Nassau County memorized. But in those districts that are more marginal but favor Republicans, the marginal impact of a vote in those districts matters quite a bit.

And so by playing with these these the competitive dynamics, by drawing lines in particular ways that over concentrate voters of a particular kind, what you're doing is you're robbing them of influence and and you're undermining their influence on the electoral process.

That's why it changes the weight of a vote. And we can actually calculate the weight of the vote.

Now, you went to law school. If you
went to if you're an engineer, raise your hand. And I will explain to you the math of how this works. But the fact of the matter is that's what happens and what I stand for. I know I'm here and I'm the Democratic witness and I you have to factor that into my credibility and however you want to do that, I can tell you that what I stand for is that I stand for equal protection under the law, the 14th Amendment, that everybody's vote should be weighted equally. It should all count equally. We should not draw maps that favor particular individuals over others.
(Whereupon, Public
interruption.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We have three more Legislators, then we'll get to the public comment.

All right. We have Legislator Ferretti, McKevitt and DeRiggi-Whitton.

LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: I'm just going to go to a brief point. Because I have to know something about redistricting. When I was in New York State Assembly for 12 years, and in 2012, I was redistricted by 87\%. I was the second biggest
redistricting in the state of New York, except for a district up in Oneida, which was 91\%. And I went from a rather more Democratic district to a Republican district. So around 2010, actually 2008, presidential, I got about 58\%. When I go to a much more Republican district in 2012, I go down to 56\%. But then four years later, I go up to 66\%. So I can even give an example on the county level where I ran my first race in County Legislature, brand new district, I got 52\%. My district in the last four years, which has had a lot more Democrats move into it, I went from 52\% to 66\%. So my district didn't magically become more

Republican with tons of Democrats moving in. It's the fact that $I$ work very hard. Many times when a constituent calls me I don't return the call, $I$ go to the house.

I see people. So the fact is, is that under whatever analysis you're talking about is, you really can't go and filter out that hard work, which is going to skew those results.

DR. MAGLEBY: I appreciate and I should have said this at the outset. I came up here animated about criticism of my research and work, and I should have prefaced all of this that what you all do is remarkable. This is a remarkable thing that in the United States, all of you would sit here on a Thursday night, late at night with and that folks would sit here and wait to talk to you, this is a remarkable thing that we do this. So you're absolutely right. The analysis that I did excludes individual campaign dynamics. I feel like I want to come back down here and take each of you to
coffee and interview you about your campaign techniques and processes, because $I$ could write a really great paper about all of this.

The problem with criticizing my work for that is that you'd have to criticize your expert's work for that, too, because they're masking those dynamics in the analysis that they do. And I would stand up for both of our analyses while disagreeing about the particulars and saying that, Mr. McKevitt, you're not going to run for office in perpetuity. Maybe you want to die in office in the Nassau County Legislature.

LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: No (laughter).
DR. MAGLEBY: You know. You could
step down. He was up here earlier as a well intentioned wingman. I was talking to Dave Mejias about this. I asked, do you ever want to do this again? He said absolutely not. This is one of the least appreciated roles in our democracy. You sit here, and I'm feeling bad that my
comments were interpreted to mean that I was impugning your characters. I 100\% appreciate what you're doing. It is noble. It is important. You won't do it forever.

So what happens when you step down?
Who succeeds you? A Democrat or a Republican? And if what we're trying to figure out is -- spoiler alert; some of you are better at campaigning than others and some of you know who you are. We have this ebb and flow and who's getting elected and re elected. And we want to understand how that works absent your own particular charisma, your ability to communicate and connect with
constituents, your ability to mobilize constituents to come out and vote for you, which is probably the most important factor. All of that is what we call a confounding or lurking variable, if I'm looking at the votes cast for you. The big problem is that -- you pointed out -you end up in another district once we
redistrict and you used a number, you said 80 and $89 \%$ ?

LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: No, I went from one which was $58 \%$ in a much more Democratic district, went to a much more Republican district, went down to 56. My first time out. Because no one knew me.

DR. MAGLEBY: Initially, I thought I heard you say that you were the most redistricted district.

LEGISLATOR MCKEVITT: I was redistricted by 87\%. My new district in 2012, I ran an 87\% new district.

DR. MAGLEBY: So this is one of these really interesting questions that goes to a point that Mr. Tseytlin said earlier. And it was a problem in the Republican proposals in the County Commission, which is how do we understand what district is our district?

Legislators should all have shirts made with the numbers of their districts on it. You get really attached to being in the 10th District or the 19th District or
the Second District. And the numbers the numbers are somewhat arbitrary, right? You stay the same. But how do we know when a district changes? That's a really tough question. So preserving cores, he suggested we paid no attention to preserving cores. I would contend that we paid about as much attention to preserving cores as you can. Because what does it mean to preserve a core? This is really getting into professor speak here. There's a really old philosophical problem called the Ship of Theseus, which you may have encountered in your philosophy classes because philosophers love this. If you went to law school, maybe you were a philosophy major. Ship of Theseus is this idea, Theseus was a hero, came back to Greece. He parked his boat outside Athens, and to celebrate his victory, they would take it out and they'd sail it around. And then they park it. And every year they did this. And every year something would break and they
would replace it. And after several hundred years, someone noticed that all of the old wood was gone. And they said, shoot, when did this stop being the Ship of Theseus? When did it stop being your district? I picked up my kid from preschool one day after thinking about this problem for way too long because that's what professors do. And he's like, Dad, what are you thinking about? I'm
like the Ship of Theseus. I explain it to him. I said, what do you think? And he said, 50\%. Just like that solves a problem that thousands of years of philosophers have never been able to answer; love five year olds, man.

The fact is, and $I$ mean this with
all due respect. Legislator Ford, it sounds like you've done really amazing things. Legislator McKevitt.

LEGISLATOR FORD: We all have.
DR. MAGLEBY: You all have. Yes. And
as I said, I appreciate it. These
districts don't belong to you. They
belong to voters, voters whose voices deserve to be heard and their voices deserve to be heard in fair ways, in ways where we're not skewing it in favor of one. And one, where the ebbs and flows when bail reform, whatever you think about bail reform, if that's a big deal for you as a voter and you want to register how you feel about that with your vote, you're entitled to have your vote heard, not have it discounted, diluted, muted or underweighted in any particular way. So $100 \%$, you're right. I appreciate you letting me give this -- is I feel like I'm filibustering myself here now and I should let whoever has other questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: One more Legislator.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Real
quick, because $I$ truly appreciate the public being here.

I sat and listened and I do appreciate both you and Mr. Tseytlin's

that correct?
DR. MAGLEBY: I need to preface any
answer I give here by making it clear that I was not asked to opine in my report or my analysis on the question of Voting Rights Act violations. And so I actually have not done the analysis that would allow me to answer that question. There was another expert that the Democrats retained that focused on that. In other work and in my research I do work on this, but I have not actually examined the data here to be able to answer that question authoritatively. I'm sorry.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: Yeah, because $I$ kind of think that that is one of the more important points in the sense of whether or not we take Minority/Majority districts into consideration or not as to whether or not we qualify. I mean, the Constitution says no, but the state laws say yes.

DR. MAGLEBY: On this, I'm going to

I'm going to go outside of what $I$ was asked to do and suggest that this is very much an open question. And it is absolutely the case that the application of Gingles in this instance will be very important in the way that we understand how to move forward.

I will say this, the analysis of the Republican map, I incorporated the Republican understanding of the application of Gingles to the simulation. So I did a different set of simulations for the Republican maps than I did for the Democratic maps. And that's because the Republicans suggested that there's a very different criteria when it comes to racial representation in the county, that there should be for Majority/Minority districts. They didn't actually say that.

They voted with their feet in the way they drew the map. In the map that they offered, there were four Majority/Minority districts. So in all the simulations I did, the ensemble I
used for the Republican map, there were at least four Majority/Minority districts.

