

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BEFORE THE
SENATE REDISTRICTING SUBCOMMITTEE
ON REDISTRICTING I
HELD IN CARBONDALE, IL

Report of the Proceedings held on April 21, 2011, at 10:30 a.m., at Southern Illinois University, Student Union Building, 4th Floor Video Lounge, Carbondale, Illinois, reported in machine shorthand by Sharon Valerius, Notary Public and Certified Shorthand Reporter #084-003349.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator John Jones
Senator Dave Luechtefeld, Minority Spokesperson
Senator Kwame Raoul, Chairman
Senator Mattie Hunter
Senator William Haine
Senator David Koehler

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Giovanni Randazzo, Clerk

1 SENATOR RAOUL: The Committee on
2 Redistricting will be called to order. Clerk, please
3 take the roll.

4 THE CLERK: Senator Jones?

5 SENATOR JONES: Here.

6 THE CLERK: Senator Luechtefeld?

7 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: Here.

8 THE CLERK: Senator Lightford?

9 (There was no response.)

10 THE CLERK: Senator Koehler?

11 SENATOR KOEHLER: Here.

12 THE CLERK: Senator Hunter?

13 SENATOR HUNTER: Here.

14 THE CLERK: Senator Haine?

15 (There was no response.)

16 THE CLERK: Senator Noland?

17 (There was no response.)

18 THE CLERK: Chairman Raoul?

19 SENATOR RAOUL: Here. This is a
20 subcommittee of the Senate Redistricting Committee.
21 There is another subcommittee that will be having a
22 hearing in Elmhurst today. This is our sixth
23 redistricting hearing this year. We intend to have
24 another, at least another six hearings. Thus far,
25 we've been to downtown Chicago, Springfield, Peoria,

1 Kankakee, Cicero, and today we have Carbondale and
2 Elmhurst. We intend on going on April 26 to
3 Yorkville, south suburbs Macomb, northwestern
4 suburbs, Chicago's west side, and Alton. The purpose
5 of these hearings are to gain input from all areas of
6 the state to form our map-making process.

7 Earlier this year, we passed
8 legislation that impacts the redistricting process,
9 both from a Voting Rights perspective, as well as
10 from a transparency perspective. About a week or so
11 ago, I announced my intention on having hearings
12 subsequent to the time that an initial map is drawn.
13 The importance of having hearings before is to learn
14 about various communities of interest,
15 characteristics about different parts of the state
16 that I certainly don't know about.

17 And the interest in having hearings
18 afterwards is to gain input on an initial product
19 that, based on hearings afterwards may be tweaked.
20 I'd like to give an opportunity to our minority
21 spokesperson today to say a few words if he wishes.
22 Senator Luechtefeld?

23 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: Well, first of
24 all, welcome to Southern Illinois. And, you know, I
25 am glad that you are committing to having hearings

1 after the maps have initially been drawn for people
2 to look at them. I've asked that question a couple
3 of times, and I guess I've never heard you say
4 directly that you were going to do that, and I take
5 it that will happen; is that right? I know at one of
6 the meetings where Senator Harmon was, I think, the
7 person running the meeting, he was asked that, and he
8 was not as committed to that as you are. So
9 hopefully that will happen.

10 You know, obviously there are, you
11 know, a lot of concerns that people have with regard
12 to counties being split, cities being split, and then
13 certain ethnic communities being split that are
14 obviously very, they are very concerned about, and I
15 guess we hope that all those things will be taken.
16 You know, it's not an easy thing to draw a map,
17 obviously, and no matter what product you put
18 forward, there will be criticism in the end. So
19 again, welcome to Southern Illinois. And hopefully,
20 we get some ideas today that might make a
21 difference.

22 SENATOR RAOUL: Thank you. And I'd
23 like to thank Southern Illinois University and
24 President Poshard for hosting us here today, and
25 thank you all for being here today. Again, I've got

1 three witness slips here. I've got David Yepsen from
2 the Paul Simon Institute, Richard Grigsby from the
3 NAACP, and John Jackson from the Paul Simon
4 Institute. If there's anyone else here who wishes to
5 testify, I'd ask that you fill out a witness slip.
6 Senator Koehler, do you have a motion?

7 SENATOR KOEHLER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
8 Once again, we have a court reporter. I make a
9 motion that these proceedings be transcribed by the
10 court reporter, so that the committee can have a full
11 transcript of this hearing, which the committee can
12 approve at a future hearing, once members and staff
13 have time to review the transcript and to make any
14 needed corrections.

15 SENATOR HUNTER: I second that motion.

16 SENATOR RAOUL: It's been moved and
17 seconded. Is there leave?

18 (Senator Luechtefeld and Senator Jones
19 nodded in the affirmative.)

20 SENATOR RAOUL: Leave being granted, it
21 will so be allowed.

22 SENATOR KOEHLER: Mr. Chairman, I'd
23 like to make a motion to allow everyone in attendance
24 today the option to take photos, as long as they
25 don't interrupt the proceedings.

1 SENATOR HUNTER: I second the motion.

2 SENATOR RAOUL: It's been moved and
3 seconded for people to be allowed to take photos. Is
4 there leave?

5 (Senator Luechtefeld and Senator Jones
6 nodded in the affirmative.)

7 SENATOR RAOUL: Leave being granted,
8 it'll be so allowed.

9 SENATOR KOEHLER: Mr. Chairman, lastly
10 I'd like to make a motion for any media present to be
11 allowed to take any photographs and record the
12 proceedings.

13 SENATOR HUNTER: I second.

14 SENATOR RAOUL: It's been moved and
15 seconded for the media to be allowed to take
16 photographs and record the proceedings. Is there
17 leave?

18 (Senator Luechtefeld and Senator Jones
19 nodded in the affirmative.)

20 SENATOR RAOUL: Leave being granted, it
21 will be allowed. David Yepsen, you're first up.
22 Welcome.

23 MR. YEPSEN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
24 Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to visit with
25 you about the redistricting issue. As many of you

1 know, at the Institute, we have a strong interest in
2 this subject. I have some written comments.

3 SENATOR RAOUL: Let me interrupt you
4 just briefly. I'd just like to add Senator Haine to
5 the roll.

6 SENATOR HAINE: Thank you, Mr.
7 Chairman.

8 MR. YEPSEN: I'd like to submit some
9 written comments if I could, Mr. Chairman.

10 SENATOR RAOUL: Absolutely.

11 MR. YEPSEN: I think there's enough
12 copies. My take on this issue, Senator, is I echo a
13 lot of the calls for transparency and meaningful time
14 for people to react to plans that are developed. But
15 I wanted to encourage the committee to look down the
16 road to the next redistricting. We've had a lot of
17 talk about the process here in Illinois.

18 I think that something has happened in
19 California and in Florida that does merit your
20 consideration and at least perhaps some staff
21 attention. Those two states, in the 2010 election,
22 approved voter initiatives to not only set up
23 commissions but to try to have more meaningful
24 citizen input, and I think that's something that
25 policy-makers in Illinois should consider in 2013.

