

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DOCKET NO. 159 MM 2017

---

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF PENNSYLVANIA, CARMEN FEBO SAN MIGUEL,  
JAMES SOLOMON, JOHN GREINER, JOHN CAPOWSKI, GRETCHEN BRANDT,  
THOMAS RENTSCHLER, MARY ELIZABETH LAW, LISA ISAACS, DON LANCASTER,  
JORDI COMAS, ROBERT SMITH, WILLIAM MARX, RICHARD MANTELL, PRISCILLA  
MCNULTY, THOMAS ULRICH, ROBERT MCKINSTRY, MARK LICHTY, LORRAINE  
PETROSKY, Petitioners,

v.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA; THE PENNSYLVANIA GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY; THOMAS W. WOLF, IN HIS CAPACITY AS GOVERNOR OF  
PENNSYLVANIA; MICHAEL J. STACK III, IN HIS CAPACITY AS LIEUTENANT  
GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA AND PRESIDENT OF THE PENNSYLVANIA  
SENATE; MICHAEL C. TURZAI, IN HIS CAPACITY AS SPEAKER OF THE  
PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; JOSEPH B. SCARNATI III, IN HIS  
CAPACITY AS PENNSYLVANIA SENATE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE; ROBERT  
TORRES, IN HIS CAPACITY AS ACTING SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA; JONATHAN M. MARKS, IN HIS CAPACITY AS COMMISSIONER OF  
THE BUREAU OF COMMISSIONS, ELECTIONS, AND LEGISLATION OF THE  
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Respondents.

On Review of the Commonwealth Court's Recommended Findings of Fact and  
Conclusions of Law, No. 261 M.D. 2017 (Dec. 29, 2017)

---

**APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF  
NUNC PRO TUNC ON BEHALF OF FAIR DEMOCRACY**

---

Marc J. Sonnenfeld (I.D. No. 17210)  
John P. Lavelle, Jr. (I.D. No. 54279)  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1701 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215-963-5000

*Attorneys for Fair Democracy*

Pursuant to Rule 531(b)(1) of the Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure, Fair Democracy hereby requests leave to file the accompanying amicus curiae brief *nunc pro tunc* and proposed redistricting plans (filed herewith) for Pennsylvania for the Court's consideration in the above-captioned appeal, and avers as follows:

1. Fair Democracy is a nonprofit unincorporated association. It is a social welfare organization under 26 U.S.C. §501(c)(4) and registered with the Internal Revenue Service. Fair Democracy was established and operates to promote social welfare, including ensuring voting rights in this country.

2. Fair Democracy has a strong interest in ensuring free and equal voting rights, as mandated in Pennsylvania by Article 1, Section 5 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, including by preventing the dilution of individuals' electoral power, preventing the corruption of elections by gerrymandering and partisan dilution of votes, and preventing the deprivation of voters' state constitutional right to free and equal elections.

3. Advocacy in the area of fair districting is an important part of Fair Democracy's mission.

4. Fair Democracy has followed this appeal closely because it has an interest in the issues of fair and equal voting representation that it raises, as well as

in the Court's announced intent to adopt a fair, new redistricting plan for Pennsylvania.

5. Fair Democracy is aware that the Court has allowed the participation of a number of intervenors and amici curiae to help inform the Court on the important public issues pertinent to this appeal, and that, to that end, the Court has invited the submission of proposed redistricting plans for the Court and its appointed master, Nathaniel Persily, to consider in adopting Pennsylvania's new plan.

6. Fair Democracy seeks to participate as an amicus curiae in order to propose to the Court two alternative Congressional redistricting maps that will comply with the requirements of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that more accurately reflect the partisan makeup of the Commonwealth, and that are more compact with minimal splits of counties and municipalities, while not removing any incumbent representative who is running for re-election from that representative's current home district.

7. In connection with this appeal, and with the hope of contributing positively to the Court's adoption of a new districting plan for Pennsylvania, Fair Democracy retained Haystaq DNA ("Haystaq"), a consulting firm with expertise in using available data and custom analytics to solve challenging problems.

8. Fair Democracy proposes two alternative districting maps for Pennsylvania that Fair Democracy to this Court as fair, constitutional, and non-partisan alternatives to Pennsylvania's current Congressional plan.

