In Re City of New York 2022-2023 Districting Commission Public Meeting to Vote on Proposed Districting Plan for City Council September 22nd, 2022

X
CITY OF NEW YORK 2022-2023 DISTRICTING COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
TO VOTE ON PROPOSED DISTRICTING PLAN
X
22 Reade Street
New York, New York
DATE: September 22, 2022 TIME: 11:01 a.m.
IIME. II.UI a.III.
PUBLIC MEETING in the above-referenced
matter, held at the above-mentioned time and
location, before Sabrina Brown Stewart, a Notary
Public of the State of New York.
LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. Computer-Aided Transcription (718)526-7100

_

1	APPEARANCES:
2	COMMISSIONERS:
3	DENNIS M. WALCOTT, Chair
4	YOVAN SAMUEL COLLADO
5	HON. MARILYN D. GO
6	KEVIN JOHN HANRATTY
7	MARIA MATEO, ESQ.
8	JOSHUA SCHNEPS
9	LISA SORIN
10	MONSIGNOR KEVIN SULLIVAN
11	KAI-KI WONG
12	MAF MISBAH UDDIN
13	MICHAEL SCHNALL
14	KRISTEN JOHNSON
15	GREGORY W. KIRSCHENBAUM
16	MARC WURZEL
17	DR. DARRIN K. PORCHER
18	
19	SENIOR STAFF:
20	DR. JOHN FLATEAU, Executive Director
21	GRACE PYUN, General Counsel
22	JOSEPH MALIGNO, Deputy Executive Director
23	ALI RASOULINEJAD, Chief of Staff
24	EDDIE BORGES, Communications Director
25	LATOYA BENJAMIN, Deputy Chief of Staff

1	CHAIR WALCOTT: Good morning, all. It
2	is a pleasure and honor to be here. It is
3	now 11:01, and we want to start on time,
4	and is Joseph around? So, Joseph can call
5	the roll and then we'll take off from there.
6	There's Joseph coming out right now.
7	Joseph.
8	MR. MALIGNO: Good morning.
9	CHAIR WALCOTT: Good morning, sir.
10	MR. MALIGNO: So, I will conduct the
11	roll call for today, starting off with Dennis
12	Walcott.
13	CHAIR WALCOTT: I am definitely
14	present.
15	MR. MALIGNO: Kai-Ki Wong?
16	COMMISSIONER WONG: Present.
17	MR. MALIGNO: Marilyn Go?
18	(No response).
19	MR. MALIGNO: Kristen Johnson?
20	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Present.
21	MR. MALIGNO: Maf Uddin?
22	COMMISSIONER UDDIN: Present.
23	MR. MALIGNO: Yovan Collado?
24	COMMISSIONER COLLADO: Present.
25	MR. MALIGNO: Lisa Sorin?

themselves to the audience and to the general public as well. And one of the things I'll talk about in several minutes, not at this moment, is the commitment of the group of commissioners who are sitting here and who are also part of our virtual world.

And why I say that, because we have one of our commissioners who's sitting in a waiting room at the airport right now. And so, I know he's on a clock, so we don't want to be accused of having him miss his plane.

So, Commissioner Schnall, we will adjust our program accordingly and give you the appropriate time in a little while, before you have to catch your transportation to your flight.

And with that being said, I'd like to turn it over to our Executive Director, the outstanding Dr. John Flateau.

Dr. Flateau.

DR. FLATEAU: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Commission. Good morning, Commissioners.

Good morning, New Yorkers.

The Executive Director's Report is the item that I'm about to share with you. It is

a narrative of the district by district changes from the preliminary plan from July 15th to the proposed revised plan that is under consideration at this meeting today. This proposed revised plan is the collective work of your commissioners, and the bright and best staff of New York in the City of New York, and I would like to have our general audience at least give an acknowledgment to our commissioners and staff and all of this hard work --

(Applause).

DR. FLATEAU: -- in lightening speed, and with a whole range of new mandates that brought us to where we are right now. Let me go right to -- I'm going to, as I narrate each of the districts, let's start -- we'll go through each borough and each district, also, in lightening speed.

CHAIR WALCOTT: And Dr. Flateau, we've been joined by Judge Go.

So, Judge, welcome as well.

DR. FLATEAU: Julia, so we're going to start with Manhattan, District 1, at the south end of Manhattan.

2.2

This is where we are. According to the proposed revised plan, District 1 consists of Chinatown, Battery Park City, Tribeca, Soho, the Financial District, Governors Island and Greenwich Village. This district was overpopulated by nearly 12,000 persons. This district remains mostly intact with little changes, small changes.

We'll go heading north on the Island of Manhattan to District 2, one to two.

District 2 consists of the Lower East Side, the East Village and parts of Kips Bay,

Murray Hill and Gramercy Park. This district was slightly overpopulated by about 800 people. The southern boundary of this district is now Houston Street and, clearly, on the east side to the East River. Then, we're moving north.

Chair, you may -- we have two commissioners.

CHAIR WALCOTT: Yep. I'm waiting for you to have your break for a second.

And we've been joined by Commissioner Sorin, Commissioner Schneps. And online, we also have Commissioner Kirschenbaum, so I

think we have a full house of commissioners, both in person as well as virtually.

DR. FLATEAU: So, we now are in District 3 in Manhattan on the west side. District 3 consists of Hell's Kitchen, West Village, West Soho, Hudson Yards, parts of Times Square, Flatiron and the Upper West Side. District 3 was overpopulated nearly 30,000 persons. There were clear testimony that Hell's Kitchen wanted to be kept intact, that was previously divided in the preliminary plan. And this particular objective was accomplished with the revised plan.

Moving north. Actually, to the east side, District 4. District 4 consists of Stuyvesant Town, Peter Cooper Village, Times Square, East Midtown and parts of the Upper East Side. District 4 was overpopulated by over 11,000 persons. So, then, some of these boundaries were adjusted to take account the requirement for population adjustments.

Moving north on the east side,
District 5 in Manhattan. District 5 consists
of parts of the Upper East Side, Yorkville

and Roosevelt Island. District 5 was overpopulated by over 8,000 persons. And it includes now Roosevelt Island, Upper East Side and Yorkville, particularly in response to changes to the preliminary plan, where there was a Queens/Manhattan crossover district, and that no longer exists in the revised plan.

District 6, Manhattan, Upper West Side.

This district consists of Central Park,

Clinton, Upper West Side and Lincoln Square.

This district was overpopulated by over 8,000

persons. The entirety of Central Park

remains in this District 6 in the proposed

revised plan.

