


MICRC Public Feedback Overview May 5 – June 11, 2021



MGGG Redistricting Lab

Contents

1	Week 1: May 1–7	2
2	Week 2: May 8–14	2
3	Week 3: May 15–21	2
4	Week 4: May 22–28	3
5	Week 5: May 29–June 4	3
6	Week 6: June 5–11	3

Contributors

Moon Duchin, Liz Kopecky, and Heather Rosenfeld contributed to this report.



	WRITTEN	theory	COI	comments	DISTRICTS	CD	SD	HD	comments	COI MAP	comments
Week 1	22	15	4	3	11	8	1	2	7	5	1
Week 2	71	34	24	11	30	10	5	5	12	6	1
Week 3	35	18	17	6	15	12	2	1	8	2	0
Week 4	64	22	38	7	21	12	4	5	10	8	1
Week 5	34	19	13	3	8	8	0	0	11	5	4
Week 6	34	13	18	5	28	19	4	5	13	15	1
TOTAL	264				114					42	

Table 1. Summary of Submissions

Notes on the summary table

- We’ve tried to classify the written testimony into two main kinds: *theory of gerrymandering*, as in what kinds of principles would make for fair redistricting; and *COI descriptions*, which are usually explaining communities and how they would like them to be handled, but without a map. Note that these two types don’t add up to the whole, because some submissions defy this classification.
- Districting plans, however, do add up as either Congressional districts (CD), Senate districts (SD), or House districts (HD).
- For each kind of submission we’ve recorded the total number of comments for the week as of now. Note that these numbers may change in the future when people go into the portal and add new comments to older submissions.

Overall themes and comments

1. Every week, there’s more written testimony than map-based testimony, but the number of COI submissions is trending up.
2. Districting plans draw the most *comments*, while COIs are the most heavily *tagged*.
3. The *theory of gerrymandering* comments have several recurrent themes throughout the nearly six weeks since the portal launched.
 - Counties: many commenters explicitly want county lines to play a major role in the process. (“counties” ×111)
 - Math, algorithms, compactness: lots of comments direct the commission to take advantage of math and/or algorithms in the deliberation process (“math”/“mathematical” ×12, “algorithm” ×6). Several commenters are interested in having the commission pay attention to district shape. In particular, quite a few advocate for the district to be rectangular (×8) or square (×8) wherever possible.
 - School districts: many commenters emphasize the importance of school district lines. (“schools” ×33, “school districts” ×20)
4. The *verbal COI* submissions ore often describe areas that should be kept together (“together” ×85, “similar” ×46) than should be held separate (“separate”/“apart” ×22, “different” ×53).



1 Week 1: May 1–7

41 submissions: 22 Written, 11 Districting, 5 COI Map, 3 File/Link

Major themes this week included COIs and process. With 11 submissions on the topic, the bulk of the written input this week requested that MICRC require commenters to disclose identifying information, including name and physical address to verify that input is submitted by Michigan residents.

Other themes included district shape, concerns about partisanship and representation, and competitiveness.

One commenter asked if the new districts will be established by the 2022 elections.

2 Week 2: May 8–14

121 submissions: 71 Written, 30 Districting, 6 COI Map, 14 File/Link

Themes this week included COIs, process, district shape, preserving political boundaries, and concerns about partisanship and representation.

COIs: The bulk of written submissions were COI descriptions. Many of the COIs submitted this underscored the importance of preserving counties and townships. With respect to COIs and political boundaries, one commenter wrote: “I think the redistricting commission should not just be asking about communities of interest. They should also be asking about the other side of the coin: If your county, city, township, etc. needs to be split, where does it make the most sense to make the split?”

Process: A few more comments addressing ID talking about address identification (×3), and a few comments about commission procedure and contracts and the portal interface (×5). Three commenters just want to thank the commission!

Shape: Commenters emphasized that importance of four-sided, rectangular districts. One commenter suggested line-drawers create longer, narrower, lake-oriented districts along the Great Lakes.

Boundaries: Commenters emphasized preserving county boundaries and school districts.

3 Week 3: May 15–21

55 submissions: 35 Written, 15 Districting, 2 COI Map, 4 File/Link

The bulk of written submissions were COI descriptions. Many of the COIs submitted this week explained the importance of preserving a particular county or township. One commenter suggested that communities bordering the Great Lakes are not adequately reflected in the current districts.

Other themes in the comments included district shape, preserving of political boundaries, and concerns are partisanship and representation, and use of algorithms.

Process: Three commenters wrote in support of the Commission’s work. One commenter re-



requested that outreach continue after 2022, and another expressed concern about processing large quantities of public comment.

Shape: Commenters emphasized compact, square districts that preserve counties and townships.

4 Week 4: May 22–28

102 submissions: 64 Written, 21 Districting, 8 COI Map, 9 File/Link

This was a big week, driven heavily by a redistricting public forum that was held on May 25 in Midland. 18 written submissions came directly from that forum.

Themes included district shape, preserving political boundaries, and concerns about partisanship and representation.

Shape: At least eight comments referenced existing shapes or requested square districts.

Boundaries: At least nine comments referenced the importance of preserving county and municipal boundaries. Two comments emphasized the importance of school districts, with one commenter suggesting the use of school district boundaries as building blocks.

5 Week 5: May 29–June 4

51 submissions: 34 Written, 8 Districting, 5 COI Map, 5 File/Link

Themes this week included COIs, process, district shape, preserving political boundaries, and concerns about partisanship and representation.

Process: Commenters thanked the Commission. A small theme this week emerged with commenters suggesting that the best practice for redistricting this year is to wipe the slate clean, discarding previous districts and drawing the new boundaries “from scratch.” (Other, in contrast, have been referencing existing districts to suggest modifications.)

Shape: At least six commenters referenced district shape suggesting compact, square, or convex shapes.

Boundaries: At least two commenters referenced preserving city, township, and municipal boundaries to the extent possible.

Partisanship: Many commenters expressed concern about partisan gerrymandering and representation. One person emphasized that the distribution of congressional seats should reflect that state as a whole.

6 Week 6: June 5–11

85 submissions: 40 Written, 28 Districting, 15 COI Map, 2 File/Link



This week themes included COIs, process, district shape, preserving political boundaries, and concerns about partisan gerrymandering.

COIs: At least one commenter expressed concern that COIs could be partisan.

Process: Commenters thanked the commission and suggested that you take advice from a professor named Moon Duchin. (Honest, we did not plant that one!)

Shape: At least six commenters referenced district shape, with some referencing existing “odd” shapes with a preference for more compact, square shapes.

Boundaries: At least two commenters this week referenced the importance of preserving city or county boundaries.

Partisanship: Many commenters expressed concern about partisan gerrymandering and representation. One commenter suggested their preference for the distribution of state senate and house seats to reflect the statewide vote totals. Four comments referenced concerns about “safe” seats and would prefer more competitive districts.