1 I realize you're all focused on the
2 current issue and the current problem. But if those
3 two states can devise plans -- those are large states
4 like Illinois; they are states with substantial
5 minority populations -- that whatever passes court
6 muster there, you know, I think is something you
7 ought to consider as language you could adopt in this
8 state for the process in ten years.

9 Why do we want to get into the next
10 process when we're still in the middle of this one?
11 Because, Senator, I think that one of the issues with
12 any of this redistricting is incumbency and current
13 personalities. And by focusing your attention in
14 2013 on the process of ten years from now, you
15 eliminate much of the consideration of personalities,
16 while at the same time, taking advantage of the
17 expertise all of you have developed on this subject
18 that you've given a great deal of thought and
19 attention to.

20 And if Illinois can simply borrow a
21 page from Florida and California, we may not have to
22 re-invent the wheel here. So I just wanted to share
23 that thought with you, looking way down the road. If
24 you have any questions, Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to
25 take them.

1 SENATOR RAOUL: Well, yes, I do. And I
2 remember having this discussion last year, and I know
3 there was some concerns about the commission process
4 in California. And I suppose, I mean, I don't know
5 whether -- obviously, we're dealing with the map this
6 year.

7 MR. YEPSEN: Uh-huh.

8 SENATOR RAOUL: And I agree it's an
9 important thing to look at what other states are
10 doing. And perhaps 2013 is a good year to look at
11 it, perhaps not, 'cause the jury may still be out on
12 what the product of what California and Florida have
13 done and other states have done in 2013. I know in
14 the brief time that the process has been adopted,
15 there's been some disputes about --

16 MR. YEPSEN: Yes.

17 SENATOR RAOUL: -- its inclusiveness.
18 So that's something that's always going to be,
19 there's going to be conflict about, 'cause one of the
20 things about the legislature is that there's a
21 natural diversity, because you have people from all
22 over the state, you have people from all races and
23 all regions, whereas a commission necessarily is
24 going to be a smaller body, and you're less likely to
25 have that diversity. So I don't know. I think the

1 jury is out on those processes. I don't know if you
2 have any thoughts on that.

3 MR. YEPSEN: All plans are going to be
4 litigated, particularly the ones involving the Voting
5 Rights Act and those very issues that you raised.
6 And whether it's 2013 or 2014, I simply would
7 encourage the members of the Illinois General
8 Assembly to look at what's happened in those states,
9 and maybe they can pay for all the legal bills so
10 that you don't have to, looking forward to the
11 process that will work in a large, diverse state like
12 ours.

13 SENATOR RAOUL: And I agree with you.
14 I think we should continuously look to seek
15 perfection, with the knowledge that we will never
16 reach perfection. Any and every system will be
17 flawed. But I agree with you. We should always look
18 towards other states as models or portions of what
19 other states do as models, and I personally commit to
20 continuing to do so.

21 MR. YEPSEN: And let me add, Mr.
22 Chairman, I commend you for being here in Southern
23 Illinois to do this hearing. I'm relatively new to
24 Illinois, but I do know the people in Southern
25 Illinois oftentimes feel like they're left out of the

1 processes in the rest of the state. So it's
2 encouraging to see you here and giving people an
3 opportunity. And I also am encouraged to hear you
4 say that you want to have hearings for people to look
5 at any proposed maps before they're enacted. I think
6 that will strengthen the credibility of what you're
7 all about, to allow people to have a meaningful
8 chance to look at the legislation before its
9 approved. So I really do commend you for that
10 position.

11 SENATOR RAOUL: Thank you.

12 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: Can I ask?

13 SENATOR RAOUL: Certainly. Senator
14 Luechtefeld?

15 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: You know, I like
16 that idea of maybe doing something in 2013, 2014,
17 rather than waiting till way late, because, you know,
18 first of all, in 2013, 2014, neither party knows who
19 will be in charge by then, and it's likely you might
20 have a, you know, a better product. I think that
21 makes some sense. Whether that will be done, a lot
22 of stuff that makes sense we don't really do. But
23 that makes some sense. I like that concept.

24 MR. YEPSEN: Thank you, sir. I mean, I
25 know there will be a tendency in every legislature,

1 when you're done with a difficult task to say, "Whew,
2 we're done with that. Let's move on." But this is
3 one where I think we ought to take advantage of this
4 expertise that you all are building on this, in
5 looking ahead to the future.

6 SENATOR RAOUL: Senator Koehler?

7 SENATOR KOEHLER: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
8 Yepsen, for your testimony. I guess while you're
9 here, I'll just maybe take a chance to pick your
10 brain a little bit. I don't know a lot of the
11 details about what California and Florida have done.
12 I'm assuming they're engaged in some kind of
13 depoliticizing of the process.

14 MR. YEPSEN: Correct.

15 SENATOR KOEHLER: Well, here's a
16 question that I've heard raised around this whole
17 issue, and that is, do we try to depoliticize what is
18 really a political process, or do we try to recognize
19 the political nature of it and make it a fair and
20 balanced political process and make it very
21 transparent? I mean, where do you fall in terms of
22 those two different concepts?

23 MR. YEPSEN: My own view is that when
24 drafting is done, we ought not to pay attention to
25 residents of incumbents and party registrations.

1 Other factors are, you can and should and have to pay
2 attention to those. But I think that it has to be a
3 little blind when it comes to looking at the
4 partisanship.

5 I agree with you, it is a political
6 process. It is inherently a political process. But
7 you all know how deeply cynical people are about this
8 and the whole notion that legislators are picking
9 their constituents as opposed to the other way
10 around. I think if you were to tell drafters, You
11 cannot pay attention to the residents of incumbents,
12 you cannot pay attention to party registrations, that
13 it would have, it would strengthen the process in the
14 eyes of citizens.

15 SENATOR KOEHLER: Just one other
16 question, if I might, Mr. Chairman. I remember in
17 some of the hearings we've had in past years, the
18 issue has come up about that some districts are not
19 competitive. But I guess I heard Senator Harmon's
20 remark on this, that every district is competitive.
21 It might be in the primary instead of the general
22 election, but that you've got, by the very nature of
23 Chicago and even some of the collar counties being
24 one party or another, that you're going to have
25 districts that may not be competitive in the general

1 election. But isn't that okay, as long as they are
2 competitive in either the primary or the general?

3 MR. YEPSEN: I don't feel that way,
4 because I feel like what has happened to our
5 political processes in this country is that it has
6 resulted in an increased polarization that if you win
7 your party's primary, you have a safe seat. And what
8 that means, as a practical political effect, is
9 inside each party, you have activists and extremists
10 that drive, in this case that would pull Democrats to
11 the left, pull Republicans to the far right.

12 And that makes it very difficult then
13 when you all have to come to Springfield or go to
14 Washington to try to work together and forge the
15 compromises that all of you achieve. So I recognize
16 there's another point of view. I think my colleague,
17 John Jackson, has a little bit different take on
18 this. We're not all on the same page on this. But I
19 like the idea of having competitive districts in
20 general elections.

