

Title: INTEGRATING CENSUS DATA TO SUPPORT A MOTION
FOR CHANGE OF VENUE

Authors: Peter A. Morrison
RAND (retired)
3 Eat Fire Springs Rd.
Nantucket, MA 02554
E-mail: petermorrison@me.com
Voice: (508) 228-8018; or cell (310) 266-9580

Dean Judson
Decision Analytics
15000 Fort Trail
Accokeek, MD 20607
E-mail: dhjudson@comcast.net
Voice: (301) 637-4481; or cell: 240-682-4406

ABSTRACT

This applied demography case study illustrates the practical application of demographic concepts and methods to an issue facing the court. We show how census data can be used to support a legal motion for a change of venue. “Change of venue,” the legal term for moving a trial to a new location, usually is sought to avoid prejudice against one of the parties to a lawsuit. The case study provides a useful instructional case for a graduate course in applied demography: students can replicate it using data for any particular pair of populous metropolitan communities. By doing so, students would gain proficiency working with Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) household records--and the person records within household records--to identify and categorize family and nonfamily relationships among household members, and practical experience translating legal issues into questions that can be answered empirically using American Community Survey (ACS) data.

Keywords: applied demography; case study; instructional case; legal; jury

I. INTRODUCTION

Assembling a fair and impartial jury is at the core of the U.S. justice system. A jury pool is supposed to represent a “fair cross section of the community.” The composition of juries may be challenged on the basis that the jury venire (the panel of people available for jury service) is not representative of the community from which the jurors are drawn and thus violates either fifth or sixth amendment rights (Weeks 1999: p. 7.1). Furthermore, individual jurors may be tainted by potential conflicts of interest.

Both these criteria—a conflict of interest and the “fair cross section” requirement—are the focus of this case study. In it, we illustrate the use of census data to support a legal motion for a change of venue. “Change of venue,” the legal term for moving a trial to a new location, usually is sought to avoid prejudice against one of the parties to a lawsuit. As a general rule, the party wishing to change courts must file a change of venue motion with the court in which the suit was brought. A change of venue may occur to move a jury trial away from a location where a fair and impartial jury may not be possible to another community in order to obtain jurors who can be more objective in their duties.¹

Our case centers on a trial in which *most* of the prospective jurors would likely have a direct or indirect economic interest in its outcome, calling their objectivity into question. Such a situation poses significant questions to which technical demographic analysis can provide answers: What proportion of the prospective jurors in a community might present such a conflict of interest, thereby necessitating their exclusion? Might their exclusion leave a pool of remaining jurors who no longer comprised a “fair cross section” of the community?

INSTRUCTIONAL USE

This case study can be replicated as a student project, using data for any desired pair of populous cities. As an instructional case, it would enable students to acquire skills that generalize to a broad spectrum of concerns that applied demographers address. Specifically, students could gain experience (1) translating legal issues into questions that can be answered empirically, (2) tabulating Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data from the American Community Survey (ACS) to answer those questions, and (3) working with PUMS household records--and the person records within household records--to identify and categorize family and nonfamily relationships among household members.

This case is based on an actual study, which we have modified to preserve confidentiality. All elements of

¹ Controversial venue changes include the 1992 trial of the four Los Angeles police officers in the Rodney King incident; this trial was moved outside Los Angeles County to neighboring Ventura County. In the trial of Oklahoma City bomber Timothy McVeigh, the court granted a change of venue and ordered the case transferred from Oklahoma City to the U.S. District Court in Denver, Colorado.

that study, including specific statistics, have been re-scaled but all particular inferences are accurate and unchanged. The specifics of applying the ACS data can be directly replicated by students using the same data sources, but for cities of their own choice.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

This case centers on a statewide health insurance system that covers all government workers and public school teachers plus their family members. Plaintiffs filed a lawsuit alleging that the health insurance system's financial advisor knowingly gave erroneous advice over a period of years, which caused the system to become underfunded. Plaintiffs sought monetary damages against the advisor in the amount of several billion dollars. Any monetary settlement would bolster the system's funding, thereby reducing the future health insurance premiums of all current and retired government workers and teachers and their family members. Obviously, all such individuals have a direct financial interest in the outcome of this lawsuit.

