

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

HOUSE REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE MEETING
FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 2012

Transcribed by:
CLARA C. ROTRUCK
Court Reporter

1 T A P E D P R O C E E D I N G S

2 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Okay,
3 members, if we can get everybody to take their
4 seats and get settled, we are going to get
5 started. If we can get everybody to get
6 settled, I think we have everybody seated.

7 Katie, if you would, please call the roll.

8 THE CLERK: Representatives Adkins?

9 REPRESENTATIVE ADKINS: Here.

10 THE CLERK: Bernard?

11 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: Here.

12 THE CLERK: Chestnut?

13 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: Here.

14 THE CLERK: Dorworth?

15 REPRESENTATIVE DORWORTH: Here.

16 THE CLERK: Eisnaugle?

17 REPRESENTATIVE EISNAUGLE: Here.

18 THE CLERK: Fresen?

19 REPRESENTATIVE FRESEN: Here.

20 THE CLERK: Frishe?

21 REPRESENTATIVE FRISHE: Here.

22 THE CLERK: Holder?

23 REPRESENTATIVE HOLDER: Here.

24 THE CLERK: Horner?

25 REPRESENTATIVE HORNER: Here.

1 THE CLERK: Hukill?
2 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: Here.
3 THE CLERK: Jenne?
4 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: Here.
5 THE CLERK: Jones?
6 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Here.
7 THE CLERK: Kiar?
8 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: Here.
9 THE CLERK: Legg?
10 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Here.
11 THE CLERK: Nehr?
12 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: Here.
13 THE CLERK: Precourt?
14 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Here.
15 THE CLERK: Rogers?
16 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Here.
17 THE CLERK: Rouson?
18 REPRESENTATIVE ROUSON: Here.
19 THE CLERK: Schenck?
20 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: Here.
21 THE CLERK: Workman?
22 REPRESENTATIVE WORKMAN: Here.
23 THE CLERK: Chair Weatherford?
24 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Here.
25 THE CLERK: A quorum is present.

1 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
2 very much, Katie.

3 Good morning, members. Thank you for
4 hanging around on a Friday. We are certainly
5 going to try to be judicious with everyone's
6 time, but I think we all know that we are here
7 to do a very important job, so we are not going
8 to rush through it. We are going to make sure
9 everybody has an opportunity to participate.

10 I want to thank the Committee. I think
11 this has been a very long process, and
12 hopefully today will be the culmination of a
13 committee that has been very deliberate,
14 started nine or ten months ago, and has worked
15 for a product -- multiple products that I think
16 we can be proud of.

17 Members, at our last meeting, we
18 workshopped seven options for Florida's two
19 State Legislative maps and Congressional map.

20 Regarding the State House map, last week
21 members of the Committee recommended that we
22 take up House Joint Resolution 6011, which is
23 plan 9027, this week.

24 Regarding the Congressional map, there
25 were members of the Committee that recommended

1 that we take up House Bill 6005, which is plan
2 9043, this week as well. As such, today we
3 will take up the maps in the following order:

4 The proposed State House map, House Joint
5 Resolution 9011 will be first. The proposed
6 Congressional map, House Bill 9005 will be
7 second, and the proposed Senate map, House
8 Joint Resolution 9001 will be third.

9 There are amendments drafted to each of
10 these. There are two amendments drafted to
11 House Joint Resolution 9011, there are two
12 amendments drafted to House Bill 9005 and
13 there's -- that is a six, okay. We have a
14 misprint on my script. It is not 9001, 9006.
15 That is probably an important thing to point
16 out. And -- what's that? 6001. Okay. So let
17 me clarify that for everyone.

18 The House Joint Resolution for the State
19 Senate map is 6001, not 9001. That is my
20 fault, I apologize for that, 6001.

21 In regard to amendments, there are
22 amendments drafted to each of these. There are
23 two amendments drafted to the House map, 9011,
24 there are two amendments drafted to the
25 Congressional map, 9005, and there's one

1 amendment drafted to the House Joint Resolution
2 for the Senate map, 6001.

3 Just so that we are all on the same page
4 here, Vice-Chairman Precourt has filed an
5 amendment to each of these Bills, and I have
6 filed amendments both to the House State map
7 and to the Congressional map.

8 Everyone here should have received an
9 e-mail from me Wednesday noting that I filed my
10 amendments based on a request from three
11 organizations, including the League of Women
12 Voters of Florida, who very recently submitted
13 maps for our consideration.

14 I filed those amendments as a courtesy to
15 those organizations so that their suggestions
16 for us and their critiques of us could be heard
17 here on the record. As I have stated
18 repeatedly to everyone here, that if you have a
19 way to make these maps more legally appropriate
20 or compliant, we certainly want to give your
21 ideas a fair consideration.

22 I did ask that they be here to explain
23 their maps in the same manner that every other
24 proposal before you has been explained. Just
25 at the outset, I want to let you know that they

1 have declined to explain via a letter that they
2 sent us last evening.

3 Now, with that said, members, there are --
4 are there any questions of us or anything I
5 have stated thus far about the process going
6 forward for today? Any questions?

7 Okay. Seeing no questions, at this time,
8 we are going to take up House Joint Resolution
9 9011, which is -- 6011, which is also State
10 House Map 9027. Members, this is the sixth tab
11 in your packets.

12 Representative Schenck, who is Co-Chair of
13 the Committee, you are recognized to explain
14 the Bill, sir.

15 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: Thank you,
16 Mr. Chair, and it is great to be here on
17 another Friday redistricting with you and the
18 rest of the Committee.

19 Last week as a committee, we decided to
20 consider HJR 6011, which is also map 9027, as
21 the base map for this week. HJR 6011 makes
22 dramatic improvements to Florida's State House
23 map, particularly when you just look at the map
24 side by side with the current House map that
25 was adopted in 2002.

1 Overall, it has a 3.97 percent population
2 deviation. The Joint Resolution splits only 30
3 of 67 counties, compared to 46 in the current
4 map, and only splits 84 of a total of 411
5 cities in the state, compared to 170 on the
6 current map.

7 Just to put that in perspective, by
8 population and geography, you must split 29
9 counties. So splitting 30 counties is only one
10 above what is physically even possible.

11 Pursuant to federal and state law, this
12 proposed map preserves the existing
13 opportunities for racial and language
14 minorities in Florida to elect the candidate of
15 their choice. We believe that this map
16 actually creates new opportunities in certain
17 areas of the state. It does all of this while
18 also being significantly more compact than the
19 current map.

20 To be very frank, Mr. Chair and members of
21 the Committee, I am astounded as to how compact
22 the staff was able to get all 120 districts,
23 even most of the minority districts.

24 With that, Mr. Chairman, we are all
25 familiar with the Bill, and so I will turn it

1 over to you for amendments.

2 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Okay. Thank
3 you very much for the explanation.

4 Members, we are going to move right into
5 the amendatory process, so why don't we move on
6 to the first amendment.

7 Amendment number one, State House Map
8 9049, which is by Vice-Chair Precourt.
9 Representative Precourt, you are recognized to
10 explain your amendment, sir.

11 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
12 Mr. Chair.

13 Members, this amendment, which is also map
14 9049, I believe you have it in your packets, it
15 makes a number of changes to the base map. And
16 due to the detail that we have here, I am going
17 to go ahead and turn it over to staff to
18 provide a much more detailed presentation.

19 The guys who can run the computer like a
20 wizard, but overall, the amendment seeks to
21 make what you guys had as an already good
22 product even better.

23 Some of the changes resulted from staff
24 just going back and taking a second and a third
25 look at what they had already drawn, and, you

1 know, really it is more like a 20th and a 30th
2 look.

3 So we had them go back and take a second
4 and third look over the map, find other
5 improvements that could be made, and we also
6 got more comments from members of the public
7 and several Supervisors of Elections, as well
8 as local county and municipal officials. So
9 we've got a number of things that we considered
10 in making these changes and improvements.

11 In addition to several other things
12 though, I think you are going to see something
13 very impressive. The staff were able to
14 make -- reduce -- changes that reduces the
15 cities split from an already impressive only 84
16 down to 75. So that is something to pay close
17 attention to as we are going through this
18 presentation.

19 And with that, Mr. Takacs, can you go
20 ahead and take us through the changes
21 themselves?

22 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: You are
23 recognized, Mr. Takacs.

24 MR. TAKACS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 Members, in your packets, there are --

1 there's an amendment packet in each of your
2 binders. So if you want to take a look at
3 that --

4 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: And, members,
5 if you can, it is actually a separate packet,
6 if you pull it out, it's -- you got it, okay.

7 MR. TAKACS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 I am just going to walk through the
9 different areas of the map that are changes
10 between the map that was workshopped last week
11 and the amendment that Vice-Chair Precourt has
12 filed.

13 First we are going to look in Pinellas
14 County. I am going to zoom in here. We were
15 able to discover that the city -- the Town of
16 Indian Shores could be kept whole, all within
17 one district. You will see here that there is
18 the city there on the screen.

19 By just making a minor adjustment to the
20 boundaries of 66 and 69, all of the Town of
21 Indian Shores is brought into District 66.

22 Moving over to Brevard County, a similar
23 situation. As we were scoping through the map
24 and looking for different areas, different
25 cities and municipalities that could be kept

1 whole within the map, we discovered that both
2 the City of Palm Bay, which you see here on the
3 screen, as well as the City of Melbourne Beach,
4 could be kept whole.

5 You see this is actually the amendment
6 before you, and that is what is accomplished
7 here, both the City of Palm Bay and the City of
8 West Melbourne -- I'm sorry, Melbourne Beach
9 are whole within the two districts.

10 Moving further south into Miami-Dade
11 County, we were able to discover that the Town
12 of Medley could be kept whole within a
13 district.

14 The adjustment was made between Districts
15 103 and 110. You will see here -- there, that
16 is where the Town of Medley's boundaries are,
17 and you can see that now that is all brought
18 into District 103.

19 Staying in Miami-Dade County, the Town of
20 Sweetwater can also be kept whole within a
21 district. So the adjustment was made to
22 District 105 to include all of that city within
23 the district.

24 One of the other things that we were doing
25 as we were reviewing this map was to see if

1 there were ways to improve the way that
2 districts follow natural or geographic boundary
3 lines, and one of those examples in this
4 amendment is the difference -- the boundary
5 between Districts 100 and 107.

6 As you zoom in here, you will see that the
7 city boundary there kind of zigs and zags right
8 along U.S. 1, and there were some boundary
9 issues there where we were trying to pick up
10 pieces of that particular municipality, which
11 was already split between the two districts.

12 So what we did -- I will turn the city
13 boundaries off. As you can see, we just
14 straightened out that line to use U.S. 1, you
15 know, that geographic boundary line between the
16 two districts.

17 A similar concept in Volusia County
18 between Districts 26 and 27. There was a --
19 East Graves Avenue was used as the boundary
20 between the two districts here, and I will zoom
21 in and show you that here in just a moment.

22 And basically what we did was we
23 straightened out that line. It does affect two
24 people that are -- that were in that un- --
25 kind of that jagged edge that we had

1 previously, but, again, we have smoothed that
2 out between Districts 26 and 27, and you will
3 see here that's where that line is here. We
4 just straightened that line out, again, to
5 better follow the roadway.

6 As the Chairman said, thinking about
7 public testimony, I will move into Lee County.
8 We received a significant amount of testimony
9 from the folks of the Estero community in Lee
10 County requesting that they be kept whole.

11 As we had mentioned in the meeting last
12 week, that we believe that maybe with some
13 possible minor adjustments to the districts,
14 that could be achieved, and that's what's done
15 here.

16 You will see in District 76, which is the
17 yellow district here, this is the general area
18 of Estero, and as you can see, the lines were
19 adjusted to make Estero whole within that --
20 within that particular district.

21 I should also note that as we were looking
22 at Lee County as a whole, we made some changes
23 to District 78 as well. It still has all of
24 the City of Ft. Myers within its boundaries,
25 but we wanted to use the roadways as a better

1 boundary and geographic boundary between
2 Districts 78, 79, and 78 and 76. So that's
3 what that change is there.

4 Going back to the concept of keeping
5 cities whole, we took a hard look at Polk
6 County, and I'm going to turn the city lines
7 back on so that you can see.

8 When you look at the Bill that we
9 workshopped last week versus this amendment
10 that is before you today, we were able to
11 determine that four municipalities in Polk
12 County could be kept whole with some
13 adjustments between 39 and 41, as well as a
14 minor adjustment to 42.

15 The municipalities that are kept whole --
16 I will kind of zoom in here a little bit closer
17 so you can take a look. The cities that are
18 now kept whole is Auburndale. You can see they
19 are wholly within 39, Lake Alfred, which is
20 wholly within 41, Haines City, which is here,
21 that is wholly within 41, and then as I
22 mentioned, with a minor adjustment to 42, the
23 City of Frostproof is now wholly within that
24 district.

25 Moving up into Duval County, thinking

1 about the testimony that we reviewed last week,
2 we heard from some testimony that there was a
3 request to see if there were some districts
4 that could better follow the St. Johns River as
5 a use of a geographic boundary between the two
6 districts.

7 After last week's meeting, we took a look
8 at Duval County as a whole to see if that could
9 be achieved, and you will see here, with the
10 amendment, that it is. If you look between
11 Districts 15 and 16 now that the St. Johns
12 River is used as the boundary between the two
13 districts, as we adjusted the population
14 between those two districts, what we were also
15 able to discover was that we could improve the
16 compactness of 14 and 12, as you can see here
17 on the screen, and then also increase or
18 improve the functional compactness, thinking
19 about drive times, for the residents of
20 District 11, which is the green district here
21 that comes into Nassau County and into portions
22 of Duval. So that is, again, what the Duval
23 County change would look like.

24 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Mr. Takacs,
25 if you could, I think Mr. Kelly wanted to add

1 something to that.

2 MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3 Just to add to this, looking at District
4 13, which is right in the center of the county,
5 it has been a fairly compact seat in any of the
6 designs, but what we did notice in examining
7 this is that we had split several
8 neighborhoods.

9 So what we did was we adjusted a number of
10 the lines just to make sure that a neighborhood
11 is completely in one district or completely in
12 another. So we did some general cleanup to
13 District 13, which is also a majority-minority
14 seat. Just wanted to add that. Thank you,
15 Mr. Chair.

16 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you,
17 Mr. Kelly.

18 Mr. Takacs, you are recognized to
19 continue.

20 MR. TAKACS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 Moving south into Palm Beach County, when
22 we looked at Districts 81, 85 and 86, we saw
23 two things: One, that there was a possibility
24 for those districts to be drawn more compactly,
25 and also to bring in the unincorporated area of

1 the acreage to make that wholly within one
2 district.

3 So that is what this portion of the
4 amendment does here. The acreage area that I
5 am talking about. I will turn the city
6 boundaries off -- is in this general vicinity
7 here. It is kind of an inverted L-shape. So
8 what we did was kind of we smoothed this line
9 out here and then brought the line down here.

10 I should also mention that while doing so,
11 we were still able to keep the municipalities
12 of Wellington, Loxahatchee Groves and Royal
13 Palm Beach wholly within 86 as a part of that
14 change. That was not -- those municipalities
15 were not affected in this amendment. They were
16 always in 86 to begin with.