21 SENATOR KOEHLER: Okay. Well, thank
22 you for your comments.

23 MR. YEPSEN: Thank you, sir.

24 SENATOR RAOUL: I want to pick up where
25 Senator Koehler left off. This notion of drawing

1 competitive districts as a goal, you know, I'm told
2 that, you know, studies have been done that say
3 like-minded people gravitate to similar geographic
4 areas, you know. I imagine it would be challenging
5 in the state of Utah to draw a line of competitive
6 districts, and there are a lot of similar states.

7 Likewise, the other portion of that
8 notion of drawing competitive districts as a
9 redistricting goal, it would seem inherently that in
10 order to intentionally draw a competitive district,
11 you'd have to look at partisan information. What are
12 your thoughts on that?

13 MR. YEPSEN: Well, I think simply
14 having drafters not pay attention to the residency of
15 incumbents and the party registrations, you can
16 achieve, the mathematical probabilities are, you will
17 have a number of competitive districts. You do have
18 to look at other demographic characteristics. You
19 have to do that to comply with the Voting Rights Act,
20 and you can easily protect communities of interest by
21 your competitiveness and your contiguousness
22 standards. So I think the natural order of things
23 will produce competitive districts.

24 Other people think you have to be more
25 assertive in trying to actually accomplish that and

1 recognize that it's a political process. You're
2 going to have so many Republican districts and so
3 many Democratic ones and we'll create some in the
4 middle. I don't share that view. I think it can be
5 blindly done.

6 SENATOR RAOUL: And there are those who
7 will argue and have argued that you have to look at
8 partisan information oftentimes to comply with the
9 Voting Rights Act. What are your thoughts on that?

10 MR. YEPSEN: Well, I think to the
11 extent you can, yes, you may have to, but I think
12 that you can avoid that and you can look at other
13 factors. But I'm not a lawyer, Senator, and so far
14 be it from me to try to interpret the complexities of
15 the Voting Rights Act.

16 SENATOR RAOUL: Senator Haine?

17 SENATOR HAINE: Thank you, Mr.
18 Chairman. I appreciate your comments very much. I
19 think they're very interesting. I have one thought.
20 When the Constitution was written in 1870 and 1970,
21 we provided an inherently competitive theory in the
22 cumulative voting. There was always a minority
23 member, a minority party member in every House
24 district. And for some reason, that was thrown out
25 by the voters in a fit of pique at the political

1 class, I suppose. A lot of the same rhetoric now was
2 current then, after a pay increase, I believe.

3 Would you agree that that was, that
4 came from the British corporation theory and that was
5 a great leavening process of the House to have those,
6 the Democrats, the speaker actually at that time,
7 William Redman, was a Democrat from a highly
8 Republican area. And you had many Democrats in the
9 similar situation, many Republicans from Democratic
10 areas. And would you favor bringing that back, a
11 cumulative vote?

12 MR. YEPSEN: I certainly think it's
13 worth considering. I'll let Governor Quinn speak to
14 the wisdom of it.

15 SENATOR HAINE: That shouldn't happen
16 for political reasons.

17 MR. YEPSEN: He has more expertise than
18 I do. I do want to make one comment about that, and
19 that is, the longer I'm here in Illinois, the more
20 people I hear state that was a pretty good idea for
21 just the reasons that you state. And, you know, we
22 at the Institute have advocated for a lot of
23 reforms. But one of the things you do have to be
24 careful of is the law of unintended consequences.
25 We're seeing that today. So while I'm all for

1 certain reforms, I do acknowledge that you folks have
2 to look for those unintended consequences, hopefully
3 before they happen.

4 SENATOR HAINE: It's be careful what
5 you pray for, 'cause you may get it.

6 SENATOR RAOUL: I, for one, feel that
7 we have enough House members as it is. Any other
8 questions?

9 (There was no response.)

10 SENATOR RAOUL: Thank you so much.

11 MR. YEPSEN: Thank you, sir.

12 SENATOR RAOUL: Richard Grigsby,
13 NAACP.

14 MR. GRIGSBY: My testimony is not going
15 to be political or technical. I'm not looking for
16 sympathy or anything else. I have lived in Pulaski
17 County all of my life, with the exception of college
18 and the military. I currently am and have been the
19 President of Alexander and Pulaski's NAACP for ten
20 years.

21 I understand that there is some
22 discussion about removing Alexander County from the
23 59th Legislative District and from the 118th
24 Representative District. Alexander and Pulaski
25 Counties are the two farthest south counties in

1 Illinois and really go together. They're probably
2 two of the poorest counties, also. Many
3 organizations in the two counties are connected.
4 They have similar economic, social, and health
5 problems. They just simply go together.

6 We have the University of Illinois
7 Extension Service, which is Pulaski/Alexander
8 Extension Service. The agricultural office located
9 in Alexander services Alexander and Pulaski
10 Counties. We had a development corporation some
11 years ago, and it was called PADCO, Pulaski/Alexander
12 Development Corporation. The local NAACP is
13 Alexander/Pulaski Counties NAACP. We have other
14 agencies that serve the two counties, such as
15 Children and Family Services, driver's license
16 facility, community health clinic and social
17 services. The empowerment zone is Alexander,
18 Pulaski, and Johnson Counties.

19 We just feel that there would be
20 disruption, political complications, confusion, and
21 unforeseen problems if Alexander County was removed.
22 We urge you to strongly consider leaving Alexander
23 County in the 118th Legislative District. Thank you.

24 SENATOR RAOUL: Thank you. Are there
25 any questions of this witness? Senator Luechtefeld?

1 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: Is there talk
2 that that's not the case, that that might not be the
3 case?

4 MR. GRIGSBY: Well --

5 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: If it is, you
6 know more than I do.

7 MR. GRIGSBY: Well, I heard a rumor.

8 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: Okay.

9 MR. GRIGSBY: You know how rumors are.
10 We lost a lot of population in our district, I think
11 10,000, so there's some discussions, I think, of,
12 well, the rumor was that they were maybe moving the
13 118th Legislative District to a northern county,
14 including a northern county and taking out Alexander
15 and putting it in with Representative Bost.

16 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: I see. So you've
17 heard that?

18 MR. GRIGSBY: I've heard that.

19 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: All right.

20 MR. GRIGSBY: I have nothing but heard
21 that. Any other questions?

22 SENATOR RAOUL: That's what I was about
23 to ask. Any questions?

24 (There was no response.)

25 SENATOR RAOUL: Thank you for your

1 testimony.

2 MR. GRIGSBY: Okay. I've got four
3 copies of this.

4 SENATOR RAOUL: Next witness is John
5 Jackson, Paul Simon Institute.

6 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, if it's
7 okay, I have a handout I'd like to pass out to the
8 members. And Brian Chapman's going to help me, if he
9 hasn't yet. Yes, there he is. He's going to pass
10 out to anyone who wants to carry a handout away with
11 them. I'm not going to cover all that, so don't get
12 concerned about the length of my testimony. I'm
13 going to simply summarize that and my position
14 today.