The trial is to be held in the state capitol. It so happens that current and former government workers and teachers are known to be heavily concentrated among the residents of this city. Accordingly, defendants move for a change of venue, questioning the impartiality of most prospective jurors in the state capitol.

The technical question posed by the defendant's motion is: Among the prospective jurors in this city, how large a percentage are current or retired government workers and teachers (who would have an obvious financial interest in this lawsuit) or their family members and friends? Are there other venues where this proportion would be markedly lower, making it easier to assemble a pool of jurors without this conflict of interest?

The issue in this case called for comparing the jury-eligible members of the population in each of two cities: the state capitol and another city to which the trial could be moved. The central question is: What percentage of each city's jury-eligible population may have either a direct or indirect economic interest in the outcome of this trial? We shall refer to state and local government employees as "SLGEs"; we shall refer to "the Board" as the state agency responsible for honoring the future health insurance benefits to which SLGEs and their family members are entitled; and for purposes of this case study, we shall refer to the first municipality as "Capitol city" and the second municipality as "York city".

To answer the above question, we shall identify and quantify for each city the number of potential jurors who are either (1) current SLGEs, (2) retired or disabled SLGEs, (3) other former SLGEs with a vested right to a future health insurance benefit payable by the Board, or (4) survivors who are entitled to SLGE health insurance benefits; and for each preceding category of individual, (5) adults who are related to them as immediate family members, or (6) domestic partners with whom they reside.

All potential jurors in categories (1) through (5) would have a direct economic interest in the outcome of this trial; those in category (6) would have an indirect economic interest.

Beyond these six categories, we shall consider the additional category of possible jurors who are their close acquaintances (e.g., neighbors or friends), whose impartiality therefore could be subject to question.

DATA SOURCES

Our approach uses a straightforward demographic accounting model to integrate tabular and PUMS data from the 2006-2008 American Community Survey, which is a sample of people living in both housing units and group quarters. Future replications of our analyses, of course, can draw on more recent data and/or a temporally broader and numerically larger ACS sample.

We also had access to the client's internal database covering all active, retired, and other former employees and their beneficiaries who had current or future entitlements under the retirement and benefit plan. This database enabled us to calculate the size of these respective populations.

II. CHARACTERIZING POTENTIAL JURORS WITH A CONFLICT OF INTEREST

This section details the steps in estimating for each city how many potential jurors would have a direct or indirect economic interest in the outcome of the trial and therefore might be ineligible to serve.

1. Derive the jury-eligible population:

Eligible jurors are defined as all persons who are US citizens and at least 18 years of age. We derived the current (2006-2008) estimate of the number of eligible jurors in each city directly from the 2006-2008 ACS tabular data accessible on American FactFinder (see Table 1, top row, and source tables).

2. Account for current State and Local Government employees:

Drawing further on the ACS data, we next derive for each city the number of jury-eligible persons currently employed as SLGEs. These current estimates are shown in middle row of Table 1, along with their percentage shares of the jury-eligible population in row 1.

In York City, for example, current State and Local Government employees number 24,344 as of 2006-08 and constitute 9.6% of the city's jury-eligible population; in Capitol City, however, the 5,397 SLGEs constitute a much higher percentage (25.5%) of potential jurors.

3. Account for the family members of current SLGEs:

Next, we estimate the number of jury-eligible persons who are related to SLGEs as immediate family members and also occupy the same household. One can derive these estimates from the 2006-2008 ACS Public Use Microdata Sample. We must first extract each household as a unit and flag those individual household members who themselves are SLGEs; and then flag any jury-eligible member of the *family* as “connected” and flag any jury-eligible member of the *household* as “connected.” (These steps utilize the PUMS relationship codes and household relationships, which are not available using the more readily available published tabulations.)