Moving north on the west side,
District 7. District 7 consists of Manhattan
Valley, Morningside Heights, Hamilton
Heights, Manhattanville, parts of Washington
Heights. District 7 was underpopulated by
over 7,000 persons. The district boundaries
changed slightly to increase, to make up that
deficit of populations. And on the north
end, this area called the East 160s was added
to District 7.

1 Moving to the east side, Manhattan, District 8. District 8 consists of 2 El Barrio, Spanish East Harlem in Manhattan, 3 4 and a portion of the Bronx, South Bronx, Mott 5 Haven, Highbridge, Concourse, Longwood and This continues to be a Port Morris. 6 7 Manhattan/Bronx cross-borough district. District 9. District 9 consists of 8 Harlem, Hamilton Heights and parts of 9 10 Manhattanville. This district was 11 overpopulated by almost 6,000 persons. 12 Additionally, testimony from residents asked 13 to ensure that Schomburg Plaza, Lakeview Apartments and Polo Grounds remain in 14 15 District 9. Going north to northernmost district in 16 Manhattan, District 10. 10 consists of 17 Washington Heights, Inwood and Marble Hill. 18 19 District 10 was underpopulated by over 14,000 persons. Parts of the southern boundary, 20 21 therefore, was moved slightly lower in District 10. 2.2 23 We're moving on now to the next borough, the Bronx, Districts 11 through 18. 24 Maybe a little larger. 25

So, District 11. District 11 consists of parts of Kingsbridge, Riverdale,
North Riverdale, Spuyten Duyvil, Bedford
Park, Norwood, Woodlawn and Wakefield, as well as Van Cortlandt Park. And this district was over 7,000 underpopulated. And slight border changes have made done to that district to bring its population requirement into focus.

Next over is District 12. It consists of Eastchester, Williamsbridge, Co-op City and parts of Wakefield. There was a population growth in District 12, and it was actually overpopulated by 4,000 persons. So, slight adjustments were made, and the lower boundary is now along Arnow Avenue and East Gun Hill Road, as well as Gun Hill Houses are contained in the 12th.

Now, District 13, which consists of
Pelham Bay, Pelham Gardens, Van Nest, Morris
Park, Bronxdale, Throgs Neck, Schuylerville,
Country Club and City Island. This district
was underpopulated by over 5,000 people. Van
Nest neighborhood was specifically asked to
be contained in District 13 in whole as a

1 neighborhood. Next district is District 14. Where 2 are you hiding? 3 4 CHAIR WALCOTT: (Indicating). 5 DR. FLATEAU: 14, West Bronx. 14, District 14, it contains parts of 6 7 Kingsbridge, Kingsbridge Heights and University Heights. This district was 8 9 underpopulated by more than 3,800 people, so 10 adjustments were made to that district as 11 well. And Kingsbridge Armory and surrounding 12 business corridors of this landmark were restored to the district, 14th District. 13 Next, District 15. It consists of 14 15 Bedford Park, Fordham, Mount Hope, Bathgate, Belmont, East Tremont, West Farms, Allerton 16 17 and Olinville. This district was slightly overpopulated and minor adjustments to its 18 19 borders. 20 District 16. It consists of Claremont, 21 Concourse, Concourse Village, Highbridge, Morris Heights, Mount Eden and Morrisania. 22 This district was slightly underpopulated by 23 2,000 persons, and that district's boundaries 24 25 were slightly adjusted to bring it into

compliance.

2.2

District 17, it consists of Concourse
Village, Crotona Park East, East Tremont,
Hunts Point, Longwood, Melrose, Morrisania,
Port Morris, West Farms, North Brother Island
and South Brother Island. And this district
was slightly overpopulated by a thousand
people. The neighborhood of Longwood,
additionally, and Concourse Village were
maintained, its entire complex in
District 17.

District 18 consists of Soundview,

Castle Hill, Parkchester, Clason Point and

Harding Park. This was overpopulated by

almost 9,000 people. Westchester Square and

Soundview are also contained in this

district, and border adjustments to bring

population in compliance were made in that

district.

We're now going to Queens, starting with District 19. This district consists of Auburndale, Bay Terrace, Bayside, Beechhurst, College Point, Douglaston, Flushing, Little Neck, Malba and Whitestone. This district was underpopulated by over 5,000 people,

therefore, minor adjustments to its
boundaries were made. And the entirety of
Bayside Village, BID, Business Improvement
District, and a number of LIRR train stations
in that area were included in that district.

The next district, District 20. It consists of Downtown Flushing, Murray Hill and Queensboro Hill. This was slightly underpopulated by about a thousand people. We were asked to also include Mitchell-Linden in that district, and other minor boundary adjustments were made.

The next district, 21. This consists of Corona, parts of Elmhurst, East Elmhurst and Jackson Heights. This district was underpopulated by approximately 1,700 people. It also retained LaGuardia Airport, Flushing Meadows Park within this district, as well as Lefrak City.

Next, District 22 in Queens. Ah, 22.

22, this consists of Astoria, East Elmhurst,

Jackson Heights and Woodside. This district

was heavily underpopulated by over 13,000

people, so adjustments were required to the

borders of that district. Ravenswood,

2.2

Queensbridge districts are in that -- no, they're in 26. They came out of the preliminary plan. This District 22 also unifies the Steinway Street BID as requested as well. District 22.

District 23, Queens. Here we are.

This district consists of Glen Oaks, Fresh

Meadows and Bellerose. This was heavily

underpopulated by over 12,000 persons. Its

main boundaries are still intact, but

population boundaries were made to adjust to

bring it into compliance for required

population.

Next, District 24. Consists of Kew
Gardens Hills, Pomonok, Electchester, Fresh
Meadows, Hillcrest, Jamaica Estates,
Briarwood, Parkway Village, Jamaica Hills and
Jamaica. This district was underpopulated by
nearly 7,000 persons, so boundaries had to be
made adjusted. We received testimony from
Jewish residents in the area required -- or
requested that Hillcrest remain intact within
24, which it does.

District 25. District 25 consists of Elmhurst and Jackson Heights. This was

slightly underpopulated by 600 persons, and the boundaries were largely kept intact, and the 82nd Street BID was also unified in that district. It received, also, testimony from residents that they were -- south of Queens Boulevard requested to be moved into District 30, and that request was also accommodated.

The next district, Council District 26.

It consists of Sunnyside, Woodside, Long

Island City, Astoria and Dutch Kills. This

district was originally overpopulated by

almost 11,000 persons. This district is now

based entirely in Queens, which was in the

preliminary plan linked to Manhattan. That

Manhattan/West Queens district no longer

exists. It's been delinked.