9. Haystaq prepared two alternative redistricting plans for Pennsylvania for Fair Democracy, "FD1" and "FD2". They are essentially identical except for the configuration of the proposed Congressional districts in Southeastern Pennsylvania and Lehigh County. In "FD1," Montgomery County is divided among three different Congressional districts, while the entirety of Lehigh County and Delaware County are each in one Congressional district. In "FD2," Montgomery County, Lehigh County, and Delaware County are each divided among two different Congressional districts. The configurations of proposed Congressional districts 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 15 differ between the two alternative proposed plans. *See* proposed Amicus Brief, Figures 1 through 4.

10. Both alternative proposals, FD1 and FD2, are superior to the current plan because they more accurately reflect the partisan makeup of the state and incorporate districts that are both more compact and have fewer splits than the current plan.

11. Fair Democracy's alternative proposed plans seek to minimize the unfairness of a new plan by ensuring that incumbent representatives who are running for re-election remain in their home districts.

12. Both of the proposed plans, FD1 and FD2, were drawn to ensure that, as in the current plan, District 2 would remain more than 50% African-American. In FD1, District 13 would be more than 50% minority voters. In FD2, District 1 would be approximately 50% minority voters.

13. Both of Fair Democracy's proposed plans, FD1 and FD2, are supported by the following data as required by this Court's January 26, 2018 Order, which has been submitted electronically to the Court:

- a. a 2010 Census block equivalency and ESRI shape file expressing the plan;
- b. a report detailing the compactness of the districts according to each of the following measures: Reock; Schwartzberg; Polsby-Popper; Population Polygon; and Minimum Convex Polygon;
- c. a report detailing the number of counties split by each district and split in the plan as a whole;
- d. a report detailing the number of municipalities split by each district and the plan as a whole; and
- e. a report detailing the number of precincts split by each district and the plan as a whole.

14. Fair Democracy's proposed Amicus Brief contains a detailed explanation of the compliance of both of its proposed plans with this Court's Order of January 22, 2018, as required by this Court's January 26, 2018 Order.

15. The current Pennsylvania map splits 28 counties, while Fair Democracy's FD1 plan splits only 13 counties, and its FD2 plan splits only 14 counties.

16. While the current Pennsylvania map splits 68 municipalities, Fair Democracy's FD1 plan splits only 37 municipalities, and its FD2 plan splits only 36.

17. Fair Democracy's proposed plans also split a very small number of voting districts. The FD1 plan splits only 36 voting precincts, and the FD2 plan splits only 35, out of the statewide total of 9,253.

18. Both of Fair Democracy's proposed plans are also more compact than Pennsylvania's existing plan: the current Pennsylvania district map has a total perimeter of 7,220.73 miles, while that of Fair Democracy's FD1 plan is 4,544.80 miles and that of its FD2 plan is 4581.11 miles— both of which are less than two-thirds of the existing plan's total borders.

19. Both of Fair Democracy's proposed plans are also significantly more compact than the existing plan as indicated by other measures.

20. Specifically, Fair Democracy's FD1 plan is more compact than the existing plan as indicated by each of the following measures: Reock (.46 compactness on average as compared to current plan's .278); and Polsby-Popper (.36 compactness on average as compared to current plan's .164). The compactness of the FD1 plan by the population polygon measure is .74, by the Schartzberg measure is 1.61, and by the minimum convex polygon is 0.79.

21. Fair Democracy's FD2 plan is more compact than the existing plan as indicated by each of the following measures: Reock (.46 compactness on average as compared to current plan's .278); and Polsby-Popper (.35 compactness on average as compared to current plan's .164). The compactness of the FD1 plan by the population polygon measure is .73, by the Schartzberg measure is 1.63, and by the minimum convex polygon measure is 0.78.

22. The compactness of the current Pennsylvania plan and that of Fair Democracy's two alternative proposed plans were also compared to the compactness of other states' districting plans (under the Reock and Polsby-Popper indices).