Show below is a sample of several PUMS household records and the person records within each, illustrating how we flag SLGE persons, and then flag all adult household members connected to a SLGE person:

| Household number | Person number | Class of Worker | Relationship to Person 1 | SLGE? | Connected to SLGE? | Immediate family with SLGE? |
|------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 1 | State Govt. Employee | Reference Person | yes | yes | yes |
| 1 | 2 | Self-employed | Husband/wife | no | yes | yes |
| 1 | 3 | Not in labor force | Son/daughter | no | yes | yes |
| 1 | 4 | Less than age 16 | Son/daughter | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 2 | 1 | Private for-profit Local Govt. | Reference Person | no | yes | no |
| 2 | 2 | Employee | Other nonrelative | yes | yes | yes |
| 3 | 1 | Private for-profit | Reference Person | no | yes | yes |
| 3 | 2 | State Govt. Employee | Husband/wife | yes | yes | yes |
| 3 | 3 | State Govt. Employee | Roomer/boarder | yes | yes | yes |
| 4 | 1 | Private nonprofit | Reference Person | no | no | no |

Of the four fictional households above, the first is a husband/wife household with a son/daughter living with them, 18 or older, but not in the labor force (persons 1,2, and 3 in household 1). The fourth household member is under age 16 and hence is not jury-eligible. The second household might represent two unrelated persons rooming together. Person #1 in household 2 is not an SLGE but is connected to one, but not as an immediate family. Person 2 is all three: an SLGE, connected to one (self), and in the immediate family of one (self).

The third household has a two-person family with a third boarder, and hence all are connected and all are in immediate families of an SLGE, but not in a “conventional” way. Person 1 (not a SLGE) is the spouse of Person 2 (a SLGE). Person 3 is a SLGE connected to one (self) and in the immediate family of one (self).

The final household is a single person living alone, and is neither an SLGE, nor connected, nor in immediately family. Note that this analysis does *not* account for the possibility that this single person might have a direct relative, living in another household in the same community, who is an SLGE².

Following this algorithm (flag=1 for any adult citizen who is a co-member of a household with a SLGE), we can derive from the PUMS data that for every 1,000 SLGEs, an additional number of immediate family members also reside with those SLGEs in the same households. Note that we must refine this calculation to exclude family members who are themselves SLGEs, i.e., members of a “dual-SLGE” household.

For York City, these data show that for every 1,000 SLGEs, there are an additional 988 adult citizens who are immediate family members in those same households. For Capitol City, the corresponding number is 623 per thousand.

Next, we apply these ratios to calculate that 24,052 (derived as $0.988 \times 24,344$) additional family members occupy the households of the 24,344 SLGEs in York City. The corresponding number for Capitol City is an additional 3,363 immediate family members per 1,000 SLGEs.

Table 2 incorporates these immediate family members of current SLGEs (but only those members residing in the *same household* as the SLGE). The data in Table 2 almost certainly understate the *total* number of immediate family members of SLGEs in each entire city, since they omit family members who may live separately in another household in the same city. Those omitted would include, for example, adult children, parents, siblings, spouses who are separated, or former spouses. Were one able to account for these nonresident immediate family members, the totals shown in Table 2 would be higher.

4. Account for domestic partners:

The immediate family members of SLGEs comprise most—but not all—of the adult members of households occupied by current SLGEs. Next we shall account for the domestic (unmarried) partners in SLGE households—who would have an indirect economic interest in the outcome of this trial—using the 2006-2008 ACS PUMS data. Here again, we must first extract each household as a unit and flag those individual household members who themselves are SLGEs. Then we must flag as “connected” any jury-eligible member of the *household* who is coded “unmarried partner.” (Here, too, we exclude domestic partners who are themselves SLGEs, i.e., members of a “dual-SLGE” household.)

² Sample code that creates these flags is available from the second author.

Following this algorithm, we can calculate for every 1,000 SLGEs the additional number of domestic partners who reside with those SLGEs in the same households. For York City, these data show that for every 1,000 SLGEs, an additional 31.2 domestic partners occupy the same households. For Capitol City, the corresponding number is 23.5 per thousand.

Applying these ratios, we can calculate that 760 (derived as $0.0312 \times 24,344$) additional domestic partners occupy the same households as the 24,344 SLGEs in York City. In Capitol City, the corresponding number is 127. Table 3 incorporates these domestic partners living in the households of current SLGEs.

