

Fullwood	Kiar	Plakon	Stargel
Gaetz	Kriseman	Porter	Steinberg
Garcia	Legg	Porth	Steube
Gibbons	Logan	Precourt	Taylor
Glorioso	Lopez-Cantera	Proctor	Thompson, G.
Gonzalez	Mayfield	Randolph	Thurston
Goodson	McBurney	Ray	Tobia
Grant	McKeel	Reed	Trujillo
Grimsley	Metz	Renuart	Van Zant
Hager	Moraitis	Roberson, K.	Waldman
Harrell	Nehr	Rogers	Watson
Harrison	Nelson	Rooney	Weatherford
Holder	Nuñez	Rouson	Weinstein
Hooper	O'Toole	Saunders	Williams, A.
Horner	Oliva	Schenck	Williams, T.
Hudson	Pafford	Schwartz	Wood
Hukill	Passidomo	Slosberg	Workman
Ingram	Patronis	Smith	Young
Jenne	Perman	Snyder	
Jones	Perry	Soto	
Julien	Pilon	Stafford	

Nays—1

Rehwinkel Vasilinda

Votes after roll call:

Yeas—Kreegel

Nays to Yeas—Rehwinkel Vasilinda

So the bill passed and was certified to the Senate.

## Motion

Rep. Aubuchon moved that, pursuant to Rule 8.2, the presentation and remarks portion on CS for SJR 1176 and CS for SB 1174, made on Thursday, February 2 and Friday, February 3, 2012, be spread upon the *Journal*. The motion was agreed to.

## Remarks on CS for SJR 1176 and CS for SB 1174

**Speaker Cannon:** Members, we are about to consider the Senate's redistricting bills, but before we do that I wanted to ask Chair Weatherford to share with us the good work that he and his committee and subcommittees have done during the last eight months. Chair Weatherford will then yield to the subcommittee chairs and vice chairs to explain each of our plans, accompanied by a presentation, which has also been emailed to each one of you. Upon completion of the presentations, we will move into consideration of the bills. We will be taking up several amendments and you will have the opportunity to ask questions. In order to streamline and facilitate debate on the amendments, please notify your respective leader if you wish to be recognized to speak in debate.

With that, Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to address the membership on this very important matter. Members, this is going to take a little bit of time to walk through this presentation. I think we sent an email out, but basically—as the Speaker stated, before we actually get to the amendatory process, we're going to walk you through each bill—so, each map. So we'll walk through the House map, the Congressional map, and the Senate map, and we're going to start that process in just a moment. So, it is going to take a little bit of time. We ask you please to keep the noise down so everyone can hear all the details that are being spoken of.

For the sake of your questions, your debate, and the process, we will go through, as I said, the House floor, we're going to have the opportunity to hear individually, all 120 House districts, all 27 Congressional districts, and the 40 proposed state Senate districts. Prior to that, I'm going to walk everyone through the process and the events that led to today. In order that we are all on the same page regarding what went into the redistricting process and, most importantly, how the results have impacted us.

It was in late 2010 that we had the first opportunity to publicly unveil the technology that the House has utilized in developing this redistricting process. That application, as you all know, is known as MyDistrictBuilder™. Early in 2011, our staff began a process of outreach, prior to even receiving the census data, by means of a social media and direct communications with likely stakeholders. For example, we outreached to supervisors of elections, civil rights organizations, and local government officials. In March of 2011, Florida received its census data. By April of 2011, our committee and subcommittees began meeting, learning about the application of the Federal and State redistricting laws and learning about the results of the census and announcing our 26-city tour.

Starting in June and all the way through September of 2011, we began what many of us called a 'listening tour.' We had the opportunity to listen and hear from nearly 5,000 people who attended those 26 public meetings in 25 different cities throughout our state. Those summer meetings generated more than 70 hours of public testimony. They helped encourage 177 submissions of redistricting maps—compare that to four, 10 years ago—and they helped encourage thousands of other emails, letters, phone calls, and faxes that we've received since then.

For last summer's public input meetings, we conducted outreach, including Spanish language outreach, via various newspapers, radio, and television outlets, and other estimates and other means with an estimated reach of greater than 4 million Floridians. On most days, if you Google or Bing to search the phrase 'Florida redistricting,' our website, [www.floridaredistricting.org](http://www.floridaredistricting.org), is the number one website. In addition, the House's MyDistrictBuilder™ online redistricting application averages over 200 visitors per day who utilize it.

Our goal, as everybody in here knows, was to cast a wide net and to allow different ways for Florida's residents to participate in this process, and that's exactly what has taken place. What could be difficult about a process like this is that people often look first before they tell you how to go forward—they look back first before they tell you how to go forward, and that's also exactly what happened. Because we, as a legislature, had to confront the reality that the districts were to serve, that were served, and today could be redrawn in a more meaningful and a more legal and appropriate manner. We had to confront the reality that the redistricting process should and would be held to a higher set of standards than we've ever held ourselves before.