15 Some of you know, the Paul Simon
16 Institute's been invested in redistricting for at
17 least five, six years now, and Mr. Chairman, you
18 brought the group down last year. Mike Lawrence,
19 David, and I all testified before this group. So
20 some of this is a distillation of what we've been
21 doing and what we've learned over five or six years
22 of working on this.

23 I think David's testimony has basically
24 pointed us toward the future and what may happen in
25 2012, 2013. I'd like to concentrate on the task at

1 hand, what you've got to do now and the decision
2 that's about to happen. And I'd like to suggest some
3 criteria in a way sort of conceptually to look at the
4 chore that everyone involved has got to face up to.

5 Obviously, you've got to start with the
6 Constitution. And so I've started at the
7 Constitution there at the top. And the 1970 Illinois
8 Constitution is quoted there, so you don't need
9 that. You already know all that. You've got to
10 start with the United States Constitution. You know
11 that. You know, of course, that you've got to start
12 with the Voting Rights Act and all of those other
13 redistricting reapportionment decisions which
14 basically started with at least Baker vs. Carr in
15 1963 and been going on ever since, and the Court's
16 still trying to decide where it's going to stand with
17 respect to some of these key issues.

18 I have taken liberally from a textbook
19 that is in my field, which is political science, and
20 quoted it there in the middle of the page, and that's
21 what I want to focus on, because I'm assuming the
22 constitutional and legal issues will be taken care
23 of, and if not, they'll be adjudicated in the
24 courts. And I want to talk about what I think is
25 more the political and the practical politics

1 consideration.

2 At the top of that, the textbook offers
3 the considerations involving form, and those are
4 well-known. They are: Equal numbers, follow natural
5 frontiers as much as possible, and compactness and
6 contiguous. They're fairly objective. And while
7 they're easy to say, they're much more difficult to
8 do. And contiguous we had in the last map. Compact
9 I would say not so much. And you've all looked at
10 the last map or other maps before that, and you know
11 there's some really strangely shaped and what is
12 popularly called gerrymander districts that came
13 out. Those are sometimes incompatible kinds of
14 recommendations.

15 I want to focus on the considerations
16 involving outcome, and they, of course, include
17 ethnic fairness, which is No. 5 there on your
18 handout. Again, I take that largely to be covered by
19 the Voting Rights Act, so I'm going to focus on party
20 fairness and party competition. I think there you
21 have to look at incumbency. I think you have to look
22 at the partisanship of the area being considered.

23 Indeed, the Court, as I read it in both
24 the Davis and the Veith cases, the Supreme Court of
25 the United States has said that that's acceptable as

1 long as they are not the only factors. I, too, am
2 not a lawyer, but what I understand of those cases,
3 that's where the Supreme Court stands, and that they
4 will allow for considerations of both partisanship
5 and incumbency. You can't really deal with
6 partisanship without dealing with incumbency and vice
7 versa, it seems to me.

8 So the question then becomes,
9 particularly for this round, is how much partisanship
10 and how much incumbency and what drives the bus and
11 what's left over at the end of that. We have, in my
12 discipline of political science, a concept that I
13 think is helpful. It's called the votes to seats
14 ratio.

15 Votes to seats ratio means, of course,
16 that there's at least some rough approximation of a
17 relationship between the numbers of votes the party
18 got statewide and the numbers of seats that it has in
19 each legislative body. That's a tried and true
20 formula for most parliaments and most legislative
21 bodies around the world, and I think there's
22 something to be said for starting with that concept.

23 You have to say, okay, which votes?
24 And there, of course, it gets more complicated. The
25 old-timers will recognize we used to have the

1 University of Illinois Board of Trustees. It was a
2 handy marker of the partisan strength statewide. We
3 lost that now that we have an appointed board.

4 I would assert, having studied lots of
5 voting returns for Illinois across lots of years, two
6 things. Number one, Illinois is a very competitive
7 state. And number two, Illinois is a state that
8 currently leans toward the Democratic Party. I would
9 cite a number of evidences for that, both of those
10 propositions.

11 One is, on the competitive side, very
12 close elections for the top two positions, the senate
13 and the governor's race. Both came down to the
14 wire. They were very close statewide outcomes. That
15 argues for the competitiveness of Illinois right
16 there alone. Illinois, however, has been called a
17 deep blue state.

18 I think that was true certainly after
19 the Democrats took over state government from 2002 up
20 through 2010. Through the 2008 elections, Illinois
21 Democrats basically won almost everything in sight
22 and dominated the state. Not so much, though, after
23 2010. It got to be a lot more competitive.

24 I just cited the governor and senator
25 races. But also, thinking about the statewide

1 constitutional offices, if you leave out the
2 lieutenant governor, three Democrats and two
3 Republicans. Again, close races and close balance.
4 So I would expect ultimately that there will be
5 considerations of partisanship and incumbency in this
6 round.

7 Whatever we do next round I think
8 should be discussed, and I think there are lots of
9 models and lots of possibilities for change. I would
10 urge you, however, while looking at the very real
11 probability that incumbency and partisanship is going
12 to be important, I think there ought to be a
13 preservation of consideration for a number of
14 marginal districts or competitive districts.

15 I think elections ought to count for
16 something. I think changes in public opinion ought
17 to count and register fairly quickly. I think, to
18 some limited extent, perhaps that's what happened in
19 2010. But you've got to have some concern for
20 marginal districts, competitive districts.
21 Otherwise, it seems to me the charge that the
22 legislators are choosing their people rather than the
23 people are choosing their legislators rings true.

24 And I think the balance between
25 marginal, safe seat Republicans, safe seat likely

1 Democratic districts, is an important policy matter
2 which you will have to struggle with. I think some
3 of those marginal districts, however, should be
4 created downstate. I think some of them should be
5 created in the suburbs, and I think some of them
6 should be a mixture of central city Chicago and
7 suburban populations. And there you would get, I
8 think, more of the legitimacy that goes with having
9 at least a battle and a race and a competitive race
10 each time. And somebody can win and somebody can
11 lose in those competitive races.

12 There are lots of plans out there. At
13 the bottom of the page, I covered some of the other
14 ones. David Yepsen covered Florida and California.
15 There are lots of other ways to do that under the
16 leading state models that I listed. Those are some
17 of the best known and some of the best regarded. And
18 then, of course, we had our own plan which we
19 advocated for in the last go-round. We didn't get it
20 adopted, but we'll be around after this is over, and
21 we'll probably have another run at something at
22 least, and we hope to continue this dialogue and
23 conversation then.

24 But we appreciate your listening, and
25 we appreciate your attention to the task that is at

1 hand. I'll be happy to try to answer your
2 questions.