5. Account for recipients, survivors, other vested employees, and their family members:

Thus far, we have accounted for *current* SLGEs and the family members and domestic partners with whom they reside. We also need to account for recipient SLGEs and their survivors, i.e., retired SLGEs eligible for health insurance coverage; other former SLGEs with a vested right to such coverage in the future; and for each category, the spouses with whom these existing or future beneficiaries reside. All such persons would have a direct or indirect economic interest in the outcome of this trial.

[NOTE: For instructional purposes, the following steps can utilize any fictional database of administrative records constructed to mirror the one described below.]

Since neither the ACS data nor any other publicly available source shows the detail needed here, we sought and obtained privileged access to a database of administrative records related to all covered SLGEs and their beneficiaries. Although this database provided only abbreviated measures of marital status and labor force status, it afforded us counts of the total number of beneficiaries with health insurance coverage based on their status as either (1) covered SLGEs, (2) disabled SLGEs, or (3) survivors of the members of either of these two populations, or (4) other former SLGEs with a vested right to future coverage. For individual cities, the database provided only the total count of all beneficiaries. Table 4 summarizes the total number of persons of each type, tabulated by city of residence.

Next, we tabulated the 34,553 beneficiaries shown in the lower left-hand cell above by marital status, which showed 28,435 of them as married. (The data limited us to a binary “married-not married” distinction, precluding the possibility of identifying “formerly married” persons.) Reasoning that for each married beneficiary there is at least one additional immediate family member (the spouse), we calculate that there are at least 823 additional immediate family members per 1,000 beneficiaries (i.e., $1,000 \times [28,435/34,553]$).

This 823-per-1,000 factor represents a lower-bound estimate of the total number of immediate family members of these 34,553 beneficiaries. The factor almost certainly would be higher if one could account for and include those other immediate family members (e.g., adult children, siblings, parents, etc.) who are not documented in this database. Therefore, in applying this ratio, we can be confident that it understates the total number of immediate family members of recipient beneficiaries with a direct economic interest in the outcome of this trial. Table 5 summarizes how we account for these additional recipients and survivors plus their spouses.

6. Summary demographic accounting:

Finally, we combine data from Tables 1, 2, 3, and 5 to present a summary demographic accounting of relevant populations and their share of the adult citizen population of each city, shown in Table 6. For York City, the row in Table 6 entitled “Subtotal, (1) – (5)” shows that persons with a direct economic interest in the outcome of this trial would constitute 25.8% of the jury-eligible population. The row entitled “Total, (1) – (6)” shows that persons with either a direct or indirect economic interest in the outcome of this trial would constitute 26.1% of the jury-eligible population. For Capitol City, the row entitled “Subtotal, (1) – (5)” shows that persons with a direct economic interest in the outcome of this trial would constitute 48.1% of the jury-eligible population. The row entitled “Total, (1) – (6)” shows that persons with either a direct or indirect economic interest in the outcome of this trial would constitute 48.7% of the jury-eligible population.

Next, we obtained the actual number of potential jurors as of early 2010 from the jury commissioner in each city. These numbers are less than the 2006-2008 ACS-based estimates of the entire adult citizen jury-eligible population. This difference is attributable to several factors: (1) not all adult citizens are eligible for jury service; (2) the geographic boundaries used by the Census Bureau and the jury clerks to delimit each city’s population may not be coterminous; (3) the population of each city will have changed in size and composition over the several years between 2006 and early 2010; and (4) the ACS has known sampling error. None of these factors, or the differences themselves, invalidates our use of the percentages in Table 6 to estimate for each city the number of persons in the actual 2010 jury pool with either a direct or indirect economic interest in the outcome of this trial. Those calculations are shown in Table 7.

7. Account for additional close acquaintances of those with a direct economic interest:

Beyond the six categories of potential jurors detailed in Table 6, we consider a seventh category who are their close acquaintances (e.g., neighbors or friends). Most adults have close acquaintances in their community—next-door neighbors, close friends, fellow church members, etc. When we factor in their additional numbers, upwards of two-thirds of all prospective jurors in Capitol City (compared with only 36% of prospective jurors in York City) would be linked either directly or indirectly (through a close friendship) to the outcome of this trial. In short, our analysis indicates that the jury pool in Capitol City would be notably more saturated with persons whose impartiality would be subject to question.