Then our subcommittees and our redistricting committees went through a process of narrowing down legislative produced options, while at the same time amending those options with additional public feedback—receiving all that along the way. With that, members, we have three maps to present to you today, and I believe they are framed by the standards of the law. They are influenced by the public and the input that we received, and they are supported by the documented record of our subcommittees and our full committee.

Members, as we go through this presentation you will see the district, or districts, being discussed on the screen. We have also emailed this presentation to everyone, so you should have it in front of you. So when we formally take up the bills later, you can use the emailed version of this presentation if you need a reference point for the map or for districts that we're discussing during second reading. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to please recognize Representative Schenck, who is co-chair of the House committee, to start the presentation of the House map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Thank you, Chair Weatherford. Members, please be reminded that we will entertain questions once all the presentations have concluded and we take up the Senate bills. Representative Schenck, you are recognized to begin explanation of the State House map.

**Rep. Schenck:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I know you asked to go through them thoroughly, so I thought maybe I'd take 30 minutes on each House district—we'd get through it sometime next week. Let me thank you,

let me thank Chairman Weatherford about giving us the most open process we've had in redistricting. Members, HJR 6011, which redraws all 120 House districts, represents Florida's 18.8 million residents. The map drawers, which I could not say enough good things about, were Mr. Jeff Takacs—who we called 'the machine'—and Mr. Alex Kelly, who spent many, many hours in front of computers drawing these. The total range of population deviation for the districts is just under 4 percent. We use this range because it was particularly helpful in keeping counties whole and also drawing districts wholly within boundaries of counties.

Two points that were very important to our subcommittee were keeping districts whole and within boundaries of our county. The State House map drawn 10 years ago only kept 21 counties whole. This proposed State House map keeps 37 counties whole. By population and geography, it is only possible—it is only possible to keep a maximum of 38 counties whole, and we keep 37. The State House map drawn 10 years ago split 170 of Florida's 411 incorporated municipalities. This proposed State House map only splits 75 of those municipalities. In terms of the various ways that you can measure compactness, this proposed State House map is dramatically more compact than the State House map drawn 10 years ago. As State and Federal law guide us in terms of opportunities for racial and language minorities, this proposed State House map fulfills our legal obligations and even creates what we believe are some new opportunities. And in doing so, most of the minority districts are even compact. With that, members, let's start looking at the districts.

As you can see up on the big board, taking a look at Districts 1 to 4, the population of Escambia, Santa Rosa, and Okaloosa counties is nearly equal to that of four State House districts. Accordingly, each of these districts is largely anchored to one of the three counties, with Districts 1 and 4 being entirely located within a single county.

Districts 5 to 6 represent the populations of Walton, Bay, Holmes, Jackson, and Washington counties. Bay County has a district entirely within its borders and the remaining four counties are kept whole.

Districts 7, 8, and 9 keep several counties whole, only splitting Leon County. However, I think we did so in a meaningful way, ensuring that the city of Tallahassee, which is larger than the size of a State House district, is only split into two different districts and that Leon County gets a district entirely within its borders. District 8 is a majority-minority district that includes the entirety of Gadsden County.

Moving on, members, to Districts 11 to 16. They represent the entirety of Duval and Nassau counties, which happen to have populations equal to that of six House districts. Nassau County is kept whole within this configuration. One of the changes we made in the Redistricting Committee was to ensure that St. Johns River was followed as a geographical boundary line. Districts 13 and 14 are majority-minority districts that have been drawn in a much more compact configuration than the districts that were drawn 10 years ago.

Districts 17 and 24 through 27 represent putting exactly five districts within the boundaries of St. Johns, Flagler, and Volusia counties. Three entire districts were included within the boundaries of Volusia County and one entire district was included within the boundaries of St. Johns County. Cities like DeLand, Deltona, and St. Augustine are kept whole. Also of note, during this entire process, we once received public input via a postcard from a Flagler County resident. She wanted a Flagler County-based district that aligns with southern St. Johns County, and District 24 addresses that request.

In the center of North Florida, Districts 10, 18, and 19, and 20 to 23 manage to keep 10 counties whole. District 18 was designed as a very compact district, entirely within the boundaries of Clay County. As requested, we heard multiple times from Clay County residents they want to be kept whole. This configuration also creates both a seat entirely in Marion County and a second seat that is more than two-thirds in Marion County. District 20 will keep seven cities whole and, at that same time, maintain a

district that historically elects the African-American community's candidate of choice.

District 34 and 35 pair Citrus and Hernando County, which, together, have the population of two House districts.

District 33 includes the entirety of Sumter County and the cities of Lady Lake and Fruitland Park, and then portions of southern Marion County that are often associated with The Villages—a compact community that's boundaries extend into Sumter, Lake, and Marion counties.

Districts 36 to 38 divide Pasco County into three very compact districts, as the population of the county is nearly equal to three districts. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my co-chair, Representative Dorworth, to continue the explanation of the proposed House map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Dorworth, you are recognized to explain House Districts 28 through 32 and 39 through 79.