When I analyzed the Democratic map, I analyzed it with the understanding that had been advanced by the Democrats. That Gingles requires that there's five Majority/Minority maps. So this is another way that my simulations differ from the simulations that were advanced by Mr. Tseytlin and Mr. Trende, is that it doesn't seem like they were taking into consideration any understanding of how Gingles would work. It was simply an exercise in drawing maps randomly without reference to race. But that that's not consistent with the actual map they drew. And that's not consistent with even -- so this is probably abundantly clear at this point. Lawyers are really good at answering exactly the question they're asked. And professors like to say, great question. Let me tell you the question you should have asked. But in this
instance, we considered both
interpretations, both the one that was in
the revealed kind of understanding in the way that the Republicans drew the map and in the revealed way that the Democrats were using the map. And it would not be appropriate, and I didn't say this in my list of things that $I$ objected to in the way he analyzed the map, he wasn't using the appropriate counterfactual based on the criteria Democrats had advanced. The question is, is there partisan bias based on a set of criteria? The Democrats brought to bear a different set of criteria. That's a question that another expert and another time can answer. If we adopt the Democratic criteria, there's no evidence that they've skewed the map in their favor. If we adopt a Republican criteria, there's evidence that the map was drawn in a way that was not neutral with respect to party. LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: So. Yes or no? Do you believe that Nassau County
would qualify for that Gingles test?
DR. MAGLEBY: It would be a big mistake to advance a map without doing exactly that kind of analysis. It would be money very poorly spent on the part of this Body to propose and pass a map that would not clearly survive a challenge under the Gingles criteria. I'm saying that as someone who's observed this process play out in different places. You absolutely need to do that analysis. If you're concerned about -- when I talk to people who are doing redistricting, they always want to know, am I going to get sued? Am I going to get sued?

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: All
right. Don't worry about it. You're right. I know I should end it with this. But so, basically, you're not $100 \%$ sure if it should be used or not. You're not sure if it should be used in Nassau County.

DR. MAGLEBY: So I have seen the analysis done by my counterpart, who was
also retained as an expert by the Democrats and that analysis indicates that there are clear patterns of racially polarized voting. The people who are affected by the Voting Rights Act, those groups of folks, live in compact areas and it would be possible to draw districts to provide them representation, up to five districts. So, yes.

LEGISLATOR DERIGGI-WHITTON: In my opinion, that is how the two of you differed. As to whether or not the Minority/Majority consideration should be taken in. And that, in my opinion, the Gingles test should show that. So I guess I don't know why we don't qualify for the Gingles test, but. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Dr. Magleby, when you go home tonight, you tell your wife you were passionate but not heated. So we very much appreciate your real passion for this.

DR. MAGLEBY: Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Thank you,

Legislators, for your time. Thank you all. Thank you all for patiently waiting. (Whereupon, applause.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All right. For the public comments, we start off with Angel Cepeda.

MR. CEPEDA: Good evening, Presiding Officer, Minority Leader, Legislators, It's very clear to me based upon what we've heard here this evening that redistricting is more an art than actually a science.

Having said that, I realize that what's before you is really a difficult task. But as a Plainview resident for more for almost 30 years, a community leader being on their school board and having been involved at the town level as well, I can tell you that community commonality is very important. And what's happened to Plainview, I would respectfully request that you look at and you put back together. Country Pointe is Plainview. It's Country Pointe at

Plainview.
These are things that as a science
it requires you to speak to each other with, find out, make these things happen.

As I said, this is more art than
science. It really is. Having listened, I
think that Dr. Magleby made it quite
clear. You can you can skew things one way or the other by just changing some of the statistics. But at the end of the day, you've got to recognize communities like Plainview.

LEGISLATOR SOLAGES: Are we entertaining speeches from political candidates or past political candidates? Just asking.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Finish, Mr.
Cepeda. Please finish.
MR. CEPEDA: Was that a question?
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: No, no, no. We're not doing Q\&A here. This is public comment. Okay. Your turn.

MR. CEPEDA: So that was what I'm here for, is to respectfully ask you to
look at Plainview and restore it as one community. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you.
LEGISLATOR FORD: Good to see you.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Next one is Karen Montalbano. Karen Montalbano.

MS. MANTALBANO: My name is Karen Montalbano. I'm with the Baldwin Civic Association. I'm their government liaison.

Now, I've taken a look at the maps and I thank you for making Baldwin mostly whole. From what $I$ hear now is there's part of it that's not in the same district. I can't tell because these maps really are very hard to read. And I know my glasses, $I$ might need better ones, but they're very hard to read and I can't tell what streets are or are not in Baldwin. We are now Legislative District Six. I don't know what that means, who our legislator is. But I noticed that in reading some of this memorandum that came out, many of these places are being
grouped by the Long Island Railroad, Sunrise Highway, which runs straight through our community, and the fact that they are near the water. And yet we seem to be going further up north. I am also very dismayed to see that many of our other communities are being divided. It's very disappointing that there are not more Majority/Minority districts being represented, and I really find that this process has never really been transparent enough for us to really comment, and especially when I'm reading things and making my changes as I go along and what I have to say.

Thank you.
LEGISLATOR KOPEL: Thank you. Mr. Mejias.

MR. MEJIAS: Hi, everybody. Thank
you for having me. Thank you, Presiding Officer, for the time, I will be brief. I know there's a lot of people here, and

I'll try to be as quick as possible.
As Legislator Solages pointed out, I
was the only Hispanic ever elected to this austere body, and I haven't been in office for 13 years. And that needs to change. And that's what this process is about. And to ask the answer the question as to whether or not race can be used in this process, I would correct Mr.

Tseytlin in that the Supreme Court in Cooper v. Harris said that we have to have strict compliance with Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. We cannot deny minority communities candidates of their choice, which is what partisan gerrymandering does. And, therefore, under the Supreme Court's analysis in Cooper v. Harris, it is a compelling state interest to have strict compliance with Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. So that point needs to be made. To sit here and say it's unconstitutional is really referring just to the Merrill case that's taking place in Alabama and it hasn't been decided. There's been some opinions out there that
maybe they should be race, maybe there shouldn't be race. But as of right now, the law and the constitutional law under the Supreme Court says that it is a compeling government interest. And if you think about it, when this Body was first started, there was two minority districts drawn at that time. And if you think it's unconstitutional to use race, you can actually draw a map where there are no minority legislators here. And that would be a violation of the Federal Voting Rights Act and certainly end up in court under that analysis.

It's interesting that the Racially
Polarized Voting analysis was not brought to the table by Mr. Tseytlin. It's being kept secret for some reason. We don't know why. Using statewide elections, as Dr. Magleby said, is a problem.

Analyzing, to Legislator Ferretti's point, the registration, if you think about it, if we just went by registration, it wouldn't make any sense.

If you use the actual results, the county executive race in the last two elections has been won by $52 \%$ of the vote or so, by Republican, by Democrat. It's flip flopped. But Republicans have $63 \%$ of the seats in this chamber. So that lends itself to say there is a partisan gerrymander. The 2013 map is a partisan gerrymander, because if it wasn't, if it was drawn completely neutrally, it would reflect the results of the countywide elections that go back and forth.

To answer other people's questions, what does Lakeview and Hempstead have in common with East Rockaway? Right. You know, nothing. There was a tremendous amount of testimony from the people that came down here that want Lakeview kept with Hempstead, and they want to make sure that they are represented. And this map dilutes minority votes illegally. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Dave.

Scottie Coads.
MS. COADS: Boy, this is a long time.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: My apologies for the long wait.

MS. COADS: He asked the right question. What does Lakeview and Hempstead have in common with Lynbrook, Malverne, East Rockaway, and a portion of West Hempstead? I have a West Hempstead address. But the portion that will be part of Lakeview is very conservative. So what do we have in common? Nothing.

When Franklin Square got 20,000 population and you're putting 6,000 from Lakeview into that district, do we have a chance? Do we stand a chance? Not at all.