3 SENATOR RAOUL: I've got a couple.

4 MR. JACKSON: Okay.

5 SENATOR RAOUL: I want to go back to
6 this notion of competitiveness. And as you enumerate
7 different criteria and some of them listed on the
8 sheet that you've handed out to us, such as, where
9 possible, respect local boundaries.

10 MR. JACKSON: Right.

11 SENATOR RAOUL: And then communities of
12 interest.

13 MR. JACKSON: Right.

14 SENATOR RAOUL: Lines of
15 communication.

16 MR. JACKSON: Right.

17 SENATOR RAOUL: What we've found from
18 our hearings, both this year and last year, some of
19 those criteria are inconsistent with one another.

20 MR. JACKSON: Right.

21 SENATOR RAOUL: So when you start
22 talking about, let's take the Voting Rights Act,
23 first of all, in drawing a voting rights district.
24 Almost necessarily those are not going to be
25 partisan, competitive districts.

1 MR. JACKSON: They're going to be
2 partisan districts, not competitive.

3 SENATOR RAOUL: Right. Likewise, we've
4 had multiple witnesses last year who are national
5 redistricting experts who have told us, you know,
6 respecting municipal boundaries in a very strict way
7 creates a packing effect that results in drawing more
8 conservative districts, and then again, less
9 competitive districts. So the complex thing about
10 this process is that all of these criteria --

11 MR. JACKSON: Yeah, are way off.

12 SENATOR RAOUL: -- that we're being
13 told that we need to observe compete with one
14 another.

15 MR. JACKSON: Yeah.

16 SENATOR RAOUL: And I just wanted your
17 thoughts on that.

18 MR. JACKSON: I think you give away
19 some flexibility on what you can do when you start
20 with some givens. And those givens, I think you have
21 to do and get out of the way, and that's why I say
22 you have to look at starting with some partisan and
23 incumbency considerations. They start partisan, but
24 they certainly have incumbency implications.

25 I think you can -- I haven't done all

1 of the many permutations you have to do to run the
2 map, but the computer will do that, of course. I
3 think you get a certain number that are pretty
4 clearly going to almost certainly going to elect
5 Democrats and a certain number that clearly are going
6 to elect Republicans, and it's important to maintain
7 some of those that are mixed, and they're very
8 diverse and have a good mixture of both. It may not
9 be 51/49, but maybe it starts at 48/52 based on past
10 voting patterns.

11 And I think you have to look at all of
12 that. But I would urge you to create some of those
13 districts. I think it would be unfortunate if, when
14 the map comes out, everyone looks at it, the media
15 will look at it, and they say the whole game's over,
16 everybody knows who's going to win all those
17 districts. There's, you know, almost no competitive
18 districts left.

19 SENATOR RAOUL: I think inevitably, you
20 know, 'cause as expert as any map maker may think
21 that they are, inevitably, you know, suppose you have
22 somebody with the most unselfish intentions, they're
23 going to fail to some extent because of population
24 shifts, mood shifts as we've seen in the last year.

25 MR. JACKSON: And that's what elections

1 and public opinion shifts are all about. That's why
2 I'm urging that some degree of respect for that
3 possibility should be given, while at the same time,
4 it's also true, as the voting statistics that I've
5 accumulated and written about over the years show,
6 there's some counties that have voted Republican
7 since Abraham Lincoln was a Whig, and some counties
8 that vote Democratic, fewer of those, but still some
9 counties that vote Democratic as frequently as those
10 others are Republican. And I think people know
11 that. And I think that's going to be a part of the
12 mixture.

13 SENATOR RAOUL: One of the interesting
14 bits of testimony we had in our, well, both in our
15 Chicago hearing as well as in our Springfield
16 hearing, dealt with the north side of Chicago's
17 boundary. And we were hearing from various ethnic
18 communities of interest that had people on both sides
19 of the boundary.

20 Within those same hearings, we heard
21 from people within the neighborhood contained in
22 Chicago describing their neighborhood as a community
23 of interest. So we had one group saying, well, keep
24 Rogers Park --

25 MR. JACKSON: Uh-huh.

1 SENATOR RAOUL: -- separate from
2 Evanston or, you know, West Rogers Park separate from
3 Skokie. And then we were hearing from another group
4 saying, hey, our ethnicity has people in Evanston and
5 in Chicago or in Chicago and in Skokie, so they came
6 forth with census data and maps. And so, you know,
7 all of these criteria are very difficult --

8 MR. JACKSON: They work against each
9 other.

10 SENATOR RAOUL: -- to reconcile.

11 MR. JACKSON: I think that's
12 inevitable, and I think some conflict is inevitable.
13 Some unhappy individuals and communities are
14 certainly going to occur. I think if you start with
15 an overall concept and set of parameters that are
16 defensible, though, that you can live with those more
17 minor kinds of internal fights that are going to have
18 to go on after you have the map.

19 SENATOR RAOUL: Arguably, both of the
20 arguments are defensible; right? Keep Rogers Park
21 together. Keep the Asian community together.
22 They're defensible.

23 MR. JACKSON: I'm sure they are. I
24 mean, I've read about --

25 SENATOR RAOUL: And I guess I'm simply

1 making the point that whatever we do --

2 MR. JACKSON: You're going to get some
3 heat.

4 SENATOR RAOUL: -- will be criticized.
5 I'm just, you know, trying to bring that out in our
6 expert testimony here. So but I appreciate it.

7 MR. JACKSON: I agree.

8 SENATOR RAOUL: Senator Koehler?

9 SENATOR KOEHLER: Yes. Thank you for
10 your testimony. So help me understand. There's a
11 difference between being partisan and protecting
12 incumbents.

13 MR. JACKSON: Yes, but they also
14 overlap. But yes, they are two different
15 considerations.

16 SENATOR KOEHLER: I guess because I
17 heard you talk about, you know, that in a sense I
18 thought it was okay to be partisan. But protecting
19 incumbents is kind of a different side of that issue,
20 is it not?

21 MR. JACKSON: That wasn't my position.

22 SENATOR KOEHLER: Okay. Well, I guess
23 the question I'm asking, and it goes back to David's
24 testimony, it seems to me since this is obviously a
25 political process, that the earlier we can set up the

1 process for the next ten years, the more objective we
2 can be, because then, I mean, I'm not going to be an
3 incumbent at that point, and we don't have to take
4 into consideration the personalities of the
5 incumbents that are in place at that point. That's
6 part of the problem with us doing it now is that
7 we're all incumbents.

8 MR. JACKSON: Right. You're in the
9 middle of the fire now.

10 SENATOR KOEHLER: I guess I'm
11 interested in this whole concept about recognizing
12 partisanship. And the one factor I want to throw
13 into the mix here that we haven't really talked
14 about, 'cause it is a little bit of a separate issue,
15 and we have dealt with it legislatively and need to
16 continue to deal with it, and that is the influence
17 of money on politics.

18 The more competitive the district, the
19 more expensive it becomes. And I'll just give you my
20 example. When I first ran for Senate back in '06, I
21 had a very tough primary and a general election. In
22 those two elections combined, I spent a total of
23 under \$300,000. My House district, which is 91st and
24 92nd District, you can't run for that district and
25 not spend a million dollars. I mean, that's what it

1 costs you for the House districts.