23. In contrast with Pennsylvania's current plan, which ranks among the worst in the country in compactness (among the 7 worst states in the country on **both** the Reock and the Polsby-Popper indices), both of Fair Democracy's proposed plans for Pennsylvania would rank among the best in the country in

compactness (among the 4 best states on the Reock index, and among the 5 best on the Polsby-Popper index).

24. A number of data sources were utilized to evaluate the partisan makeup of Fair Democracy's two alternative proposed plans, including 2011 adjusted Census data, statewide election results from 2000 to 2016, and partisan voter registration data.

25. Both of Fair Democracy's proposed alternative plans are politically neutral, fair, and constitutional because they more accurately reflect the partisan makeup of Pennsylvania.

26. Fair Democracy believes that its proposed alternative plans may be helpful to the Court in preparing a fair and constitutional redistricting plan for Pennsylvania as contemplated in its Orders of January 22 and 26, 2018, and its Opinion issued on February 7, 2018.

27. For that reason, Fair Democracy seeks leave to participate in this appeal by filing an amicus curiae brief and submitting its proposed alternative plans and their underlying data to the Court for consideration in preparing a fair and constitutional redistricting plan for Pennsylvania.

28. Fair Democracy's brief would comply with the standard that would apply under Rule 531 to a brief filed during merits briefing.

WHEREFORE, Fair Democracy respectfully requests that its motion for leave to file an amicus curiae brief be granted, and that it be granted leave to submit its proposed plans and their underlying data to the Court for its consideration in adopting a redistricting plan for Pennsylvania.

Dated: February 15, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: /s/ John P. Lavelle, Jr.  
Marc J. Sonnenfeld (I.D. No. 17210)  
John P. Lavelle, Jr. (I.D. No. 54279)  
1701 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215-963-5000

*Attorneys for Fair Democracy*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on this day, two (2) true and correct copies of the **APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF NUNC PRO TUNC ON BEHALF OF FAIR DEMOCRACY** were served on the following via First Class U.S. Mail which satisfies the requirements of Pa.R.A.P. 121:

Mary M. McKenzie  
Michael Churchill  
Benjamin D. Geffen  
George A. Donnelly, IV  
Daniel Urevick-Ackelsberg  
**THE PUBLIC INTEREST LAW CENTER**  
1709 Benjamin Franklin Parkway, 2<sup>nd</sup> Flr.  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
*Counsel for Petitioners*

David P. Gersch  
John A. Freedman  
R. Stanton Jones  
Helen Mayer Clark  
Daniel F. Jacobson  
John Robinson  
Elisabeth S. Theodore  
Lindsey D. Carson  
John D. Cella  
**ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP**  
601 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20001-3743  
*Counsel for Petitioners*

Andrew D. Bergman  
**ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP**  
700 Louisiana Street, Suite 4000  
Houston, TX 77002  
*Counsel for Petitioners*

Timothy J. Ford  
**OBERMAYER REBMANN MAXWELL & HIPPEL LLP**  
Center Square West  
1500 Market Street, Suite 3400  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
*Counsel for Republican Intervenors*

Patrick T. Lewis  
**BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP**  
Key Tower, 127 Public Square  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
*Counsel for Michael C. Turzai*

Bruce M. Gorman  
Daniel S. Morris  
**BLANK ROME LLP**  
301 Carnegie Center, 3<sup>rd</sup> Fl  
Princeton, NJ 08540  
*Counsel for Joseph B. Scarnati, III*

Robert J. Tucker  
**BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP**  
200 Civic Center Drive, Suite 1200  
Columbus, OH 43215  
*Counsel for Michael C. Turzai*

Brian S. Paszamant  
Michael D. Silberfarb  
Jason A. Snyderman  
John P. Wixted  
Huaou Yan  
**BLANK ROME LLP**  
One Logan Square  
130 North 18<sup>th</sup> Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
*Counsel for Joseph B. Scarnati, III*

Kathleen A. Gallagher  
Carolyn Batz McGee  
Russell D. Giancola  
Jason R. McLean  
John E. Hall  
**CIPRIANI & WERNER, P.C.**  
650 Washington Road, Suite 700  
Pittsburgh, PA 15228  
*Counsel for Michael C. Turzai*