And the other thing is, cracking, stacking, and packing are the three things that should be decided with redistricting. So what have you done to Lakeview? You've cracked us away from where we were since 1980. When our district was first formed in 1980, the
census, and then redistricting, we were doing great in Lakeview. And then all of a sudden, in 2023, you decided that we need to be with Lynbrook, Malverne, and East Rockaway, and then you added West Hempstead. I would have felt a whole lot better if you put us with a district that we had common interests. We have none.

I just drive through Lynbrook. They couldn't care less. I have someone here with me tonight who's always experienced racism in Lynbrook. And then here we are in 2023, after all our fighting to make sure our district in Lakeview was strong, we find ourselves fighting to get out of three, four districts that we don't belong in. For what reason, other than gerrymandering?

And I say to you, I don't know what to say, actually. What do we want? We want to be put back where we were. When our district was first formed in 1980, we worked our butts off in Lakeview to make our community strong. I can remember we
didn't have to worry about, maybe we should have, but we didn't, we didn't worry about parading through Hempstead, Baldwin, Freeport, Roosevelt, and on to Lakeview with a stream of cars fighting to get people to vote. And we built all of those communities. And you took, in 2023, a community that fought -- we try not to make a difference with who's running or whatever. But you know what? We lucked out because we got good representatives in the First District, in the Second District and in the Third District. We're not here to talk about which representative we want to represent us. We want to talk about fair lines. The lines are not fair. They were not drawn fairly.
So I'm going to say to you, my
little -- I see you don't have the time on me, so that's a good thing. I'm going to read some stuff that $I$ know three minutes I have a tendency of going over. But let me just say this, I rise this
evening representing the great community of Lakeview along with the avid
supporters of Lakeview communities. Many of them don't live in Lakeview, but they support us because they know we're strong. We have a strong community that has been fondly referred to as "Little Old Lakeview". You see, we acquired that name affectionately because although we are a small community, we carry a big stick. What do I mean by that? If rattlesnakes are voting in Lakeview, we vote. And that's the truth. And we are fair.

There are people who are sitting on this side $I$ have invited ten years ago to hear me speak about redistricting.

Presiding Officer, you were one of them who showed up to one of my meetings ten years ago. We do what's right. Lakeview has stayed home since the inception of the 18th Assembly District, and that's where we want to be put back. Back with Hempstead. Back with Baldwin, Freeport,

Roosevelt, Uniondale, even a portion of West Hempstead Falls in the 18th Assembly District. Lakeview has got two addresses, two post offices. One is 11570, Rockville Centre. The other one is 11552, West Hempstead.

Why do I not want to be in West Hempstead? Because the portion you're putting us in is all conservative. We will not have a chance to elect or have common interests. We just use the post office.

We have a school district with
Lakeview, Lynbrook, Malverne. What does it mean? We just fought Malverne to stop with its racist street naming. The name was recently changed in Malverne. I have many friends in Malverne. It has nothing to do with friends. It has to do with the proper lines and how we are going to be represented.

And I say to you, our hearts are hurting. And if you don't believe it, I almost went to tears when I saw our hard
work being put into a district or in districts like Lakeview, Lynbrook,

Malverne. Those people don't even want us there. They don't even talk to us. We have no common interests. None. Except our school district have the three names. And we had to fight like the dickens Transport 12 to even get Lakeview recognized to get busing in Malverne. I'm telling you, maybe I'm aging myself. But I got the history. We worked our butts off in all of our districts in One and Two, and we say we need to be put back where we belong, where our common interests are the same.

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Scottie. Lisa Ortiz.

MS. ORTIZ: Good evening, everyone.
Thank you for allowing me to come before you all tonight. I am here, I am a resident of Lakeview, one of the founding members of the Lakeview Civic Association. I am a trustee on the

Lakeview Public Library Board, and I am a very proud member of Lakeview.

I've come before you several times throughout the redistricting process, and one of the main concerns initially was that Lakeview remain whole. We asked, and you actually accommodated and we are grateful for that.

Our next request was to place us in a district with communities that share commonalities with us. We've asked this several times, and yet here we are again, asking again. The district that has now been presented for Lakeview, the last set of maps was comprised of Lakeview, Lynbrook, Malverne, and Valley Stream. This current map that is proposed by the Republican Majority places Lakeview, Lynbrook, Malverne, West Hempstead, and now East Rockaway. All of those communities have at least double the amount of constituents in it than we do. So when we think about disenfranchising, when you think about silencing and you
think about gerrymandering and you think about making sure that you are silencing a community that has a very, very loud voice, that's exactly what you're doing to us.

Lakeview has fought very hard from the time back in the sixties when Dr. King came through to integrate our schools. The first school district to be forced to be integrated by the state was done because of Lakeview.

When one of the your experts, the
Republican expert, spoke about the commonalities that we have are school districts, we can talk about that. Our school district is the only thing that we share, but we don't share the same name. I mean, the school district is Malverne, not Malverne/Lakeview, like Old Bethpage/Plainview. When we requested that, from what I understand, it's been denied.

Recently, many representatives from Lakeview fought long and hard in
conjunction with the school district, to have that street name that was named
after a leader in the $K K K$ to be removed. It was a very long and hard battle. A grand wizard in the KKK. That battle started back in the sixties, am I right, Scottie? For 60 years we had to fight. While that may seem like, Oh, well, at least you're making progress. How much? How much do we have to fight? We're here tonight. No other communities are here. Malverne is not here fighting to remain in their district. West Hempstead is not here fighting to remain in their district, because their districts still look like their communities. Our communities that we share commonalities with Hempstead, Roosevelt, Baldwin, Uniondale. These are the places that we go to worship. These are the places that we go to shop, to spend time with our family, our friends. But yet you want to throw us into a district that we have zero commonalities with?

So tonight to wrap this up, because there are many people that I'm sure want to speak at 10:42 at night, I am asking that you would place Lakeview back where it was into a Majority/Minority district. That will give us the opportunity to choose a candidate of our own choice. Place us with a district that will not silence our voice, that will understand the needs of our community and ensure that whoever represents it comes out there, not afraid of us, they'll work with us to make sure that our community is kept intact. And most importantly, we still want to remain whole in a Majority/Minority district.

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Ms. Ortiz.

Doris Newkirk.
MS. NEWKIRK: Good evening,
everyone. I am Doris Hicks-Newkirk, newly
Newkirk. And I come before you as a resident of Lakeview, homeowner for the
last 37 years, retired educator of the Malvern School District.

Some of the things you've heard are true. Last week, two weeks ago, we had the renaming of the Street name Linder Place. We led that through the initiative of the Lakeview NAACP under my direction under a Call of Action in 2020. We then passed it on to the school and let the children do their thing. I stand before you as the president of the Lakeview NAACP, letting you know that we also have a youth council where our young people come out and have their voice heard as well.

I ask you a question: What is your reasoning for this by putting us in this district? I ask you: What do you gain? And I will say to you, that we wish to remain number one, whole. Number two, a Minority/Majority voting district. We want to be in a community of likeness.

And believe it or not, you must understand that you are taking away our

voting strength. And we will not be silenced.

I also want to tell you that it's not okay to smother our vote by placing us in those communities. I have friends in some of those communities, very few. But I'll tell you, I know that some of our young people have walked down the street and been told to go back where they came from. So I tell you what, send my children back to Lakeview. Let them stay where they can grow up and know the community that they come from. We've heard it. We've seen it. We've heard people in the store tell our children we don't serve the "Ns". They've come to me and told me, and they were afraid to tell me. I wish they had told me as soon as it happened. Because the NAACP would have been on it like white on rice.

I say to you, Have we gained too
much recognition in Little Old Lakeview?
Have we been given too much support by our awesome Legislator, Siela Bynoe? As I
stood before you a few months ago, I
thought of some of the things and reported it to you the things that she's done for our wonderful district. Need I remind you? I think I should take one second and remind you: Health fairs, tax reforms, street repairs, walking our community, holiday celebrations, and last but not least, we've had someone that has cared for us. The first time in 37 years.

I can tell you, we have little to none in common with the communities that you want to put us in. So before you make your final decision, I strongly ask you to think on these things.