2 And the kind of money that has to be
3 raised, especially for the caucuses, either the
4 Democrat or Republican caucuses, is substantial. So
5 there's always the question of, well, who do you
6 answer to? Do you answer to your constituents, or do
7 you answer to the people who pay for your campaign?

8 And I think we have to, at some point,
9 address that, 'cause that's part of the dilemma we
10 face, if we're really asking people to get involved
11 in the political process, is just the amount of money
12 it takes at this point is just phenomenal. Any
13 comments on how that relates to this?

14 MR. JACKSON: Well, I agree that it is
15 a problem, and the more competitive, more marginal
16 districts you have, the more money the total is
17 certainly going to require. I'm certainly concerned
18 about money and the pernicious influence. I think
19 the Citizens United decision is there and has to be
20 lived with, and it's a terrible decision, but it's
21 the law of the land, and so there's going to be huge
22 amounts of money as long as that's the law. And I
23 don't have very good, a very good answer for that. I
24 just, I think it's a grinding problem for our
25 system.

1 SENATOR RAOUL: Senator Luechtefeld?

2 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: You know, would
3 you agree with this? I mean, I think there will
4 always be noncompetitive districts in Chicago, for
5 instance. Those will, except in the primary, will be
6 noncompetitive. And there may be some areas of the
7 state where there will be noncompetitive Republican
8 districts. And I think we all know it's impossible
9 to make them all competitive.

10 The point that my constituents, or at
11 least I hear a lot of, that the map-making process
12 that we use today takes districts that are
13 competitive and makes them noncompetitive. Would you
14 agree with that? That's what the citizens I talk to,
15 basically depending, again, on who's drawing the map,
16 the purpose is to certainly have a number of safe
17 districts, but then take districts that are
18 competitive and make them less competitive. Would
19 you agree with that or not?

20 MR. JACKSON: Well, I'm sure that
21 happens, and I'm sure that is a complaint that people
22 have, particularly if they get moved from one to the
23 other, certainly. That's why I'm suggesting maybe
24 starting with some larger theoretical outlook as to
25 what we're doing. And if you start with some sense

1 of what justice is, that is a votes to seats concept
2 and people can look at it and say, okay, this is a
3 competitive state that currently leans Democratic,
4 then it won't be an outrage if it turns out looking
5 roughly like that among the competitive.

6 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: Right.

7 MR. JACKSON: Particularly if you've
8 got the balance wheel of the marginals are going to
9 determine who controls the House and the Senate and
10 the Congressional delegation. There's always,
11 though, going to be people really feeling put on if
12 the district, the district that they're currently in
13 gets moved around.

14 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: Uh-huh.

15 MR. JACKSON: And we, of course, down
16 here always have the problem of needing more
17 geography and population issues.

18 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: You know, another
19 issue that I've felt was sort of a -- would you agree
20 with this? That whatever party controls the Supreme
21 Court tends to be sort of a cushion or a safety valve
22 for if, let's say the party that draws the map is not
23 the party that controls the Supreme Court. There's a
24 comfort feeling or comfort level that the party that
25 doesn't draw the map feels that the Supreme Court

1 could give them and will give them. Is that -- would
2 you agree with that statement?

3 MR. JACKSON: Well, I think if they
4 remember Seymour Simon in 1990 and the Jim Edgar case
5 and all of that, there's some reason to think that's
6 exactly how it can work, as I remember that situation
7 at least.

8 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: Uh-huh.

9 SENATOR RAOUL: Senator Hunter?

10 SENATOR HUNTER: Thank you. I had a
11 question. In terms of partisanship, do you think
12 that if we had a higher level of citizen
13 participation in terms of voter education? My thing
14 is, I'm finding that more people are not aware of the
15 political process. Many people are naive. And I
16 believe that regardless of whether your county is one
17 hundred percent Democrat or Republican, that people
18 are just going to stick with what they already know,
19 rather than trying to learn something different.

20 I just think that there's a major issue
21 dealing with the civics, and folks just simply aren't
22 aware, or I don't know if they're not concerned. I
23 know that there's a high level of empathy, and
24 exactly why, I don't know. Can you share your
25 thoughts on that.

1 MR. JACKSON: Well, you're playing my
2 tune. I've been saying that for about four decades
3 of teaching here at SIU, trying to teach these young
4 people. Particularly we just had a Carbondale
5 election. The turnout was 11 percent. And I railed
6 against that beforehand and said to all the students,
7 You should go vote in the Carbondale election. You
8 live in Carbondale. And we had about 37 of them went
9 to vote. So I'm not getting there very fast. But I
10 agree entirely.

11 SENATOR HUNTER: When people come out
12 and vote, many of them do not know what the issues
13 are, and they're voting just to be voting, you know.
14 And you're talking about partisanship and
15 competitiveness versus noncompetitiveness. And I
16 just think that if we had more of an educated
17 electorate, it would make a difference.

18 MR. JACKSON: I certainly salute that.
19 I would say as a political scientist, the response
20 is, partisanship does that as a way for people to
21 vote their interests. Having that cue of
22 partisanship means that they're voting for people
23 that they support up and down a bunch of issues,
24 because their parties are different, stand for
25 different things. So partisanship's not all bad in

1 terms of rational voting, issue-oriented,
2 philosophically-oriented voting. That's the beauty
3 of it. That's one of the importances of it.

4 SENATOR HUNTER: So you were mentioning
5 your students. So what about the adults who are not
6 in school? What about their level of knowledge and
7 participation? How can we address that issue?

8 MR. JACKSON: Well, the two great
9 engines for addressing that are here today, that is
10 public education and the mass media. And both of us
11 are not doing our job well enough on that. Civics
12 education -- the senator here was a social studies
13 teacher. He knows. He knows how hard it is to get
14 through to those young people. But those young
15 people that I started teaching are now grandparents
16 in some cases, and we just, we're not getting civics
17 education done adequately. And the media make a mess
18 of it for us. And so between the mass media and mass
19 education, we need to do some work.

20 SENATOR HUNTER: Thank you.

21 SENATOR RAOUL: Senator Haine?

22 SENATOR HAINE: Just a quick comment.
23 Professor Jackson, I appreciate your testimony a
24 great deal. I'll take it to heart. In fact, you're
25 appealing to our better natures, our angelic

1 natures. It's Maundy Thursday, so I appreciate that,
2 'cause my first thought was to say I think that
3 Senator Jones and Senator Luechtefeld's districts
4 should be competitive.

5 SENATOR JONES: They always are.

6 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: Absolutely they
7 are.