Lawrence J. Tabas  
Rebecca L. Warren  
Timothy Ford  
**OBERMAYER REBMANN MAXWELL &  
HIPPEL LLP**  
Center Square West  
1500 Market Street, Suite 3400  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
*Counsel for Republican Intervenors*

Michael R. Abbott  
**CIPRIANI & WERNER, P.C.**  
450 Sentry Pkwy, Suite 200  
Blue Bell, PA 19422  
*Counsel for Michael C. Turzai*

Alex M. Lacey  
Clifford B. Levine  
Alice B. Mitinger  
**COHEN & GRIGSBY, P.C.**  
625 Liberty Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222  
*Counsel for Michael J. Stack III*

Karl S. Myers  
Jonathan F. Bloom  
Kyle A. Jacobsen  
**STRADLEY RONON STEVENS &  
YOUNG, LLP**  
2600 One Commerce Square  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
*Counsel for Pennsylvania General  
Assembly*

Matthew H. Haverstick  
Mark Seiberling  
Joshua Voss  
Kleinbard LLC  
1650 Market. St., 46<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
*Counsel for Joseph B. Scarnati, III*

Jason Torchinsky  
Shawn Sheehy  
**Holtzman Vogel Josefiak  
Torchinsky PLLC**  
45 North Hill Drive, Suite 100  
Warrenton, VA 20186  
*Counsel for Michael C. Turzai and  
Joseph B. Scarnati, III*

Lazar M. Palnick  
1216 Heberton Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

*Counsel for Michael J. Stack III*

Dated: February 15, 2018

/s/ John P. Lavelle, Jr.  
John P. Lavelle, Jr.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

NO. 159 MM 2017

---

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF PENNSYLVANIA, CARMEN FEBO SAN MIGUEL,  
JAMES SOLOMON, JOHN GREINER, JOHN CAPOWSKI, GRETCHEN BRANDT,  
THOMAS RENTSCHLER, MARY ELIZABETH LAW, LISA ISAACS, DON LANCASTER,  
JORDI COMAS, ROBERT SMITH, WILLIAM MARX, RICHARD MANTELL, PRISCILLA  
MCNULTY, THOMAS ULRICH, ROBERT MCKINSTRY, MARK LICHTY, LORRAINE  
PETROSKY,

Petitioners,

v.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA; THE PENNSYLVANIA GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY; THOMAS W. WOLF, IN HIS CAPACITY AS GOVERNOR OF  
PENNSYLVANIA; MICHAEL J. STACK III, IN HIS CAPACITY AS LIEUTENANT  
GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA AND PRESIDENT OF THE PENNSYLVANIA  
SENATE; MICHAEL C. TURZAI, IN HIS CAPACITY AS SPEAKER OF THE  
PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; JOSEPH B. SCARNATI III, IN HIS  
CAPACITY AS PENNSYLVANIA SENATE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE; ROBERT  
TORRES, IN HIS CAPACITY AS ACTING SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA; JONATHAN M. MARKS, IN HIS CAPACITY AS COMMISSIONER OF  
THE BUREAU OF COMMISSIONS, ELECTIONS, AND LEGISLATION OF THE  
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Respondents.

---

**BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE FAIR DEMOCRACY**

---

Marc J. Sonnenfeld (I.D. No. 17210)  
John P. Lavelle, Jr. (I.D. No. 54279)  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1701 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215-963-5000

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Fair  
Democracy*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION .....	1
STATEMENT OF INTEREST .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	4
I.    THIS COURT REQUESTED THE SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS FOR A FAIR AND NON-PARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING PLAN THAT WILL COMPLY WITH ARTICLE 1, SECTION 5 OF THE PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION.....	4
II.   FAIR DEMOCRACY HAS PREPARED TWO ALTERNATIVE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING PLANS TO ASSIST THIS COURT IN ADOPTING A NEW DISTRICTING PLAN FOR PENNSYLVANIA .....	6
A.   The Proposed FD1 Plan .....	8
B.   The Proposed FD2 Plan .....	10
III.  FAIR DEMOCRACY’S PROPOSED PLANS ARE SUPERIOR TO OTHER PROPOSALS .....	11
CONCLUSION .....	16