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Ms. Newkirk.

Tristen Salley.
MR. SALELY: Good evening to each of
you. I stand tonight as a proud Lakeview resident, a community activist, and the pastor of one of the oldest black congregations in the hamlet of Lakeview.

I recognize and am grateful for this Body that listened to the residents of my community 94 days ago, when we came before you and asked to be made whole. And we acknowledge that. But in making us whole, there's a little bit more that needs to be done. Here we are in the middle of Black History Month faced with redistricting where it has been proposed to crack and disenfranchise black and minority votes to dilute the vote and our voice that would prevent us from potentially electing candidates of our choice who represent us morally. And we've seen the importance nationally of making sure that candidates represent our communities with high morals across both sides of the aisle.

I ask tonight that you would consider deeply and greatly continuing to keep Lakeview whole in a district with commonalities. To your witnesses point from the Republican side tonight, as one of the pastors in Lakeview, I can tell
you that we share absolutely no religious commonalities with Malverne, Lynbrook, or East Rockaway. We don't. We're not a part of any associations together. We don't worship together. And truly, one of the most segregated hours that you will find in those communities is the hour of worship on Sundays and Saturdays.

And so we ask you, we implore of you, to think long and hard about the actions in which this Body will take as it represents Little Lakeview and other minority communities. Do not disenfranchise those who have worked tirelessly, who have died for fighting for equal rights and voting rights and the importance of having a voice in this community and in this country. Do not ignore it.

Ninety four days ago I stood before you getting ready to welcome my first born child. I asked you to make sure that he could grow up in a community that would represent him fully and wholly.

Well, he's here and I'm still fighting. Because there's more that this Body can do to make sure that communities of color are equally represented in Nassau County. I beg of you to consider your actions.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you, Pastor Sally.
Karen Moskowitz.
MS. MOSKOWITZ: My name is Karen
Moskowitz, and I serve as a co-chair of the Redistricting Committee of the Nassau County League of Women Voters. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Legislature. Although I think I almost lost the will to live about an hour and a half ago.

The League is a nonpartisan, grassroots nonprofit, encouraging, informed and active participation in our democracy. The league takes positions on a variety of public policy issues, but never supports or opposes any political party or candidate.

The Legislature's proposed map,
released February 9th, is commendable in that it creates for Minority/Minority (sic) districts. However, with Nassau's minority population now at $44 \%$ per the 2020 Census, the expectation is that at least five Minority/Majority districts are needed to avoid diluting their political influence by diminishing their ability to elect representatives of their choice. Equitable representation of minorities is mandated by New York's Municipal Home Rule Law. Contrary to the repeated statements of the Republican witness, we note that racial minority groups are explicitly referenced in that law.

Additionally, we see that the Minority/Majority villages of Hempstead and Freeport have been split. Although in the case of Hempstead, we recognize that this might, might have been done to create more minority districts.

Finally, we note that District 18 is extraordinarily elongated, running
southeast from the north coast and sharply narrowing as it squeezes through Williston Park, ending at the Mineola border.

We have two questions for the legislature. I think we've beaten the first one to death. We would like to understand the reasoning behind the creation of only for Minority districts.

I think the Republican representative explained that based upon the fact that he did not take into account racial groups.

And secondly, we'd appreciate knowing when the Legislature plans to vote on a map. And I don't know, Mr. Nicolello, if you can tell us when you plan to vote on a map, if you're aware right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: We expect to vote on a map on Monday, on February 27.

MS. MOSKOWITZ: All right. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you.

Jeffrey Daniels.
MR. DANIELS: I would say good evening, but $I$ probably better off to say goodnight to everyone.

We've been using the word or the phrase common interest a lot tonight. Everybody's been saying common interest amongst ourselves, whether it be Lakeview, Hempstead, and other places. But I'd say I think we all have common interests. We all want to live the best life we could actually live, and we all hold that in common. Not as Republicans, not as Democrats, not as African

Americans, Caucasians, Irishmen, wherever you come from. You came to America to live your best life. And in order to do that, that is the common denominator, the common interest, if you would, that we all have that we all seek to continue to have here.

Now, we've all started from

different places. Our experiences are different. We've been disenfranchised.

Purposely disenfranchised. And then laws and rules that were meant to stop the disenfranchisement were actually used to continue it. And that's a little bit of what we're hearing tonight, is that we can't have minority districts because that's against the law.

I'm going to give you a very quick example, because the time is ticking. We've got minority set asides and MBWE set asides for minorities. Primarily entrepreneurs that are just getting started. You have to get certified to be an MBWE contractor. That's the only place

I know that you've got to tell somebody and prove to somebody that you're black in order for you to get what was meant for you to actually receive.

And then we're doing something very similar today. You have gutted my village. You put it into three pieces. Let's not act as if that was not
intentional. Because one who lives in
Hempstead only has to look at the map to
tell you exactly what streets you cut.
Along Cathedral Avenue is now part of
this part of town. Terrace Avenue was cut
out like this in the box. That's
intentional. That's not someone just
coming through with the line.
So let's give each other an
opportunity to live that best life. And
it's not racial, it's American. And we're
all American. We need representation
because we started in a different spot.
We understand each other differently. We
need real representation. You cannot gut
-- the mecca of black and brown in all of
Long Island is the Village of Hempstead, and you've now taken that and watered it down. And we can't have that.

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you, Mr. Daniels.
Stephanie Chase.
MS. CHASE: Good evening. Just some
have a few figures here:
Lynbrook has 20,741 residents:
76.48\% are white; That's 14,871. Black and African, they say it's 4.56\%; 886. I really don't believe there's 886 black people in Lynbrook. I used to work there in the post office and I never saw 800 people. Malverne has 7,238; 84.99\% is white. Black 6.29. We're put in with these areas. We will be diluted.

Lynbrook I know doesn't care about us. I worked there. Scottie mentioned, I faced so much racism, but I have met very good people there. But for my age, I'm 66, and I started working there in '85. I can't tell you. The shock. The hurt. Being called the $N$-word, people yelling mysteriously out of windows as I deliver mail. Police officers following me every day. I don't know how I'm sane. Every day they followed me. I always had a uniform because I had a friend who worked in Brooklyn and he gave me a uniform. He just said, you know, you're going to need
this so people will know who you are.
Because they have a thing when you start, you don't have a uniform, so you're not identifiable. But it's funny that all the black people that work there, they've been stopped by the police asking what they're doing there. I was in uniform, the truck down the street I was asked, what are you doing? My hands were full with mail. I'm trying to get done. And I just looked at him and went (indicating). So I know most of them don't care about us. I could see the evidence. Just stand on the corner near the theatre and watch how many black and Latino people get stopped in their cars by the police. Now, I'm saying there are good people there. Malverne, like we said, I'm sorry. Took so long to change that street. East Rockaway. Forget it. I don't understand why you would want to do this. I really don't understand why you want to do that. And then you're going to turn around and say, Oh, look at those people. They
don't this and they don't that. And you're taking away our rights. You're taking away everything. We fought. We fight to get the roads. We fight to do this. We fight to keep our community. But you're trying to take that away from us. Why? Why? Why are you afraid? Why are you so afraid of black and Latino people?

I'm sorry. It angers me. I think I'm kind of lost my mind a little bit from what I've gone through. I really have. Got to do better. Got to be fair. Don't sit here and talk about God and this and that and you're not even following the basic principles. All you got to do is do the Ten Commandments. But you don't do it.

Then you sit there and you're talking about, oh, you don't want to get into minute details. They were important to what we what we think. Those little minute details $I$ wanted to hear. I don't know. I don't know what to tell you. It's a shame that we have to, in this day and
age, come here and do this. But we're going to fight. Mighty Lakeview, you're going to hear from us.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Ms. Chase.

Barbara McFadden.
MS. MCFADDEN: Good evening. Thank
you very much, Minority Leader.
I've been here so long, my phone
died. Thank you, Legislator Abrahams, for helping me be able to speak this evening. Please forgive me, I'm only eight weeks and two days post spinal surgery.