17 I am going to move back up. We received
18 some comments from various Supervisors of
19 Elections' office. You know, as we mentioned
20 last week, one of those was from the Clay
21 County Supervisor's Office. I am going to zoom
22 in here real close. They asked that one census
23 block that was on the boundary between
24 Districts 18 and 19 be moved into District 19.

25 I am going to do my best to zoom in on

1 that particular census block so you can see
2 what we're talking about. They requested that
3 that be done so that the boundaries line up
4 with the Camp Blanding Florida National Guard
5 base. So that is done here in this amendment.

6 And if you will bear with me here, I will
7 work to find that -- that particular census
8 block. It affects no population, it was along
9 a roadway, and actually what we did was we
10 actually brought in the census block that was a
11 very small census block on top of the one they
12 asked so that it would create a squared-off, 90
13 degree angle for that roadway.

14 I am going to go over to Leon County now.
15 As we had mentioned last week, the Supervisor
16 of Elections' Office in that county asked us
17 for a series of changes between the boundaries
18 of Districts 8 and 9. You can see them here.

19 In the series of requests that they gave
20 us, there were three requests that they asked
21 in whole, and their second request was actually
22 a two-part request.

23 What we had found is we had looked at
24 making all three of those changes, that the
25 black -- the black voting age population for

1 District 8, which is currently a
2 majority-minority black district, would
3 actually have dropped to 49.99 percent, taking
4 away that majority-minority status for that
5 particular district.

6 So what we did was we made all of the
7 changes possible to preserve that
8 majority-minority district and also following
9 the request of the Supervisor of Elections. So
10 of the three requests, we essentially honored
11 two and a half of those requests.

12 And lastly, Mr. Chairman, ending at the
13 beginning, the Escambia County Supervisor of
14 Elections' Office asked us to take a look at
15 the boundary between Districts 1 and 2 and how
16 they interacted with the city boundary of
17 Pensacola.

18 I am going to zoom in here so you can take
19 a look at what we did. What we did was in this
20 region here, we initially had used, I believe,
21 this roadway here where my mouse is as the
22 boundary in this particular area of the two
23 districts, and they requested that we drop that
24 down so that it would match up with the City of
25 Pensacola's line, and so we did that in

1 accordance to their request.

2 And, Mr. Chairman, that is the amendment.

3 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
4 very much, Mr. Takacs.

5 Members, are there any questions on the
6 amendment? I think we had a question from
7 Representative Bernard. You are recognized,
8 sir.

9 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: Thank you,
10 Mr. Chair.

11 Jeff, going back to -- in Palm Beach
12 County, District 85 and 86, it appears to me
13 that initially you had the community of Century
14 Village in -- I think in District 85, and I
15 don't know where it is at now, if it's been
16 shifted to District 86, or is it still in 85?

17 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: You are
18 recognized.

19 MR. TAKACS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 Let me get to that area on the map and we
21 can -- we can see. Thinking about the
22 amendment, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that --
23 and I will zoom in here a little bit closer,
24 Representative Bernard.

25 The only area that was affected in 85 is

1 this area here, and then when you look to 86 to
2 make up for the population in order to make the
3 districts more compact, that came from this
4 area here. So I don't know if you are able to
5 see, if that shows you enough visually to
6 answer your question.

7 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: Okay. So is it
8 in 86 now? I just want to know which one --

9 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: I think what
10 he is saying, Representative Bernard, is that
11 the swap of population was between those two
12 districts of 85 and 86.

13 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: Thank you very
14 much, Mr. Chair.

15 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Any other
16 questions, members, in regard -- Representative
17 Jones, you are recognized.

18 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Thank you,
19 Mr. Chairman, and I know I heard you state what
20 the breakdown was in terms of the number of
21 cities and the difference with what this
22 amendment made. Can you tell us what that
23 split count is?

24 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: You are
25 recognized.

1 MR. TAKACS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 After the amendment, there would be 75
3 Florida cities that are split. Prior to this
4 amendment, it was 84.

5 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
6 very much. Any other questions, members?

7 Okay, seeing none, is there any public
8 testimony on the amendment? Any public
9 testimony on this amendment?

10 Okay. Members, any debate on the
11 amendment?

12 Seeing no debate, Representative Precourt,
13 you are recognized to close on the amendment.

14 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
15 Mr. Chair, and just in closing, I want to draw
16 everyone's attention to the level of detail in
17 tightening this up and the effort that staff
18 put into this.

19 It was -- they were tremendously helpful,
20 and you can see how difficult it is and how
21 challenging to get this just right. So thank
22 you, Mr. Chair, for tasking us with this.

23 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you.
24 And with that, if the administrative assistant
25 would please call the roll.

1 THE CLERK: Chair Weatherford?
2 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Yes.
3 THE CLERK: Representative Adkins?
4 REPRESENTATIVE ADKINS: Yes.
5 THE CLERK: Bernard?
6 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: No.
7 THE CLERK: Chestnut?
8 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: No.
9 THE CLERK: Dorworth?
10 REPRESENTATIVE DORWORTH: Yes.
11 THE CLERK: Eisnaugle?
12 REPRESENTATIVE EISNAUGLE: Yes.
13 THE CLERK: Fresen?
14 REPRESENTATIVE FRESEN: Yes.
15 THE CLERK: Frishe?
16 REPRESENTATIVE FRISHE: Yes.
17 THE CLERK: Holder?
18 REPRESENTATIVE HOLDER: Yes.
19 THE CLERK: Horner?
20 REPRESENTATIVE HORNER: Yes.
21 THE CLERK: Hukill?
22 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: Yes.
23 THE CLERK: Jenne?
24 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: No.
25 THE CLERK: Jones?

1 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.

2 THE CLERK: Kiar?

3 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: No.

4 THE CLERK: Legg?

5 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Yes.

6 THE CLERK: Nehr?

7 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: Yes.

8 THE CLERK: Precourt?

9 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Rogers?

11 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.

12 THE CLERK: Rouson?

13 REPRESENTATIVE ROUSON: No.

14 THE CLERK: Schenck?

15 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: Yes.

16 THE CLERK: Workman?

17 REPRESENTATIVE WORKMAN: Yes.

18 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Show the

19 amendment passes.

20 Members, at this time, I am going to turn

21 the gavel over to Vice-Chair so that I can

22 explain the next amendment.

23 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,

24 Mr. Chair. Okay. You are recognized to

25 explain the next amendment.

1 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
2 very much.

3 Members, probably a little uncustomary, if
4 that is even a word, for the Chairman of the
5 Committee to offer an amendment, but I thought
6 it was important.

7 The League of Women Voters and many
8 organizations have followed this process since
9 the very beginning. They have traveled around
10 the state with us as we did public hearings and
11 have been, frankly, a part of this throughout
12 from the very first day this committee met.

13 And so when they asked us to consider a
14 map that they had taken the time to draw, I
15 thought that it would be perfectly appropriate
16 for this committee to do so, and so I offered
17 it because the workshop process had been done,
18 we are now into the amendatory process.

19 So the only way essentially to consider it
20 would be to file it as an amendment, and I
21 thought that that would be the appropriate
22 thing to do.

23 We have worked extremely hard to make this
24 process a no-surprises process. We have made
25 this, I believe, to be very open, very

1 transparent. I think we have followed the
2 letter to the law up until the very end. And I
3 have to say I am a little bit disappointed that
4 the League has chosen not to speak, and I want
5 to just one more time before I go into the
6 explanation of the map, I know there are
7 members of the representative of the League of
8 Women Voters that are here, Mr. Wilcox, who
9 serves as their lobbyist.

10 Mr. Wilcox, we would love to have you come
11 and express any of your thoughts on this map.
12 I know y'all worked hard on it. We have had
13 many others express thoughts, and just one more
14 time we would love to give you a chance to do
15 that or share any words with the Committee.
16 Not prepared to do that? Okay.

17 Well, I think the citizens of Florida
18 deserve better than a 12-page letter the night
19 before the Committee meets, and I think the
20 citizens of Florida deserve better than a map
21 proposed to this Committee two and a half days
22 before we take a vote.

23 We put our maps out on December 6th,
24 members, we put all of our maps out on
25 December 6th. We have been talking about them

1 for six or eight weeks. Any amendments could
2 be filed, any comments could be made. We've
3 made adjustments to the maps based on
4 suggestions from members of this Committee and
5 members of the public.

6 We have made adjustments based on what we
7 thought to make the map more legally compliant.
8 And, frankly, I find it disappointing that
9 anyone would suggest first calling our maps --
10 looking at them in a derogatory manner saying
11 that they don't follow the letter of the law,
12 and then refusing to stand before us and
13 explain to us how theirs does, and I am very
14 disappointed by that.

15 But, Mr. Chairman, since we don't have
16 members to speak on that, I think that it is a
17 frankly unfortunate political and more likely
18 probably a legal stunt that this is taking, and
19 I frankly find it offensive personally how
20 hard -- given how hard this Committee and given
21 how hard this Chamber has worked to try to make
22 this process fair and open.

23 And with that, that is my explanation of
24 the amendment.

25 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,

1 Representative Weatherford.

2 Members, are there any questions of the
3 Representative on the amendment?

4 Seeing no questions, is there any public
5 testimony on this amendment? Second chance,
6 another bite at the apple.

7 Seeing no public testimony, members, we
8 are moving right into debate. Is there anyone
9 that wishes to debate on this amendment?

10 Representative Eisnaugle, you are
11 recognized in debate.

12 REPRESENTATIVE EISNAUGLE: Thank you,
13 Mr. Vice-Chairman. I will keep it brief.

14 I view this amendment and the letter that
15 I have had a chance to review, the 12-page
16 letter, as nothing more than pre-textual. The
17 letter states that the House map is plainly
18 drawn to favor incumbents. It has an entire
19 section discussing that.

20 I was incredibly disappointed when I read
21 the letter, because while it mentions several
22 members of the Legislature and several
23 districts who are not drawn into the same
24 district, it utterly fails to discuss and
25 adequately discuss those members who are drawn

1 into the same district as other members.

2 And, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it -- you know, I
3 was shocked by that, frankly, because
4 personally I know that there are members drawn
5 into the same district as other members.

6 Frankly, sir, you and I are drawn into the
7 same district in this map, and yet this letter
8 fails to even put it in a footnote. I find it
9 disingenuous, I find the amendment
10 disingenuous, and, Mr. Chairman, I am also
11 offended by it, and I encourage the Committee
12 to reject this amendment.

13 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
14 Representative Eisnaugle.

15 Further debate on the amendment?
16 Representative Workman.

17 REPRESENTATIVE WORKMAN: I was going to
18 speak, but Eric has chinned me up, and I did
19 review the map and, you know, they try to do
20 this nesting thing that flies in the face of
21 our minority districts.

22 They create a map that is going to be
23 difficult to get Hispanics elected in
24 predominantly Hispanic areas, and I find it
25 insulting, because we spent so much time early

1 making maps that would not degrade their right
2 to choose, to elect a person of their choice,
3 and these maps tend to -- well, not tend to --
4 seem to fly in the face of that basic tenet
5 that we put together.

6 It reduces the black. I can go on and on
7 with what it reduces in regards to our minority
8 populations, but I won't. So I certainly want
9 to say that I am in favor of voting this map
10 down loudly.

11 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
12 Representative Workman.

13 Further debate? I think we have a
14 question or debate from Representative Frishe.
15 You are recognized.

16 REPRESENTATIVE FRISHE: It's kind of a --
17 thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is kind of a
18 question. I thought we were hearing from the
19 League of Women Voters. Clearly we are hearing
20 from the Audubon Society, because we are
21 talking about nesting now, not redistricting.

22 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you for
23 that comment, Representation Frishe.

24 Now we will move to Representative Nehr.
25 You are recognized in debate.

1 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: Thank you,
2 Mr. Chair.

3 You know, it is very inherent in this
4 process that we hear from people and
5 organizations regarding the maps and how --
6 suggestions on how to improve those maps.

7 We have heard many suggestions over the
8 course of many months that we have gone around;
9 however, it is always consistent in those cases
10 that the citizens and the groups took the time
11 to explain all of their reasonings behind the
12 suggestions and the changes.

13 And, likewise, our own staff made many
14 recommendations, and in addition, explained
15 them fully to everyone how they affected the
16 legality of the maps.

17 Everything I have heard and seen when I
18 looked at the maps and the letter I have read
19 does not explain anything. The League does not
20 explain why they say our maps are poorly drawn,
21 they don't explain why theirs are better.

22 Now, I have no idea why they have done
23 that, why they refuse to come out and explain
24 anything. It is -- as far as I am concerned, I
25 don't see any reason why any of us could vote

1 in favor of the League's maps today, and I
2 suggest that everyone vote this amendment down.

3 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
4 Representative Nehr.

5 Further debate on the issue?
6 Representative Julien, you are recognized.

7 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: Bernard.

8 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Bernard, sorry.

9 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: We look alike.
10 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Justice is
12 blind.

13 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: Thank you,
14 Mr. Chair.

15 At this time, I am going to vote against
16 the map since we received -- I think it was
17 filed on Monday, and I haven't had the chance
18 to review the map fully to understand the
19 impact of the map. So at this time, I will
20 vote against the map.

21 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
22 Representative Bernard.

23 Representative Horner, you are recognized
24 in debate.

25 REPRESENTATIVE HORNER: Thank you,

1 Mr. Chairman.

2 I've spent a little bit of time looking at
3 the subcommittee product, looking at the
4 League's map, and the thing that strikes me is
5 the exceptional job that the subcommittee did
6 and the staff has done in using whole counties
7 in putting these districts together, or keeping
8 districts entirely within a county. To be only
9 one over your -- the mathematical possibility
10 is, frankly, amazing.

11 It looks to me the League gave precedence
12 to this nesting concept and felt that nesting,
13 which is not mentioned anywhere in the
14 Constitution, was somehow more important than
15 preserving political boundaries, and
16 specifically county boundaries.

17 And we spent all summer hearing from folks
18 that it was important to preserve these county
19 boundaries, we needed to go by Amendment 5. So
20 just looking at it on its face, our maps have
21 fewer county splits and they are more compact.
22 So it is an easy choice for me, and I will be
23 voting down this amendment.

24 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
25 Representative Horner.

1 Further debate?

2 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: Yes.

3 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Representative
4 Hukill, you are recognized in debate.

5 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: Thank you,
6 Mr. Chairman.

7 I have to reiterate what some people have
8 said. We did spend a lot of time, many members
9 traveled throughout the state this year, so
10 that we could hear from so many people in very
11 different parts of the states and how they felt
12 that we should be completing this process.

13 And yet when I look at this amendment and
14 some of these districts, and they're areas that
15 we visited, which you look at Duval County and
16 you look at Polk and the Space Coast and
17 southwest Florida, I can't even find the words
18 to describe some of these districts.

19 And I think that if we had the
20 opportunity, I know we don't, but if we had the
21 opportunity to go back face-to-face and visit
22 some of these areas, that at the very least,
23 the people we spoke to would be extremely upset
24 and probably would be very vocal and -- about
25 these particular types of districts.

1 I do want to compliment the members of the
2 public who did spent an awful lot of time
3 devising their maps and giving us comments so
4 that we could understand their thinking and how
5 they arrived at their feeling about the maps
6 and the maps that they created, and I think
7 that it is a compliment to the many people who
8 did take the time to explain it to us, because
9 it is very important to us, and that is -- and
10 even more important today as we sit here and
11 the League refuses to explain how they
12 developed their districts and what their
13 process and what their thought process was.