District 27. District 27 consists of Cambria Heights, Hollis, Jamaica, St. Albans, Queens Village and Springfield Gardens. This district was very slightly underpopulated.

This district now, as request -- from public testimony, requested unification of the Downtown Jamaica Central Business District, which is now in District 7, along with three

2.2

business improvement districts, all unified in one district.

District 28, it consists of Jamaica,
Richmond Hill, Rochdale Village and
South Ozone Park. District 28 was
overpopulated by 10,000 persons. The
boundaries of District 28 have been slightly
revised moving close to the Merrick Boulevard
corridor, as well Ozone Park is primarily
united into this one district.

Next district is 29. It consists of
Rego Park, Forest Hills, Kew Gardens and
Richmond Hill. This district was
underpopulated over 8,000 persons and
required adjustments to its boundaries. It
remains anchored with Forest Hills, Rego Park
and Kew Gardens.

Next district is District 30.

District 30, it consists of Glendale,

Maspeth, Middle Village, Ridgewood, Woodhaven

and Woodside. This district was

underpopulated by almost 6,000 persons. In

response to testimony, Elmhurst Triangle

located -- was near Woodhaven Boulevard have

been included in District 30.

1 District 31. District 31, it consists of Arverne, Brookville, Edgemere, Far 2 Rockaway, Laurelton, Rosedale and Springfield 3 4 Gardens. It was just slightly overpopulated and retained most of its current district 5 lines. Additional testimony wanted the JFK 6 7 Airport kept in this district, 31. 32. District -- it consists of Ozone 8 9 Park, Howard Beach and Woodhaven. It was 10 underpopulated by over 7,000 persons and 11 required some boundary adjustments. 12 Now, we're moving to Brooklyn. CHAIR WALCOTT: Hey, John, I don't want 13 to shortchange the other boroughs, but I also 14 15 want to be conscious of our Commissioner who's sitting in the airport. So, continue 16 17 on, but --DR. FLATEAU: Whenever I'm 18 19 interrupted --20 CHAIR WALCOTT: No. No. I don't --21 DR. FLATEAU: I can always come back. 22 CHAIR WALCOTT: -- want to interrupt the other boroughs because I think we should 23 have full context, so I just want to let you 24 25 know, if you could just speed it up a little.

1 DR. FLATEAU: Okay. Oh, you're 2 shortchanging Brooklyn, huh? CHAIR WALCOTT: Not at all, sir. 3 4 DR. FLATEAU: Hey, hey. Okay. Yes, 5 sir. Wow, we have the most districts to run 6 7 through, so this is going to be a lightening round. Pay attention. 8 District 33, this is the waterfront 9 10 district, northern Brooklyn -- Boerum Hill, 11 Brooklyn Heights, Navy Yard, Dumbo, Fulton 12 Ferry. It is the largest overpopulated district in the City, along with the west 13 side. So, clearly they needed a lot of 14 15 adjustments along 33. And there's an important population in Williamsburg, the 16 17 Jewish community was kept intact there. Next, District 34, coming around. 18 19 is the only Latino voting rights district in 20 the borough. It was slightly underpopulated. 21 It is a cross-borough, that little horn you 22 see is actually going over the Queens line, and it has been that way for the last 23

were made.

24

25

20 years, decades, and that minor adjustments

Coming in 35. I mean, 35 right here.

Very minor changes to the current district

boundaries of 35, and you could say similarly

for 36. And you'll hear more about these

Central Brooklyn districts and the Southeast

Queens when we hear from our expert,

Dr. Handley, a little later.

Let's go to 37. This is another district, was very underpopulated by over 9,000 people. It currently consists of South Bushwick, Cypress Hills, parts of Ocean Hill-Brownsville and Wyckoff Heights. No major adjustments to 37.

38 consists now of Red Hook, most of Sunset Park and parts of Park Slope, Windsor Terrace, Dyker Heights, and a small portion of Bensonhurst.

Next, District 39. Carroll Gardens,
Gowanus, Park Slope, parts of Windsor
Terrace, Kensington and Prospect Park. It
was slightly overpopulated and minor
adjustments were made.

Next, District 40, covers Ditmas Park, East Flatbush, Flatbush, parts of Lefferts Gardens, and Prospect Park South. It was

severely underpopulated by 17,000 people, so a lot of adjustments had to be made to make that 40 come into compliance for population requirements.

Next, District 41, consists of mainly
Ocean Hill, Brownsville, small parts of
East Flatbush and Crown Heights. It was also
underpopulated by almost 9,000 people, 41,
and some minor adjustments around this
bounder, therefore, had to be made.

Next, District 42. 42, mainly

East New York, Brownsville. It was slightly underpopulated as well, over 4,000 people.

Slightly, adjustments were made.

The next district after 42, 43. This is a newly-drawn councilmanic district there in South Brooklyn. It consists primarily of Sunset Park, parts of Dyker Heights and Bensonhurst. It is a new district created that research showed, and census, that there's a very large, new and growing, Asian American population in that area, and the Commission created a new district. You'll hear more, again, from Dr. Handley about that district.

Next, District 44. 44 consists of
Borough Park, Midwood, Gravesend and
Mapleton. And it was expressed, a request to
try to unite the Borough Park and Midwood
portion -- major part of those neighborhoods
together in one district, 44.

45 consists of Flatbush, East Flatbush, Flatlands and a small part of Midwood. It was severely underpopulated by over 15,000 people and, therefore, adjustments had to be made along those borders to balance that population for 45.

Next, District 46. 45, 46. It consists of Gerritsen Beach, Mill Basin, Canarsie, Georgetown and parts of Flatlands. It was slightly overpopulated by about 4,000 people, so along the borders, slightly, adjustments were made for that 46.

Next, District 47. 47 consists of Bay Ridge, parts of Dyker Heights, Bath Beach, Gravesend, Coney Island and Sea Gate. The shape of this district results from the creation of that 43. So, there was a small corridor needed to unite these two neighborhoods that expressed a request to be

united in one district, 47.

48 consists of Manhattan Beach,
Brighton Beach, Sheepshead Bay and Midwood.
This district was overpopulated by almost
8,000 people. Therefore, 48, some slight
adjustments along its borders were made to
bring it into population compliance.

We're leading to our last wonderful borough, Staten Island.

Staten Island. 48, now we're going to

49. 49 consists of -- that's the North Shore

district -- Arlington, Clifton, Clove Lakes,

Concord, Elm Park, Graniteville, Mariners

Harbor and a number of other neighborhoods on

that North Shore. It was slightly

underpopulation, some minor adjustments were

made to the 49th District proposed.