But as a child of the south, 76
years, I have to say, I didn't move from the south. I moved up south.

Tonight, I'm representing the
National Coalition of 100 Black Women in Long Island Chapter, Inc. It advocates to influence policies that promote gender equity and health, education and economic empowerment. Given that policy is so intrinsic and it is intrinsically related
to voting activity, fighting against all acts of voter suppression is a key tenet to our agenda.

Therefore, the National Coalition of 100 Black Women Long Island Chapter, wants the Commission, this Body, this Legislative Body to have on record our adamant rejection of any attempt at gerrymandering to weaken the black vote, and thus black voices in this country's political process.

This practice also makes it that much harder for Long Islanders to achieve equity on Long Island, and that is done intentionally. If the Urban League can quantify that billions of dollars were lost due to segregation, and then we had a huge community fund put back dollars into Long Island, then you know that it's not something that Lakeview is just talking about. It is a reality.

We emphatically call on this
Commission, as I said, again, to reconsider approving any map that harms
the communities, any of our communities. We also want to make it clear that gerrymandering is not only unethical, it is illegal, and we will support any effort to combat this illegal practice. Thank you very much and good night.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Ms. McFadden. Chris Jacobs. So the next three speakers are Chris Jacobs, James Jacobs and Pearl Jacobs.

MR. CHRIS JACOBS: Good evening. So the map, although I'm grateful that, you know, was kept whole, I'm disappointed that the other communities weren't kept whole; Lakeview, Baldwin, Freeport. They should all be kept all along with the other ones.

I also noticed when you go on the map, you go on the website, when you zoom in right next to the two, you can't see here, but if you go online right now, you'll see it says East Garden City. And for over a decade, Uniondale has been fighting to have the East Garden City
designation removed. So that's something that should be taken into account on whatever map is put forward. Hopefully, Uniondale, along with all the other communities, stay whole.

This map is an okay map for a certain parts, but it definitely needs improvement. I was at the Town meeting a couple of nights ago and I watched them pass an abomination of a map, which is terrible.

But that's all I got to say.
Basically, thank you for Uniondale whole, but make good on the other ones. Lakeview should be whole and the rest of them should be whole and after that, it'll be a good map that works for everybody.

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you, Mr. Jacobs. We will go back and look at that map. If it is indeed there, we'll take that term out.

MR. J. JACOBS: James B. Jacobs. That's my son. I'm proud of what he's
saying. And my wife, too. I support
Lakeview and their struggle. Same thing with Baldwin the rest of everybody else, because the struggle is real.

That's why we have the John Lewis Law, because if everybody did the right thing, we have to have laws on the books for people to do the right thing, you know?

And now, Mr. Nicolello, thank you, Kevan, for speaking your truth. Siela Bynoe and Mr. Solages for speaking your truth. I really appreciate you both.

I just need clarification on some things. So if you could bear with me, I appreciate it. On District Two, my son brought up the fact about East Garden City, that shouldn't be there on the right hand top, right hand corner.

On District Seven, this district combined interconnecting communities of five towns consistent with public comment urges them to draw together a new map bringing together Orthodox Jewish
synagogues, train station and other service that served these communities.

Now, my understanding of how the
Constitution works and the First
Amendment is a separation of church and state. But yet, if you're of a religious persuasion, just me sharing a thought, my personal opinion, my last name is Jacobs, I have opinions. It's just that, how come they have consideration for religious affiliation when when you look at what they spoke about worship on Sunday being the most segregated hour in America, how come that was not taken in consideration? Because like-minded folks together and and to me, if the same political parties had ideas that anybody would find competing, they will vote for them. But see, why would I vote for someone that don't have my best interests at heart? So I commend the people up here for speaking their piece. Because here's the thing. Thirty years ago, when I move out to Nassau County in the Town of Hempstead, I
was told it was very welcome to
everybody. But between redlining and
other things that were done to the
community as a whole as a disservice,
that a veteran served this country, she
worked for federal government and so
forth. But where's the love they show to
a constituent? Because the way I look at it think you're picking your voters now we're picking the politician.

And let me not forget other thing. There's something that jumped out at me, but something somebody said about how they putting all these communities in train stations and divided towns by the railroad. If people know the history and the thing about it, because here's the thing. Just like in Florida, they went black history from 1970 going forward.

Now, I didn't realize until someone brought it to my attention that the Town of Hempstead used to have a slave trade. Just saying. I just want it to be a fair map.

I'm just going to finish on this note. I wish you all the best. Like I said, Mr. Nicollelo, to me you seem like a stand up kind of person. Kevan, Siela Bynoe. Josh, like your commercial. And that young lady there, you okay. I'm keeping it real.

But the thing in the nutshell is that as long to treat people fairly and they think the votes count and is weighed evenly and equitably, then it's all good. Because I'm of the philosophy, I don't care what party you are about, but if you come to me in my community to enlist in my vote and disrespect me that way, why should I vote for you?

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Mr. Jacobs. Pearl Jacobs.

MS. JACOBS: Good evening. Good evening.

My son said about the Town of Hempstead, yes. That map was an abomination. It definitely split

Uniondale, which $I$ was not happy about.
We came there all the time. We held up by signs. Keep Uniondale whole, other communities, keep their communities whole. But I'm going to read something that the Town of Hempstead wrote regarding District Three. It's just a paraphrase. "In addition to uniting the Five Towns, the Board's proposed plan does not split Woodmere, which members of the community testified should be kept whole". So to me, that's blatant
discrimination. Good for my brothers and sisters and with me, I'm happy for them, but they're respected. And they said, we want to keep be kept whole, they are kept whole because they say we want to be kept whole, and Uniondale was not.

You know why I was sitting there. I was just looking for synonyms for gerrymandering: Dishonesty, crookedness, trickery, treachery, and fraudulence.

These are not flattering words, and gerrymandering is not a flattering or
ethical action.
I'm happy that Uniondale was kept whole. I'm happy about that. But I'm extremely -- but I'm not happy about the East Garden City sitting there, so I know you're going to look into that, Presiding Officer, it has to be taken off, East Garden City -- but I'm not happy that my fellow Majority/Minority communities were not kept whole. Lakeview, Queen Scottie. I always call you Queen Scottie because because she is the queen of advocation. And Freeport, Hempstead, Baldwin, Elmont, when my fellow Majority/Minority
communities are not kept whole, I am not happy. So I'm with you on that. I'm with you on that.

So you, as our elected officials, have the ability to break this discriminating action of gerrymandering. Please take that under consideration and make all of our communities whole and together with people and communities that they want to be together with. Like
minded. Thank you.
Hey, Josh, keep giving Santos hell. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Pearl. Christina Arroyo. (Whereupon, no response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Casey Marlowe.

MR. MARLOW: Hi. My name is Casey Marlow. I'm from Farmingdale, and I'm a member of the Nassau County Democrats.

First of all, I'd like to thank everyone involved with the Commission for their time and hard work throughout this important process, and to my friends and fellow citizens tonight for waiting it out to make sure that their important comments are heard and also at previous meetings. A special shout out to my former professor, Professor Magleby, for his expertise and excellent testimony tonight and in assisting members of the Commission and the Democratic Caucus.

However, as someone who's seen this
process go along in numerous hearings, I can only conclude that this process is shamefully devolved into something of a farce. Democracy is not happening in this process. It is being subverted and strangled by the process of which we are seeing another gerrymander of our county for another ten years. Ten years? It's a whole decade. Details matter when it comes when we're talking about something for a whole decade. And we've already been racially gerrymandered in the 2013 maps, too. That's already been proven by Professor Magleby. It's frankly, un-American. And Professor Magleby, he brought all the receipts, and I think he proved why this map is illegal.

Now, I'm not a lawyer, but as I heard tonight, basically taking race into consideration when you're making maps and making sure that minority voters have some representation, that seems to be racial gerrymandering, the same as cracking and packing them. That's absurd.