14 So I do once again want to compliment the
15 subcommittees and also this Committee, and I
16 would vote not in favor of this amendment.

17 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
18 Representative Hukill.

19 Further debate? Representative Dorworth,
20 you are recognized in debate.

21 REPRESENTATIVE DORWORTH: Thank you,
22 Mr. Chairman. Like you, the allergies in town
23 can get to me a little bit, so forgive my -- my
24 voice is a little weak today.

25 But I do find some irony that the

1 organization whose battle cry throughout the
2 legislative hearings on redistricting was "Show
3 us the maps," showed us the maps about 60 hours
4 before we were expected to vote on the maps.

5 When you, Mr. Chairman, and the Chairman
6 in the Senate, Senator Gaetz, made a
7 conscientious decision for us to travel
8 throughout the state, hold hearings and to have
9 the most transparent process certainly in the
10 history of redistricting in the state of
11 Florida, and possibly in this country, by
12 offering an open-source software so that people
13 could see the programming tools that we use,
14 they made the conscientious decision to bring a
15 map, to not share with us who authored that
16 map.

17 We have no idea who did, we don't know
18 what computers were used for it, we don't know
19 if they were operatives for one particular
20 political party, we don't know anything about
21 it. And today we as a deliberative body are
22 being asked to vote on them. We are not able
23 to ask any questions.

24 And the juxtaposition to me of our
25 committee staff standing before you, week after

1 week, offering amendments and showing why we
2 were doing it, improving compactness, showing
3 fewer city splits, fewer county splits,
4 adhering to all the standards set forth by
5 Amendments 5 and 6 in our Constitution were
6 brought there, and instead what we see today is
7 a map, a half-hearted explanation and a
8 steadfast refusal to address it all.

9 So I think it is pretty obvious which way
10 I am leaning on that, but I think I would be
11 very much opposed to doing it. Thank you.

12 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
13 Representative Dorworth.

14 Representative Legg, I believe you wanted
15 to debate.

16 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Thank you,
17 Mr. Chair.

18 You know, going throughout the state and
19 the public hearings, I have attended over half
20 of them, and one of the -- kind of the
21 nomenclature that was said is dealing with
22 compactness, and many of the folks and mainly
23 from the League of Women Voters said when they
24 said, you know, when we asked them what was
25 their definition of "compactness," and they

1 says, "Well, we'll know it when we see it," you
2 know.

3 And I looked at -- I look at the map up
4 there and I look at our region, or my region,
5 in particular, the Tampa Bay region over there,
6 and if that is the definition -- their
7 definition of "compactness" compared to our --
8 the map that's been proposed, I would be
9 shocked and amazed.

10 My three-year-old could draw something a
11 little bit more compact than that. That is
12 anything but compact. I find it is kind of
13 insulting to those many folks that went out
14 there and spoke at the public hearings and the
15 definition of "compactness," you know.

16 And I will just have to also say, you
17 know, for once, I am going to enjoy voting
18 against Chair Weatherford for -- I think it's
19 the first time I've ever done that.

20 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: I am sure he is
21 happy that we could tee this up for you.

22 Further debate, anyone? Any further
23 debate? Okay. Seeing no further debate,
24 Representative -- Chair Weatherford, you are
25 recognized to close on your amendment.

1 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
2 very much, Chairman.

3 Before I close, I know we have had a
4 chance to hear from all the members of the
5 Committee, but I do think that there are
6 probably some -- some legal issues and maybe
7 some details that I am probably not equipped to
8 answer to close out this debate and make sure
9 that everyone has all the information before we
10 take a vote.

11 So I would like to just very briefly, as
12 part of my close, ask staff and our legal team
13 to walk us through some of the details that are
14 in this map that I think need to be
15 transparently discussed before we take a vote.
16 So I would like to transfer that over to Mr.
17 Kelly.

18 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: You are
19 recognized, Mr. Kelly.

20 MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
21 members, and Mr. Chair, pursuant to your
22 request, in the time that we were afforded when
23 the letter was received last night.

24 We did -- as staff, we did a cursory
25 review of the letter, again, to the extent of

1 time we had. Right now, Mr. Fairbrother is
2 passing out a copy of the letter to any of the
3 members who have yet to see it.

4 There were -- we do note some statements
5 made in the letter that are, in fact, not
6 correct, and in other cases are revealing in
7 terms of this process and the legal issues
8 involved in this process.

9 First, page one of the letter, the League
10 and others state that their maps contain more
11 whole counties and more whole cities than do
12 the Legislature's proposed maps.

13 However, looking at the tables provided on
14 pages three to four, their own data illustrates
15 that this is not the case. In terms of county
16 splits -- Mr. Takacs has put on the screen a
17 chart for you.

18 In terms of county splits, the House map
19 proposed, the Precourt amendment that was just
20 adopted, the House map only splits 30 counties,
21 the League map splits 32.

22 In terms of -- and just to -- this covers
23 the Congressional map briefly as well. In
24 terms of the Congressional map, the amendment
25 that is being considered later today would

1 split 21 counties. The League amendment would
2 split 22. Not a great difference, but,
3 nonetheless, the statement on page one of the
4 document is inaccurate.

5 In terms of municipal splits, as you can
6 see on the screen, in terms of the State House
7 map, the Precourt amendment brings the city
8 split total down to 75. The League amendment
9 is at 70. Out of Florida's 411 municipalities,
10 there's a difference of five.

11 Note, in terms of the document that was --
12 the letter that was provided by the League,
13 they are stating that there are over 1,000
14 cities in the state of Florida.

15 Not sure whether it was an intentional or
16 unintentional inaccuracy, but at the time of
17 the 2010 census, there were 411 municipalities,
18 incorporated municipalities, in the state. It
19 is likely that they are including data related
20 to unincorporated communities, but,
21 nonetheless, the data in the letter is not
22 accurate.

23 There are a very similar number of
24 municipal splits in the State House map being
25 proposed by the House and the map being

1 proposed by the League.

2 In terms of the Congressional map, again,
3 looking at the screen, the Precourt amendment
4 that you will be looking at later today brings
5 the total number of city splits in the House's
6 proposal down to 27. The League's proposal is
7 at 36.

8 Moving on in the document, page eight of
9 the League's letter state that the districts
10 are very similar to the 2002 districts, and
11 that the new districts contain almost
12 60 percent of their old constituencies.

13 We found that 52 of the 120 districts, so
14 less than half, shared that 60 percent or
15 greater population of a district from the 2002
16 map. However, when you factor in that many of
17 the minority districts by law will result in
18 sharing similar constituencies, this statistic
19 turns out to be relatively misleading in terms
20 of its use and the actual compliance with the
21 law.

22 On page nine of the letter, the League
23 references -- just, again, to a very specific
24 example -- the League references the division
25 between the districts that would be represented

1 by Representative Adkins and Representative
2 Renuart, and that line -- according to what the
3 League has found is that that line is a short
4 distance from Representative Renuart's
5 residence.

6 What is failed to be mentioned in the
7 letter is that that division is the St.
8 Johns/Duval County line. The line was used in
9 adherence to following county boundary lines.
10 What is also failed to be mentioned in the
11 letter is that the League's submission uses the
12 same line in their map.

13 By implication, the particular accusation
14 and others also brings into question -- well,
15 actually, illustrates that the League's data
16 includes the residence of the members, at least
17 some of the members of the Legislature.

18 In addition to that, by using the same
19 line, the question then does come up, did the
20 League intend to favor Representative Renuart
21 in the drawing of their map.

22 At the very end, page 11 of the letter,
23 the League acknowledges that the proposed State
24 House map by the House is more compact than
25 their proposed State House map. The assertion

1 that is made following is that this is the
2 result of due to the House's proposed map not
3 being as adherent to political and geographical
4 boundary lines.

5 However, as was just mentioned in the
6 League's own data tables on pages three to four
7 of the document, they actually show that the
8 House -- Jeff, if you could go back to that
9 visual -- they actually show that the House
10 used county lines slightly more frequently than
11 the League did, and in addition, nothing the
12 correction that we noted earlier about city
13 splits, the House used -- the House split fewer
14 cities in the Congressional map, the League
15 split fewer cities in the State House map, but
16 both numbers are very comparable, and in every
17 case, all the numbers on the screen are a
18 significant departure from the existing maps.

19 Those numbers being relatively equal or
20 similar in terms of county splits and city
21 splits, the data then just does come back to
22 point that the State House proposed map by the
23 House is significantly more compact than the
24 proposed amendment.

25 That is it, Mr. Chair, in examining the

1 letter. The letter did not actually address
2 your questions about who drew the map, how the
3 lines were picked. The letter did note that
4 the lines were picked based on corresponding
5 with the League's proposed State Senate map,
6 but in that case, it didn't note how those
7 lines were picked for that map, nor were there
8 any questions answered regarding the
9 methodology of drawing districts in a manner
10 which does seem to subordinate compactness in
11 an irregular fashion compared to other
12 standards.

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair, that is our
14 analysis.

15 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you, Mr.
16 Kelly, for that very thorough analysis in such
17 a short time frame, I might add. Who knows
18 when you have a little bit more time to go
19 through this and dig further?

20 Chair Weatherford, are you finished with
21 your close?

22 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Well, I just
23 -- I wanted to give the opportunity -- we have
24 members of our legal team here. Just very
25 briefly, if there's anything that we've missed

1 or that the Committee needs to be aware of
2 before we take a vote, I would like to give
3 them that opportunity, Mr. Meros.

4 MR. MEROS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
5 members. I will be brief, but there are some
6 very important legal matters to consider here.

7 If this map had been proposed on
8 December 6th or any day after that, I would
9 have advised this Committee that it violates
10 the amendments -- it violates Amendment 5, it
11 violates the Voting Rights Act, and I will be
12 brief about some portions of it, but I would
13 like Mr. DeGrande to talk about the Hispanic
14 districts in south Florida, because that is a
15 particularly egregious example of the
16 violations of law here.

17 I would like to talk about the issue of
18 compactness and just go directly into that, and
19 Mr. Takacs has some districts that I would like
20 to compare.

21 Now, compactness has all different sorts
22 of mathematical measurements, but one of the
23 key elements of compactness is the visual
24 element, and as Dr. Bernie Grothman said, whose
25 opinion about how to assess minority Voting

1 Rights Act was accepted by the U.S. Supreme
2 Court in the Jingles case.

3 Dr. Grothman says the best way to look at
4 compactness is the intraocular test, and that
5 is if it leaps out at you and hits you between
6 the eyes, you know it isn't compact. And so
7 let's look at some of these districts.

8 On the left is the House map in the Duval
9 County area, which, by the way, includes two
10 majority-minority African-American seats,
11 which, nonetheless, are amazingly compact,
12 particularly as against 2002. Look at District
13 2 on the right. I don't know how you would
14 describe that.

15 I can tell you that I am sure Chair Legg's
16 three-year-old could do a better job than that
17 in drawing that map. That is not a
18 majority-minority district. That is -- that is
19 a regular district with no explanation
20 whatsoever as to how that could be compact.
21 And if I am correct, and Jeff will correct me
22 if I am wrong, that crosses the St. Johns River
23 in an area where there is no bridge. So bring
24 your boat if you want to be in that district.

25 Going down further south to the next area,

1 and particularly looking at the Districts 54,
2 55, 84, on the House map, and then compare that
3 with District 78. One of the things you always
4 worry about in compactness measures is whether
5 there is a loop-around or a horseshoe or
6 something like that surrounding a district.
7 Again, there are no Section 2 or legal
8 requirements to do so. Seventy-eight is
9 unprotected and absolutely uncompact.

10 Going a little further south from there to
11 the Pasco County area, right, and look at --
12 look at what the House did on the left, compact
13 districts within the county, and look at the
14 jagged edges and the knife stabs along the
15 county for no other legal reason, no legal
16 compulsion.

17 Going further south to District -- to the
18 areas of District 78 and District 76 on the
19 House map, and one might not believe that that
20 -- that District 68 includes something north of
21 the number and south, but, again, that is a
22 district. I don't know what you would call it,
23 it is not a majority-minority district. It has
24 appendages, it has jagged edges.

25 It has all of the things that if this

1 House had done in maps, you would have been
2 excoriated for doing. You cannot explain this
3 by any common sense measurement without someone
4 accusing you of having a political reason to do
5 so.

6 The only other thing I will say, again,
7 because I do need to be brief, the notion of
8 nesting is not in and of itself a nefarious
9 concept, but the first thing to notice, it is
10 not in Amendment 5.

11 If the House, again, had interposed a
12 concept that was not in Amendment 5, you would
13 have been lambasted from the beginning about
14 doing so.

15 Another thing about nesting, beware, there
16 are studies, including the University of
17 California study, that says that nesting makes
18 it much more difficult to preserve minority
19 voting rights, it makes it much more difficult
20 to preserve county and other geographical
21 boundaries.

22 And when I think about nesting in a common
23 sense way, if you have a Senate district and
24 three House districts, ask yourself, can a
25 citizen who wants to become a Legislator, who

1 is not a Legislator, win in the House or the
2 Senate when you have three House members vying
3 for a Senate seat who are already in the area
4 and have name ID, can citizen Legislator win
5 that Senate district? I don't think so.

6 Think about a Senator coming into the
7 House. Can a Senator who represents that
8 entire area be beaten by a citizen Legislator
9 in an area by virtue of nesting? I don't think
10 so. I cannot imagine that this House would
11 have been applauded for a concept that might
12 have the effect of incumbency protection.

13 So with that, I would ask if Mr. DeGrande
14 can talk briefly about south Florida.

15 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Mr. DeGrande, you
16 are recognized.

17 MR. DEGRANDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18 Good morning, members.

19 If I may, we have significant concerns
20 that in south Florida, the districts that were
21 crafted will not only violate the Federal
22 Voting Rights Act, but would also violate the
23 provisions of Tier 1 of Amendment 5.

24 In fact, this plan would take you probably
25 to a place prior to pre-1992 redistricting.

1 In the late 1980s, when I was elected to
2 the House of Representatives and was privileged
3 to sit at that table, we had seven
4 majority-minority Hispanic seats. After the
5 1992 redistricting, as of the 1994 election, I
6 believe, there were ten performing
7 majority-minority Hispanic seats. The 2002
8 plan created 11, and this plan, in my analysis,
9 would take it to, at best, nine.

10 Now, you see some of the districts that
11 look in their face to be more than 50 percent
12 VAP. Let me walk you through some of the
13 issues that exist there.

14 For Hispanic districts, you normally want
15 to have anywhere from minimum, bare minimum,
16 55, but better, 60 percent Hispanic VAP,
17 because you have to factor in for the low
18 citizenship rate, registration rate, et cetera,
19 and make sure that those districts perform.

20 This plan has elements of both cracking
21 and packing to defeat the rights of minorities
22 to elect candidates of choice. You see three
23 districts in Miami-Dade County that are
24 Hispanic districts that are over 90 percent
25 Hispanic, and then you see some 50 some percent

1 districts, and some of them are adjacent to
2 each other and it makes you wonder why they
3 weren't balanced.