**Representative Dorworth:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and if could just take a quick second to echo the sentiments of Co-Chair Schenck about our staff. And I really don't think you can understand the enormity of dividing this state and having Congressional maps and Senate maps, and State House maps. The job they did was nothing short of stellar and they call the man 'the machine' because he's a machine, so Jeff Takacs and Alex Kelly are best in class as far as I'm concerned. We are very, very blessed to have them here.

Now, if I may, let me just go through the districts in Central Florida to start. Districts 28 to 32 and 44 to 49 represent much of the Central Florida region. District 32 met the goal of including one district entirely in Lake County and Districts 28 and 29 met the goal of including two districts entirely in Seminole County. Our subcommittee looked at multiple configurations of this area and ultimately passed amendments that improved the numbers of cities kept whole here.

Districts 46 and 48 are both majority-minority districts, and District 45, we believe, may be a new opportunity—a second opportunity for the African-American community in Orange County to elect a representative of their choice. The compactness and adherence to county lines of these districts improve greatly as compared to the State House map drawn 10 years ago.

Districts 50 to 53 represent Brevard County moving into east Orange County. Three entire districts are located within Brevard County in a very compact design. Members, as you are probably starting to see, we heard a theme all summer long that people wanted districts entirely located within a single county when possible. This is an example of a legally appropriate decision that also addresses that public input.

Districts 39 to 43 represent the bulk of Polk and Osceola counties. District 43, which is entirely located in Osceola County and keeps the city of Kissimmee whole, is a new majority-minority Hispanic district. Districts 40 and 41 are wholly located in Polk County. This design of Polk County is very much what the Polk County Commission requested for the State House map. Both our subcommittee and the full committee made changes in Polk County that led to several additional cities being kept whole.

District 56 is also in Polk County, encompassing Bartow and all of Hardee and Desoto counties. The district uses US 17 as a transportation artery, which was a specific request from the public. Districts 57 and 64 encompass most of Hillsborough County. The bill creates three east Hillsborough Districts, keeping Plant City and Temple Terrace whole. Districts 61 and 62 are both majority-minority districts in what is a Section 5 Voting Rights Act county. Of the nine districts in Hillsborough County, seven of them are entirely within the boundaries of the county.

District 64 is about two-thirds Hillsborough County and one-third of the population in Pinellas County, including the entirety of Oldsmar and Safety Harbor. Districts 65 to 69 are all entirely within Pinellas County, meaning

that five of the seven districts in Pinellas County are entirely within Pinellas. There are a significant number of municipalities in Pinellas County many of which are kept whole. Pursuant to the request of the public, these proposed districts make a particular effort to keep small cities whole in Pinellas County.

District 70 connects the four counties in this region: Hillsborough, Manatee, Pinellas, and Sarasota counties. A mathematical note about these four counties: they happen to be the size of 18 districts. District 70 historically elects African-American candidates and is partially located in the Section 5 covered county, Hillsborough County. Therefore, it was important to make an effort to maintain its ability to elect a candidate of choice. In addition to that, the district is used in such a way that the population it covers in Manatee and Sarasota allows the remainder of those two counties to be represented by two districts that are mostly in Manatee County and two districts that are entirely in Sarasota County, both of which were requests from the public.

So, of these 18 districts in Hillsborough, Manatee, Pinellas, and Sarasota, 14 of them are located entirely within one county. Districts 75 to 79 encompass all of Charlotte and Lee counties; in fact Charlotte County is District 75. Lee County happens to be nearly equal to the size of four State House districts. Therefore, its borders are not crossed in this map. In our most recent committee meeting, an amendment was done in response to a public input to make the community of Estero whole. Every incorporated city in Lee County is also kept whole.

District 55 encompasses the entirety of Okeechobee, Highlands, and Glades counties, along with a few thousand residents of western St. Lucie County. District 54 is the entirety of Indian River County along with a small portion of St. Lucie County. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back to Chair Weatherford.

**Speaker Cannon:** Chair Weatherford, would you yield to Representative Frishe? Representative Frishe, you are recognized to explain House Districts 80 to 120.

**Rep. Frishe:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And like my co-chairmen on this committee, I'd like to echo their thanks to our staff who have been just outstanding in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, members, District 82 to 84 encompasses the remainder of St. Lucie County, all of Martin County, and approximately 60,000 residents in northern Palm Beach County. Port St. Lucie is larger than the size of the State House district. Otherwise, every other city in these two counties is kept whole.

You look at Districts 81 and 85 to 91. The remainder of Palm Beach County includes eight districts that are entirely within the borders of the county. If you reflect on the districts drawn in the State House map 10 years ago, there is no longer a district that encompasses both sides of the Okeechobee—something that we heard a great deal about in public hearings. Instead, you have a western Palm Beach County district. The turnpike is used as a geographical divider for some of the districts in the county, and the overall compactness of these districts has significantly improved.

District 86 includes the entirety of Wellington, Loxahatchee Groves, and Royal Palm Beach.

District 88 maintains the existing majority-minority African-American district and not one district crosses the Palm Beach/Broward County line.