How can one account for such close acquaintances? Although we lack data specific to each city, one can formulate an overly conservative assumption about the pervasiveness of acquaintanceship and then calculate the arithmetic consequences. Let us simply assume that 40% (at most) of the adults in each city are socially isolated from other adults in the community—a level far above the 6% to 12% levels of isolation reported by Hampton et al. (2009).³ Under this assumption, *at least* 60% of prospective jurors in each city would have *at least* one close adult acquaintance in that same community. So 60% sets a credible lower bound on the percentage of prospective jurors who have a close friend in that city.

From the data in Table 7, we estimate that over 48.7% of prospective jurors in Capitol City will have a direct or indirect interest in the outcome of this trial. Assuming (conservatively) that at least 60% of the other 51.3% have at least one close adult acquaintance, we can calculate that at least 30.8% of that other 51.3% (i.e., $51.3\% \times 0.6$) have such an acquaintance.

Since 48.7% of prospective jurors will have a direct or indirect interest in the outcome of this trial, we can estimate (assuming acquaintanceship is random) that an additional 15% of prospective jurors (i.e., 48.7% of the 30.8% above) will prove to be the additional close acquaintances of persons with a direct or indirect interest in the outcome of this trial.

For Capitol City, therefore, the total of all persons in the bottom row of Table 7 (8,513) plus their estimated 2,622 close acquaintances (15% of 17,480) add up to 11,135 of all 17,480 prospective jurors in Capitol City—nearly two-thirds (63.7%) of the jury pool. With nearly two-thirds of all eligible jurors either directly or indirectly (through a domestic partner or close friendship) standing to gain from the outcome of this trial, the jury pool is saturated with persons whose impartiality would be subject to question. For York City, the corresponding calculations show that slightly over two-fifths (41.1%) of all eligible jurors would stand to gain from the outcome of this trial.

To summarize our results thus far:

³ Hampton et al. (2009) report that 6% of the adult population has no one with whom they can discuss important matters or who they consider to be “especially significant” in their life; and 12% have no confidant. Christakis and Fowler (2009: p. 18) report that the average American has 4 close social contacts, and most have between 2 and 6; only 12% listed no one with whom they could discuss important matters or spend free time. See also McPherson (2006).

1. In Capitol City, at least 8,513 of 17,480 potential jurors (i.e., over 48.7% of the entire jury list) have a direct or indirect economic interest in the outcome of this trial. That interest stems from their status as either a current SLGE; a recipient SLGE, or survivor now receiving SLGE benefit payments; a former SLGE with a vested right to receive payments in the future; an immediate family member of any person above; or a domestic partner in a household occupied by a current SLGE.
2. In York City, at least 60,323 of 231,121 potential jurors (i.e., over 26.1% of the entire jury list) have a direct or indirect economic interest in the outcome of this trial for the reasons cited above.
3. For Capitol City, the analysis establishes that a total of (a) all 8,513 persons with a direct or indirect economic interest in the outcome of this trial plus (b) their close acquaintances will exceed 11,135 (i.e., 63.7%) of the 17,480 prospective jurors in Capitol City. With nearly two-thirds of all eligible jurors linked either directly or indirectly (through a domestic partner or close friendship) to the outcome of this trial, the jury pool is saturated with persons whose impartiality would be subject to question.
4. Based on the above data, one can conclude that the unbiased venire pool (i.e., 17,480 minus 11,135) numbers less than 6,345 prospective jurors in Capitol City but approximately 136,130 prospective jurors in York City.

III. EVALUATING THE “FAIR CROSS-SECTION” STANDARD

The prospect that upwards of two-thirds of prospective jurors in Capitol City may be found ineligible to serve raises the possibility that the remaining eligible jurors would differ from those who would be excluded, thereby forming a pool of jurors no longer representative of the community. For the applied demographer, this issue poses a need for technical demographic analysis to evaluate how those remaining jurors would likely differ from the entire pool without exclusion. This section shows how one can make that evaluation. The results, as we shall see, document an important point: Excluding all SLGEs from the jury pool in Capitol City would distort, in numerous ways and with differing degrees of intensity, the socioeconomic composition of the jury pool that remained.