And like I said, but I'm not a lawyer. I saw the Republican witness say this. And to be clear, no disrespect to him, I'm sure he's an excellent litigator. I'm sure he's a great lawyer. But, man, he proclaimed expertise on this subject of redistricting and mapmaking and then we all saw what happened tonight when confronted by a real expert. He said a lot of malarkey. And I wish that you all had enough respect for the process and for the voters to have taken this seriously and get a real expert as your witness. It was kind of grotesque.

Because you guys are trying to pass what is essentially another gerrymander for the next decade. But you got lazy and you brought in, I'm sure, an excellent lawyer, someone who has a, you know, a record of litigation, and you all got shown up big time. I just wish that News 12 got all of Magleby's testimony on film because, my God.

But as many of you have heard me
say, my friends, at these hearings, this process is about representation and democracy. Something so important that our founding fathers pitched a revolution to secure them for our beautiful America. I'm almost done. Generations of Americans bled and died for these the most noble of principles. I'll restate the simple fact that representation today means power and also means resource allocation. This illegal map disrespect the diversity of our county in a way that is frankly un-American. We can all see that these maps are trying to deny representation to black and brown and Asian people in this county, and thus power and resources to those who have been perpetually ignored. And yet there are still growing and they are still getting stronger, these communities, despite this. But the only way this map could be worse is if George Santos himself drew them. Joshua, I want you to get on that, okay.

But, you know, frankly, given the complete lack of transparency throughout the Commission and how lazy this process has been handled, especially tonight, and when you look at the thoroughly discredited measurements and variables used to draw it, George Santos might well have drawn this map and given you all ran him twice, I wouldn't put it past you.

In conclusion, I would like to thank those involved with the Commission for their service to the people of this county, to Professor Magleby, and to my fellow friends and citizens for their determination tonight to have their voices heard on this all important matter. It's a shame that so much time and effort through this process was corrupted into an illegal map. I hope that we, the people in Nassau County, get justice and the legal map that we deserve, because this map ain't it.

Also, Presiding Officer, Jay Jacobs is a good friend of mine and he's a good
man, and I'm sure he's happy that you shouted him out tonight. Thank you. Have a great night.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you.

Meta Mereday.
MS. MEREDAY: "Stony the road we trod,

Bitter the chastening rod,
Felt in the days when hope unborn had died,

Yet with a steady beat.
Have not our weary feet,
Strayed from the place for which our
fathers and mothers died?
We have come over a way that with tears has been watered,

We have come over way of the blood of the slaughtered,

Yet with a steady beat. Yet with a steady beat."

I'm here to lift every voice and I'm going to sing. Not because I'm singing like the historians used to say that the
slaves were singing in the cotton fields because they were happy. They weren't singing because they were happy. They were singing because they were sharing the message that they were going to be free. They were releasing the shackles, not the master, unless we're talking about the master up above.

Fannie Lou Hamer said, If I fall, I'll fall 5'4" inches, which was her height. Forward in the fight for freedom, she said, I'm not backing off. And guess what? I'm not either. We are not either.

Interestingly enough, today,
President Biden, who is the President of these United, sometimes divided, States of America, had to issue an Executive Order to further advance racial equity and support for underserved communities through the federal government, because clearly, the House is not going to make that happen. That's a house divided against itself. And guess what? It's going to fall. That majority will not
stand.
The first act, his executive order when he was inaugurated on January 20 th, was advancing racial equity. Two years later, he had to further that advance. Why? Because this is the country going backwards. We are going backwards.

Many have already spoken with regard to the issues with these maps. I'm glad we finally got a time frame because I'm still disgusted by the display just south. And we can talk Mason-Dixon Line right here in Nassau County, just south of here in the town of Hempstead. When they voted on a more divisive map than this one. But guess what? By hook or crook, somebody is going to be here on Monday, the 28th. So y'all got between then, now and then to get it right. To get it right. Twenty seventh, whatever the day is, because I know they're trying to get these maps out by the end of the month. I get it.

But it was already spoken with
regard to you saying you can't have the racial inequities and all of that. But you got a clear statement in District 17 about the South Asian Chamber of Commerce. What is that? You have the Orthodox Jews listed in their district. I'm all for everybody. But you have a Commission about anti Semitism. But people of color, specifically African Americans, are still the most in terms of hate crimes. Where is the justice? Where is the equity?

So again, you already have all the information about what you need to do with these maps. You sure need to get Lakeview straight. And please tell me, where is the other half or the other piece of Baldwin? I would just like to know. Because it says most of Baldwin. You know, we're already separated down the middle in Baldwin with the Town. We have one representative and a ghost because I guess they're still trying to do all the qualifications to find out
who's going to take over for that spot for our second representative.

But I am imploring this Body. And I appreciate the shout out, Minority

Leader, I appreciate that. I didn't even know you said my name, but I appreciate that.

LEGISLATOR ABRAHAMS: Fairly so, fairly so.

MS. MEREDAY: I'm hopeful that we can, again, work together to make this happen, because we're going to continue to lift every voice. Not just in February, because black history is American history.

Thank you. Have a good night.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Meda.

Perry Grossman.
MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Presiding Officer, and to the members. I drove here from the Bronx this evening because someone called me up to tell me that Mr. Tseytlin cited the
testimony of the NYCLU in his map. I'm the director of the Voting Rights Project for the New York Civil Liberties Union, and I'm pretty familiar with our testimony. And when $I$ heard what he said, I was concerned because he only cited a small portion of our testimony, I think missed some critical pieces. And there's been a lot of discussion about when the consideration of race is appropriate in redistricting.

And so the first thing $I$ want to do is go back to the testimony that we submitted because Mr. Tseytlin neglected to mention this part. He noted correctly that the attempt by the Republican Commissioners to draw a non Hispanic black Majority district violated Cooper v Harris because there was not sufficient evidence that a black majority district was required to allow black voters to elect their candidates of choice in Legislative District One; that's true. And so we helped you avoid one legal
claim. You are all quite welcome.
The issue that was neglected,
however, was that we pointed out that the evidence in the record shows that the Gingles conditions are present here in Nassau, that there is substantial evidence in the record, Mr. Tseytlin did not note it, of Racially Polarized Voting, of political cohesion among black and Latino voters, and that drawing

Majority/Minority districts is, in fact, appropriate. The Republican Commissioners and the Democratic Commissioners both recognize that both drew Majority/Minority districts. The Rules Committee advanced both of those maps.

The consideration of race here is entirely appropriate. What Mr. Tseytlin notes in saying that the consideration of race is not appropriate is one sentence where he says that, "Sean Trende conducted a Gingles Precondition analysis and concluded that Nassau County contains no districts meeting the Gingles

Preconditions that would require or permit the creation of any race focused district for the purpose of compliance with Section two of the VRA". That's all, he says. If Mr. Trende's analysis is worth its salt, publish it. If you don't want to, of course you don't have to. But this is not enough to go on to say that race conscious redistricting is inappropriate. Because the evidence in the record, the only evidence in the record right now, shows that there is Racially Polarized Voting and that the preferred candidates of white voters usually defeat the preferred candidates of black and Latino voters.

The Gingles Preconditions are present here. And frankly, this is something that's well known to anyone who's had contact with Nassau County at any point over the last 50 years is that racial voting patterns are polarized and there is a need for race conscious redistricting consistent with the

Municipal Home Rule Law. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you, Mr. Grossman.
Matthew Pasternak.
MR. PASTERNACK: Matthew Pasternak.
This is my first time addressing the County Legislature. And again, I just want to say thank you all for taking our testimony and hearing our testimony.

But at the same time, I'm very
disappointed by these maps. I feel that they don't represent the interest of the communities that are respected here tonight. They don't further or advance Nassau County as a place for good government and democratic accountability.

And I feel that they really have fundamentally flawed issues that are either going to be litigated against or it's just not going to stand.

I mean, the people here who have spoken have been passionate, honest, and truthful about what they're trying to say. And I think the thing is they still
feel like communities of color are not being represented by the map. There's still a lot of cracking and packing in areas that shouldn't be, and that it's a map that fundamentally fails every independent mapping topography test imaginable.

