

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT SEATTLE

8 SUSAN SOTO PALMER, *et al.*,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 STEVEN HOBBS, *et al.*,

12 Defendants,

13 And

14 JOSE TREVINO, *et al.*,

15 Intervenor-Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:22-cv-05035-RSL

ORDER

16  
17 On August 10, 2023, the Court found that the boundaries of Washington Legislative  
18 District 15, in combination with the social, economic, and historical conditions in the  
19 Yakima Valley region, results in an inequality in the electoral opportunities enjoyed by  
20 white and Latino voters in the area. Judgment was entered in plaintiffs' favor on their  
21 Section 2 Voting Rights Act claim, and the State of Washington was given an opportunity  
22 to adopt revised legislative district maps for the Yakima Valley region pursuant to the  
23 process set forth in the Washington State Constitution and state statutes. When news  
24 reports indicated that the Majority Caucus Leaders of both houses of the Washington State  
25  
26

1 Legislature had declined to reconvene the bipartisan redistricting commission, the State  
2 was directed to file a status report notifying the Court of the Legislature's position. Having  
3 reviewed the State's submission and the responses of plaintiffs and the Minority Caucus  
4 Leaders, the Court finds as follows:  
5

6         Given the practical realities of the situation as revealed by the submissions of the  
7 interested parties, the Court will not wait until the last minute to begin its own redistricting  
8 efforts. If, as the Minority Caucus Leaders hope, the Legislature is able to adopt revised  
9 legislative maps for the Yakima Valley region in a timely manner, the Court's parallel  
10 process, set forth below, will have been unnecessary. The likelihood that that will happen  
11 has lessened significantly since the Court issued its Memorandum of Decision, however.  
12 Establishing earlier deadlines for the presentation of alternative remedial proposals will  
13 allow a more deliberate and informed evaluation of those proposals.  
14  
15

16         The parties shall meet and confer with the goal of reaching a consensus on a  
17 legislative district map that will provide equal electoral opportunities for both white and  
18 Latino voters in the Yakima Valley regions, keeping in mind the social, economic, and  
19 historical conditions discussed in the Memorandum of Decision. If the parties are unable to  
20 reach agreement, they shall (a) further confer regarding nominees to act as Special Master  
21 to assist the Court in the assessment of proposed remedial plans and to make modifications  
22 to those plans as necessary and (b) file alternative remedial proposals and nominations on  
23 the following schedule:  
24  
25  
26

1 December 1, 2023 -- Deadline for the parties<sup>1</sup> to submit remedial proposals,<sup>2</sup>  
2 supporting memoranda, and exhibits (including expert reports).


3  
4 December 1, 2023 – Deadline for the parties to jointly identify three candidates for  
5 the Special Master position (including their resumes/CVs, a statement of interest,  
6 availability, and capacity) and to provide their respective positions on each candidate.

7 December 22, 2023 – Deadline for the parties to submit memoranda and exhibits  
8 (including rebuttal expert reports) in response to the remedial proposals.

9  
10 January 5, 2024 – Deadline for the parties to submit memoranda and exhibits  
11 (including sur-rebuttal expert reports) in reply.

12  
13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15  
16 Dated this 4th day of October, 2023.

17  
18   
19 Robert S. Lasnik  
United States District Judge

20  
21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 <sup>1</sup> No party has identified an individual or entity that has unique information or perspective that could help the Court  
beyond the assistance that the parties and their lawyers are able to provide, nor have they shown any other justification  
for the allowance of amicus briefs.

24 <sup>2</sup> The parties shall discuss the format and functionality of the remedial proposals, but the Court generally favors  
25 plaintiffs' suggestions that the maps include important roadways, important geographical markers, and voting precinct  
26 boundaries, that the maps be in a zoomable pdf format, and that the proposals include demographic data (e.g., total  
population per district and race by district of total population and citizen voting age population). Contemporaneous  
with the filing, all counsel of record shall be provided shapefiles, a comma separated value file, or an equivalent file  
that is sufficient to load the proposed plan into commonly available mapping software.