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Statutes**

26 U.S.C. §501(c)(4)..... 1

**Other Authorities**

Pa. R.A.P. 531(b) ..... 1, 3

Pennsylvania Constitution Article 1, Section 5 ..... 1, 2, 4

## **INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to Pennsylvania Rule of Appellate Procedure 531(b)(1)(iii), amicus curiae Fair Democracy submits this brief in support of its request that the Court adopt one of its two alternative proposed plans as Pennsylvania's new Congressional districting plan. This appeal, and the opportunity to propose its districting plans in the appeal, are of particular concern to Fair Democracy because it has a strong interest in ensuring free and equal voting rights, as mandated in Pennsylvania by Article 1, Section 5 of the Pennsylvania Constitution. It believes that its proposed plans will better achieve these goals and are superior with respect to the indicators this Court has identified than the plans that others will submit. Fair Democracy's proposed plans will have fewer split counties, municipalities, boroughs, and precincts than any other proposed plan. Its plans will have more compact districts than those of other plans. Its plans will also achieve fairness because they ensure that incumbent representatives who are running for re-election remain in their home districts.

## **STATEMENT OF INTEREST**

Fair Democracy is a nonprofit unincorporated association that is a social welfare organization under 26 U.S.C. §501(c)(4) and registered with the Internal Revenue Service. Fair Democracy was established and operates to promote social welfare, including ensuring voting rights in this country. Fair Democracy has a

strong interest in ensuring free and equal voting rights, as mandated in Pennsylvania by Article 1, Section 5 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, including by preventing the dilution of individuals' electoral power, preventing the corruption of elections by gerrymandering and partisan dilution of votes, and preventing the deprivation of voters' state constitutional right to free and equal elections.

Advocacy in the area of fair districting is an important part of Fair Democracy's mission. Fair Democracy has followed this appeal closely because it has an interest in the issues of fair and equal voting representation that it raises, as well as in the Court's announced intent to adopt a fair, new redistricting plan for Pennsylvania. Fair Democracy is aware that the Court has allowed the participation of a number of intervenors and amici to help inform it on the important public issues pertinent to this appeal, and that, to that end, the Court has invited the submission of proposed redistricting plans for the Court and its appointed master, Nathaniel Persily, to consider in adopting Pennsylvania's new plan. Fair Democracy is participating as an amicus curiae in order to propose to the Court two alternative Congressional redistricting maps that will comply with the requirements of the Pennsylvania Constitution, that more accurately reflect the partisan makeup of the Commonwealth, and that are more compact with minimal splits of counties and municipalities, while not removing any incumbent

representative who is running for re-election from that representative's home district.

In connection with this appeal, and with the hope of contributing positively to the Court's adoption of a new districting plan for Pennsylvania, Fair Democracy retained an experienced consulting firm, Haystaq DNA ("Haystaq"), to prepare two alternative districting maps for Pennsylvania that Fair Democracy could propose to this Court as fair, constitutional, and non-partisan alternatives to Pennsylvania's current Congressional plan. Fair Democracy believes that these proposed plans are superior to those in the plans that others will submit with respect to the indicators this Court has identified. For that reason, it has an interest in presenting its proposed plans to this Court and advocating for their adoption in this appeal.

Pursuant to Pa. R.A.P. 531(b), the amicus curiae states that no other person or entity has paid for the preparation of, or authored, this brief in whole or in part.

### **SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

The Court should adopt one of Fair Democracy's two alternative proposed districting plans as Pennsylvania's Congressional district plan. As Fair Democracy has established, and as its submissions and data show, the proposed plans meet the criteria this Court has identified for a fair, non-partisan district plan that complies with Pennsylvania's constitutional guarantee of free and equal elections. The plans

more accurately reflect the partisan makeup of the Commonwealth. They incorporate districts that are more compact under a number of different measures. They split fewer counties, municipalities, and voting districts than the current plan. They avoid unfairness because they ensure that incumbent representatives who are running for re-election remain in their home districts. They are politically neutral, fair, and constitutional because they achieve a configuration that more accurately reflects the partisan composition of the electorate, rather than packing Democratic voters into a small handful of districts and diluting their votes.