8 MR. JACKSON: We're past Maundy
9 Thursday, I take it.

10 SENATOR HAINE: But I'm not going to go
11 there.

12 SENATOR RAOUL: Senator Koehler?

13 SENATOR KOEHLER: Just in looking at
14 the bottom of your sheet here, I'd just like to have
15 you comment on the advantages of decoupling the House
16 and the Senate districts. That was one of the parts
17 of the legislation that we did not get enacted this
18 past year that I think many of us were very intrigued
19 with. But what are the advantages, in your
20 estimation?

21 MR. JACKSON: I think you folks know
22 better than I that you can get in one another's hair
23 and one another's interests and all kinds of
24 complications by having to coordinate with the other
25 body. You know, we used to have that, before the

1 1970 Constitution, for part of the districts, and it
2 seemed to work quite well then.

3 We at the Institute worked long and
4 hard with a group of staffers from the General
5 Assembly who had been involved with three or four
6 waves of past redistricting, and these were
7 knowledgeable people we worked with. And we thought,
8 they thought that giving the Senate the opportunity
9 to build the Senate districts and the House the
10 opportunity to build the House districts would
11 maximize those other values, so that you don't get
12 stuck with dealing with all the givens from the House
13 that are laid on you.

14 SENATOR KOEHLER: Thank you.

15 SENATOR RAOUL: I want to go back to my
16 favorite topic of competitiveness again, 'cause I'm
17 really intrigued with this study of competitiveness.
18 And one of the things that strikes me, we talk about
19 competitiveness in terms of party; right? And, you
20 know, one of the first things my predecessor told me
21 my very first day in Springfield is make sure you
22 spend some time on the other side of the aisle,
23 getting to know people from the other side of the
24 aisle, and make sure you get to spend some time with
25 people from other regions of the state. And because,

1 you know, probably equal to partisan divide is
2 sometimes regional --

3 MR. JACKSON: Right.

4 SENATOR RAOUL: -- divide. And then to
5 the extent that we communicate, we begin to find out
6 we have a whole lot more in common than we have
7 differences. But it strikes me that the notion of
8 seeking that competitiveness with regards to party
9 label, that the goal should somehow be flipped around
10 a little bit, too, that the parties bear
11 responsibility for competing for sectors of the
12 population that they don't traditionally compete
13 for.

14 You know, when you talk about certain
15 ethnic groups, you know, you assume that you're
16 talking Democrats; right? And notwithstanding the
17 fact that, you know, a friend of mine, J.C. Watts
18 down in Oklahoma, was elected as a Republican
19 Congressman. We've got a black Republican
20 Congressman in the state of Florida. But some of
21 that comes from the parties competing for the people,
22 as opposed to the other way around.

23 MR. JACKSON: Yeah, and not just giving
24 up on them.

25 SENATOR RAOUL: It seems that as we

1 discuss this from a redistricting standpoint, we're
2 discussing it the other way around.

3 MR. JACKSON: Yeah, I agree entirely,
4 and it's good advice from a good source. And I think
5 the issue to me is how the legislative process at
6 either the state or national level is going to
7 ultimately work or not work. And seems to me it's
8 not worked as often as not in the last decade or so.
9 And that is toward what end are you competitive and
10 toward what end are you sticking with the partisan
11 and ideological points.

12 And to me, being, I think, a pragmatist
13 toward getting something done that works out of the
14 legislative process and that addresses the issue and
15 the problem, instead of sticking to some really pure
16 position that causes the kind of polarization that
17 we've got in this country now, where the
18 polarization, I think, threatens the basic system and
19 threatens the economic system and threatens to gum up
20 the works at the federal level to the point where
21 it's totally dysfunctional.

22 I mean, stopping the government or
23 bringing down the credit rating of the United States
24 of America is a dysfunctional, destructive thing to
25 do. So how long do you stick with the position

1 before you reach compromise? And I don't have to
2 tell you folks, the legislative process won't work
3 without compromise. It's not a bad, it's not a bad
4 word. You get a half a loaf, or maybe if you're
5 lucky you get 60 percent of the loaf. That's the way
6 it's supposed to work.

7 SENATOR RAOUL: Absolutely. But if we
8 focus so much on this notion of competitiveness as
9 just a notion of party competitiveness, you know,
10 people talk about competing for the middle. On what
11 issue? I mean, some issues I may be in the middle,
12 some issues I may be considered on the right, and
13 some issues I may be considered on the left.

14 And I think we all should consider an
15 issue on an issue by issue basis, not on the basis of
16 what party label we have. And to the extent we start
17 talking in the redistricting process or in another
18 process about competitiveness based on party level, I
19 think we're doing something wrong.

20 MR. JACKSON: I agree. I think we need
21 to back off of how deeply divided we are and how
22 polarized we are as a nation, and go back to
23 understanding that the other side may have some
24 points and they may be valid, and we may need to
25 incorporate some of those points.

1 SENATOR RAOUL: Well, I mean, there are
2 issues where, there have been plenty of issues where
3 you have a mixed roll call, and I think that's what
4 it should be; right? It's not so much about one side
5 versus the other. It's about individuals making
6 determinations based on the issue, whether they're in
7 one caucus or the other. And so I question whether
8 or not this notion of the goal of competitiveness
9 based on party label is as noble of a goal as, you
10 know, some talk about.

11 MR. JACKSON: I'm not sure I painted it
12 as noble. But I did paint it as pragmatic and the
13 way things are going to be, and it's hard to ignore
14 the importance of it.

15 SENATOR RAOUL: I appreciate it.
16 Senator Koehler?

17 SENATOR KOEHLER: Just a comment. This
18 is a fascinating discussion. I really appreciate
19 this. But in your question, Mr. Chairman, I guess
20 what I thought about is, I'm from Peoria, and we have
21 quite a tradition of statesmen from the Peoria area,
22 Senator Dirksen from Pekin, where my office is, and
23 Bob Michel, former minority leader of the U.S.
24 House.

25 And what has been talked about,

1 especially in relationship to Congressman Michel, is
2 that we've lost the element of civility in our
3 political discussion, and I don't know how we can map
4 civility. We can't. But it seems to me, to speak to
5 your point in terms of we have really kind of a
6 junkyard dog attitude in politics at this point, and
7 I have to say that I think your advice from your
8 former predecessor, Barack Obama, that that was good
9 advice.

10 I value my relationships on the
11 Republican side as much as I value the relationships
12 I have on the Democrat side. And it's only when you
13 have those relationships, and you know that there is
14 a role you play in terms of representing your
15 constituency, but you can still be civil in that, and
16 how important that is. And I don't know how we get
17 that back, but it seems to me, if we lose sight of
18 this issue of civility, then we've really seen the
19 demise of part of our political heritage.

20 MR. JACKSON: Well, the Auditor General
21 was here two nights ago under a program we sponsored,
22 and he said that he thinks this spring the General
23 Assembly has done a lot better job of having an
24 attitude of let's get on with it, let's work with one
25 another, and he gave a very optimistic assessment of

1 the atmosphere in Springfield.