So I wouldn't even be so deeply
concerned about it. But I think the thing I'm most concerned about is how one side isn't releasing data or empirical evidence that would clearly put these issues to rest. So if you believe your numbers, you did due diligence well, then, you know, that's something you're taught in elementary school. You know, you have to show your work. It's unfortunate or unfortunate whether you think. If $I$ were to take a test and not show how I got one plus one equals two, I get kicked out. Or if I present my work product, I'd be laughed at and told to start over again.

So I think we can fundamentally have
better maps. We can change the trajectory. But $I$ think unless one side shows it's data, shows empirical evidence, you're going to have this deep level of mistrust. You see it in this room. I mean, there's so many questions about this map going forward that we're not going to see, but $I$ think we can put it to rest. And I'm not saying it's done purposely. I'm not saying there's mischief or anything, but you can easily see how the indication could be there.

I thank the commissioners for doing their work, I thank the Legislature for taking up this map. But please, at the end of the night, please do the right thing. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Mr. Pasternak.

Cheryl Ingram.
MS. INGRAM: Good evening, sir. How you doing, everyone?

I'm proud to say that I'm a Lakeview girl since August of 1974. I got my
everything from Lakeview. I learned how to swim at Lakeview Park. I also became a Girl Scout. But we got disbanded in 1978 because it was not enough money. But my mother didn't let us run the streets.

I remember even when $I$ was a little girl went after they had shut down the Woodfield Road School, I used to have activities after school and I used to beg my mother. Can I go up to the after school activities there? She allowed me, and I learned a lot.

But I think that Lakeview should remain whole. I remember that even when we used to go to Echo Park to learn how to swim. I learn how to swim in the winter of 1974. By the time spring came around in 1975, I knew how to swim. I got everything from Lakeview.

I'm also a proud Malverne alumni. Come June of this year, I have been out of Malverne High School for 40 years. Even my uncle asked me two days ago on St. Valentine's Day how long I had been
out of Malverne High School. I remember when we went to school there, they didn't even want our black behind over there in that school. I went to Linder Place School. I even knew they was racist then because I used to come home and say things to my mother and she go, we don't talk like that around here. Where did you
learn that? Linder Place School.

I also was a Nassau County Park ranger. Tom Gulotta was the one who was instrumental with getting me hired because I had the background and experience.

Also, I later on went to Nassau County Police Department, and little do I know that I was going to become the victim of assault and battery by my own police department. I had to reach out to Siela Bynoe. Didn't I? I had to write a two page e-mail show, bruises or what they did to me, you know. So I know people are telling the truth.

I even had to give up my Camaro in

2014, I have been driving since 19. I got my license in 1986. In 1989, I finally got a car and consistently had a car. And every time I turn around they're behind me. I have been pulled over 17 times, 14 times, and my Chevy Cavalier. So I know what you're talking about, about constantly being harassed. And then when my family bought me a Chevy Camaro SS, I had to give that up in 2014. Constantly being followed, constantly being followed. Why?

And you know something too, when I was a park ranger and $I$ was down in Bay Park, you have the Marine Bureau that's down there and you have the Aviation

Bureau. When I had my 1983 Buick Regal Limited 3.8 was always pulled over. Why am I being pulled over? I work down there. That's my post. That's my post down there. If that's where you assign me to go down there, whether it's three miles or six miles from my house, why am I constantly being harassed?

So a lot of times when people come to me and tell me about these things going on in the community, everybody is not lying, you know.

And I believe that we should remain whole because I noticed that that map does not accurately depict Lakeview. And H. Scottie Coads, she's telling the truth. I used to live on Barbara Lane in West Hempstead, right? She's about three blocks from me, and I always had the longest walk to go to school.

Lakeview never had a post office. Our mail always came through the West Hempstead Post Office, and I always had to put the plus four code 4012 any time when $I$ would label my mail as Lakeview. We were non-existent. It's the same thing with the Rockville Centre Post office. Our zip code is 11573, but I had to also let them know why I used the plus four code of 3305. Because also in the Incorporated Village of Rockville Centre there is a Clinton Avenue, but we don't
have a Lakeview post office. Right.
That's why all our mail has to go through the Rockville Centre post office.

We don't have nothing in common.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Okay.
Miss Ingram, could you please sum up?
MS. INGRAM: Oh, I'm done.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Oh,
you are? Okay. Thank you, Miss Ingram.
Larry Weiss.
MR. WEISS: Good evening, everyone. I don't know about you. I'm toast. You guys probably are too, so try to hear me out for a bit.

Larry Weiss, 25 year resident of Plainview, lifetime resident of Nassau County. I know a little bit about the geography of the county. We stand with our brethren in Lakeview and the surrounding communities. And we are a community, too. And I believe a big part of what everyone's talking about tonight is for communities to have cohesive representation, for a community to have a
representative sitting in this
Legislature.
Plainview is one of those
communities that's being cracked, right?
I need to talk about District 16. As I see on the map, it stretches from the Suffolk County line, two thirds of the way across the county. We have Plainview going all the way to East Williston. Plainview has nothing in common with East Williston. What Plainview has something in common with is Old Bethpage. I live in Plainview/Old Bethpage. I serve on the board of the Plainview/Old Bethpage Chamber of Commerce for 13 years. My daughter graduated from Plainview/Old Bethpage High School. My wife spent the afternoon today at a lecture at Plainview/Old Bethpage Library.

To draw a line separating Plainview from Old Bethpage is no different from what we're hearing from the rest of the community here. You can't be dividing communities in half. For what purpose?

How are we going to have a representative sitting here who represents Plainview and East Williston and somebody else representing Old Bethpage? It makes no sense.

Frankly, dividing this up the way you have in this map is just kind of ridiculous. You know, the Plainview/Old Bethpage Chamber is one chamber. I heard District Five being referred to as a cohesive community because of a chamber of commerce. We have a chamber of commerce, the Plainview/Old Bethpage Chamber of Commerce. You want to divide that in half?

It's kind of ridiculous to have East Williston part of this district and not Old Bethpage. That's ridiculous. But what's unconscionable is to draw a line 100 feet from where our representative currently lives, Arnie Drucker, and deprive us of that representation.

Arnie's been with us since we lost Judy Jacobs. It's up to the voters of our
community whether Arnie sits in that
chair or not. It's not up to this Body to make that decision. And yet this decision is going to be made based on redistricting. That's not fair to us voters, right? We live here and we're entitled to our choice. And with that, I'll let you go because everybody's really tired. Okay. Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Mr. Weiss.

Paul Beuer.

MR. BEUER: Paul Beuer, 52, lifelong resident of Baldwin, honorary resident of Lakeview tonight.

Couple points here. First off, thank you for making me want to audit Professor Magleby's class. It was an excellent presentation.

You guys have a credibility problem. The problem that we have here is an issue of bread and circuses versus good governance. On the national level, we have a former Town of Hempstead Council
member who sits with election deniers on national security committees and on the local level here, we had a circus in Town of Hempstead ridiculous redistricting meetings which led to a vote on the evening of Valentine's Day, which is not good governance at all. First off.

Secondly, good governance requires several things. It requires communities, library districts, school districts to be held whole. It requires towns like mine of Baldwin, and I'm a proud product of Baldwin public education and I've watched that town wither for two plus decades. We need one Baldwin in order to redevelop and stop the blight. But, you know, you guys are intent on disenfranchising people during their own history month. Unacceptable.

And once again, bread and circuses. You want to talk about a casino? Great. You don't want to talk about Santos after two political cycles. Understandable. But now you're trying not even to talk about
election integrity. You know, if you guys feel very good about your records, run on them. Don't be afraid of Majority/Minority districts. If the public doesn't want them, they won't vote for them. Right? Just very simple. But you're weighing against people's right to vote and to have a voice.

So, what do I ask for? I urge this
chamber to have a discussion at some point on things like ranked choice voting, things like independent public commissions for redistricting. That's good governance.