Moving to Broward County, 10 of the 14 districts in the county are entirely located within the county. They are all major improvements in terms of compactness, even the four districts that historically elect African-American candidates—District 92, 94, 95, and 101 are very compact. And District 95 also maintains a significant Caribbean-American community.

Moving into northern Miami-Dade County, District 107 and 108 have significant concentrations of Haitian Americans maintaining the two districts in the State House that historically allows this language-minority community to choose a candidate of their choice.

When you look further at districts like 103, 110, and 111 you'll see that the proposed State House map looks frequently toward roadways in Miami-Dade County as boundaries. Most of the district lines, or many of the district lines, were straightened, squared off, and neighborhood boundaries were looked to as frequently as possible so as to not divide neighborhoods—not to split them up. There is also some, were some, changes done in both subcommittee and committee to improve the use of municipal lines here, and also to maintain the existing districts that enable Hispanic communities to choose a candidate of their choice.

Looking further into Miami-Dade County at Districts 112, 114 to 119, overall Miami-Dade County represented dynamic improvements in terms of compactness of the districts. Most of the districts in this slide are districts that traditionally perform for Hispanic candidates, although District 117 historically elects an African-American candidate. In all cases, we maintain the ability to elect the minority community's candidate of choice.

Down at the bottom, District 120 is Monroe County. That also encompasses portions of southern Miami-Dade.

District 105, and this one you'll notice is a Section 5 Voting Rights district that is about two-thirds in Miami-Dade County and one-third in Collier County. In the State House map that was created 10 years ago, a similar district was created as the result of a settlement with U.S. Department of Justice and Federal Court that required that the Hispanic community in Collier County maintain the ability to elect a Hispanic candidate. To accommodate that court settlement, a second district that crossed the state was also created 10 years ago. However, in the proposed State House map, only this district crosses the middle of the state—that being the district that was necessary pursuant to the court settlement.

Moving further into Collier County, pursuant to a request of the Greater Naples Chamber, there are only three districts in Collier County. District 106 is entirely within the county and includes the city of Naples. District 80 is the northern Collier County district and also includes all of Hendry County. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield back to Chairman Weatherford.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker that concludes the presentation of the State House map. Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to please recognize Representative Legg to begin the explanation of the Congressional map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Legg, you are recognized.

**Rep. Legg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is CS/HB 6005, which are the Congressional districts. Members, as you know, we have 27 Congressional districts—plus two this time around, versus 10 years ago. The two new Congressional districts—as an interesting note, states like New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, have all lost congressional representation, and we have gained two. The map drawers for this Congressional district, these Congressional maps, are Alex Kelly, Jason Poreda, Jeff Silver. The standard deviation for each of these districts, members, take a note of this, is zero. There is zero deviation in these maps to adhere to the one-person, one-vote principle. Members, 10 years ago, the former map consisted of 37 whole counties. This current map consists of 46 whole counties. The former map consisted of 110 city splits, this map has only 27, out of the 411, cities that are split.

Members, voters wanted a map that was compact. This Congressional map is more compact in every possible measurement than the map 10 years ago. Voters wanted a map that protected racial and language minorities. This map

fulfills that obligation in every capacity. Members, let's look at the descriptions of each of the districts.

**Speaker Cannon:** Members—Representative Legg, excuse me just a moment. Members, please give Representative Legg your attention. Keep the noise down. Representative Legg, you are recognized.

**Rep. Legg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Starting in the panhandle, District 1 includes all of Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton counties, and a portion of Holmes County. District 2 includes a portion of Holmes and Madison counties, and all of Jackson, Washington, Bay, Calhoun, Gulf, Liberty, Franklin, Gadsden, Leon, Wakulla, Jefferson, and Taylor counties. District 3 includes a portion of Madison, Clay, Alachua, Marion counties and all of Hamilton, Suwannee, Lafayette, Dixie, Levy, Gilchrist, Columbia, Union, and Bradford counties.

In Northeast Florida, District 4 includes all of Baker and Nassau counties and a majority of Duval County. Looking back to the district in this general area drawn 10 years ago, it stretched from Duval County all the way to Tallahassee. We received feedback from Tallahassee residents asking that they no longer be connected to Jacksonville in a district, and District 4 accomplishes this.

District 5 includes a portion of Duval, Clay, Putnam, Alachua, Marion, Lake, Seminole, and Orange counties. In this district, the municipalities of Eatonville, Green Cove Springs, Hawthorne, Palatka, and Reddick are all kept whole. The core of this district is very similar to the core of the existing district, a district that has historically elected an African-American to Congress. The first version of this district was drawn by a Federal court in 1992. Prior to that, the state of Florida had not had an African-American member of Congress since Reconstruction.

District 6 includes a portion of Putnam County, the majority of Volusia County, and all of St. Johns and Flagler counties.

Moving on to central Florida, District 7 includes portions of Volusia, Seminole, and Orange counties, keeping several cities whole throughout the district.

District 8 includes all of Brevard and Indian River counties and a portion of Orange County.