The Mid Island district, 50. And this, how you might want to describe it, a thumb, that is actually a piece of Brooklyn. The Mid Island is now connected by the Verrazano Bridge and takes in a small portion of Brooklyn, South Brooklyn on the other side of that bridge, to help pop -- balance the populations for the three Staten Island

districts.

And there were some changes along the Mid Island 50th degree -- I mean, district boundaries. And on the Brooklyn side, it takes in Fort Hamilton, that rectangle, Fort Hamilton Base, the VA Hospital, Dyker Beach Park and a few other blocks; that's the 50th.

And then, the last district is the 51st, consisting of -- that's 51, South Shore district on Staten Island, Annadale, Arden Heights, Bay Terrace, Charleston, Great Kills, and a number of neighborhoods throughout that South Shore community. It was underpopulated by over 13,000. So, adjustments made across those three Staten Island districts, so that's all 51 districts throughout the City are in compliance with the new 5 percent state-mandated deviation.

And there are -- just a highlight very briefly. There are 29 majority/minority districts. That's more than half of the districts in the City of New York in this revised plan, and you'll get more details now on that last point.

Should I stop or hand off -- okay.

We'll hear from our next presenter after we hear from the Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIR WALCOTT: So, what I'd like to do with the Commissioners' permission is to call for a vote, and then we'll have Dr. Handley speak afterwards. And this is out of respect to our Commissioner, who has to take off. We want to make sure all votes are recorded.

And in addition to that, just to add to that part of the discussion, that when you do vote -- obviously, we always have our back and forth with each other, so as you vote, you can feel free to talk about your vote, if you still desire.

In addition to that, I just want the Commission to know how much I appreciate all the Commissioners, all the hard work, people who had to postpone vacations, people who were sick, the commitment, publications that we got out into 70 newspapers, multiple languages, over 9,600 responses.

We have been out in the community, people meeting individually and we have laid a foundation for the feedback that we

received to influence it. And the way 1 Dr. Flateau laid it out, I wish it was that 2 easy in our discussions because as we know, 3 4 every change that is made has a domino effect 5 on something else. And we have been very, hopefully, considerate. And where it needs 6 7 to be adjusted, if the vote is passed, then that will be on City Council to either accept 8 9 or put it back to us and then we'll have 10 another round of public hearings and then 11 move it from there. 12 I just want the Commission to know that 13 I'm honored to be a part of this and honored that the Mayor asked me to join. And I think 14 15 that we are well-served in serving the 16 public. 17 And if there's a motion to entertain 18 or --19 COMMISSIONER UDDIN: So moved. 20 CHAIR WALCOTT: So moved. 21 Is there a second? 2.2 (No response). 23 CHAIR WALCOTT: Is there a second for the vote? 24 25 (Hand gestures).

1 CHAIR WALCOTT: Seconds around. And if 2 the transcriber -- do you need the names as well, Counsel? 3 4 So, Maf is the originator of the motion 5 and I saw Josh Schneps and I saw Kristen also second, so -- and Lisa Sorin. 6 7 COMMISSIONER PORCHER: And I second the motion. 8 CHAIR WALCOTT: I hear Dr. Porcher as 9 10 well, so we have a number of seconds on the 11 table. 12 Commissioner Schnall, knowing of your timeline and I think I see you up in the top 13 corner, and I want to make sure I don't get 14 15 accused of delaying you for other reasons, the floor is yours, sir, for your vote. 16 17 COMMISSIONER SCHNALL: Thank you, Chair Walcott. And I really, really appreciate the 18 19 ability to vote now, so that I can catch my 20 flight back, come back to the city that I 21 love and see my family, see all of you. So,

Since the last vote in July, a lot has

I just want to provide some quick context on

my vote, and again, thank Chair Walcott for

allowing me to speak for a few minutes.

22

23

24

25

happened. We've met in all five boroughs.

We've hosted a lot of virtual participation.

We've seen over 9,500 pieces of testimony.

We've had meetings learning about racial bloc voting, hundreds of hours of mapping sessions, thousands of staff hours. We made every intention and effort to make -- to think about, deliberate and incorporate all the feedback we've received.

It's an incredible amount of hard work and energy and dedication that went in, and I am so thankful for everyone's participation, the staff's hard work, the education I've gotten from this whole process and feel honored to be here. With that said, I wanted to make three quick points to explain my vote.

First, I learned a long time ago that it's best -- it's often best to listen and rely on others with expertise when you don't have any, and so this applied to my work on the Commission. And I took the position that if I wasn't intimately familiar with a neighborhood, I would listen, observe but not inject my uninformed viewpoint. And what I

saw during this last round of mapping was a little unsettling and frankly unfair.

A few individuals undid some of the work of the many, often at the last minutes of a mapping session, which got finalized in these maps. Frankly, I think it's unfair to the countless members of the public who took time to testify and a little disrespectful to the work of our staff and fellow commissioners.

Second, process matters. Some lawyers will tell you that if you cannot argue substance, you argue process. And in this instance, I'm talking about both. But since July, most of our meetings have been held during the workday, short notice was given for some, and it made navigating the process and being present very difficult.

I know, including myself, we did everything we could to the best of our abilities to participate as much as possible, but it was very challenging and I know we could do better. But I know that we also can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. So, I know that if we go further in

this process, we will do things better.

Third, and my last point is that the two boroughs with the most to lose in the second round of drafting did, the Bronx and Staten Island. So, for the record, I wholly oppose and oppose the dilution of Bronx political power with the change in the ratio of Council District 8, which now favors

Manhattan. Rebalancing this district would have taken some really, really hard work, but I think it would have been worth the effort to better balance the district and restore the power that Bronx deserves.

And I know that I'm a broken record on this, and I resent the fact that Staten
Island has been blamed for all the troubles identified in the first draft. The reality is that there are three things that cause more issues than anything else. A 5 percent deviation handed down from Albany without any challenge or pushback from the Law
Department, a newly redrawn South Brooklyn district and intentionally underpopulated districts.

So, when it comes to vilifying Staten

Island, and there has been a lot of that recently, frankly it's cliché. I've heard it my entire life. I'm tired of it, and enough is enough. Staten Island deserves the same respect and chance at self-determination that the other boroughs enjoy.

And speaking of Staten Island, and most importantly why I am voting the way I am, I am adamantly opposed to the addition of approximately 16,000 people from Brooklyn to Council District 50. This move disenfranchises those 16,000 people, who deserve adequate and accessible representation. They will have to pay a \$20 toll and drive 10 miles to see their council member. This is unfair, inequitable and completely avoidable.

This Brooklyn addition dilutes Staten

Island's political power and sets the borough back ten years in the progress we've made to establish ourselves and chart our own future as a borough. So, as such, and as the only Staten Islander on this Commission and for all the reasons above, I vote no.