2 SENATOR RAOUL: We're doing a lot
3 better than Congress, I'll tell you that. Go ahead.
4 Senator Luechtefeld?

5 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: We have a month
6 to go. With one month left, we'll see how this all
7 works out at the last month. But so far, I think
8 there has been --

9 MR. JACKSON: No fist fights yet, huh?

10 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: Well --

11 MR. JACKSON: Close?

12 SENATOR RAOUL: Close.

13 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: But, you know, I
14 hope that continues. But the real tough choices are
15 coming up, obviously, in this last month. You know,
16 I think Senator Raoul makes a very good point. And,
17 you know, when you talk about competitiveness, one
18 party doesn't really and should probably compete more
19 for certain blocks of people that they feel like
20 they've lost. And that part, I believe, makes some
21 sense. There's no doubt about that. And I think you
22 probably would agree with that.

23 MR. JACKSON: I would.

24 SENATOR LUECHTEFELD: But, you know, in
25 the end, this process of the way we do the

1 redistricting, I think, you know, there are, you
2 know, I guess I always come back to this, and I don't
3 know whether you agree with this or not. But once
4 the law is met, once federal law, state law,
5 constitutions have been met with the map-drawing
6 process, whoever draws the map, whether it be
7 Republicans or Democrats, their number one priority
8 will be, how do we stay in power? Would you agree
9 with that?

10 MR. JACKSON: It's certainly been the
11 case in the past. I was urging at least one other
12 factor to be considered. That is, let's create some
13 marginal districts and have a free-for-all, so we can
14 let the elections count for something.

15 SENATOR RAOUL: I had one question on
16 incumbency. I believe there was a Georgia Voting
17 Rights case where incumbency was, in fact, an
18 important factor. I wanted your thoughts on that.
19 We had a witness last year, and I forget who it was,
20 that said, You know what? You ought to consider the
21 universe. We had people saying, You don't consider
22 incumbency, you don't consider partisan population,
23 you don't consider -- we had a witness that said, you
24 know, You consider everything, but you try to do it
25 as transparent as possible.

1 MR. JACKSON: Yes, that would be my
2 position. You've got a whole matrix of factors
3 you're going to have to consider, and, you know, as
4 long as they're transparent, put them out there, then
5 fine, as far as I'm concerned. And that's my
6 understanding of where the Court is. Figuring out
7 where the Supreme Court is on this is pretty
8 complicated, but as best as I've been able to read,
9 that's where they are.

10 SENATOR RAOUL: They're a moving
11 target.

12 MR. JACKSON: Yes.

13 SENATOR RAOUL: Thank you so much.

14 MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

15 SENATOR RAOUL: Are there any other
16 witnesses?

17 (There was no response.)

18 SENATOR RAOUL: With that, I want to
19 again thank you, Southern Illinois University, for
20 hosting us today, and Senator Luechtefeld. Senator
21 Jones?

22 SENATOR JONES: Thank you, Mr.
23 Chairman. Since there's no other testimony, you
24 know, I guess probably the most disappointing thing
25 to me today, and it may be the time, the day of the

1 week, you know, but very little participation in this
2 process. And we'll hear about it later on. You
3 know, when the maps are finally drawn and the votes
4 are taken on the House and Senate floor and goes to
5 the Governor's desk and all that, we'll hear about
6 it.

7 But, you know, those few of you that
8 did show up, I appreciate that. And I want to
9 recognize a couple of people. I'm going to mention
10 their names, but, you know, you don't have to
11 testify. Don't go into shock. But I have two of my
12 mayors here, and I deeply appreciate them showing up
13 today and witnessing this process. And I think
14 everyone on this panel knows both of them, maybe not
15 personally, but you know their communities.

16 Mayor Mary Jane Chesley of Mt. Vernon.
17 I think everybody on the panel up here supported
18 Senate Bill 4 last week for a tire manufacturer, and
19 we deeply appreciate that. And I thank the mayor for
20 coming and participating.

21 And then I have Mayor Joe Bisch of
22 Grayville, Illinois, which is located right on Route
23 1 and Interstate 64 on the, almost on the Indiana
24 line. I thank him for being here today, also. And
25 I'm sure all of you remember that community because

1 of the Grayville prison we were going to build there,
2 and then we had a former governor that backed out on
3 the deal.

4 But I want to thank the members on the
5 panel here, because I know each and every one of you
6 supported that, of giving that land back to that
7 community and even some monetary support back to that
8 community. So, you know, just, you don't get an
9 opportunity very often to thank your colleagues for
10 participating, and especially when you have two
11 distinguished people here representing two
12 communities in Southern Illinois. So thank you both
13 for being here. And thank you.

14 SENATOR RAOUL: Well, Mt. Vernon is my
15 second home, so better be careful, I may be running
16 against you, Senator. Thank you. Maybe we can have
17 a line that goes all the way up to Chicago.

18 SENATOR JONES: Are you going to come
19 right down 57?

20 SENATOR RAOUL: I do share Senator
21 Jones -- I think Senator Jones sent out a press
22 release, and we sent out a press release, and we try
23 to do the best we can to put out notice for
24 participation. I think the only way that this works
25 to its best is that we get as much participation as

1 possible.

2 Senator Hunter touched upon just civic
3 education in general, or lack thereof. We've got to
4 do something, folks, in our respective communities to
5 get more and more people involved. So I'm hopeful
6 that -- we still have hearings yet to come, and I'm
7 hopeful that we can maximize on the participation at
8 those hearings. With that, the Committee on
9 Redistricting is hereby adjourned.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 The transcripts produced will be the property of the
21 Illinois State Senate and will be made available to
22 the public through the Illinois General Assembly
23 website after approval by the members of the Illinois
24 State Senate Redistricting Committee. Any
25 reproduction or redistribution of this material in
electronic or written form is expressly prohibited by
law.

24

25

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2)
3 COUNTY OF JACKSON)

4
5

6 I, Sharon Valerius, a Freelance Court
7 Reporter for the State of Illinois, do hereby certify
8 that I reported in machine shorthand the Senate
9 Subcommittee on Redistricting Hearing held on April
10 21, 2011, at 10:30 a.m., at Southern Illinois
11 University, Carbondale, Illinois; that I thereafter
12 caused the foregoing to be transcribed into
13 computer-aided transcription, which I hereby certify
14 to be a true and accurate transcript of the same.

15

16 Dated this 22nd day of April, 2011.

17

18

19

20

21

22

FREELANCE COURT REPORTER

23

24

25

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2)
3 COUNTY OF JACKSON)

4
5

6 I, Sharon Valerius, a Freelance Court
7 Reporter for the State of Illinois, do hereby certify
8 that I reported in machine shorthand the Senate
9 Subcommittee on Redistricting Hearing held on April
10 21, 2011, at 10:30 a.m., at Southern Illinois
11 University, Carbondale, Illinois; that I thereafter
12 caused the foregoing to be transcribed into
13 computer-aided transcription, which I hereby certify
14 to be a true and accurate transcript of the same.

15

16 Dated this 22nd day of April, 2011.

17

18

19

20

21

22

FREELANCE COURT REPORTER

23

24

25