District 9 includes all of Osceola and portions of Orange and Polk counties. Over the past several months, we have received feedback from the people of Osceola County requesting that they be kept whole in a Congressional district, as well as requests for us to link Osceola and Orange counties. Furthermore, we received numerous requests from the public to create a district that acknowledges the growth of the Hispanic community in Central Florida. In that regard, we've married up these two different requests from the public, and done so while keeping an entire county and several cities whole.

District 10 includes a portion of Orange and Polk counties and the majority of Lake County.

District 11 includes all of Citrus, and Hernando, and Sumter counties, and a portion of Lake and Marion counties. In terms of population, Marion County is still the most significant county in this district, even though the county is divided.

In the Tampa Bay region, District 12 includes all of Pasco County and a portion of Hillsborough and Pinellas counties, keeping several cities whole.

District 13 is wholly contained in Pinellas County and keeps 21 municipalities in the county whole. In this district, along with District 14, were amended in committee due to both concerns about the Voter's Right Act of compliance with District 14, but also a public request from Pinellas County residents who wished to be in Pinellas County districts. District 14 includes a portion of Hillsborough and Pinellas counties. Ten years ago, a similar configured district stretched down in Manatee and Sarasota counties. We

received input from the public calling for that district to be removed from those two counties and go more into Hillsborough County, and that is exactly what we did. This district is covered under Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act.

District 15 includes the eastern portion of Hillsborough County and the western portion of Polk County. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield to our subcommittee co-chair, Representative Holder, to explain Districts 16 through 27.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Holder, you are recognized to explain Districts 16 through 27.

**Rep. Holder:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. District 16 includes the majority of Manatee County and all of Sarasota County. The people of those two counties overwhelmingly asked that they be connected in a Congressional district, and that's exactly what we did.

District 17 includes portions of Polk, Hillsboro, Manatee, and Lee counties, and all of Hardy, Desoto, Highlands, Okeechobee, Glades, and Charlotte counties.

District 18 includes all of St. Lucie and Martin counties and a portion of Palm Beach County. You may remember that that district is the area the state that, drawn 10 years ago, stretches from Palm Beach County all the way across the state to Charlotte County. We heard from residents from the Treasure Coast, and frankly, throughout the state, calling for the end of cross-state districts, and so we did away with that district.

District 19 includes the majority of Lee County and portions of Collier County including all of Naples.

And moving southeast to southeast Florida, District 20 includes portions of Hendry, Palm Beach, and Broward counties. District 20 is a Section 5 Voting Rights district. We received maps for this area that were submitted by members of the public who did an excellent job of keeping the municipalities whole, and we took that advice. This particular district keeps 14 municipalities whole.

District 21 includes portions of Palm Beach and Broward counties.

District 22 includes portions of Palm Beach and Broward counties, and like District 20, keeps many municipalities in the region whole. In fact, 20 municipalities are kept whole within that district.

District 23 includes portions of Broward and Miami-Dade counties. It keeps 16 municipalities whole, including Davie, Hollywood, and Weston.

District 24 also includes portions of Broward and Miami-Dade counties. This area of the state has traditionally elected an African-American to Congress and this district recreates that opportunity. Additionally, this district keeps several cities whole.

District 25 includes portions of Hendry, Collier, Broward and Miami-Dade counties. This district is also impacted by Section 5 of the Federal Voting Act, Federal Voting Rights Act.

District 26 includes portions of Miami-Dade and all of Monroe County.

District 27 is the second district that is wholly contained within a county and its all in Miami-Dade. The additional one point that I want to mention about Districts 25, 26, and 27 is they're drawn to create a more compact and cohesive meeting point between the districts, nearby and along the Tamiami Trail. In that way, we're able to both maintain these three majority-minority districts, but also design them in a more compact fashion. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back to Chair Weatherford.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Speaker, I now would like to recognize Representative Horner to explain the differences between the House and Senate versions of the Congressional map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Horner, you are recognized.

**Rep. Horner:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, I'd like to discuss the differences between the Congressional map and CS for SJR 1176 that the Senate passed on January 17 and the proposed map just described to you by Chairman Legg and Holder in CS/HB 6005. Some of the overall differences between the two maps are the Senate's version of the Congressional map splits 24 counties and 46 cities; the House's version only splits 21 counties and 27 cities throughout the entire map.

The first area I'd like to talk about is, of course, Osceola County and Congressional District 9 on our map. Both the House and Senate drew the districts in a similar way, including all of Osceola and portions of Orange and Polk counties. The District 9 in our bill is noticeably more compact than its counterpart.

The next area I'll bring up is the Pasco/Hernando area and the Tampa Bay region. In the Senate's version—the Congressional map, Hernando and Pasco counties are linked together, which pushes the district to the north, containing Citrus and Sumter County, further into Lake County. As a result, the Senate's version of the map has a Congressional district that entirely spans northern Pinellas and Hillsborough counties. In the House's version of the Congressional bill, Hernando County is joined with Citrus and Sumter counties, whereas Pasco County is in the district that also has portions of north Pinellas and Hillsborough County. This configuration in the House's proposal also creates a district that is mostly in eastern Hillsborough and western Polk counties, keeping Plant City, Lakeland, and Bartow wholly within the district.