Thank you, Chair, for allowing me the

grace and privilege to voting right now, and I will see you back in New York.

CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner Schnall. Have a safe flight. Look forward to seeing you back in New York.

And with that being said, I will call the roll and I will start, with the Commission's permission, with myself. And I will vote "Yes" for this plan. And in addition to what I heard the Commissioner say, Commissioner Schnall, I believe both in the substance and the process, and I think the substance and the process has been adhered to.

I think the number of community meetings, the input for the individuals as well as the dialogue back and forth, including Commissioner Schnall and others as far as the line-drawing with the mappers as well, has been extremely beneficial to the process.

And again, I think the challenge is making sure that we don't undermine all of the hard work and allow the process to unfold to the next step, because I think the

1 Commission has done an excellent job in 2 meeting its responsibility and its due diligence and for that reason, I vote yes. 3 Commission Collado. 4 COMMISSIONER COLLADO: Thank you, 5 Mr. Chair. 6 7 I wholeheartedly agree with those comments. First and foremost, I'd like to 8 thank the staff, the Commission and everyone 9 10 who has put in countless hours into these 11 maps. Thank you. And most importantly the 12 public, for their input, which was our 13 guiding light in this process. And with that, I vote yes. 14 15 CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner. 16 Commissioner Go. 17 COMMISSIONER GO: Thank you, Chair, 18 19 Chairman Walcott. I join in your -- in the praise that we've heard for the public 20 21 because voting is such an important right to this country. And interestingly, I'm a judge 2.2 by training and a lawyer by training, it's 23 24 interesting that the Constitution never 25 explicitly protects the right to vote, but

voting appears in the Constitution many times. And the concept of equity proportionality is so important to our life. We want to be fair and we want every vote to have the same weight.

So, I do feel Commissioner Schnall's pain about Staten Island. I think the people in Staten Island were wonderful. We were very impressed with them in coming up with the preliminary plans. But ultimately, the principle of one-person, one-vote, equity proportionality governs. And so, I do know that I have received some requests to delay the vote, and I share some of Commissioner Schnall's reservation about the process.

I wish people had had the chance to see these final maps that we are voting on.

However, the maps were made after consideration of many comments, many hours of hearings, many consultations with the map-makers, and I really do thank the public. How many districting commissions can have the privilege of receiving over 9,000 comments? That is a credit to John Q. Public. Thank you. I applaud all of you who are here who

are not reporters. Thank you for bearing with us.

2.2

And that being said, and being so long-winded about it, I vote "yes" in favor -- even though I have no problems with delaying this vote to consider additional comments, I think the outreach has been fabulous. We've received wonderful responses, and there's just no reason for further delay and consideration by the City Council.

CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Hanratty.

COMMISSIONER HANRATTY: Yes. First of all, I'd like to say that it's an honor to serve on this Commission. I feel privileged to be here. And I'd like to thank Chairman Walcott and all my fellow Commissioners and Dr. John Flateau and the entire staff for all the hard work they've put in.

However, at this time, I will be voting "no" on this proposal because of the -- what's perceived to be the adverse effect on

certain communities of interest and certain competitive districts. So, my vote this time will be a "no." Thanks.

CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner Hanratty.

Commissioner Mateo.

COMMISSIONER MATEO: Thank you.

Good morning, everyone. I would like to join in the comments of all the Commissioners, thanking the hard work, all the hours of the staff and especially the Commissioners who've been putting so many hours and a lot of work into making these maps come into fruition.

With that being said, there have been -- even though we have been making great strides as to making the districts much better, there have been a lot of public comments from my Dominican community, especially in some districts in Manhattan, specifically the second one and the seventh one.

And my Dominican community has grave concerns about the diluting of the Dominican vote. For those reasons and some others that

1 we will address in due time, I believe that there is still work to be done before we 2 submit the maps to the City Council. So, I'm 3 4 voting no. CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner 5 6 Mateo. 7 Commissioner Schneps. COMMISSIONER SCHNEPS: My vote is no, 8 9 largely because this is an incredibly 10 thorough process, and I would say that the 11 amount of time that I spent on it, a lot, and 12 that's nothing compared to the staff here. 13 But just hearing some of the feedback here, 14 just the end of the process has been really 15 too quick for us to even hear each other's feedback for the final decision. 16 17 CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner 18 Schneps. 19 Commissioner Sorin. 20 COMMISSIONER SORIN: Okay. So, I'm 21 going to echo, this has been a process like 2.2 nothing other, and I've learned a lot. will say that I want to move on to the next 23 24 process. Selfishly, I'm going to be completely honest and say that what I don't 25

want is another huge round of public hearings. Because I think that among ourselves there's been so much debate, so much conversation.

We've listened to the testimony, but there's still a lot to be heard. There's still conversations among the Commission, and I need to hear more from the Hispanic community. So, for that reason, I vote no.

CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner Sorin.

Commissioner Sullivan.

COMMISSIONER SULLIVAN: Thank you.

I want to just emphasize that the vote we are taking today is not to -- is not to approve this plan. As the draft letter of the Chairman to the Speaker of the City Council says, it is to present it to them for their conversation. So, this is not an approval of this plan. It is to take it to the next stage of the process.

So, it's for that reason that I believe, given all the hard work that has been done, I think it is time for us to hear from the City Council itself on this plan.

And if the City Council chooses to send it back to us for the additional work to deal with any of the -- any of the deficiencies or anything in the plan.

For that reason, I would -- I am voting that we do present this plan for the consideration of the City Council, as in Chairman Walcott's letter to the Speaker.

CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner Sullivan.

Commissioner Wong.

COMMISSIONER WONG: Okay. Good morning, everybody. I'm such honor to be sitting there as Chair, as Commissioner.

First of all, my -- I have to thank all the people -- John and the team worked so hard and diligently. But I have some suggestions for the mapping working. Since I worked City, for City for 35 years, I know the zoning is so important. With New York, we have 58 zoning districts, but the district for the voting is 57. If all this zoning district is changing constantly and every day they're doing upgrade and downgrade, they're going to affect the population.