4 If you look, for example, at District 107,
5 that is 55 percent Hispanic VAP. It is
6 adjacent to District 117, which is at 90.6
7 percent VAP. It is adjacent to District 118,
8 which is 87.9 percent VAP. It is adjacent to
9 108, which is 81 percent VAP. Now, that
10 district, which is 107, only 55 percent
11 Hispanic VAP, is actually only 46 percent
12 Hispanic registered voters.

13 Now, we have looked at one particular race
14 that was recent to see how these districts may
15 have performed. We looked at the
16 Rubio/Meek/Crist Senate race. In this
17 district, Senator Rubio would have gotten
18 elected, and Senator Rubio was overwhelmingly
19 the Hispanic candidate of choice, but only
20 because he was also in that district the white,
21 non-Hispanic candidate of choice.

22 So what it tells you is that's more of a,
23 at best, coalition district, but not a true
24 majority-minority Hispanic district.

25 We look now at District 106, which is

1 53 percent Hispanic VAP. It is adjacent to
2 District 108, which is 81 percent. In the
3 proposed League of Women Voters district map,
4 106 has an actual percentage of Hispanic
5 registered voters of only 37 percent.

6 Now, District 120, which is 50.67 Hispanic
7 VAP, neighbors District 118 at 87.9, District
8 119 at 91 percent. The actual percentage of
9 Hispanic registered voters in that district is
10 only 40 percent.

11 Now, again, we looked at the
12 Rubio/Meek/Crist race. That district would
13 also have elected Senator Rubio, who was
14 clearly the Hispanic candidate of choice, but
15 also because the non-Hispanic white candidate
16 -- he was the non-Hispanic white candidate of
17 choice in that election. Again, indicates
18 that, at best, it would be a coalition
19 district, not truly a majority-minority
20 District.

21 District 115, which is 51.37 percent
22 Hispanic VAP, is in proximity of District 114
23 at 82.8, to District 117 at 90.6. Now, this
24 district has an actual percentage of Hispanic
25 registered voters of only 33 percent.

1 Now, again looking at that Rubio race,
2 this district would not have favored Senator
3 Rubio, because although he was clearly the
4 Hispanic candidate of choice, in that
5 particular district, he was not the white,
6 non-Hispanic candidate of choice. And that
7 illustrates the problems with that district
8 where Hispanics do not have an equal
9 opportunity to elect a candidate of choice.

10 I could go very briefly, if you want, into
11 some of the African-American districts. In my
12 opinion, the League of Women Voters' map
13 contains only one majority black district
14 predominantly within Miami-Dade County. That
15 is District 98, and that District is a bare
16 minimum 51 percent in black voter registration.

17 The League of Women Voters proposed
18 Districts 99, 101 and 102 are retrogressed back
19 to 49 percent black registration, 45 percent
20 black registration and 46 percent black
21 registration, respectively.

22 In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the map
23 suffers from both cracking and packing. There
24 is clearly evidence in Miami-Dade County that
25 the three prongs of Jingles are met. Most

1 recently, there was also a study regarding
2 polarized voting in Miami-Dade County to craft
3 their redistricting plan, which certainly
4 indicates, based on that analysis and data,
5 that the three prongs of Jingles are met in
6 Miami-Dade County.

7 And, therefore, a conscious effort to
8 dilute minority strength in some districts, and
9 at the same time, pack minorities in another
10 district to diminish the opportunity to create
11 effective adjoining districts I believe would
12 violate the Voting Rights Act and certainly
13 violates Tier 1 of Amendment 5. Thank you,
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
16 Mr. DeGrande.

17 Chairman Weatherford, back to you.

18 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you,
19 Mr. Chairman.

20 I want to apologize to the Committee and
21 to the members who are here for the longest
22 close in history, but I think it was necessary,
23 and I am not going to drag this out much
24 longer, but I will just say that the integrity
25 of this process and the manner in which this

1 process has gone forward for the last eight
2 months is very important to this Committee, and
3 not just important to me, but the fact that we
4 are protecting the integrity of this process.

5 This is the first time that the
6 Legislature, and particularly the House, has
7 had a chance to pass maps with new
8 constitutional standards. So we are setting
9 a -- we are setting a course for how future
10 Legislators and how future members of this
11 Chamber will handle the redistricting process,
12 and that is an important thing, it is bigger
13 than this map, it is bigger than today.

14 And so I believe it is incumbent on me and
15 on us to protect the integrity of that process.
16 A lot of people predicted there would be a
17 January or February surprise from the House.
18 When we first put out our maps and people
19 recognized the amount of incumbents that would
20 be running against each other, many members
21 within this room did not believe these were
22 going to be the real maps.

23 They thought surely members would not draw
24 maps that would take themselves out of their
25 districts. Who would do that? They thought

1 surely there will be some January surprise or
2 February surprise that will come into the
3 process and will save everyone.

4 Little did we know that not only were we
5 going to stay the course and do what we said we
6 were going to do since March, but that the
7 January surprise would come from the very
8 organization that told us that they didn't
9 think that we would be transparent or open or
10 that we would follow the law.

11 And so the January surprises come from
12 them, and to -- for anyone to say -- and this
13 is what I took most issue with in that
14 letter -- for anyone to say that any type of
15 political and/or incumbent protection was
16 considered in this map is just wrong.

17 There is over -- according to accounts
18 from the media, not me, one out of every three
19 members who sits on that floor with us does not
20 live in their district or is paired with
21 someone else, one out of every three.

22 I would challenge any member of this
23 Committee to go find any state in the United
24 States of America that was not issued a court
25 order that has ever drawn out a third of their

1 membership, a third.

2 So, with that, I am going to read you a
3 quote that I heard from the League by their
4 Chair just a few months ago that said, "We
5 remain concerned that the citizens will have
6 minimal time to give substantive comment on the
7 real maps being concerned by the Legislature --
8 being proposed by the Legislature." We have
9 given citizens plenty of time to consider our
10 maps. They have given the citizens none.

11 And for that, members, for the integrity
12 of this process, I would ask that you vote down
13 this amendment. I never thought I would ask
14 members to vote against my amendment, but in
15 this case, I will, and help us protect the
16 integrity of this process.

17 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
19 Chairman Weatherford. Members, Chairman
20 Weatherford having closed on the amendment --
21 procedurally, remember, we are voting on the
22 League of Women Voters Weatherford amendment
23 right now.

24 We will get back to voting on the
25 underlying Bill in a minute, but with that

1 closed, Katie, will you please call the roll on
2 this amendment?

3 THE CLERK: Chair Weatherford?

4 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: No.

5 THE CLERK: Representative Adkins?

6 REPRESENTATIVE ADKINS: No.

7 THE CLERK: Representative Bernard?

8 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: No.

9 THE CLERK: Chestnut?

10 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: No.

11 THE CLERK: Dorworth?

12 REPRESENTATIVE DORWORTH: No.

13 THE CLERK: Eisnaugle?

14 REPRESENTATIVE EISNAUGLE: No.

15 THE CLERK: Fresen?

16 REPRESENTATIVE FRESEN: No.

17 THE CLERK: Frishe?

18 REPRESENTATIVE FRISHE: No.

19 THE CLERK: Holder?

20 REPRESENTATIVE HOLDER: No.

21 THE CLERK: Horner?

22 REPRESENTATIVE HORNER: No.

23 THE CLERK: Hukill?

24 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: No.

25 THE CLERK: Jenne?

1 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: No.

2 THE CLERK: Jones?

3 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.

4 THE CLERK: Kiar?

5 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: No.

6 THE CLERK: Legg?

7 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: No.

8 THE CLERK: Nehr?

9 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: No.

10 THE CLERK: Precourt?

11 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: No.

12 THE CLERK: Rogers?

13 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.

14 THE CLERK: Rouson?

15 REPRESENTATIVE ROUSON: No.

16 THE CLERK: Schenck?

17 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: No.

18 THE CLERK: Workman?

19 REPRESENTATIVE WORKMAN: No.

20 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: And, members, by
21 your vote, show that amendment fails. And I
22 will turn the gavel back over to Chairman
23 Weatherford.

24 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
25 very much, Mr. Vice-Chair.

1 Members, we are back on the Bill. Is
2 there any public testimony on the Bill? Any
3 public testimony on the Bill?

4 Seeing none, is there any debate on the
5 Bill as amended? Any debate on the Bill? You
6 have public testimony? Yes, sir, please come
7 forward. We are going to need you to fill out
8 a card -- oh, I'm sorry, you did that.

9 MR. TERRELL: Yes.

10 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Our fault.
11 Mr. Ryan Terrell, you are recognized, sir.

12 MR. TERRELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
13 members of the Committee. I am going to try
14 and be brief.

15 I have been a member who has been
16 participating in the process, who has been
17 going on the Senate side particularly and
18 working on Senate maps, but I did want to bring
19 to the attention one potential issue that I did
20 have with the House map that we are voting on,
21 particularly in the Tallahassee area.

22 One of -- I think it was the November
23 Senate Reapportionment Committee meeting, we
24 had members from the Nature Coast who came and
25 testified about what exactly the Nature Coast

1 is, and what counties and cities identify as
2 being part of the Nature Coast.

3 Unfortunatly, it looks like the Nature
4 Coast is split under this map. Residents from
5 the counties of Taylor County and Lafayette
6 County, particularly cities of Mayo and Perry,
7 identified as being a part of the Nature Coast,
8 along with Dixie, Levy and Gilchrist and Citrus
9 Counties. Those were the counties that they
10 identified as the Nature Coast.

11 The problem that we have here is that if
12 you look at District 7 under this map, compared
13 to other maps that this Committee has reviewed
14 last week, the travel time from one end of the
15 district to the other has expanded
16 exponentially.

17 To go from Port St. Joe, which is on the
18 western end of the district in Gulf County, to
19 Mayo, which is in Lafayette, which is all the
20 way on the eastern side, is a two hour and 53
21 minute drive from one end to the other.

22 One of the other proposals that this
23 Committee considered last week would have gone
24 from Port St. Joe just to Leon County. Leon
25 County and Wakulla County would have been the

1 dividing line. That would have cut down the
2 travel time by an hour from one end of the
3 district to the other.

4 So my concern with this Committee is that
5 maybe with particular -- in that area of the
6 map, it doesn't look like any other areas are
7 majorly affected by changing the Capitol
8 region. So maybe it might be better to just
9 try and reduce the travel time to increase
10 better representation for the Tallahassee area,
11 and that is really my request for this
12 Committee.

13 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
14 very much for your comments. We have a
15 question from Representative Kiar?

16 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: It is not a
17 question, it is more of a quick comment.

18 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Okay. You
19 are recognized.

20 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: I just wanted to --
21 and this has absolutely nothing to do with the
22 substantive portion of these maps. I just want
23 to let the Committee know how proud I am of
24 this young man.

25 I've actually known him for a number of

1 years. His family lives in my district. Ryan
2 has recently moved to Tallahassee, and I always
3 tell him if I lose by one vote, I am going to
4 blame him, but I just want to --

5 A VOICE: What makes you think he's voting
6 for you?

7 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: That is true, that
8 is a good point. But I do want to let
9 everybody know Ryan has been working very hard
10 on these issues from the beginning, and unlike
11 many other people, Ryan is a college student
12 who just is interested in the process, and I
13 think that is a real testament to just
14 Floridians. I am very proud of him, I just
15 wanted to mention that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you,
17 Representative Kiar, and Ryan, thank you, and I
18 think that it speaks to the process, you know,
19 the fact that technology and the openness that
20 this process has created has allowed people
21 just like Ryan to come and give substantive
22 thoughts and ideas, and we really appreciate
23 you coming in today and we will certainly take
24 your ideas and your suggestions into thought.

25 So we have one more stop, and that is the

1 floor, so we will look into it. Thank you very
2 much.

3 MR. TERRELL: Thank you.

4 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Any other
5 members of the public who wish to speak? Yes,
6 ma'am, please come forward. If you can
7 identify yourself, and we will get you to fill
8 out a speaker card, if you could, after you
9 speak. You are recognized, ma'am.

10 MS. OFNER: I would be glad to fill out a
11 speaker card. I am Eleanor Ofner, I am a
12 resident and a voter in Wakulla County, and I
13 have been to Mayo, and it seems to me that Mayo
14 is much more akin to the Alachua area,
15 Gainesville, as a metropolitan area, which
16 people in south Florida don't understand we
17 don't really have them up here.

18 But in -- we very much relate to Leon
19 County, and in a number of ways, because many
20 people from Wakulla County work in Leon County.

21 In addition, the Leon County, Wakulla
22 County, Gadsden County, Jefferson County, these
23 counties work together on transportation issues
24 and other issues, social issues. So I think it
25 is important that you take a look again at

1 this.

2 I was hoping that one of the amendments
3 was coming up might have addressed this in
4 terms of our -- what we consider our
5 metropolitan area, our city area. So I hope
6 you can still consider that. Thank you very
7 much.

8 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
9 very much. We appreciate you taking the time
10 to speak, and if you could fill out that card.

11 MS. OFNER: This is what you want me to
12 fill out?

13 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Yes, ma'am.
14 Thank you so much.

15 Any other members of the public wishing to
16 speak?

17 Okay. Any debate on the Bill as amended?
18 Debate on the Bill?

19 Seeing no debate, Representative
20 Schenck -- we're back to Representative
21 Schenck. Representative Schenck, you are
22 recognized to close on the Bill.

23 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: Thank you,
24 Mr. Chair. Just some closing comments to sort
25 of summarize up the map.

1 In HJR 6011, our subcommittee placed a
2 focus on keeping counties whole and adhering to
3 county lines in those cases where a county was
4 larger than the size of a district, and I think
5 we have accomplished that.

6 In this Committee, we took the next step
7 of further reducing city splits, reducing the
8 -- that number by 95 splits from the current
9 House map that was adopted ten years ago.

10 Both of these are, of course, consistent
11 with the law and much of the public input we
12 received throughout the state. Regarding that
13 public input, members, when you read the
14 district-by-district explanation in the Bill
15 analyses, it makes it clear how much public
16 input impacted the designs of each district.

17 In fact, I think we have adopted
18 amendments in the subcommittee and now in this
19 Committee based specifically on public input.
20 We have a process, members, that has worked.
21 Where we can bring together our legal
22 obligations and the input of the public, that
23 is the right thing to do, and I believe that is
24 the thing we have now done.

25 Thinking about compactness, when you look

1 at the districts in Brevard County, Pasco
2 County, Lee County, and really throughout the
3 map, it is remarkable how much more compact
4 they are. We even made most of the minority
5 districts very compact as well.

6 Speaking of which, we did maintain those
7 existing minority districts, and we even
8 created additional opportunities in Orange
9 County, Osceola County and possibly other
10 places.

11 All in all, I really do ask for everyone's
12 vote, and before I close, Mr. Chair, I would
13 like to give one more final thanks not only to
14 our committee staff, as many of you have
15 experienced the machine, Jeff Takacs, and the
16 amount of expertise and Alex and the rest of
17 our subcommittee.

18 I would also like to give a thanks to my
19 excellent co-Chair, Chairman Dorworth, and a
20 lot of members of the Committee, you know. We
21 had members like Representative Bernard and
22 Julien, which today I learned were two
23 different people, Representatives Clarke-Reed
24 and Rogers, who went to almost every public
25 hearing we had over the summer, Representative

1 Baxley and Frishe and others, and the amount of
2 work, time and effort that they have put into
3 this map I think makes it legally compliant.

