

CONGRESSIONAL APPORTIONMENT (EXCERPT)
Act 282 of 1964

3.54 Provisions applicable to redistricting plan.

Sec. 4. All of the following apply to the redistricting plan in section 1:

(a) In adopting the redistricting plan for congressional districts, it is the intention of the legislature to comply fully with section 3 of the congressional redistricting act, 1999 PA 221, MCL 3.63.

(b) The number of county breaks in the redistricting plan is determined by the following principles:

(i) Breaking a county line means assigning part of the population of a county to 1 or more counties in the formation of a district.

(ii) If population is shifted from a county to a single election district, including a district from 2 geographically-separate areas, there is 1 break. Except as provided in subparagraph (iii), if population from a county is shifted to 2 or more election districts, there are 2 or more breaks.

(iii) If 1 part of a county is shifted to a district and the rest of the county is shifted to another district, there is 1 break.

(c) The redistricting plan was designed to comply fully with both section 2 of the voting rights act of 1965, Public Law 89-110, 42 U.S.C. 1973, and the requirements of the equal protection clause of amendment XIV of the constitution of the United States, as set forth in Shaw v Reno, 509 US 630 (1993), and subsequent cases concerning racial gerrymandering. In light of these dual obligations, the plan avoids any practice or district lines that result in the denial of any racial or ethnic group's equal opportunity to elect a representative of its choice and, at the same time, does not subordinate traditional redistricting principles for the purpose of accomplishing a racial gerrymander or creating a majority-minority district. As a consequence, the plan does not result in retrogression or dilution of minority voting strength, particularly in light of the demographic limitations caused by relative population losses and the neutral criteria set forth in section 3 of the congressional redistricting act, 1999 PA 221, MCL 3.63. However, the plan does not sacrifice traditional neutral principles, such as, most importantly, preservation of county and municipal boundaries, for the purpose of engaging in a gerrymander that unnecessarily favors 1 racial group over others.

(d) The plan furthers the underlying purpose of the state constitution of 1963 by facilitating effective representation in the legislature where elected representatives can advance the shared interests of unified municipalities or counties. It does so without sacrificing voting rights act of 1965 principles, equal electoral opportunities, or racial fairness.

(e) The redistricting plan for congressional districts consists of 15 single member districts comprised of convenient territories contiguous by land. All of the following apply to the plan:

(i) The population in each of districts 1-9 and 11-15 is 662,563. The population of district 10 is 662,562.

(ii) The number of breaks in county boundaries is 11.

(iii) The number of breaks in city and township lines is 14.

(iv) No congressional district is wholly contained within a city.

History: Add. 2001, Act 115, Eff. Mar. 22, 2002.

Constitutionality: In an original action, plaintiffs challenged the plan for redistricting Michigan's fifteen seats in the U.S. House of Representatives adopted by 2001 PA 115. Plaintiffs claimed that the statute was not validly enacted because the bill passed by the Legislature was changed by the Secretary of the Senate before presentation to the Governor for his approval. Second, they contended that the redistricting plan failed to comply with Michigan statutory requirements for congressional redistricting established by 1999 PA 221.

The Michigan Supreme Court concluded: (1) 2001 PA 115 was validly enacted because the changes made before submission to the Governor were technical corrections that did not violate the provisions of the Michigan Constitution regarding enactment of legislation; (2) the redistricting guidelines of MCL 3.63 (c), as enacted by 1999 PA 211, were not binding on the Legislature's redistricting of Michigan's congressional seats in 2001; and (3) the reference to the 1999 guidelines in the 2001 redistricting act did not indicate legislative intent to make the redistricting plan reviewable using those guidelines. The Court denied plaintiff's application for review of the congressional redistricting plan. LeRoux v Secretary of State, 465 Mich 594 (2002).