1 For example, Long Island City special district, before it's M1-1, the zoning is 2 around that area, it's a manufacture zone. 3 4 Today, you could see Long Island City, they have five different subdistricts for zoning, 5 and they have constructed the building, 6 7 60-story building, mixed-use building increase population certainly. 8 9 So, the zoning has also affected the 10 population so quickly and we are -- maybe 11 it's not falling so fast. We have ten years 12 to redo the districting map, but the zoning 13 map, they change constantly. So, somehow we have to link, incorporate with the zoning map 14 15 and that there's some kind of synchronization 16 to consider, the zoning map and districting 17 That's my idea. Thanks. map. CHAIR WALCOTT: And your vote is, sir? 18 19 Your vote. 20 COMMISSIONER WONG: Temporarily, I say 21 no. 2.2 CHAIR WALCOTT: No, okay. Thank you, Commissioner. 23 Next is Commissioner Uddin. 24 25 COMMISSIONER UDDIN: Yes. Good

morning, everybody. It is an honor that I sit with these distinguished people, we have worked very hard. I want to thank the staff, especially Dr. John Flateau, and Chair, you have been so kind.

I think the most important thank you deserve our community, over 9,000 people testified in different ways, in different format, twice in each borough, and the Commissioner was so kind. Everybody gave their time, thoughts and analysis and we arrived here.

I agree with the Commissioner that this is the process. We have preliminary maps on July 15th, we received feedback. We worked harder, and now September 22nd, we're going to send to the City Council. If City Council wants to do some of those legal things or do better, we have time to do it.

And that is why I am going to vote yes.

And with that, I want to thank you, everyone who is here, and just to let you know how proud I -- how honored I am because I think this is one of the commissions that I have seen in the last 38 years in this country,

1 most diverse, most intelligent, and most analytical. And so, I feel so proud that I 2 3 am part of it. 4 Thank you very much. 5 CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner. 6 7 Commissioner Johnson. COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Hi, everyone. 8 9 So, I'll start off with my vote. My 10 vote is a "yes," to the current iteration of the maps. And I want to echo the thanks to 11 my fellow Commissioners, to the staff. 12 mean, it's clear a lot of work has gone into 13 this, including the public's work, right? 14 15 And so, the one thing I will say is I think part of the hard work is, how do we 16 17 reconcile all of the public comments, right? Into like -- there's conflicting testimony, 18 19 right, every -- it's not all kumbaya in all the comments. So, how do we reconcile that 20 21 with the reality of complying with the Voting 22 Rights -- the Constitution, the Voting Rights 23 Act, the City Charter? And I believe this Commission has 24 25 worked hard to do that, and so my vote is

yes, for the current iteration of the map. 1 2 CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner. 3 Commissioner Kirschenbaum. 4 COMMISSIONER KIRSCHENBAUM: 5 afternoon, everyone. It's just after noon. 6 7 I want to echo a lot of the same sentiment that has been mentioned by my fellow 8 Commissioners. I think the staff has worked 9 10 extremely hard incorporating a lot of the 11 feedback that we received from the public 12 here, and I want to thank all of the public members who came out to the public hearings 13 in person and submitted testimony 14 15 electronically and via Zoom. By no means do I think that this is the 16 17 most perfect map in the history of the world, but I do think that we made a lot of progress 18 19 and put a lot of time into this. And that 20 time is now to send it to the next step, 21 which is submitting it to the New York City Council. 2.2 If there is feedback for things that 23 need to be tweaked, I think we're all happy 24 25 to review that. But I vote yes in the moving forward with this process. And I just want to echo again, thanking everybody for their hard work on this process.

CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you,

CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner.

2.2

Commissioner Porcher.

COMMISSIONER PORCHER: Thank you.

First, I want to say -- I want to give a special thank you to Chair Dennis Walcott.

I think you did an amazing job dealing with a polarizing topic in connection with the redistricting of the City of New York.

Dr. Plateau (sic), your efforts were phenomenal in organizing one of the Herculean feats that's known to this city's history. I think we, as a Commission, did a great job in exchanging our ideas, especially in connection with the public hearings. Because on many instances, we may have had diametric opposition to specific topics. However, I believe that we coalesce behind the ultimate, and that was to support the democracy of the City of New York to ensure that the redistricting process was sound.

That being said, I had a number of

2.2

concerns, more so specific to Staten Island,
Brooklyn -- Brooklyn South specifically and
Manhattan, which I felt that there were some
very challenging issues that were introduced,
that I don't think we're fully satisfied in
connection with the redistricting.

So, as a result of that, I'm voting no, and I'm hopeful that we can get to a point whereas we can all -- and I know it's not going to be 100, but eventually I believe that we can coalesce behind a strategy that supports the eight and three-quarter million residents of the City of New York, to ensure the voting process is sound moving forward. So, in synopsis, my vote is no.

CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner Porcher.

Commissioner Wurzel.

COMMISSIONER WURZEL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I, too, would like to acknowledge the hard work and long hours that our staff, our map team from District R, our consultants, our volunteer commissioners have invested in this process to date. I'd also like to thank

the thousands of New Yorkers who testified and participated in this process.

I'd also like to thank, on behalf of the Commissioners and the staff, our families and as it applies to Commissioners, many of our employers, who have tolerated and supported us through this time-consuming process.

Unlike the preliminary plan, which I supported as a working draft, I cannot support the formal submission of this districting plan to the City Council because I don't think it meets an acceptable standard that addresses all of the criteria set forth in the Charter.

As Commissioner Schnall said in his opening remarks, there was a false narrative after we published the preliminary plan, that having three wholly contained districts in Staten Island was the root of each and every perceived problem with the preliminary plan. It's ironic that as soon as we -- as the Commission walked away from having three districts on Staten Island, more problems developed, some inevitable and some

2.2

self-inflicted.

There are several improvements in this current plan that Commissioners worked cooperatively to address. For example, this plan, as a preliminary plan, continues to meet and exceed voting and civil rights standards established by state, federal and local law, and by the courts. But there are a number of serious problems that still precludes me from endorsing this document.

Quite frankly, we just ran out of time because we're adhering to an aggressive schedule and deadline that we were forced to follow. We'd rather not meet a deadline or push that deadline to get something right rather than meet an arbitrary deadline with a less than satisfactory product.

As we began this process in the spring, and as we proceeded through it, we have been hamstrung by an unfortunate act by the governor and the legislature this fall, this past fall, to dust off a poorly drafted piece of legislation that has eviscerated the population variance that was approved by city voters and has been used to draw New York

2.2

Council districts for the past 30 years.

As a result, communities like the south -- south Brooklyn have been twisted into a mess because we have interjected a Staten Island appendage that was supposed to solve problems but somehow trigger more of them. We've shifted a South Bronx-dominated district that was connected to Manhattan, to now a Manhattan-dominated district that connects to Southwest Bronx. And we've twisted, divided and cannibalized several communities in a handful of competitive fair fight districts in Queens and Brooklyn, deeply concern me.