4 With that, I am proud to close on the
5 House maps, Mr. Chair.

6 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
7 very much, Representative Schenck, always
8 levity in your close, my friend, and with
9 having closed on the Bill, would the
10 administrative assistant please call the roll?

11 THE CLERK: Chair Weatherford?

12 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Yes.

13 THE CLERK: Representative Adkins?

14 REPRESENTATIVE ADKINS: Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Bernard?

16 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: No.

17 THE CLERK: Chestnut?

18 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: No.

19 THE CLERK: Dorworth?

20 REPRESENTATIVE DORWORTH: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Eisnaugle?

22 REPRESENTATIVE EISNAUGLE: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Fresen?

24 REPRESENTATIVE FRESEN: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Frishe?

1 REPRESENTATIVE FRISHE: Yes.
2 THE CLERK: Holder?
3 REPRESENTATIVE HOLDER: Yes.
4 THE CLERK: Horner?
5 REPRESENTATIVE HORNER: Yes.
6 THE CLERK: Hukill?
7 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: Yes.
8 THE CLERK: Jenne?
9 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: No.
10 THE CLERK: Jones?
11 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
12 THE CLERK: Kiar?
13 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: No.
14 THE CLERK: Legg?
15 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Yes.
16 THE CLERK: Nehr?
17 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: Yes.
18 THE CLERK: Precourt?
19 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Yes.
20 THE CLERK: Rogers?
21 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.
22 THE CLERK: Rouson?
23 REPRESENTATIVE ROUSON: No.
24 THE CLERK: Schenck?
25 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: Yes.

1 THE CLERK: Workman?

2 REPRESENTATIVE WORKMAN: Yes.

3 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Okay. With
4 that, show that the Bill passes, or the HJR
5 passes.

6 Members, we are going to move forward. At
7 this time, we are going to take up House Bill
8 6005, which is also Congressional Map 9043.
9 Members, that is the third tab in your packets.

10 Representative Legg, Chair Legg, you are
11 recognized to explain the Bill.

12 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Thank you,
13 Mr. Chairman.

14 Mr. Chairman, last week our Committee made
15 the recommendation of HB 6005 to you, which is
16 also map 9043, as the base map to build on. I
17 want to briefly describe that map in kind of a
18 large view.

19 First, HB 6005 is a complete redistricting
20 map of Florida's new 27 congressional
21 districts. Unlike the House and the Senate
22 maps, the Congressional map has a population
23 deviation of zero percent.

24 The Bill reduces the number of county
25 splits from 30 on the current map to just 22.

1 It reduces the city splits from the current 110
2 at the current map to just 39 as compared to
3 the current Congressional map.

4 The Bill significantly improves the
5 compactness of Florida's Congressional map in
6 terms of perimeter, width/height measurements
7 and in terms of drive time measurements.

8 The Bill also maintains Florida's
9 commitment to the Florida Voter Rights Act and
10 Florida's new constitutional standards
11 regarding racial and language minority.

12 With that, Mr. Chair, that is the overview
13 of the Bill.

14 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
15 very much, Chair Legg.

16 Members, moving forward, I believe we have
17 an amendment by Representative Precourt.
18 Vice-Chair Precourt, you are recognized to
19 explain your amendment.

20 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you, Chair
21 Weatherford.

22 This amendment, members, is also map 9047,
23 you also have it in your package, and it,
24 again, makes a number of changes to the
25 underlying map that's already been adopted.

1 Staff will make more detailed
2 presentation, just like we did previously, but
3 briefly, the overall amendment reduces the
4 number of cities split from 39 down to 27, a
5 substantial reduction, and reduces the number
6 of counties split from 22 down to 21.

7 Additionally, the amendment improves the
8 likelihood of minority representation, and
9 Alex, I believe, will be getting into the
10 details on that as well.

11 So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would like
12 to have Mr. Kelly give a more detailed
13 presentation of the changes that are proposed
14 in this amendment.

15 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Okay. Thank
16 you very much, Representative Precourt.

17 Alex, if you could maybe give us a little
18 more further explanation on the amendment.

19 MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
20 members, and I will walk through initially the
21 municipal issues in the amendment.

22 Just moving first to the Pinellas County
23 area of the map -- and we will turn on the city
24 boundary lines so that you can see those.

25 What the amendment does is the amendment

1 places the entirety of the municipalities of
2 Tarpon Springs and Oldsmar into Congressional
3 District 12. In addition to that, Gulfport is
4 placed entirely into Congressional District 13.

5 While we are in the Pinellas/Hillsborough
6 area, at the advice of counsel, District 14 has
7 shifted to -- proportionally greater to the
8 Hillsborough County side. If you look sort of
9 to the region where I am moving the mouse at
10 this point, that portion was previously in the
11 earlier design of District 14. It's now been
12 moved to the Hillsborough County side.

13 The point raised by counsel is that
14 District 14 is a district that has a
15 significant coalition of African-American,
16 Hispanic and other minority voters. That
17 district, as a result of being in Hillsborough
18 County, is a Section 5-covered jurisdiction,
19 and that district needed to have a slight
20 increase due to the minority population.

21 Effectively what the increase does is the
22 total minority population of the district is
23 approximately 53 percent of the district, so it
24 is just a small shift ensuring that the
25 minority population is essentially a majority

1 of the district as compared to the non-minority
2 population in the district.

3 So, again, it is a small shift, and
4 incidentally, that request also corresponded --
5 for different reasons, but that request
6 corresponded with a significant amount of
7 public input that you had and that you reviewed
8 during your prior meeting.

9 We will move to Broward County now, and,
10 again, along the lines of issues relating to
11 municipal splits, the City of Coconut Creek is
12 now entirely included in Congressional District
13 21, the municipality of Wilton Manors is now
14 entirely included in Congressional District 22.

15 Moving down a little further into Broward
16 County, the municipality of Hallendale Beach is
17 now entirely included in Congressional District
18 23; likewise, the City of Hollywood is now
19 entirely included within Congressional District
20 23.

21 Moving down further, looking at
22 Congressional District 24, again, we have the
23 city lines featured, a view with them not
24 featured, now a view with them on. North Miami
25 and North Miami Beach now are both also

1 included entirely in Congressional District 24.

2 Moving to the other side of Congressional
3 District 24, the municipality of Opa-Locka is
4 also entirely included in Congressional
5 District 24. And just as a side note, a piece
6 of public input that was actually received in
7 the Florida Senate regarding the Opa-Locka
8 airport, the request was if the city was to be
9 entirely included, have the airport, and just
10 to match up with the public input, which we do
11 share back and forth with the other Chamber,
12 the airport is also entirely included within
13 District 24 as well.

14 Moving to Palm Beach County, there are two
15 additional municipalities that are kept whole,
16 both Loxahatchee Groves and the municipality of
17 Lake Park are kept whole in this region, both
18 in the proposed Congressional District 20.

19 And we will move briefly to Polk County.
20 The municipalities of -- I will turn the county
21 off here -- Auburndale, which is what is
22 highlighted here, Auburndale and Dundee are now
23 wholly located within districts.

24 In addition to that, taking a step back to
25 the county level, at the county level, the

1 county of Osceola County is now wholly included
2 in Congressional District 9. Okeechobee County
3 is now wholly included in Congressional
4 District 17. So that was two more counties --
5 county splits that were reduced.

6 Now, the City of Bartow had been kept
7 whole previously in the prior versions of the
8 map, but in this particular case, the City of
9 Bartow has been moved entirely into the 15th
10 Congressional District as opposed to previously
11 it was in the 17th Congressional District.

12 In addition to that, changes were made to
13 the 5th Congressional District, the proposed
14 5th Congressional District, which today is just
15 slightly under a 50 percent -- has just
16 slightly under a 50 percent black voting age
17 population.

18 House maps proposed previously had
19 proposed a 48 percent district; however, the
20 opportunity was identified to increase the
21 black voting age population above 50 percent.
22 I will turn on the county boundaries to give
23 you an idea of the effect.

24 So the district -- the principal change,
25 the district now would come into Seminole

1 County, increasing the black voting age
2 population to just slightly above 50 percent.
3 I believe it is exactly 50.06 percent.

4 In addition to that, in terms of the
5 9th -- the proposed 9th Congressional District,
6 which has been sometimes referred to as a sort
7 of Hispanic opportunity district, or at the
8 very least, a potentially future opportunity,
9 the district would now have approximately a
10 41.3 percent Hispanic voting age population.

11 The district previously in this particular
12 iteration, this particular map, did not come
13 into Polk County, although some of the other
14 House suggestions had brought the district into
15 Polk County.

16 So this is more tracking what this
17 district did in some of the other maps that the
18 Committee has looked at. It would now come
19 into Polk County. The net effect did not add
20 to any -- in terms of this district, did not
21 add to any city splits, and, in fact, as we
22 just covered, it actually kept Osceola County
23 whole.

24 And, Mr. Chairman, with that, that is the
25 amendment.

1 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
2 very much, Mr. Kelly, for the detailed
3 explanation.

4 Members, are there any questions to Mr.
5 Kelly or Mr. Precourt on the amendment? Any
6 questions?

7 Seeing no questions, is there any public
8 testimony to the amendment?

9 Seeing no public testimony, is there any
10 debate on the amendment? Any debate?

11 Seeing no debate, Representative Precourt,
12 you are recognized to close on the amendment.

13 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
14 Mr. Chair. Once again, I just appreciate all
15 the help from staff. With the level of detail
16 that is required on these things, it is a lot
17 of work.

18 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
19 very much. Having closed, would the
20 administrative assistant please call the roll.

21 THE CLERK: Chair Weatherford?

22 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Representative Adkins?

24 REPRESENTATIVE ADKINS: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Bernard?

1 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: No.
2 THE CLERK: Chestnut?
3 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: No.
4 THE CLERK: Dorworth?
5 REPRESENTATIVE DORWORTH: Yes.
6 THE CLERK: Eisnaugle?
7 REPRESENTATIVE EISNAUGLE: Yes.
8 THE CLERK: Fresen?
9 REPRESENTATIVE FRESEN: Yes.
10 THE CLERK: Frishe?
11 REPRESENTATIVE FRISHE: Yes.
12 THE CLERK: Holder?
13 REPRESENTATIVE HOLDER: Yes.
14 THE CLERK: Horner?
15 REPRESENTATIVE HORNER: Yes.
16 THE CLERK: Hukill?
17 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: Yes.
18 THE CLERK: Jenne?
19 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: No.
20 THE CLERK: Jones?
21 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
22 THE CLERK: Kiar?
23 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: No.
24 THE CLERK: Legg?
25 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Yes.

1 THE CLERK: Nehr?

2 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: Yes.

3 THE CLERK: Precourt?

4 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Yes.

5 THE CLERK: Rogers?

6 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.

7 THE CLERK: Rouson?

8 Schenck?

9 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Workman?

11 REPRESENTATIVE WORKMAN: Yes.

12 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Show the Bill

13 -- show the amendment is adopted.

14 Okay. I think I am going to have to turn
15 the gavel back over to the Vice-Chair again.

16 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
17 Chairman. Chair Weatherford, you are
18 recognized to explain this amendment.

19 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
20 very much, Mr. Chairman.

21 Members, I am not going to go into the
22 near detailed explanation. I think we have
23 touched on the process under which these maps
24 were brought forth to us, but what I would like
25 to do is to turn over to our legal team to talk

1 about some of the specifics, and ask them to
2 walk us through maybe some of the details or
3 potential challenges that this map may have.

4 And so, with that, as part of the
5 explanation, if Mr. Meros and potentially
6 Mr. DeGrande could come up and walk us through
7 that very briefly, we would appreciate it. You
8 are recognized, sir.

9 MR. MEROS: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
10 members, and I will be very brief, and I will
11 limit my testimony to just a very few
12 instances.

13 Once again, with regard to the League of
14 Women Voters' Congressional map, I find serious
15 constitutional and -- or serious Florida
16 constitutional problems with regard to the
17 notion of the obligation not to diminish the
18 opportunity to elect representatives of choice,
19 as well as potential Federal Section 5
20 violations.

21 Regarding Congressional Amendment 5, what
22 the League of Women Voters has done has taken a
23 district that has been historically in the 48
24 to 50 percent African-American population,
25 which has elected an African-American for the

1 past 20 years, which was created by a Federal
2 District Court in 1990 as a result of
3 litigation brought by then Representative
4 Miguel DeGrande to try to create protections
5 for minorities, and has cut that district from
6 48 percent or 50 percent to 35 percent.

7 To some extent, that is a matter -- that
8 is a personal matter for Mr. DeGrande and a
9 personal matter for me, because I represented
10 some of the parties in 1990, and at that time,
11 there had not been an African-American
12 congressional -- congressperson elected in
13 Florida since reconstruction.

14 After that and after the Federal District
15 Court came in and recognized minority Voting
16 Rights Act, thereafter there were three
17 African-Americans elected. Thereafter, that
18 has stood the test of time and has consistently
19 elected an African-American as the population's
20 candidate of choice.

21 What has happened -- we have a standard,
22 which all of you heard from the testimony from
23 the proponents of Amendment 5 and 6, that is a
24 Tier 1 standard that says that we shall not,
25 must not diminish the opportunity of citizens

1 to elect a candidate of their choice.

2 That diminishment standard, by the words
3 of the promoters of Amendment 6, is a Section 5
4 type analysis as to whether there's any -- any
5 movement backwards, whether the population is
6 less able to elect a candidate by virtue of a
7 change.

8 I suggest to you that it doesn't take a
9 lawyer, it doesn't take careful analysis to
10 know that when you go from 48 or 50 percent
11 African-American population to 35 percent, you
12 have made that district less able to elect a
13 candidate of choice. That is absolutely a
14 diminishment by any means and by any stretch of
15 the imagination.

16 Worse still, in the central Florida area,
17 the public testimony will reflect that there
18 were 10 to 15 members of the African-American
19 community, including ministers of churches in
20 that area, that urged that that district
21 remain, and that they remain in congressional
22 -- proposed Congressional District 5.

23 What has happened by virtue of what the
24 League of Women Voters has done here is to
25 displace over 80,000 African-Americans in

1 central Florida and put them in a white
2 district which will not elect an
3 African-American or their candidate of choice.

4 That cannot be justified by me as a matter
5 of law and as a matter of common sense. It
6 ignores the public testimony, it ignores the
7 Tier 1 standard, it ignores what the proponents
8 said would never be a diminishment.

9 Now, very briefly, the -- I say Alcee
10 Hastings' seat, I apologize, I don't remember
11 the proposed district number, but there is a
12 District 23 in this proposed map is a map -- is
13 a district that touches a Section 5 county
14 under the federal voting rights, and -- Voting
15 Rights Act, and so care, much care must be
16 taken with any potential that the Department of
17 Justice would not pre-clear this district by
18 virtue of any diminishment of the electoral
19 opportunities of African-Americans or
20 minorities in that district.

21 This district has less black voting age
22 population, two or three points, than the
23 proposed map. It, to me, is tempting fate and
24 asking for a delay, asking for a refusal for
25 pre-clearance to do that. Why would we do

1 that? Why would we provoke the Department of
2 Justice and possibly risk a Section 5
3 pre-clearance when the result would be voters
4 would be confused, there would be delays in
5 drawing the map, and ultimately potentially a
6 federal court drawing an interim map simply by
7 virtue of that decision?