The next difference is also in the Tampa Bay region. In the House map, District 14 does not go into Manatee County, so that the district is wholly and more compactly located in Pinellas and Hillsborough counties. The Senate's version of the Congressional district dips into Manatee County.

Moving south along the Gulf Coast, the House version of the Congressional map keeps Sarasota County whole along with the majority of Manatee County. The most similar district in the Senate's version of the Congressional map splits Manatee, Sarasota, and Charlotte counties with the coastal side being in one district and the rural side being in another district.

Moving to District 17, the Senate's version splits Charlotte and Okeechobee counties. The House version keeps these counties whole.

The final area of significant difference in the two districts in Miami-Dade County and Monroe County. Both maps connect Monroe County with Miami-Dade County. However, the Senate's version of the map connects Monroe County with eastern Miami-Dade County, while the House's version creates what turns out to be a more compact design connecting Monroe County with western Miami-Dade County. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield back to Chair Weatherford.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to now recognize Representative Hukill to explain Senate Districts 14 through 22, 24 through 26, and 28. Oh, I apologize—I skipped. Representative Nehr, I haven't forgot about you, buddy. I still got your back. I'd now like to recognize Representative Nehr to explain the Congressional map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Nehr, you are recognized.

**Rep. Nehr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, we will now be discussing CS/HB 6001, which represents the redistricting of all 40 State Senate districts. This is an identical map to CS for SJR 1176 that our colleagues in the Florida

Senate passed on January 17th. The total range of population deviation for the districts is just under 2 percent, approximately plus or minus 1 percent. And the State Senate map drawn 10 years ago only kept 22 counties whole. HB 6001, before you here today, keeps 36 counties whole. The State Senate map drawn 10 years ago split 126 cities out of the 411 cities throughout Florida, and this proposed map only splits 54 cities. With that, members, let's look at the districts.

Taking a look at Districts 1 and 3, the population of Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, Holmes, Jackson, Washington, and Bay counties are nearly equal to that of two State Senate districts. The two districts' primary boundary lines between them are Interstate 10 and the Intercostal Waterway, the Yellow River, as well as several municipal lines.

District 5 is made up of entirely 11 whole counties: Calhoun, Franklin, Gadsden, Gulf, Hamilton, Jefferson, Leon, Liberty, Madison, Taylor, and Wakulla.

Now, looking at Districts 2, 7, and 11, you can see there are 12 whole counties between these three districts. District 7 is made up entirely of Alachua, Clay, and Union counties. And District 2 is made up of eight whole counties along Florida's Nature Coast—as well as a portion of Marion County. District 11 contains the other part of Marion County, only dividing the county into two districts. District 11, also, keeps the areas known as The Villages and The Golden Triangle—the cities of Eustis, Tavares, and Mount Dora—whole.

Districts 4, 6, and 9 consist of much of Northeast Florida District 4 and keeps Nassau County whole, connecting it to Duval County. District 6 is drawn to maintain a district that historically elects the African-American community's candidate of choice in that region. And Districts 6 and 9 also meet the goal, that public input suggested, that St. Johns and Flagler counties be linked.

District 8 encompasses the majority of Volusia County and connects the county to northern Brevard County, and the district follows many municipal lines within the county, again accomplishing the goal of several people who testified at the Daytona Beach public hearing who requested there be fewer districts in the county and that their city lines be respected.

Moving to the Central Florida area, Districts 10, 12, and 13 are made up of Seminole County, as well as eastern Orange County and southern Lake County. And District 12 preserves the district that historically elects the African-American community's candidate of choice in the Orlando area. Districts 10 and 13 also meet the goal of both Lake and Seminole County residents who wanted to see their counties divided as few times as possible. These districts make sure both counties only have two State Senate districts. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back to Chair Weatherford.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please recognize Representative Hukill to explain Senate Districts 14 through 22, 24 through 26, and 28.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Hukill, you are recognized.

**Rep. Hukill:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, moving to the Gulf Coast, we see that District 20 keeps Hernando County whole and joins it with portions of Pasco and Sumter counties. This district makes use of county and municipal borders for the majority of its border. Moving back to the Central Florida area, Districts 14 and 16 are made up of southern Orange County, northern Polk County, and keeps Osceola County whole between the two districts. District 14 has an Hispanic voting-age population of over 50 percent. Several publicly submitted maps drew a similar district in the Orlando area.

Districts 15, 17, 19, 21, and 22 make up the Tampa Bay region made up of all of Pinellas and Hillsborough counties as well as parts of Pasco and Manatee

counties. Both Pinellas and Hillsborough counties have a state Senate district entirely within each county in District 17 and 21, respectively. This reflects the public testimony of residents of the two counties requesting that a Senate district be wholly located in their county. District 19 connects areas of Pinellas, Hillsborough, and Manatee counties and historically elects African-American candidates, and it is also partially located in a Section 5-covered county, Hillsborough County. Therefore, it was important to make an effort to maintain its ability to elect a candidate of choice.