That is an important priority for me and has been ten and 20 years ago when I served on this very same Commission to draw balanced districts that support competitive elections. That's a basic tenet of good government. Every voter deserves a chance to elect the representatives of their choice, not just the voters who are enrolled in a certain political party and who can vote in a closed primary.

Election Day, not primary day, should

2.2

not determine who our elected representatives are, and that's the case in fair fight competitive districts that I have long sought in this city. So, I certainly plan to focus my energies to correct some of these issues when the City Council responds to this plan and we consider the modifications this fall. But I cannot lend my name to this document that we're proposing to submit to the City Council.

Finally, I cannot let this opportunity pass and not express my profound disappointment that confidential maps were shared with media outlets before they were adopted or even subjected to a vote by the Commissioners, and share -- and not shared with the public. A plan is not a plan until it is adopted and authorized by Commissioners.

I do not know who thought it was a good idea to share these intimate and confidential details of the maps hours and minutes after the mapping process concluded. I do not share an assessment. Consequently, I vote no on this plan.

CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner Wurzel.

So, based on the vote, we will not be submitting these plans to the City Council.

And then we will reconvene to discuss our next steps. And I want to thank the Commissioners, but also, I do want to take advantage, since we rearranged our schedule to accommodate Commissioner Schnall.

Dr. Handley, if you don't mind giving a brief presentation or I think it's important because you've put a lot of work into this, and I do not want to ignore all the hard work both from the Commissioners, the staff and those experts who've been part of this process.

DR. HANDLEY: Well, I was going to tell you that the plan that you drew passed Voting Rights Act muster, in my opinion. I'm not sure what's going to happen now, but let me tell you how I went about doing this.

I was retained by the Commission to do an analysis of voting patterns by race. This is required, essentially, by the Voting Rights Act if you have a significant minority

2.2

population. Here in New York, you have three significant -- I mean three protected minority populations that are significantly large enough to draw districts.

So, we're interested here in what the voting patterns of black voters, Hispanic voters and Asian voters are, relative to white voters. So, this is what I analyzed: It turns out the voting is polarized in New York City. It has been -- this shouldn't have been a surprise. It was ten years ago. It was 20 years ago. It was 30 years ago. It is still.

This is particularly true in democratic primaries, but the democratic primary is particularly important in New York City, so this is important. So, what this means is that you have to draw districts that comply with the Voting Rights Act.

First slide. I have some slides here. So, as I said, voting is polarized in New York City and you have to draw districts or if you already have them, you have to maintain them in a way that allows minority voters to elect their candidates of choice.

Now, this doesn't necessarily mean you draw majority/minority districts. An opportunity district is one that allows minorities to elect their candidates of choice, but it may be the case that they're only a plurality in the district and they get enough votes from, say, white voters or other minorities if you're talking, say, about a Hispanic district to elect the candidate of choice.

So, what I'm focusing on are districts with significant minority populations, that is, are -- is the minority a -- are blacks, Hispanics or Asians, a majority or a plurality in the district? And those are the districts that I focused on to determine how many opportunity districts you have in the current plan and how many you will have in any proposed plan that you put forward.

Okay. Next slide.

So, how do we do this? No elections have taken place under the district you've drawn, so we have to come up with some method just as if -- just as I use statistics to come up with a way of determining whether

voting was polarized. I'm going to use a method called recompiled election results to see if you have districts that will allow each of these minority groups to elect their candidates of choice.

We do this by looking at previous elections and we call these Bellwether elections, elections that were polarized previously and we want to see by recompiling the election results to the proposed districts if the minority-preferred candidate would carry these proposed districts. So, this is how we tell if you have maintained a minority district. And here is a list of the district, the elections that I looked at to determine if you had succeeded in drawing minority opportunity districts.

Now, each of these districts in general elections, black voters, Hispanic voters and usually Asian voters vote alike. But in democratic primaries, not necessarily so at all. So, each of these groups have to be considered separately and each of these districts have to be considered separately.

Next slide.

Okay. So, the first thing I did was, given that voting was polarized, identify how many districts currently could be called opportunity districts for each of these groups, and I did that by determining whether the minority-preferred candidate was being elected to City Council.

Next step was looking at the proposed districts and comparing the -- not just the demographic composition of these districts, but because we're supposed to be doing a district-specific functional analysis, looking at possible electoral outcomes. So, that's what I was going to do with each of the proposed districts.

Next slide.

So, I'm going to go through borough by borough. Here are the data, but let me just summarize and say -- so, in Manhattan, you had one district, District 9. And you can see the statistics for this, what it's in -- what exists in the current plan and what the revised plan is. And this remains an effective district. That means it's an opportunity district for black voters.

Next slide.

2.2

You have two majority Hispanic districts that are going to remain effective, District 7 was a different story. It was a plurality Hispanic voting-age populations district. This was -- Hispanic voting-age population was decreased. The white population was increased, so now it's a plurality white district.

Now, the voting in this district was not polarized between Hispanics and whites. It was between Hispanics and black voters, I believe, but not between Hispanics and whites. The current representative was supported by both Hispanics and whites. And presumably, in the future, it's possible that a Hispanic can win with white support, but not with Hispanic support alone because it's no longer a plurality Hispanic district.

Next slide.

Okay. So, you have one majority black district in the Bronx and you maintained that district. It's as effective as it was in the currently plan.

Next slide.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

There are five majority Hispanic districts, four of them elect Hispanic-preferred candidates. The other one is an opportunity district, but it elect a black-preferred candidate. The -- you increase the black -- the Hispanic VAP, so it's going to trend towards a Hispanic district. It is a minority opportunity district, but not a Hispanic minority opportunity district.

Next slide.

2.2

This is the data for that. Next slide. So, you have two plurality Hispanic districts, one of which is not an opportunity district. It did not elect a Hispanic-preferred candidate and the other did, and that district did not change very much. So, you have one plurality district that's an opportunity district that remains an opportunity district. And the other, which was not and remains not an opportunity district. Again, these -- this is not a majority district. This is a plurality district.

Next slide.

In Queens, you have two majority black districts and they remain effective opportunity districts for black voters in the revised plan.

Next slide.

2.2

Then you have a plurality black district that was -- that you increase the black population and this will increase the effectiveness of that particular district, which was already an opportunity district.

Next slide.

You have one majority Hispanic district, which changed very little and will remain an Hispanic district in Queens.

Next slide.

So, there is one majority Asian district in the revised plan, as there was in the current plan and is equally effective in both plans. There were four plurality Asian districts, three of which were opportunity districts for Asian voters and remain opportunity districts. And the fourth of which, District 25, although it elects an Asian, turns out that's the Asian candidate of choice of white voters. Asian

2.2

voters supported a different Asian candidate, so that's not an opportunity district and it remains not an opportunity district in the revised plan.