8 That same issue is -- the same thing is at
9 risk in the Hillsborough and Pinellas County
10 area where there is a district that, again, is
11 in Hillsborough County, which is a Section 5
12 district that does reduce the minority
13 population to some extent, and, again, temps a
14 Section 5 challenge or a Section 5 refusal to
15 pre-clear that need not occur.

16 A cynical mind would say messing with
17 those two districts is an intent to have
18 justice pre- -- refuse to pre-clear and delay
19 the process. Whatever the result is, it makes
20 no sense, it is not a rational thing to do, and
21 I think would violate the law. Thank you.

22 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
23 Mr. Meros. Chair Weatherford?

24 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you. I
25 was just saying, I wanted to give Mr. DeGrande

1 an opportunity as well to speak and give some
2 legal analysis on this map. Thank you.

3 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Mr. DeGrande,
4 you are recognized.

5 MR. DEGRANDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 Members, I think Mr. Meros has covered
7 most everything I would say, except I will take
8 you back to 1990 and that litigation.

9 At that time, as Mr. Meros mentioned,
10 there had not been an African-American elected
11 to Congress since reconstruction. There was
12 one majority Hispanic-American seat, and as a
13 matter of fact, until Claude Pepper passed away
14 in 1989, Claude Pepper was the Hispanic
15 candidate of choice in that district, and when
16 he passed away, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen became the
17 Hispanic candidate of choice in that district.

18 When we got to the remedy phase in that
19 litigation, there was an impasse in the
20 congressional, and the Court had to draw a map,
21 and both members of the Legislature and
22 Plaintiffs had an opportunity, and Intervenors
23 had an opportunity to propose maps to the
24 Special Master, which ultimately would go to
25 the three-judge panel, and in those maps, we,

1 the Plaintiffs, actually drew four
2 African-American congressional seats, and the
3 Court did not accept it.

4 The Court -- there was one seat that
5 became colloquially known as the barbell
6 district because it joined areas of Orlando and
7 Tampa through the I-4 corridor, and the Court
8 said no, that is too much. But this plan with
9 three African-American seats is a good plan.

10 And when you look at District 3, that
11 district is basically the template of what a
12 three-judge federal panel drew, improved in
13 2000 and greatly improved now in this amendment
14 that you just passed by keeping more cities
15 intact and respecting and adhering to the
16 standards of Amendment 5.

17 So that district, as it has been proposed
18 by the Legislature, to me, is nothing more than
19 following the dictates of a federal court that
20 knew what the limits were in terms of a
21 district that would stretch the boundaries of
22 constitutionality.

23 It found that template to be
24 constitutional. That template has been
25 significantly improved upon in the amendment

1 that you just passed, and, therefore, I think
2 that it is wholly compliant with constitutional
3 provisions.

4 I agree fully with Mr. Meros that this
5 amendment would not be, because of the reasons
6 he stated. Thank you very much.

7 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
8 Mr. DeGrande.

9 Chair Weatherford, further explanation of
10 the amendment?

11 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: No.

12 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Okay. Chair
13 Weatherford having explained the amendment,
14 members, are there any questions on the
15 amendment? Representative Jenne, question on
16 the amendment.

17 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: Thank you, and I am
18 not sure if this would be appropriate now or
19 later. It is more on the mechanism. When the
20 two gentlemen were just speaking, I had some
21 questions about how we figure out minority
22 representation.

23 So I am not sure if it would be better to
24 ask that question now on this, or to wait later
25 on when we are back on the --

1 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: If -- yes, if
2 it's -- Chair Weatherford.

3 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: I was going
4 to say, if I could answer that, Mr. Chairman,
5 if it pertains to this specific amendment, we
6 can do it. If it is not, we can do it later at
7 the end of the meeting.

8 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: Chairman, I will
9 wait then, thank you.

10 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Representative
11 Rogers, you are recognized for a question.
12 Thank you. Any further questions on the
13 amendment, members?

14 Okay. Seeing no further questions, we are
15 on to public testimony. I don't believe we
16 have any testimony cards filled out. I don't
17 see anyone approaching the podium.

18 So seeing no further public testimony,
19 members, we are into debate. Any debate on the
20 amendments?

21 Okay. Seeing no debate on the amendment,
22 Chair Weatherford, you are recognized to close.

23 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
24 very much, Mr. Chairman. I think I would echo
25 the comments I made earlier in my close on the

1 House map in regard to the process and why I
2 think that this amendment should be voted down
3 strictly on those purposes.

4 But I also think that our counsel, who has
5 done this for a very long time and is very
6 well-schooled in the legal matters that involve
7 redistricting, I think have laid out some
8 significant problems with this map.

9 And so for those reasons, and for the
10 reasons in regards to the process, I would urge
11 members of this Committee to vote no.

12 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you, Chair
13 Weatherford. Having closed on the amendment,
14 members, please recall we are voting on the
15 amendment, not the underlying Bill.

16 Katie, will you please call the roll?

17 THE CLERK: Chair Weatherford?

18 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: No.

19 THE CLERK: Rep Adkins?

20 REPRESENTATIVE ADKINS: No.

21 THE CLERK: Bernard?

22 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: No.

23 THE CLERK: Chestnut?

24 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: No.

25 THE CLERK: Dorworth?

1 REPRESENTATIVE DORWORTH: No.
2 THE CLERK: Eisnaugle?
3 REPRESENTATIVE EISNAUGLE: No.
4 THE CLERK: Fresen?
5 REPRESENTATIVE FRESEN: No.
6 THE CLERK: Frishe?
7 REPRESENTATIVE FRISHE: No.
8 THE CLERK: Holder?
9 REPRESENTATIVE HOLDER: No.
10 THE CLERK: Horner?
11 REPRESENTATIVE HORNER: No.
12 THE CLERK: Hukill?
13 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: No.
14 THE CLERK: Jenne?
15 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: No.
16 THE CLERK: Jones?
17 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
18 THE CLERK: Kiar?
19 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: No.
20 THE CLERK: Legg?
21 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: No.
22 THE CLERK: Nehr?
23 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: No.
24 THE CLERK: Precourt?
25 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: No.

1 THE CLERK: Rogers?

2 Rouson?

3 Schenck?

4 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: No.

5 THE CLERK: Workman?

6 REPRESENTATIVE WORKMAN: No.

7 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Members, by your
8 vote, the amendment fails, and I will turn the
9 chair back to Chair Weatherford.

10 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
11 very much, Mr. Vice-Chair.

12 Members, we are back on the Bill. Is
13 there any public testimony in regard to the
14 actual Bill as am- -- no appearance cards,
15 okay, so we are good.

16 Any debate on the Bill, members?

17 Seeing no debate -- I'm sorry, do you have
18 a question? Sure, we will do a question.

19 Representative, you are recognized.

20 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Thank you,
21 Mr. Chairman. After listening to the comments
22 around the League of Cities -- League of Women,
23 corrected, League of Women's maps, I just
24 wanted to be reminded of the definition the
25 Committee used to determine if districts were

1 racially fair, and was it not -- what was it?
2 What did we use? I know we -- I like our maps,
3 I like our comments, I attended --

4 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Does that
5 mean you are voting for them?

6 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Just keep --
7 answer my question. I like it, you know, not
8 that much, but I am telling you --

9 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: I think I
10 know the question you have.

11 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: -- I attended 25
12 of the 26 meetings around the state and I heard
13 the comments, and just remind me again, because
14 I know we are comparing those maps, and I
15 wanted to know our definition.

16 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Let me
17 restate your question, and you tell me if I am
18 asking the right question for you so I can --
19 and get our attorneys.

20 I think what you are asking is, you want
21 to know what standard are we using when we are
22 looking at what is diminishment of a minority
23 district, how are we determining diminishment?
24 Okay.

25 Because that is more complicated than I

1 can probably answer, so I would probably ask
2 our general counsel to walk us through that and
3 give us that explanation. You are recognized.

4 MR. MEROS: Representative, the standard
5 we are using is the standard in Amendment 6,
6 because it is a Congressional map. It is the
7 same as in Amendment 5. It is the Tier 1
8 standard that says you shall not diminish the
9 opportunity of citizens to elect candidate of
10 choice.

11 What everyone has agreed that standard
12 means is a -- is a -- the standard for Section
13 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act, which now
14 applies to all districts in the state, as
15 opposed to the five districts that it applies
16 to under the Federal Voting Rights Act.

17 And the notion there is that there shall
18 be no backsliding, not going backwards in the
19 opportunity of citizens to elect a candidate of
20 choice. That is different than standards under
21 Section 2, and what -- and particularly in the
22 reenactment of the Federal Voting Rights Act
23 and Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act.

24 Congress made it clear in their analysis
25 that the language of Section 5 had changed

1 somewhat in response to the Georgia v. Ashcroft
2 decision, which suggested somewhat of a
3 weakening of what that standard was, and
4 Congress said it intended to make it clear that
5 in every district, the issue is whether
6 minority citizens are less able to elect a
7 candidate of choice in the new district than
8 they were in the old district.

9 Now, I know some would argue that, well,
10 what that means is you can take a district from
11 50 percent down to 35 percent, because once you
12 crunch a bunch of numbers, the minority
13 candidate has a pretty good chance or an equal
14 chance of winning. But that is not what
15 Amendment 6 says. That is not what Congress
16 said even about the Federal Voting Rights Act.

17 What Congress said and what the Floridians
18 said is if you backslide, if you make it less
19 able to elect a minority candidate, then that
20 is a violation. Now, if you go from 50 percent
21 to 35 percent, maybe someone, maybe an
22 African-American candidate will win, maybe an
23 incumbent. But it is not about the incumbent,
24 it is about the population that originally
25 elected an African-American candidate.

1 And so the notion that there is no going
2 backwards from 50 percent to 35 percent, to me,
3 defies common sense. It defies the law and it
4 defies every analysis of voting rights that I
5 am aware of.

6 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you,
7 Mr. Meros.

8 Ms. Rogers, did you have a follow-up?

9 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No, Mr. Chair.
10 Thank you very much. Can I just make a
11 comment?

12 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Yes, you may.

13 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: I really enjoyed
14 the process, really enjoyed working with you,
15 so -- and looking forward to the next vote.

16 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Well, thank
17 you very much. I appreciate that.

18 Representative Jenne, you are recognized,
19 sir.

20 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: Thank you, Chairman
21 Weatherford, I appreciate it. And I think the
22 question is really best given to you, and thank
23 you so much, as always, for being here with
24 your answers, and I know we have a lot of
25 detailed questions.

1 Piggy-backing a little bit off of
2 Representative Rogers' question, is there any
3 mathematical formula that we can use to try to
4 determine -- and this is really a blanket
5 question for any of the maps --

6 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Sure.

7 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: -- to be completely
8 honest. But is there a formula, numeric or
9 otherwise, that we can use to determine if we
10 are harming minority representation, or is that
11 just a straight numbers game?

12 MR. MEROS: If one is harming minority
13 representation in what way, I'm sorry?

14 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: I'm sorry,
15 weakening it in some way, I apologize.

16 MR. MEROS: Meaning the diminishment
17 standard?

18 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: The diminishment
19 standard, yes, sir.

20 MR. MEROS: Sure.

21 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: Is there a numeric
22 formula, or some other type?

23 MR. MEROS: There is no set formula to
24 assess that. It is a -- it is an assessment
25 that is in part based on electoral results in

1 the past, it is based on registration of
2 minority voters, it is based on turn-out.

3 It is based on the minority population in
4 that area and their wishes, any number of
5 things that in combination come up with the
6 notion as to whether people in that district
7 have gone backwards in their -- in their
8 ability to elect a candidate of choice.

9 The one thing that is clear is that after
10 enactment of the congressional -- or after
11 Congress reenacted Section 5, the language was
12 intended to make it clear that one cannot say,
13 well, you can backslide a little bit in one
14 district, but strengthen another and you are
15 okay, or that you can think more about a
16 coalition district and backslide traditionally
17 and maybe that's okay. Congress said no. The
18 question is less able.

19 Now, less able, again, would have to look
20 at all sorts of factors: Registration,
21 turnout, the -- you know, the polarization in
22 that area, any number -- the wishes of the
23 minority community, such as the Orlando
24 community. And so my analysis of that is I
25 cannot imagine a case where going from

1 50 percent to 35 percent means that you are not
2 less able to elect a candidate of choice.

3 Maybe there are, but I don't -- I can't
4 imagine it. But it is a -- it is a complex and
5 comprehensive analysis that you have to
6 undertake.

7 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: A brief follow-up,
8 Mr. Chair, if that's all right?

9 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: You are
10 recognized.

11 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: You mentioned
12 turnout, and it kind of led to another
13 question --

14 MR. MEROS: Sure.

15 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: -- that I had had,
16 and that is basically election performance data
17 and how or if it was even used to determine if
18 the districts diminished the ability of
19 minorities to elect candidates of their choice.

20 MR. MEROS: Well, I can tell you what the
21 House did was to focus on districts that had
22 historically performed for African-Americans or
23 for Hispanics, because now non-diminishment was
24 statewide, and tried very carefully not to
25 diminish the population percentages more than

1 one or two or three points, or sometimes more,
2 and in doing so there, to comply with other
3 standards, such as compactness and complying
4 with city and county boundaries.

5 And the reason for that was obvious.
6 Diminishment means diminishment. If you reduce
7 it more than a few percentage points, you at
8 least facially have to address the possibility
9 that there is a diminishment. And so that is
10 very much how the House went about doing it.

11 And, again, one of the things here we have
12 to realize is if we delay the process or permit
13 there to be challenges to the map that have
14 some possibility of succeeding, then this is
15 taken away from the Legislature and the
16 legislative prerogative and put into the court
17 simply by virtue of the delay involved in
18 having this sort of thing litigated.

19 As a matter of just policy and as a matter
20 of legal prudence, one would never want to do
21 that.

22 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you,
23 Mr. Meros.

24 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: One last follow-up?
25 Mr. Chair, thank you.

1 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Sure. You
2 are recognized for a follow-up.

3 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: And this is the
4 last one, sir. Thank you so much for being up
5 there to answer these questions in a kind of --
6 one bridges off the other.

7 The next and my final question here is,
8 are we improperly overpacking a district with
9 minority voters if we place more of that group
10 in a district than is necessary to allow
11 minority voters their personal choice and --
12 but simultaneously violate other criteria? Do
13 you see the gist of the question?

14 MR. MEROS: Sure, sure. That essentially
15 is an issue of are you packing minorities in a
16 given dis- -- that is a Section 2 sort of
17 claim. Are you packing minority voters in a
18 district and thereby diluting their strength
19 which could be in two districts rather than one
20 district?

21 With regard to Congressional 5, you are
22 clearly not doing that, because, remember,
23 there are two standards that -- the Tier 1
24 standards that the voters wanted and that the
25 proponents of these districts have set from

1 start to finish, and that is there is a Section
2 2 protection for minority and there is a
3 Section 5 protection statewide, so don't worry,
4 all of the concerns that this Legislature
5 raised about the possibility of weakening
6 minority voting rights, they said don't worry.
7 When you talk about diminishment, the issue is
8 are you backsliding, are you making it less
9 able for a minority to be elected. That is a
10 different standard, that is a very strong
11 standard. And so that is not packing. If that
12 district is at 48 or 50 percent, and when you
13 take it to 35 percent, someone is less able to
14 elect a candidate of choice, that is not
15 packing, that is complying with that standard.
16 That is -- the Legislature didn't do that. I
17 didn't do that. The voters of Florida did
18 that.