Moving from the Gulf Coast, we move back to the east coast of the state looking specifically at Brevard and Indian River counties that are joined by District 18. This district limits the division of Brevard County to only two State Senate districts, which was a request of those who testified at the Melbourne public hearing. This district also does not divide any municipalities in either county.

Moving back to the Gulf Coast, we look at Districts 24 and 28. [District] 24 connects municipalities in eastern Manatee County, such as Myakka Head, Old Myakka, and Myakka City, within areas in eastern Hillsborough County and southwestern Polk County. District 28 keeps Sarasota County whole and connects that county with areas such as Port Charlotte and Grove City in eastern Charlotte County. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to our vice chair, Representative Workman, to continue the explanation of the proposed State Senate map, HB 6001.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Workman, you are recognized.

**Representative Workman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As we continue to move around the map, we look next at District 26, which is a geographically large district made up of five whole inland counties in Hardy, DeSoto, Highlands, Glades, and Okeechobee. The district also connects these counties with southern Polk County, western St. Lucie, and Martin counties, and a portion of Charlotte County.

District 25 connects eastern parts of Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, and eastern Palm Beach County. This area is linked together by the major transportation routes of Interstate 95 and US 1.

Moving back to the southern part of the state to the Gulf coast, District 23 and 30 link Lee County with the coastal portion of Collier County and the southern portion of Charlotte County.

District 30 keeps municipalities such as Cape Coral, Sanibel, Naples, and Marco Island are kept whole in District 30. Both Districts 23 and 30 use major transportation routes in the area, such as Interstate 75 and the Tamiami Trail, to connect these areas together.

Moving back to the East Coast, we'll now look at Districts 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, and 36. These are the six State Senate districts that make up the majority of Palm Beach and Broward counties. District 27 is wholly located within Palm Beach County and Districts 31 and 36 are wholly located within Broward County. District 29 is a majority-minority district in Palm Beach and Broward counties and has historically elected an African-American community's candidate of choice in that region.

Moving south in Miami-Dade County, we'll look at Districts 33, 35, 37, 38, and 39 all together. Districts 33, 37, and 39 traditionally offer Hispanic communities the opportunity to choose a candidate of their choice. District 38 historically elects an African-American candidate.

Moving further south, we will look at District 40, which has two whole counties in Monroe and Hendry County. This district also has parts of Collier and Miami-Dade counties. This district includes three Section 5 counties in Monroe, Collier County, and Hendry counties where the minority community has traditionally been able to elect an African-American candidate. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back to Chair Weatherford.

**Speaker Cannon:** Chair Weatherford, back to you.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, those are the explanations of the Senate, House, and Congressional maps. And I think we've got it all out there.

**Speaker Cannon:** All right, we are now ready to take up the Senate bills. Take up and read CS for SJR 1176.

**CS for SJR 1176** was read the second time by title on Thursday, February 2, 2012 (as previously shown in the *Journal* on page 328).

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Nehr, you are recognized to explain the bill.

**Representative Nehr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, this is CS for SJR 1176. It's the proposed State Senate map as passed by the Florida Senate. It is identical to the State Senate map that our Redistricting Committee passed in CS/HJR 6001. This is the same Senate map that we just explained during the presentation and that is the bill, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** All right, are there questions to the sponsor? Representative Jenne, for a question.

**Rep. Jenne:** Mr. Speaker, thank you. Chairman Nelson, I have some questions here. I was hoping to start off with some that focus on the issues of racial fairness in the map. Oh, who did I say? I'm sorry, it's just, I'm in insurance and I just think of Bryan Nelson a whole heck of a lot. [laughter] Representative Nehr, I do apologize.

First of all, if you could, please tell us the definition of 'retrogression' as it is applied to this particular plan.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Nehr.

**Rep. Nehr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to tell you, I'll have Representative Weatherford take that question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a good question, Representative Jenne, thank you for bringing it forth. It's been talked about a lot, trying to define, in a very finite manner, the definition of 'retrogression.' I don't know if I have a perfect answer for you, but I can tell you this—'retrogression,' to me, and I think to the committee that has worked for these great bills, means not going backwards. It means that if you have a district, for example, that is a minority-majority district in a Section 5 county, it should not go backwards. It means that, for example, in Amendment 6, that speaks very clearly and Amendment 5, it speaks very clearly to not having diminishment within the minority districts. I think that's what 'retrogression' is.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? For a follow up, Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Representative Weatherford, thank you for that. I'll address my questions back to Representative Nehr, my dear friend Peter Nehr. Some districts must be drawn to allow minorities to elect the Representative of their choosing, but having the 2002 districts change and what I'm wondering, really, is—do we have to maintain 2002 minority districts in order to re-elect someone?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, is that a follow up? Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate it. It's a very good question. Look, I think that the Federal law is extremely and implicitly clear. There are different things that you have to look at. For example, we have five counties within Florida that are Section 5 counties within the Voting Rights Act. We cannot allow for diminishment to take place within those five counties—certainly for districts that are within those five counties. But also,

we have Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act that also says that you cannot take a district that is a minority-majority district and take it below 50 percent.