## **ARGUMENT**

### **I. THIS COURT REQUESTED THE SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS FOR A FAIR AND NON-PARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING PLAN THAT WILL COMPLY WITH ARTICLE 1, SECTION 5 OF THE PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION**

By order dated January 22, 2018, this Court held that Pennsylvania’s current Congressional districting plan violates Article 1, Section 5 of the Pennsylvania Constitution due to its partisan gerrymandering of Congressional districts which favors the election of Republican candidates and disfavors the election of Democratic candidates, and therefore fails to ensure fair and equal voting. The Court ordered that if the General Assembly did not submit a congressional districting plan on or before February 9, 2018, or if the Governor should not approve the General Assembly’s plan on or before February 15, 2018, the Court “shall proceed expeditiously to adopt a plan based on the evidentiary record

developed in the Commonwealth Court,” and that “[i]n anticipation of that eventuality, the parties shall have the opportunity to be heard; to wit, all parties and intervenors may submit to the Court proposed remedial districting plans on or before February 15, 2018.” Order at 2-3. The Court stated that

any congressional districting plan shall consist of congressional districts composed of compact and contiguous territory; as nearly equal in population as practicable; and which do not divide any county, city, incorporated town, borough, township, or ward, except where necessary to ensure equality of population.

*Id.* at 3.

In a follow-up Order dated January 26, 2018, the Court made several orders “in anticipation of the possible eventuality that the General Assembly and the Governor do not enact a remedial congressional districting plan by the time periods specified in [the Court’s January 22, 2018 Order].” Those orders included the appointment of Professor Nathaniel Persily “as an advisor to assist the Court in adopting, if necessary, a remedial congressional redistricting plan.” The court also ordered that “any redistricting plan the parties or intervenors choose to submit to the Court for consideration include the following”:

- a. A 2010 Census block equivalency and ESRI shape file expressing the plan;

- b. A report detailing the compactness of the districts according to each of the following measures: Reock; Schwartzberg; Polsby-Popper; Population Polygon; and Minimum Convex Polygon;
- c. A report detailing the number of counties split by each district and split in the plan as a whole;
- d. A report detailing the number of municipalities split by each district and the plan as a whole;
- e. A report detailing the number of precincts split by each district and the plan as a whole;
- f. A statement explaining the proposed plan's compliance with this Court's Order of January 22, 2018.

**II. FAIR DEMOCRACY HAS PREPARED TWO ALTERNATIVE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING PLANS TO ASSIST THIS COURT IN ADOPTING A NEW DISTRICTING PLAN FOR PENNSYLVANIA**


In connection with this appeal, Fair Democracy directed its consultant to prepare districting maps for Pennsylvania that meet the requirements set forth in this Court's order of January 26, 2018, and that Fair Democracy could propose to this Court as fair, constitutional, and non-partisan alternatives to Pennsylvania's current Congressional plan. Two alternative redistricting plans were prepared, "FD1" and "FD2". The two plans are essentially identical except for the configuration of the proposed Congressional districts in Southeastern Pennsylvania

and Lehigh County. In “FD1,” Montgomery County is divided among three different Congressional districts, while the entirety of Lehigh County and Delaware County are each in one Congressional district. In “FD2,” Montgomery County, Lehigh County, and Delaware County are each divided among two different Congressional districts. The configurations of proposed Congressional districts 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 15 differ between the two alternative proposed plans. *See* Figures 1 through 4 below.

The maps of the districts in the two alternative proposed plans are set forth hereto as Appendices A and B, respectively, and the statewide maps and maps for Southeastern Pennsylvania for both proposals are identified below as well. Fair Democracy also proposes to submit to the Court the detailed data used in the plan in electronic form (thumb drive) simultaneously with the electronic filing of its application for leave to file amicus brief and its amicus brief.