19 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: Sir, thank you.

20 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Follow-up,
21 Representative Jenne?

22 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: Mr. Chairman, no,
23 thank you, and I appreciate it.

24 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Representative
25 Chestnut, you are recognized for a question.

1 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: Thank you,
2 Mr. Chair. In terms of the -- we were talking
3 about performance data, I think the question
4 came up. Does staff have access to performance
5 data at all?

6 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Mr. Meros, you
7 are recognized.

8 MR. MEROS: The public has access to it,
9 the staff has access to it, you can -- you can
10 go to places where there's all sorts of
11 election data, so, sure. And in drawing
12 districts that have significant minority
13 populations, it is incumbent upon us to look at
14 those matters. And if you will recall in the
15 debates before when this House was asking about
16 how can we do these, the framers of the
17 amendment said of course you look at election
18 data and performance data when it comes to
19 minority districts. That is part of the
20 calculation you have to do to comply with the
21 law.

22 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: And since that
23 is a technical question on the system itself, I
24 would like to have Mr. Kelly address that as
25 well. Alex?

1 MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2 Representative Chestnut, yes, data is in
3 the application right here that you are looking
4 at on the screen.

5 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: Thank you.

6 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: And that you
7 have access to, as well as everyone else.

8 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: Thank you.

9 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Representative
10 Bernard, you are recognized for a question.

11 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: Thank you,
12 Mr. Chair.

13 Mr. Meros, going to District 5, I guess,
14 was it -- I guess the 2002 map, was that
15 district short in terms of population?

16 MR. MEROS: I will defer to staff on the
17 specifics of that. I -- Alex, if you want to
18 answer that.

19 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Mr. Kelly,
20 you are recognized -- I will tell you what.
21 He's going to probably have to pull that out.
22 I don't think he has it off the top -- do you
23 have it?

24 MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25 Jeff, if you could pull up the current

1 congressional map.

2 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: This is so
3 much better than 1980. We would have run out
4 of crayons by now.

5 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: Go ahead, Alex.

6 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: I don't think
7 Mr. Kelly can see it from here. We need to get
8 him some bifocals like you've got there.

9 MR. KELLY: Okay. So the population
10 deviation was 37,289 under in District 3.

11 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: Follow-up,
12 Mr. Chair?

13 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: You are
14 recognized for a follow-up.

15 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: Thank you.

16 What I -- I guess what I want to find out
17 is since the district was created in nineteen
18 -- if that -- the concept of the district was
19 created in 1992, and the population changed
20 from 1992 to 2002 and then two thousand and --
21 in 2012, if the population is declining, do we
22 still -- if we had to get the numbers from
23 somewhere else, would we have -- would we have
24 to kind of like -- if the numbers were in Key
25 West, would that district have to be created

1 from Jacksonville to Key West to make up that
2 number, if that is how it would -- for
3 minorities to elect a representative of their
4 choice?

5 MR. MEROS: Entirely appropriate question,
6 and the answer is certainly no. When
7 population shifts occur, one has to go back and
8 figure out what can be done. A Section 5
9 analysis does not mean -- and I say Section 5,
10 an Amendment 5 diminishment standard -- does
11 not mean if that population vanishes, you have
12 to create something you cannot. What you do
13 have to do is look at it and say can you make a
14 good faith effort to avoid backsliding with a
15 population as it exists now. And so certainly
16 that is a factor.

17 Clearly there is sufficient population in
18 that district to avoid non-diminishment,
19 because -- to avoid diminishment. If we were
20 to take it to 35 percent, then one of the
21 factors would be, well, wait a minute, there
22 are alternative maps that better comply than
23 earlier that don't -- that don't diminish so
24 much, and those alternatives is the very proof
25 that there is backsliding.

1 But you are absolutely correct, the
2 population shifts are a factor that you have to
3 take into consideration.

4 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: Thank you.

5 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Okay.

6 Members, any other questions? Mr. DeGrande,
7 did you want to add to that explanation?

8 MR. MEROS: He is going to correct my
9 mistakes.

10 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Okay.

11 MR. DEGRANDE: Absolutely not. Just one
12 additional comment, at least how I interpret
13 the constitutional amendments.

14 When the voters voted to say no
15 diminishment, in the same way that it could be
16 assumed that they knew what all the intricacies
17 were of the amendment, it could also be assumed
18 that they needed a configuration of the
19 districts that they didn't want diminished.
20 And so an argument to say that the, you know,
21 current District 3 shouldn't be redrawn the
22 same way, if it can be redrawn with the same
23 template in a manner that does not diminish, it
24 would seem to me that that is exactly what the
25 voters that voted for Amendment 5 and 6 were

1 asking this Legislature to do, because they
2 would have known that, okay, that is what it
3 looks like now, we don't want it diminished.
4 So I don't see -- again, not only do I see that
5 as simply following a template that was
6 approved by a three-judge court, but also very
7 consistent with the intent of the voters in
8 Amendment 5 and 6.

9 And to your point, Mr. Chairman, in 1990
10 when I was a member of the House, we had a
11 computer that was I think \$5 million in a
12 cooled environment that had less computing
13 capacity than your laptop today to do
14 redistricting. That's how much we've advanced.

15 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: You are aging
16 yourself, be careful, Miguel.

17 Representative Jones, I think you had a
18 question.

19 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Thank you,
20 Mr. Chairman. We talked earlier about the
21 number of counties that had been split into
22 multiple districts. Do we have that
23 information for the congressional in comparison
24 to 2002?

25 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: We do, I

1 think we do. If I could restate that, I think
2 what you would like to see is the data on the
3 amount of county splits we had in the 2002
4 congressional map versus the 2012 suggested
5 congressional map?

6 MR. TAKACS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
7 2002 congressional maps split 30 counties. The
8 proposal, as amended, would only split 21
9 counties. So it would keep nine additional
10 counties whole.

11 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: One final question.

12 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: You are
13 recognized for a question.

14 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: How are we
15 measuring compactness for the congressional
16 seats?

17 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Very good
18 question, and I will let staff answer that as
19 well.

20 MR. TAKACS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21 Representative Jones, there's a number of
22 different ways to measure compactness. There
23 are some -- there are some traditional scores
24 that are utilized based on perimeter or area of
25 the districts, width plus height test, and

1 sometimes you take a ratio of those different
2 numbers. Those are actually all included in
3 the planned data report that is in your packet
4 for each bill.

5 In addition to that, we have implemented a
6 number of functional measures that measure
7 items such as drive time, mileage, the average
8 mileage to cross a district, mileage based on
9 physically what you actually can drive. So
10 there is functional compactness measured as
11 well.

12 In addition to that, a comment that was
13 utilized in a number of the maps, not just the
14 congressional, was during a course of the
15 summer meetings, a number of individuals from
16 the public oftentimes made a case that
17 compactness and county boundary lines tended to
18 be relative equals in their eyes. And so that
19 comment was factored in in terms of the drawing
20 and in terms of the debate and discussion in
21 your various subcommittees.

22 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Thank you,
23 Mr. Chairman.

24 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: You're
25 welcome. Members, any other questions?

1 Okay. We are back on debate. Is there
2 any debate on the bill? Debate on the bill as
3 amended?

4 Seeing no debate, we are now going to
5 recognize Representative Legg to close.

6 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Thank you,
7 Mr. Chair. I just want to briefly go over some
8 numbers that Representative Jones was just
9 asking. Forty-six of the 67 counties are kept
10 whole. Only 27 of the 411 cities in the state
11 have been split, versus the current
12 congressional map, which has over 110 splits
13 right now.

14 The -- this congressional map has been
15 held true to Amendment 6 by keeping county and
16 city boundaries. It's also held true to all
17 the public testimony that we have heard
18 throughout the state about keeping the
19 communities and cities and counties together.
20 This -- the districts are significantly more
21 compact than Florida's current congressional
22 map, and the district also maintains a
23 likelihood that minority communities can elect
24 a candidate of their choice.

25 And with that, Mr. Chair, I just want to

1 echo the words of Chair Schenck and just say
2 thank you to our co-Chairs, Chair Holder and
3 Vice-Chair Horner, and all our committee staff
4 who worked on this, and look forward to
5 presenting it on the floor if this Committee
6 passes.

7 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
8 very much, Representative Legg. And with that
9 closed, would the administrative assistant
10 please call the roll.

11 THE CLERK: Chair Weatherford?

12 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Yes.

13 THE CLERK: Rep Adkins?

14 REPRESENTATIVE ADKINS: Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Bernard?

16 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: No.

17 THE CLERK: Chestnut?

18 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: No.

19 THE CLERK: Dorworth?

20 REPRESENTATIVE DORWORTH: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Eisnaugle?

22 REPRESENTATIVE EISNAUGLE: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Fresen?

24 REPRESENTATIVE FRESEN: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Frishe?

1 REPRESENTATIVE FRISHE: Yes.
2 THE CLERK: Holder?
3 REPRESENTATIVE HOLDER: Yes.
4 THE CLERK: Horner?
5 REPRESENTATIVE HORNER: Yes.
6 THE CLERK: Hukill?
7 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: Yes.
8 THE CLERK: Jenne?
9 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: No.
10 THE CLERK: Jones?
11 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
12 THE CLERK: Kiar?
13 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: No.
14 THE CLERK: Legg?
15 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Yes.
16 THE CLERK: Nehr?
17 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: Yes.
18 THE CLERK: Precourt?
19 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Yes.
20 THE CLERK: Rogers?
21 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.
22 THE CLERK: Rouson?
23 Schenck?
24 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: Yes.
25 THE CLERK: Workman?

1 REPRESENTATIVE WORKMAN: Yes.

2 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: All right.

3 And with that, show HJR 601 passes -- I'm
4 sorry, 605 -- 6005 passes.

5 We are now moving on to HJR 6001, which is
6 also the State Senate Map 9004. Members, this
7 is in the first tab in your packets. This is
8 the last HJR we will go through.

9 Representative Nehr, you are recognized to
10 explain the House joint resolution.

11 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: Thank you,
12 Mr. Chairman. I want to share with you some
13 details regarding House Joint Resolution 6001
14 as a whole, and how it compares to the current
15 State Senate district map.

16 For the 40 districts in this particular
17 map, there is only a 1.84 percent total
18 population deviation. And compared to our
19 current map, the bill reduces the number of
20 county splits from 45 all the way down to 31,
21 and the number of city splits from 126 down to
22 a very low number of 78.

23 Looking at some of the more mathematical
24 compactness scores relating to perimeters and
25 height and width of districts, this proposed

1 committee bill consistently improves the
2 compactness of Florida's 40 State Senate
3 districts. And looking some at the more
4 functional compactive measures, such as drive
5 times, the bill again consistently improves
6 these measures of compactness compared to the
7 existing State Senate map. The bill maintains
8 Florida's commitments to compliance with the
9 Federal Voting Rights Act, both Section 2 and 5
10 of Florida's constitutional standards regarding
11 racial and language minorities. Thank you,
12 Mr. Chairman.

13 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
14 very much. Are there any questions on the
15 bill? Yes, you are recognized for a question.

16 A VOICE: Mr. Chairman, thank you, as
17 always. The first question is this,
18 Representative Nehr: Is this -- basically this
19 is the same map that the Senate passed off
20 their floor?

21 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Actually, if
22 I could interject just really quickly, we're
23 going to get to an amendment by Representative
24 Precourt.

25 A VOICE: That will get us to that

1 posture.

2 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: That will get
3 us to that posture?

4 A VOICE: Thank you, yes.

5 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Would you
6 like to wait to get there?

7 A VOICE: Yes, absolutely, sir. Thank
8 you.

9 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Okay. Well,
10 then, any other questions before we move to the
11 amendatory process?

12 Seeing none, we are going to move to
13 amendment number one by Representative
14 Precourt. You are recognized to explain the
15 amendment.

16 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you,
17 Chairman Weatherford.

18 Members, again, you have the amendment in
19 front of you. This amendment is a little bit
20 different than the others. It is also map
21 9008, and it conforms to this bill that we have
22 in front of us, the one that passed through the
23 Senate subcommittee and that we workshopped in
24 our last meeting. It conforms that bill to the
25 Senate map included in SJR 1176, 1176, which is

1 the bill that the Senate passed last week.

2 I will let staff again outline the
3 detailed changes that were made, but in
4 summary, the amendment reduces the number of
5 cities that were split by 24 cities, reduces it
6 by 24, decreasing that down to only 54 cities
7 that are split, and it also lowers the total
8 population deviation to two percent. So with
9 that, Mr. Chair, we ought to have Mr. Poreda --

10 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Yes, why
11 don't we do that, if we could, staying in the
12 same light here, why don't -- Mr. Poreda, if
13 you could enlighten us on some of the
14 differences between the former map and what the
15 amendment would do, thank you.

16 MR. POREDA: Absolutely. Thank you,
17 Mr. Chairman.

18 The amendment makes several changes all
19 around the map. It actually decreases the
20 amount of cities split by 24 cities, going from
21 78 to 54 cities all around the map. In many
22 cases, some of those changes are just one or
23 two census blocks where no people live in them
24 that were changed to keep the city whole, and
25 rather than take the Committee through every

1 single one of those little, tiny changes, I
2 will highlight some of the three or four
3 examples to kind of show some of the larger
4 examples and then go from there.

5 First we will go to the Lake County area
6 once it comes back up. This you can see, this
7 is probably the largest change that is most
8 visible on the map. Previously the three
9 cities considered the Golden Triangle of
10 Eustis, Tavares and Mt. Dora were split. On
11 this map, those three cities are kept whole.
12 And I think the city lines are -- yes, there
13 you go. So you can see those three cities that
14 are in the green District 11 right there, those
15 are the Golden Triangle cities that are kept
16 whole. And by keeping those three cities
17 whole, the district was actually -- District
18 10, the pink district directly underneath it,
19 was actually able to keep the City of Leesburg
20 whole and the City of Fruitland Park whole,
21 which were both cities that were previously
22 split in the previous map.

23 Next we will kind of go to the Orange
24 County area to see the City of Oakland, that
25 little city right there. This is an example of

1 a city that Senate reapportionment staff saw
2 that they could keep whole, and made that
3 change to the map. So that is one of the
4 changes that you can see there.

5 The next example is an example of a city
6 where the Polk County Supervisor of Elections,
7 as well as public input, suggested they keep
8 whole. That is the city of Davenport in Polk
9 County. Previously, the City of Davenport was
10 split. That is Haines City right there.
11 Davenport is right above that. You can see it
12 is kept whole in the District 16 just above
13 Haines City. Right there, yeah, that is the
14 City of Davenport. Previously, this was a city
15 that was split. The Polk County Supervisor of
16 Elections suggested to try to keep that city
17 whole, and there was a lot of public input
18 speaking to that effect as well, and they were
19 able to make that change.

20 Another example of the many changes
21 throughout the map are small, little changes
22 that Supervisors of Election throughout the
23 state asked. If we go to the Pensacola area
24 real quick, you can see that -- if we zoom in
25 on the City of Pensacola, the borders between

1 Districts 1 and 3 were altered very, very
2 slightly, in some cases, just a couple of dozen
3 people were affected. Those changes were
4 recommended by the Escambia County Supervisor
5 of Elections to try to keep -- try to prevent
6 some of the voter islands, the concept that we
7 talked about last week where there might be a
8 school board district that overlaps just ever
9 so slightly with one of the Senate districts,
10 so then that would -- only a couple dozen
11 people would get a unique ballot and you would
12 be able to figure out how they voted. So
13 that's very, very minor changes to that, and
14 the rest of the changes throughout the map are
15 kind of in the same light, recommended by the
16 Supervisors of Elections around the state.