First, we note that the ACS data limit us to evaluating the effect of excluding just those persons who are *current* SLGEs (i.e., ACS does not classify retirees or other beneficiaries by their former employer ties). We shall use data from the 2006-2008 American Community Survey (ACS) to examine the effect of such exclusion on the makeup of the remaining eligible jurors in the 2010 pool.

To do so, we first distinguish the jury-eligible population (citizens 18 or older) on the ACS Public Use Microdata Sample file who reside in the particular census PUMA that encompasses Capitol City. Note that the correspondence between PUMA and city may not be exact, which may necessitate certain caveats about

the assumed *relative* similarity of PUMA and city populations on each socioeconomic dimension considered below: educational attainment, employment patterns, occupation and prior military service, household income, and racial composition.

Below, we compare current SLGEs with all other eligible jurors on each socioeconomic dimension. For each comparison, we show the difference that would result from excluding current SLGEs. Our “Deviation from perfect cross-section” measure quantifies the statistical deviation from a perfectly representative cross-section of the community: $\text{Deviation} = ((\text{“All others”} / \text{“Total”}) - 1) \times 100$.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: As shown in Table 8, excluding current SLGEs from the jury pool would concentrate jurors with the least education (those without a high school diploma or college degree) among remaining eligible jurors. Specifically, persons with no high school degree would constitute 9.6% of remaining eligible jurors rather than their 8.4%-share of the entire jury pool (which is a relative deviation of 15.4%). More highly educated jurors (persons with a BA or graduate degree) would be underrepresented. They would constitute only 18.3% of remaining eligible jurors rather than their 23.4%-share of the entire jury pool (a relative deviation of -21.7%).

SELF EMPLOYMENT: Excluding current SLGEs from the jury pool also concentrates those workers who are self-employed, as well as workers who are unemployed, among remaining eligible jurors (Table 9).

OCCUPATIONAL SELECTIVITY: Excluding current SLGEs from the jury pool diminishes the presence of persons in particular occupations among remaining eligible jurors. One noticeable difference (documented in Table 10) is the 64.7% relative underrepresentation of persons in teaching occupations.

Another such difference (documented in Table 11) is the relative excess of jurors with prior military experience (+10.0%) and the -3.7% relative shortage of jurors with no prior military experience.

HOUSEHOLD INCOME: Excluding current SLGEs from the jury pool concentrates persons in the lowest household income bracket among remaining eligible jurors and diminishes the presence of those in the highest household income bracket. Table 12 documents a 19.4% relative excess of jurors with low annual household incomes (under \$40,000) but a 16.8% relative shortage of jurors with high annual household incomes (above \$80,000).

RACE: Excluding current SLGEs from the jury pool also alters the racial makeup of the remaining jury pool (Table 13). The representation of persons who are racially nonwhite would increase 2.9% (reflecting mixed directions of effect among different minority groups).

To summarize the significance of these results: A jury pool is supposed to represent a “fair cross section” of the community from which it is drawn. Excluding all *current* SLGEs from the jury pool in Capitol City would distort the socioeconomic composition of those who remained as prospective jurors. Perhaps most noteworthy, the latter would contain proportionally fewer college-educated jurors; proportionally fewer teachers; and proportionally more persons in the lowest household income bracket and fewer persons in the highest income bracket.

Such differences raise the possibility that the composition of juries might be open to challenge were the resulting jury pool deemed to be no longer representative of the community from which it is drawn.

EPILOGUE

In the adversarial legal arena, the applied demographer’s technical analysis may well advantage (or disadvantage) one party to a lawsuit. In settings where adversaries seek common ground in order to negotiate their differences, the demographer’s technical analysis can help foster a settlement instead of a lengthy and expensive trial.

In this instance, the technical analyses illustrated above, supporting the motion for change of venue, apparently helped motivate the opposing parties to settle the actual lawsuit. The plaintiff agreed to accept a several hundred million dollar settlement from the defendant in exchange for dismissing its suit accusing the defendant of leaving the plaintiff’s health care trust with billions of dollars in unfunded liabilities. The defendant cited the uncertain outcome of a jury trial in the state capitol—where a large concentration of beneficiaries reside—as one factor prompting the settlement.