## A. The Proposed FD1 Plan

The statewide map of Fair Democracy's proposed FD1 plan (**Figure 1**) is as follows:




The map of Fair Democracy's proposed FD1 plan for Southeastern

Pennsylvania (**Figure 2**) is as follows:




## B. The Proposed FD2 Plan

The statewide map of Fair Democracy's proposed FD2 plan (**Figure 3**) is as follows:



The map of Fair Democracy’s proposed FD2 plan for Southeastern

Pennsylvania (**Figure 4**) is as follows:



### III. FAIR DEMOCRACY’S PROPOSED PLANS ARE SUPERIOR TO OTHER PROPOSALS

The alternative plans that Fair Democracy’s consultant prepared are superior to other proposals because they more accurately reflect the partisan makeup of the state and incorporate districts that are more compact and have fewer splits than the current plan. The unfairness of a new plan is avoided because both proposed plans ensure that incumbent representatives who are running for re-election remain in

their home districts. The maps were also drawn to ensure that, as in the current plan, District 2 would remain more than 50% African-American. In FD1, District 13 would be more than 50% minority voters. In FD2, District 1 would be approximately 50% minority voters.

Each of Fair Democracy's alternative proposed plans includes the following elements as required by this Court's January 26, 2018 Order:

- a. a 2010 Census block equivalency and ESRI shape file expressing the plan;
- b. a report detailing the compactness of the districts according to each of the following measures: Reock; Schwartzberg; Polsby-Popper; Population Polygon; and Minimum Convex Polygon;
- c. a report detailing the number of counties split by each district and split in the plan as a whole;
- d. a report detailing the number of municipalities split by each district and the plan as a whole;
- e. a report detailing the number of precincts split by each district and the plan as a whole.

As discussed below, both of the proposed plans comply with this Court's Order of January 22, 2018, for the following reasons.

First, Fair Democracy believes that the greater geographic compactness and smaller number of splits on both of its proposed plans are superior to those in the plans that others will submit. Fair Democracy believes that both of its proposed plans will have fewer splits than any other plan that will be proposed, and will therefore satisfy the criteria this Court has identified for a new redistricting plan. Both of Fair Democracy's plans significantly reduce the numbers of splits of counties and municipalities: while the current Pennsylvania map splits 28 counties, Fair Democracy's FD1 plan splits only 13 counties, and its FD2 plan splits only 14 counties. While the current Pennsylvania map splits 68 municipalities, Fair Democracy's FD1 plan splits only 37 municipalities and its FD2 plan splits only 36.

Second, both of Fair Democracy's proposed plans also substantially revise and simplify the districts, including the most problematic districts identified in the Court's opinion such as the 7th District. Rather than "Goofy kicking Donald Duck," the 7th District in both of Fair Democracy's plans is a logically shaped district that generally follows county lines without "wandering," "jutting," or "sprawling" appendages. Fair Democracy's proposed plans do not split Montgomery County, the third most populous county in the Commonwealth, among 5 districts, as the previous plan did, which prevented it from constituting a majority in any district. The other districts in Fair Democracy's proposed plans

(including the 1st, 3rd, and 12th Districts) are likewise devoid of the “isthmuses,” “tentacles,” and “geographic idiosyncrasies” that the Court found rife in Pennsylvania’s current plan, and instead follow the integrity of the political subdivisions they encompass.

Third, Fair Democracy’s proposed plans were intentionally drawn with voting precinct boundaries in mind, and they split a very small number of voting districts (the FD1 plan splits only 36, and the FD2 plan splits only 35, of the statewide total of 9,253).

Fourth, both of Fair Democracy’s proposed plans are more compact than Pennsylvania’s existing plan, under a number of objective indicia. The current Pennsylvania district map has a total perimeter of 7,220.73 miles, while that of Fair Democracy’s FD1 plan is 4,544.80 miles and that of its FD2 plan is 4581.11 miles— both of which are less than two-thirds of the existing plan’s total borders. Fair Democracy’s proposed plans are also significantly more compact than the existing plan as indicated by other measures.

Specifically, Fair Democracy’s **FD1** plan is more compact than the existing plan as indicated by each of the following measures: Reock (.46 compactness on average as compared to current plan’s .278); and Polsby-Popper (.36 compactness on average as compared to current plan’s .164). The compactness of the FD1 plan

by the population polygon measure is .74, by the Schartzberg measure is 1.61, and by the minimum convex polygon is 0.79.

And Fair Democracy's **FD2** plan is more compact than the existing plan as indicated by each of the following measures: Reock (.46 compactness on average as compared to current plan's .278); and Polsby-Popper (.35 compactness on average as compared to current plan's .164). The compactness of the FD1 plan by the population polygon measure is .73, by the Schartzberg measure is 1.63, and by the minimum convex polygon measure is 0.78.