17 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Great. Thank
18 you very much, Jason.

19 Members, are there any questions in regard
20 to the amendment? Questions on the amendment?

21 Is there any public testimony on the
22 amendment? I don't think we have any cards.

23 Any debate on the amendment? Seeing no
24 debate on the amendment, you are recognized to
25 close the amendment, Representative Precourt.

1 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Thank you, Chair
2 Weatherford. Again, thank you to staff for all
3 the detailed hard work they did on this, and I
4 waive close.

5 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Having waived
6 close, would the administrative assistant
7 please call the roll.

8 THE CLERK: Chair Weatherford?

9 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Representatives Adkins?

11 REPRESENTATIVE ADKINS: Yes.

12 THE CLERK: Bernard?

13 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: No.

14 THE CLERK: Chestnut?

15 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: No.

16 THE CLERK: Dorworth?

17 REPRESENTATIVE DORWORTH: Yes.

18 THE CLERK: Eisnaugle?

19 REPRESENTATIVE EISNAUGLE: Yes.

20 THE CLERK: Fresen?

21 REPRESENTATIVE FRESEN: Yes.

22 THE CLERK: Frishe?

23 REPRESENTATIVE FRISHE: Yes.

24 THE CLERK: Holder?

25 REPRESENTATIVE HOLDER: Yes.

1 THE CLERK: Horner?
2 REPRESENTATIVE HORNER: Yes.
3 THE CLERK: Hukill?
4 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: Yes.
5 THE CLERK: Jenne?
6 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: No.
7 THE CLERK: Jones?
8 Kiar?
9 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: No.
10 THE CLERK: Legg?
11 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Yes.
12 THE CLERK: Nehr?
13 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: Yes.
14 THE CLERK: Precourt?
15 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Yes.
16 THE CLERK: Rogers?
17 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.
18 THE CLERK: Rouson?
19 REPRESENTATIVE ROUSON: No.
20 THE CLERK: Schenck?
21 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: Yes.
22 THE CLERK: Workman?
23 REPRESENTATIVE WORKMAN: Yes.
24 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Okay. So the
25 amendment passes.

1 We are back on the bill. Is there any
2 debate on the bill as amended? Any debate on
3 the bill? Any questions on the bill? Do you
4 have a question? Representative Jenne, we are
5 back to you, questions on the bill.

6 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: Thank you, thank
7 you, Chairman, and, again, I always appreciate
8 it.

9 And I guess what my question is, I have
10 seen public comment that -- and I guess beauty
11 is in the eye of the beholder, but I've heard a
12 lot of public comment after the Senate map had
13 come out that our map -- our map meaning the
14 map governing the House seats -- was better.
15 I've read public commentary from members and
16 other folks who had said that.

17 So my question is this: Outside of
18 legislative tradition, why do we want to vote
19 this map out? Is this the best product we
20 have, or is there something we can do moving
21 forward, because I know there are some concerns
22 with this map?

23 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: What I would
24 say is if your curiosity peaks you to such an
25 extent, you can certainly file an amendment to

1 change the map. We have had the maps out since
2 December the 6th. We have been following the
3 Senate map very closely. We send e-mails
4 regularly out to every member of this Committee
5 and of the chamber to let them know what the
6 amendment deadlines are. If any member of this
7 Committee or of the chamber would like to file
8 an amendment, we have another crack at it on
9 the floor, and if you feel like you can improve
10 the map, we would encourage you, Representative
11 Jenne, to file that amendment and explain it on
12 the floor.

13 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: I always appreciate
14 your encouragement, Chairman, thank you.

15 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: You're
16 welcome. Any other questions?

17 Seeing no questions, any debate on the
18 bill?

19 Seeing no debate on the bill, you are
20 recognized to close on the bill, Representative
21 Legg -- or, I'm sorry, Representative Nehr.

22 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: Thank you,
23 Mr. Chairman.

24 I don't have much to add, members. I just
25 want to reiterate that the bill, when you

1 reflect on those issues that are pertinent in
2 the law, makes improvements in every single way
3 in terms of compactness, use of city, county
4 and other boundaries, and in terms of
5 representation for racial and language
6 minorities. And at this time, Mr. Chair, I
7 just want to thank my co-Chair, Representative
8 Hukill, for all her hard work that she's put
9 into this particular bill. Also I want to
10 thank the redistricting staff as a whole,
11 especially Alex Kelly, for their hard work, and
12 with that, Mr. Chairman, I close.

13 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Thank you
14 very much. Having closed on the bill, would
15 the administrative assistant please call the
16 roll.

17 THE CLERK: Chair Weatherford?

18 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Representatives Adkins?

20 REPRESENTATIVE ADKINS: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Bernard?

22 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: No.

23 THE CLERK: Chestnut?

24 REPRESENTATIVE CHESTNUT: No.

25 THE CLERK: Dorworth?

1 REPRESENTATIVE DORWORTH: Yes.
2 THE CLERK: Eisnaugle?
3 REPRESENTATIVE EISNAUGLE: Yes.
4 THE CLERK: Fresen?
5 REPRESENTATIVE FRESEN: Yes.
6 THE CLERK: Frishe?
7 REPRESENTATIVE FRISHE: Yes.
8 THE CLERK: Holder?
9 REPRESENTATIVE HOLDER: Yes.
10 THE CLERK: Horner?
11 REPRESENTATIVE HORNER: Yes.
12 THE CLERK: Hukill?
13 REPRESENTATIVE HUKILL: Yes.
14 THE CLERK: Jenne?
15 REPRESENTATIVE JENNE: No.
16 THE CLERK: Jones?
17 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
18 THE CLERK: Kiar?
19 REPRESENTATIVE KIAR: No.
20 THE CLERK: Legg?
21 REPRESENTATIVE LEGG: Yes.
22 THE CLERK: Nehr?
23 REPRESENTATIVE NEHR: Yes.
24 THE CLERK: Precourt?
25 REPRESENTATIVE PRECOURT: Yes.

1 THE CLERK: Rogers?

2 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Yes.

3 THE CLERK: Rouson?

4 REPRESENTATIVE ROUSON: No.

5 THE CLERK: Schenck?

6 REPRESENTATIVE SCHENCK: Yes.

7 THE CLERK: Workman?

8 REPRESENTATIVE WORKMAN: Yes.

9 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Okay. Let's
10 show that it passes favorably.

11 Okay, members, we are almost there. A
12 couple of announcements that we want to get out
13 of the way here. I appreciate everyone hanging
14 in there with us, but before I make some
15 parting comments, I want to walk through the
16 process of where we go from here.

17 The plan right now is that next week we
18 should have second reading of these bills on
19 Thursday. Amendments would be due to the
20 Committee by 12:00 p.m. on Tuesday. That's
21 that -- the two-day rule that we've got to give
22 everyone opportunity to see amendments. At a
23 minimum, I will have two amendments.

24 First, we are in possession of a single
25 joint resolution from the Senate for both state

1 legislative -- for both state legislative maps.
2 That joint resolution contains the State Senate
3 map that they passed, and it essentially
4 contains language, without any details, as a
5 parking spot for the State House map to be put
6 into it. We will be taking up the joint
7 resolution passed by the Florida Senate, and
8 amending it to the State House map.

9 Second, we are in possession of a single
10 general bill from the Senate for the
11 congressional map. I will be offering an
12 amendment to strike the congressional map as
13 passed by the Florida Senate and replacing it
14 with the congressional map that we passed here
15 today. In addition to that, in the maps passed
16 by the Florida Senate, they include a
17 plain-language description of the geography of
18 each of the districts as whereas clauses in the
19 beginning of the bills. My amendments will
20 also include a plain-language description of
21 the State House and the congressional maps.
22 Essentially, if you look at the bill analysis
23 of the bills that were passed today, the
24 whereas clauses will be almost exactly the
25 same, very similar to those.

1 Are there any questions on what I just
2 walked through or on the process between now
3 and Friday? Representative Bernard, you are
4 recognized for a question.

5 REPRESENTATIVE BERNARD: Thank you,
6 Mr. Chair. Regarding the House maps that we
7 passed out, do we expect any amendments filed
8 by staff or anything like that from now until
9 next week, or is this it?

10 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: As far as
11 changes to the map we just pass -- at this
12 stage of the game, I would say we don't have
13 any plans to file any additional amendments.
14 Certainly we have had people who showed up just
15 today offering suggestions, and I think that is
16 part of the fluid process of this, so if new
17 amendments come forth, they certainly would be
18 filed by Tuesday and we'd give everyone ample
19 opportunity to look at them, and we encourage
20 anyone, if you feel like you can make an
21 improvement to this map and make it in
22 compliance with the law better than what we
23 have done, we certainly would ask you to do so.
24 Good question.

25 Any other questions before we move

1 forward?

2 If I could just -- really quickly, I just
3 think that -- I want to thank the indulgence of
4 this Committee, of all the subcommittees and
5 really everyone who participated in this
6 process. We have been doing this for quite
7 some time. We've gotten to know each other
8 very well. We've sat through a lot of public
9 hearings. We had thousands of people come
10 before us and tell us what they thought, and I
11 think it is really historic. And what I said
12 earlier about us charting a course for the
13 process in the future, I really meant that. I
14 feel like it is our obligation to do this in
15 the right way so that when people come behind
16 us in 2022 and 2032 and '42 and so forth, that
17 we have laid a foundation that is honorable and
18 holds up the integrity of this process. I feel
19 like we have done that. I am very proud of you
20 and your contributions to this.

21 We are not done, but I certainly want to
22 thank all of our co-Chairs who worked extremely
23 hard to get the product to this Committee, and
24 I want to thank all the members of this
25 Committee for your support.

1 We had -- in the essence of thanks,
2 there's a couple of folks I want to thank.
3 First of all, we want to thank our
4 redistricting staff. Alex Kelly and -- I have
5 never witnessed a staff that has worked harder.
6 I mean, these guys have been -- you know, we
7 know our staff and this process work hard the
8 last three or four weeks of session. They have
9 been working that hard for three or four months
10 straight. And you guys all deserve a good
11 vacation, so -- and a bonus. I will try to
12 talk to the Speaker. I am not sure I can pull
13 that trigger for you. But Alex Kelly and Jeff
14 Takacs and Jason Poreda and Katie Crofoot and
15 Ben Fairbrother and Jeff Silver, these folks
16 have really sacrificed a lot of time, time with
17 their families, to try to make this process go
18 smooth, and we just cannot thank you all
19 enough. We are very proud of the product you
20 have put forth.

21 I also want to thank the House -- the
22 Office of Public Information. They have done a
23 wonderful job of making sure all the things
24 that we are doing have been available to the
25 public, and we are very grateful for that.

1 I want to thank Speaker Cannon. Speaker
2 Cannon came to me early on -- I think I have
3 told you all this story, but when he told me I
4 was going to Chair this Committee, he had a big
5 smile on his face, and I wasn't sure why he was
6 smiling, but I've figured it out now, and that
7 he knew this was going to be a challenge, but
8 he entrusted me with this opportunity to guide
9 this process, and I thank the Speaker for
10 making sure that this process was a fair and
11 open one.

12 And, frankly, lastly, and I will close
13 with this, I want to thank all the citizens who
14 have worked so hard to make this product what
15 it is. This truly is a product of thousands of
16 people. It truly is a product that
17 incorporated more thoughts, more public
18 testimony, more input, than I think anybody at
19 the beginning of this process would have
20 imagined, and we should be proud of that as a
21 committee, I look forward to presenting it on
22 the floor, and I thank you all for working with
23 me.

24 And, Representative Rouson, you've got
25 that look on your face, I know you want to say

1 something, so I will recognize you, too, sir.

2 REPRESENTATIVE ROUSON: Thank you very
3 much, Mr. Chair. I do want to say that I think
4 people have had an opportunity to be heard.
5 You certainly have been a good Chair, allowing
6 folks to speak. And I attended a lot of the
7 hearings, like everybody else here, but I have
8 to say to you that it wasn't until today that I
9 really heard invectives, pejoratives, reference
10 to organization as being like a three-year-old,
11 you know. Maybe it is because we couldn't
12 speak at some of the public hearings that we
13 didn't hear it before. Like I've said to you,
14 I think some of us have prided ourselves on
15 being able to attack policy, procedure, as
16 opposed to character of men or character of
17 organizations or refer to each other in terms
18 that are less than endearing. I hope that when
19 this does get to the floor and as we continue
20 this process, that as a statesman and not so
21 much as politicians we remember in our comments
22 that, you know, extremism and attacking
23 people's motives and character, we need to look
24 out for that and be concerned. I certainly
25 would never tell an organization that they

1 acted like a three-year-old, or use some of the
2 other words that I heard today, I would never
3 say that to a fellow State Representative. If
4 I have done it, I apologize, and -- but
5 certainly this has been a tense process, but as
6 we move towards the floor, I hope we are guided
7 by our real purpose here.

8 REPRESENTATIVE WEATHERFORD: Mr. Rouson, I
9 appreciate those comments, and the ones at
10 least that you stated never came out of my
11 mouth, but I will say this: If someone is
12 going to attack the integrity of this Committee
13 and attack the integrity of the process under
14 which we've spent the last eight months working
15 for, then we have every single right to push
16 back, we have every single right to defend
17 ourselves and to defend, frankly, this process.
18 It is not defending people. We are not talking
19 about people. This is not about organizations
20 or people. This is about a process, this is
21 about a constitutional obligation that we
22 signed up for. And when we follow that
23 constitutional mandate and people challenge
24 that integrity and the integrity of the people
25 who sit on that Committee, then as Chairman and

1 as a member of this Committee, we have every
2 right to challenge that, and we will continue
3 to do that, and if people challenge it on the
4 floor, we will challenge it there as well.

5 But I welcome your comments, I take your
6 words to be genuine, and we should be careful
7 as to the types of words that we utilize when
8 we are expressing our thoughts. But I view it
9 as Chairman of this Committee who has worked to
10 guide this process through in a legal manner,
11 that if someone tries to attack the manner in
12 which we led this Committee, that we will push
13 back, and we will answer those questions with
14 honesty and with integrity, and we will make
15 sure that when this map passes the floor,
16 everything we have done up until this point
17 will be for the right reasons and we will
18 follow through on the things that we said when
19 we started out.

20 So thank you, and with that, if there's no
21 other comments, Representative Nehr moves we
22 rise.

23 (Whereupon, the proceedings were
24 concluded.)

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF FLORIDA)
COUNTY OF LEON)

I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is of a tape-recording taken down by the undersigned, and the contents thereof were reduced to typewriting under my direction;

That the foregoing pages 2 through 137 represent a true, correct, and complete transcript of the tape-recording;

And I further certify that I am not of kin or counsel to the parties in the case; am not in the regular employ of counsel for any of said parties; nor am I in anywise interested in the result of said case.

Dated this 7th day of February, 2012.

CLARA C. ROTRUCK

Notary Public

State of Florida at Large

Commission Expires:

November 13, 2014