And also your own expert, your own expert inferred, you have to litigate because there's no case law. I mean, if that's how you think you're going to run Nassau and a Mega Nassau at that with bread and circuses, you know go ahead. We'll turn Nassau blue. It's about the voters. It's not about you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Mr. Beuer.

Marie Jordan.
(Whereupon, no response.)

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Amanda Field.
(Whereupon, no response.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Charlene Thompson.
MS. THOMPSON: Good evening,
everyone. The hours late, but we stuck it out because we felt we had some things that we wanted to say tonight.

And so you guys know me. I'm
Charlene Thompson. I would like to share just a little bit. I've had the privilege of being a professor at SUNY Old Westbury in their Politics, Economics and Law Department. And one of the classes I taught was the Politics of Race and Class. And we looked at Nassau County politics, the history of politics and voting patterns in Long Island.

And also $I$ want to share with you, in the aftermath of the Long Island Divided exposé by Newsday, I read that
article and I said, hey, those real estate licenses are going to need some training. And so I went out and got certified by the state to do continuing education training for real estate licenses, and in researching the development of my courses, I realized and came to understand the history of government, developers, politics, and racial division by design. We have a unique history of that here in Nassau County, having the Levitt homes being the first American suburb. And, you know, William Levitt gets a bad rap about being a segregationist. But it wasn't his fault because the FHA loans that he used to develop the properties were subject to racial covenants. And then when the mortgage holders wanted to get mortgages in the Levitt homes, they had to have restrictive covenants placed on the mortgages and the deeds and that was designed by government, by our federal government.

Now, William Levitt had black builders on his projects and wanted to sell those homes to the black builders, but unfortunately he couldn't. So you know what he did? He went over and did another development in Lakeview, and that's how we got part of the segregation. And then we see in the real estate industry, we still have vestiges of racial steering and redlining.

So there's a couple of things that I
want to talk about. Even now, when we look at these maps that have been produced, it's a start. I disagree with the fact that we can't use the racial lens because we are becoming more diverse and more melanated. Long Island, also, is still increasingly segregated. I think we're up to four Majority/Minority districts that both sides can agree upon. And so we should go back and look at this and look at the racial makeup of the communities and these Majority/Minority districts.

But I also want to talk about a term that was used and thrown out by the Democrats expert. He talked about political gerrymandering. And that was an interesting term to me, because if you look at political gerrymandering versus racial composition and incumbent protection, they don't all come out in the wash. You got to give some to get the other. You're not going to be able to please everybody.

So what I would recommend and encourage the Body to do is to take the maps as a start, go back and put on that lens to make sure that we're fair to our communities where we have demonstrated historical voting blocks and common interest.

Thank you for your time.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank you, Miss Thompson.

Patt Terrelongue.
MS. TERRELONGUE: Last name
Terrelongue. I also represent the

Tuskegee Airmen. I am the president for the Tri-State Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen.

This summer, there were some kids Malverne on the Malverne side of the creek, tearing up the railroad tracks. One kid's yelling, he's from Germany, his family's from Germany, he's a Nazi, and he can't wait to go Ns and Js. I called the police several times. My neighbors called the police. Of course they never come. I get the whole spiel. Is it on your side? No, it's on your side. They never come.

You heard about the street named after Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan, which my granddaughter had to walk past all the time.

I had to have the talk with my 11-year-old great grandson right before Christmas. I was the child that was told to get up in the middle of a grammar lesson and tell how much cotton I could pick a minute. I'm the kid who was asked
to write a paper on a member of my family that contributed to society, and when I turned in it was thrown at me with a big red "D". I had to go back to school with newspaper clippings proving my heritage and my family.

What do I have in common with these people? I live in both worlds: Your world and my world. I've walked worked on Wall Street. When my son was becoming a teenager, I decided I couldn't handle those hours with Morgan Stanley, I took a job doing arbitration and holding hearings for Transit. I retired from them some time ago.

I went to a church in Lynbrook and one in East Rockaway thinking I'm going to a flea market. And what do I see? Nazi paraphernalia. What do I have in common? I beg -- no, no, no. I'm demanding that you keep us whole.

You know, the government said we were too dumb, our brains were too small, and the World War II would be over by the
time we could learn to fix a plane.
Well, you know what? They gave us planes that were retired. It took five planes to make one good plane for our men to fly. And we showed them what we could do. Don't tell me we can't, because we will. I am demanding for the residents of

Lakeview to be placed in a
Majority/Minority district where our
voices are able to elect the candidate of our choice. A district that does not silence my voice -- well, it's hard to silence me, honey -- and keep us whole. I will go to court if necessary. I don't like what you do, and it's really ugly.

But, you know, the Tuskegee Airmen taught me so much. I grew up with them. They were our God parents that were our uncles, our mother, my father, and all
the men that $I$ knew personally. And they didn't stand for nothing. One of them was almost lynched when he tried to vote after he came back from Italy, and he didn't want to go back to Selma. Martin

Luther King asked him. The police come and he said, Pat, I was scared. I don't ever want to see Selma again. But he went back because he says it's righteous. So I've made up my mind to always do the righteous thing. And if it means fighting you on this, I will. I don't want to. I hope you will do the right thing. I have nothing in common with these people other than they want to kill me and my family. Please do something about this.

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: All
right. Well, thank you, everyone who's had the patience to stay with us
throughout the entire hearing. But now we're going to have a motion to close. Motion by Legislative Walker to close the hearing.

MS. KREMEN: Excuse me. Can I just say something? I didn't get to sign up, but just for a moment. I'm from Plainview/Old Bethpage since I'm a year and a half old. My name is Barbara

Kremen, $K-R-E-M-E-N$.
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Go ahead.

MS. KREMEN: So I just first wanted to say that I really appreciate everybody's what they've been saying because our country has really gotten crazy with not giving everyone equal votes, which is what we're all supposed to have. And I worked for Nassau County for 23 years as a public health educator, So I worked in a lot of the districts that you talked about with the public clinics. And $I$ know that there's not a commonality with a lot of the districts that they're trying to put you in with. So it is clearly a sign of breaking things apart.

Coming back to Plainview/Old Bethpage, that's my district. You know, I went to school there. You know, my parents bought in 1955. I've been there for 68 years. So it's quite a long time that it's Plainview/Old Bethpage. I just
wanted to to correct what your
representative from your Republican side said in his piece. In A4, the Appendix about Plainview/Old Bethpage. He noted that Syosset and Woodbury share a school district, community parks, commercial interests with their extensive commercial relationship embodied in a single chamber of commerce covering both areas. Well, Plainview/Old Bethpage have all those same things and more. Amanda Fields was here and I asked her, does Plainview Water District actually serve Plainview/Old Bethpage? And she said, yes. I said, I guess it ought to be called the Painview/Old Bethpage Water District.

But clearly, you know, this is it. It's the Plainview/Old Bethpage community. So to cut us in half makes no sense either. You know, myself, my family, my children grew up in this house. I really don't see the the benefit to the people of Nassau County breaking
up these communities that have been for so long.

So I thank you for taking my statement and I hope that you all will consider that and keep us, as you've all said, whole.

Thank you.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Once again, a motion to close.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: One second. Scottie.

MS. COADS: I know I had my turn, but I want to say thank you for all that you do. I spoke tonight, and it was my seventh time testifying. And for the legislators that represent us, my district, Siela, Carrie A, Kevan and all of you who have stood by us and all of you who want to see things happen for us,

I thank you on both sides. Everybody not evil. And I just want to let you know that we are proud of our legislators. Very much so. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Thank
you, Scottie. Legislator Walker.
LEGISLATOR WALKER: Motion to close the hearing.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO:
Seconded by Legislator Ford. All in favor
of closing the hearing signify by saying,
"Aye".
(Whereupon, all members of
the Nassau County Legislature
respond in favor.)
PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: Those
opposed.
(Whereupon, no verbal response.

PRESIDING OFFICER NICOLELLO: It's closed. Thank you very much.
(Whereupon, meeting is closed, 12:10 p.m.)
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