The compactness of the current Pennsylvania plan and of both of Fair Democracy's alternative proposed plans (under the Reock and Polsby-Popper indices) were also compared to the compactness of other states' districting plans. In contrast with Pennsylvania's current plan, which ranks among the worst in the country in compactness (it is among the 7 worst states in the country on **both** the Reock and the Polsby-Popper indices), both of Fair Democracy's proposed plans for Pennsylvania would rank among the best in the country in compactness (among the 4 best states on the Reock index, and among the 5 best on the Polsby-Popper index).

A number of data sources were utilized to evaluate the partisan makeup of Fair Democracy's proposed plans, including 2011 adjusted Census data, statewide election results from 2000 to 2016, and partisan voter registration data. Both of

Fair Democracy's proposed plans are politically neutral, fair, and constitutional because they more accurately reflect the partisan makeup of Pennsylvania. They now achieve a configuration that more accurately reflects the partisan composition of the electorate, rather than packing Democratic voters into a small handful of districts.

Fair Democracy believes that its proposed alternative plans represent a fair and constitutional redistricting plan for Pennsylvania as contemplated in the Court's Orders of January 22 and 26, 2018, and its Opinion issued on February 7, 2018; are superior to other proposals; and that the Court should adopt one of Fair Democracy's two alternative plans as Pennsylvania's new districting plan.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, amicus curiae Fair Democracy requests that the Court adopt one of its proposed plans as Pennsylvania new districting plan.

Dated: February 15, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: /s/ John P. Lavelle, Jr.  
Marc J. Sonnenfeld (I.D. No. 17210)  
John P. Lavelle, Jr. (I.D. No. 54279)  
1701 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215-963-5000

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Fair  
Democracy*

## **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

It is hereby certified that this brief is in compliance with the word count limitations of Pennsylvania Rule of Appellate Procedure 2135 because this brief does not exceed 7,000 words as calculated by the Word Count feature of Microsoft Word 2010, excluding the materials specified in Pa. R. A. P. 2135(b).

Dated: February 15, 2018

/s/ John P. Lavelle, Jr.  
John P. Lavelle, Jr.

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

I certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania: Case Records of the Appellate and Trial Courts* that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

Dated: February 15, 2018


Submitted by: John P. Lavelle, Jr.


Signature: /s/ John P. Lavelle, Jr.

Name: John P. Lavelle, Jr.

Attorney No. (if applicable): 54279

# APPENDIX A





Montgomery

8

2


7


1


Philadelphia


13


Delaware











11

15

Lehigh

Berks

8

Bucks

Montgomery

7

6

Chester

2


Delaware


1


Philadelphia


13


FD1-7











Montgomery

Bucks

7


8

13

2

Philadelphia

FD1-13



12


Allegheny


14

Washington

18

FD1-14  
Westmoreland





10

Luzerne

17

Monroe

Carbon

Northampton

Schuylkill

15

Lehigh

11


Berks


8


Bucks

7


FD1-15







# APPENDIX B



Montgomery

13

2


7


1


Philadelphia

Delaware

FD2-2







5

Centre

Union

Snyder

10

Northumberland

15

Mifflin

Juniata

Schuylkill

11

Berks

Perry

Dauphin

Lebanon

Huntingdon

Cumberland

Lancaster

16

ulton

9


Franklin


Adams

4

York

FD2-4





11

8

Bucks

Berks

Montgomery

7


Lancaster

6

Chester

1

Delaware



Lehigh

8

11

Berks

Bucks

7

Montgomery

13

Chester

6


Philadelphia


2


Delaware


1


FD2-7











3

Butler

Beaver

12


Allegheny

Washington

18

14

FD2-12



7

8

Bucks

Montgomery

13

Philadelphia

2

1

FD2-13

12


Allegheny


14

Washington

18

FD2-14  
Westmoreland





Luzerne

17

Pike

Monroe

10

Columbia

Carbon

15

Northampton

Schuylkill

Lehigh

11

Berks

8

Bucks

FD2-15