Next slide. Next slide.

In Brooklyn, you have six majority black districts. They've all -- in the revised plan, as in the current plan, are effective or opportunity districts for black voters.

Next slide. Next slide.

You have one district that's a majority Hispanic district, District 37, that remains essentially the same and it is an effective Hispanic district.

Next slide.

So, you have -- you have created a new Asian district. It is an effective Asian district. You can tell by the votes for Yang, Andrew Yang, when he ran for mayor. District 38 was an Asian plurality district and the current plan is an Asian plurality district. Now, it was not electing the Asian candidate of choice. It was electing Hispanic candidate of choice. This was

traditionally a Hispanic district.

2.2

What the revised plan does, it
maintains the same Hispanic percentage,
decreases the Asian percentage and increases
the white percentage. Now, the Hispanic
incumbent won with Hispanic vote and white
vote, so there's no reason to believe that
the current incumbent wouldn't win this
district. It was Asian voters who did not
support this candidate. This district, Asian
voters and Hispanic voters were quite
polarized in this district.

Next slide.

In Staten Island, you maintained your majority/minority district with essentially the same black, Hispanic and Asian voting-age population.

And finally, my conclusion.

You have maintained the exact same numbers of black and Hispanic opportunity districts in the revised plan, as in the current plan, and you've increased the number of Asian districts, Asian opportunity districts, by one. And this, of course, is the fastest growing minority population and

it certainly -- I would say that you would 1 have been successfully sued had you not done 2 that, if somebody brought a suit, because it 3 4 was possible to draw one and voting in that 5 area was very polarized. And that concludes my comments on the 6 7 revised plan. 8 CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you, Dr. Handley. 9 And questions for Dr. Handley? 10 Commission Wurzel. 11 COMMISSIONER WURZEL: Dr. Handley, 12 correct me if I'm wrong with this characterization: You're analysis, there 13 are -- and I think John highlighted this in 14 15 his presentation. There are 29 effective performing majority districts that were part 16 17 of your detailed analysis, and one additional -- I guess for lack of a better 18 19 way of describing it, we've used this 20 description, a coalition district. 21 Is that correct? 2.2 DR. HANDLEY: Not exactly. 23 COMMISSIONER WURZEL: So, please 24 correct me. 25 DR. HANDLEY: So, as I said, a majority

district isn't necessarily an opportunity district, and some plurality districts might be opportunity districts. Now, let me see if I can get the numbers. There are currently, let's see, 19 majority districts in which either black, Hispanic or Asians are a majority.

All of those are effective opportunity districts, except that one of these Hispanic majority, as I mentioned, is actually a black opportunity district. There are also a number of plurality districts, some of which are opportunity districts.

So, the numbers are a little -- the number shift. So, do you want to know about majority districts, plurality districts, opportunity districts?

COMMISSIONER WURZEL: No, I would -the point I'm trying to get to by asking this
is that these are 29 districts, but I guess
30 districts, that if they -- as we go back
to the drawing board, if they're -- if we
maintained the demographics of those
districts, your analysis moves on to cover
these districts as well?

1 DR. HANDLEY: Yes. Yes. I'm not sure about your numbers, but yes, that's correct. 2 COMMISSIONER WURZEL: Well, I just 3 4 added up the numbers. I added up the districts --5 DR. HANDLEY: Again, it's not just 6 7 majority districts. COMMISSIONER WURZEL: Well, I didn't --8 9 I'm talking about the combination of, you 10 know, the majority performing, you know. I 11 put everybody in the same, you know, set to, 12 you know, ask my question, you know, if we -as we move forward, if we keep these 13 districts, the demographics of these 14 15 districts somewhat comparable to where they are now, they would meet the standards of 16 17 voting rights, civil rights, local law and court findings about polarized voting. 18 19 DR. HANDLEY: With the caveat that it's 20 not just the demographics. You're going to 21 look at recompiled election results as well, because it has to be a functional analysis. 22 23 But, yes. Yes. 24 COMMISSIONER WURZEL: Thank you. 25 CHAIR WALCOTT: So, to take

Commissioner Wurzel's question to a different level and also trying to tie together as far as next steps, we would still have to make sure that you are reviewing what we post and make sure that we're in compliance, no matter where those districts are, if there are any reconfiguration that meets a new need, as identified by other Commissioners, that role that you play is still extremely important as far as those next steps are concerned.

DR. HANDLEY: If these districts that I've identified as opportunity districts are modified, I would have to review them; that's correct.

CHAIR WALCOTT: Thank you very much.

Any other questions for Dr. Handley?

(No response).

CHAIR WALCOTT: So, for next steps, since we are not submitting this plan to the City Council, that means we'll be reconvening at some point.

Staff, we'll be getting back to all of you within 24 to 48 hours to set a date for the next meeting. And then, we will go through the process of addressing any of the

concerns because we still have a
responsibility to submit these plans to the
City Council for their review, as Commission
Sullivan indicated. And if they have
concerns around them, then they will get back
to us with those concerns or they can pass on
the maps once we do submit them.
Is that a correct way to articulate the
next steps?
MS. PYUN: Yes.
CHAIR WALCOTT: Okay. Fine. So,
you'll be hearing from staff shortly to find
a mutually satisfactory date for all.
And if that is it, if there aren't any
other questions, can I have a motion to
adjourn?
COMMISSIONER UDDIN: So moved.
CHAIR WALCOTT: There's a motion to
adjourn.
Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER SORIN: (Hand gesture).
COMMISSIONER MATEO: (Hand gesture).
COMMISSIONER COLLADO: (Hand gesture).
COMMISSIONER HANRATTY: (Hand gesture).
CHAIR WALCOTT: All in favor?

```
1
                   (Chorus of ayes.)
 2
                    CHAIR WALCOTT: All opposed?
 3
                   (No response).
                    CHAIR WALCOTT: And thank you for your
 4
 5
              time and your energy and your commitment as
 6
              well.
 7
                   (TIME ADJOURNED: 12:27 p.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF NEW YORK)
4	:SS
5	COUNTY OF QUEENS)
6	
7	I, Sabrina Brown Stewart, a shorthand
8	reporter within and for the State of New York, do
9	hereby certify that the within is a true and
10	accurate transcript of the statement taken on
11	September 22, 2022.
12	I further certify that I am not related to
13	any of the parties to this action by blood or by
14	marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the
15	outcome of this matter.
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
17	hand this 8th day of October 2022.
18	
19	
20	Sabrina Brown-Stewart
	Sabrina Brown Stewart
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	