REFERENCES

Christakis, N. A. & Fowler, J. H. (2009). *Connected*. New York: Little Brown.

McPherson, M, Smith-Lovin, L., and Brashears, M. E. (2006). Social Isolation in America. *American Sociological Review*, 71(3), 353-375.

Hampton, K., et al. (2009). Social Isolation and New Technology. Pew Internet and American Life Project. www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2009/18--Social-Isolation-and-New-Technology/Executive-Summary/Findings.aspx Accessed November 26, 2010.

Weeks, J. R. (1999). Jury Representativeness: Challenging the Array. In W. F. Abbott & J. Batt (Eds), *A Handbook of Jury Research* (pp. 7.1-7.31). Philadelphia: American Law Institute.

TABLES

Table 1. Derivation of SLGE Share of Jury-eligible Population

| | York City | Capitol City |
|--|------------------|---------------------|
| Citizens ages 18+ | 253,442 | 21,187 |
| State & Local Gov't Employees | 24,344 | 5,397 |
| SLGEs as % of citizen adults | 9.6% | 25.5% |
| Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey, Tables B05003 and B24080. | | |

Table 2. Derivation of Immediate Family Members in SLGE Households

| | York City | Capitol City |
|---|------------------|---------------------|
| Citizens ages 18+ | 253,442 | 21,187 |
| State & Local Gov't Employees | 24,344 | 5,397 |
| Additional immediate family members in households of SLGEs | 24,052 | 3,362 |
| Total, SLGEs plus additional family members in SLGE households | 42,845 | 8,759 |
| Total as % of citizens 18+ | 16.9% | 41.3% |
| Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey, Tables B05003 and B24080, and Public Use Microdata Sample. | | |

Table 3. Derivation of Domestic Partners in SLGE Households

| | York City | Capitol City |
|---|------------------|---------------------|
| Citizens ages 18+ | 253,442 | 21,187 |
| State & Local Gov't Employees | 24,344 | 5,397 |
| Additional domestic partners in SLGE households | 760 | 127 |
| Additional domestic partners in SLGE households as % of citizens 18+ | 0.3% | 0.6% |
| Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey, Tables B05003 and B24080, and Public Use Microdata Sample. | | |

Table 4. Recipient Beneficiaries by Type with SLGE Health Insurance Coverage

| Type of Beneficiary | Total | York City | Capitol City |
|---|--------|-----------|--------------|
| All retirees | 25,451 | n.a. | n.a. |
| All disabled | 512 | n.a. | n.a. |
| All survivors | 1,901 | n.a. | n.a. |
| All others with vested right to future coverage | 6,689 | n.a. | n.a. |
| Total, all beneficiaries | 34,553 | 8,592 | 719 |

Table 5. Derivation of Spouses of Recipient Beneficiaries

| | York City | Capitol City |
|--|-----------|--------------|
| Citizens ages 18+ | 253,442 | 21,187 |
| Total SLGE recipients, survivors, and disabled | 8,592 | 719 |
| Plus spouses of above (823 per 1,000) | 7,071 | 592 |
| Total, SLGEs, pensioners, survivors, and disabled plus spouses | 15,663 | 1,311 |
| Total as % of citizens 18+ | 6.2% | 6.2% |

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey, Tables B05003 and B24080, and Public Use Microdata Sample.

Table 6. Summary Demographic Accounting

| Measure | York City | Capitol City |
|--|------------------|---------------------|
| Citizens ages 18+ | 253,442 | 21,187 |
| 1. % who are SLGEs | 9.6% | 25.5% |
| 2. % who are recipient, disabled or their survivors | 3.4% | 3.4% |
| 3. % who are other SLGEs with vested rights to future benefits | ~ 0.5% | ~ 0.5% |
| 4. % who are family members of SLGEs | 9.5% | 15.9% |
| 5. % who are spouses of recipient, disabled, & survivors | 2.8% | 2.8% |
| Subtotal, (1) – (5): | 25.8% | 48.1% |
| 6. % who are domestic partners in SLGE households | 0.3% | 0.6% |
| Total, (1) – (6): | 26.1% | 48.7% |
| Source: Tables 1, 2, 3, and 5 | | |

Table 7. Derivation of Current Jurors with Economic Interest in Trial Outcome

| Measure | York City | Capitol City |
|---|------------------|---------------------|
| 1. 2010 jury pool | 231,121 | 17,480 |
| 2. Percentage with direct economic interest in trial outcome (subtotal, (1) – (5) from Table 6): | 25.8% | 48.1% |
| Number in 2010 jury pool with direct economic interest in trial outcome ((2) x (1) x 0.01): | 59,629 | 8,408 |
| 3. % who are domestic partners in SLGE households | 0.3% | 0.6% |
| 4. Percentage with direct or indirect economic interest in trial outcome (total, (1) – (6) from Table 6): | 26.1% | 48.7% |
| Number in 2010 jury pool with direct or indirect economic interest in trial outcome ((4) x (1) x 0.01): | 60,323 | 8,513 |
| Source: Jury commissioners in York City and Capitol City; Table 6. | | |

Table 8. Change in Educational Attainment Among Remaining Jurors

| Educational attainment | Citizen Population Ages 18+ | | | Deviation from perfect cross section |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Total | SLGEs | All others | |
| No high school degree | 8.4% | 2.6% | 9.6% | 15.4% |
| No BA degree | 68.3% | 51.3% | 72.1% | 5.5% |
| BA or graduate degree | 23.4% | 46.1% | 18.3% | -21.7% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey PUMS, variable=SCHL for PUMA5 00300.

Table 9. Change in Class of Worker Among Remaining Jurors

| Class of Worker | Citizen Population Ages 18+ | | | Deviation from perfect cross section |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------|------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Total | SLGEs | All others | |
| Self employed | 11.2% | 0.0% | 14.1% | 26.3% |
| Not self employed | 88.5% | 0.0% | 85.5% | -3.4% |
| Unemployed | 0.3% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 26.3% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey PUMS, variable=COW for PUMA5 00300.

Table 10. Change in Type of Occupation Among Remaining Jurors

| Occupation | Citizen Population Ages 18+ | | | Deviation from perfect cross section |
|------------|-----------------------------|-------|------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Total | SLGEs | All others | |
| Teachers | 4.9% | 20.3% | 1.7% | -64.7% |
| All other | 95.1% | 79.7% | 98.3% | 3.3% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey PUMS, variable=OCCP for PUMA5 00300.

Table 11. Change in Military Service Among Remaining Jurors

| Military Service | Citizen Population Ages 18+ | | | Deviation from perfect cross section |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Total | SLGEs | All others | |
| Has prior military service | 16.0% | 8.8% | 17.6% | 10.0% |
| Now on active duty | 5.0% | 0.0% | 6.2% | 22.2% |
| Never served in military | 77.5% | 90.5% | 74.6% | -3.7% |
| Other | 1.5% | 0.7% | 1.6% | 11.6% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey PUMS, variable=MIL for PUMA5 00300.

Table 12. Change in Household Income Among Remaining Jurors

| Household Income | Citizen Population Ages 18+ | | | Deviation from perfect cross section |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------|------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Total | SLGEs | All others | |
| Under \$40,000 | 30.1% | 15.4% | 35.9% | 19.4% |
| \$40,000-\$79,999 | 32.2% | 30.8% | 32.7% | 1.6% |
| \$80,000 and over | 37.8% | 53.7% | 31.4% | -16.8% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey PUMS, variable=HINCP for PUMA5 00300.

Table 13. Change in Racial Composition Among Remaining Jurors

| Race | Citizen Population Ages 18+ | | | Deviation from perfect cross section |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------|------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Total | SLGEs | All others | |
| White alone | 78.9% | 81.7% | 78.3% | -0.8% |
| Not white alone | 21.1% | 18.3% | 21.7% | 2.9% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

Source: 2006-2008 American Community Survey PUMS, variable=RAC1P for PUMA5 00300.