On top of that, the voters, in 2010, voted for Amendments 5 and 6 that very clearly stated, as a tier one criteria, that we cannot diminish the opportunity for minorities, communities to elect a candidate of their choice. And so, I think it's pretty clear as to what we have to do and what we've done within these maps.

**Speaker Cannon:** For a follow up, Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Again, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It may be these line of questions are along the same vein so, I'll probably address them to Representative Nehr, but please feel free. What was the definition the committee used to determine if districts were racially fair—that threshold that you just spoke of, was there anything else and was it that no plan could diminish the percentage of minority voters in any minority district below its current total or are we just working with that 50 percent threshold? If you would, please, sir.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is no specific threshold. It is a district-by-district analysis that we have to make. Certainly, when you're going through the Department of Justice, they require certain data that we have to show and prove that we did not diminish a minority community's ability to elect a candidate of their choice.

**Speaker Cannon:** For a follow up, Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker. Next question, whoever needs to answer it. Does compliance with the Constitution require the use of minority voting data, majority voting data, performance in various elections, ability of minority voters to elect, and I was wondering if you could tell me why or why not, depending upon your answer, of course?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, a good question. The Voting Rights Act and the Department of Justice, as well, in order for us to make sure we have not diminished according to Amendments 5 and 6, we do have to use data to show that we have not taken away that community's ability to vote for a candidate of their choice.

**Speaker Cannon:** For a follow up, Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Again, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I had the opportunity and the honor to sit on these committees, there was a lot of talk, seemed to be wherever, at least, that I went and my colleagues reiterated to me that they heard a lot on the different legs of the trip, but there was a lot of talk about making preservations of minority districts a priority—I think we can all agree upon that. Is there any numerical formula, any at all? We know that now, that there isn't. So, how then do we know if the plan diminishes or does not diminish the ability if we're not using any specific type of threshold?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I answered that question before, but it is a district-by-district analysis. There is no specific threshold—it is a district-by-district analysis. And I would also add, that it wasn't just this body that agrees—that is a tier one standard to protect people's ability to elect a candidate of their choice. Sixty-three percent of the voting public in 2010 also agreed.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Again, thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the plan packs large minorities of Democratic voters into some districts—is that evidence, or can we take that as evidence, as the plan is intended to favor one party or another? If we see packing, really not just the Democrats and I apologize because that's

my point of view, but in either party, if we're packing people in—is that evidence to show that it was intended to favor one group or the other, sir?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very proud of the fact that our maps do not have any packing within them, whatsoever. It's not a part of any of our maps. We made sure of that and it's nowhere within any one of these House, Congressional, or Senate maps—there was no packing, whatsoever.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you, Speaker. Based on the map that we're currently presented with—does it represent the greatest number of minority or coalition districts that could have been drawn? If no, why not? If the answer is yes, could you please tell us how you know that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Certainly, we can give you a lot of data on the districts that were drawn that potentially would give communities the ability to vote for a candidate of their choice, but there is no requirement of law that you maximize anything like that. So, that is not something that we look to do.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If it's statistically probable that minority voters will elect a candidate of their choice, with 40 percent minority voting age population—is it constitutional, constitutionally permissible, for that district to contain 55 percent, 65 percent, 75 percent, so on and so forth?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I don't believe there is a numeric standard that you can unilaterally or paint across the entire state of Florida. I think that it is a district-by-district analysis that you have to run through to make sure that you feel confident that that community would be able to vote a candidate of their choice. There is no number that you can put your hat on and say that that is the magic number—does not exist.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as always. Was election performance data used, Representative Weatherford, to determine if districts improved or diminished the ability of minorities to elect candidates of their choice? If yes, you could define what that data was and I'll save the rest for follow up if necessary, dependent upon your answer.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Justice actually requires that we use performance data to prove that the districts that we've drawn continue to allow a community to elect a candidate of their choice. Our staff, along with our attorneys, look at that data and they analyze it on a district-by-district basis to make sure that that is taking place—the answer is yes.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we ask what the source of that data, where the source of that data was?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** The source is the Department of State, Division of Elections, and also, I would like to point out on the earlier question as well, if I could, Mr. Speaker, that we only use that data when dealing with those

districts, the minority districts.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Switching gears, I'm going to go back because these next set of questions deal with incumbency and perhaps it will go back to you, Chairman Weatherford, but I'll formally address them to Chairman Nehr at this point, until I know otherwise. Chairman Nehr, if the 2002 districts were drawn in order to preserve incumbency or to help any particular political party, is that something relevant to determining whether or not we can simply keep the 2012 districts and plans approximately the same as configured in 2002? Because I have to be quite honest, when I look over things it seems to be that they are very, very similar in nature.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Nehr.

**Rep. Nehr:** Mr. Speaker, once again, I'd like to yield to Representative Weatherford.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could not disagree more. I don't think our districts in 2012 reflect, very much of anything in 2002, but I would also like to point out that I don't think anybody here can specifically talk about what the intent of the legislature was 10 years ago. I didn't serve in this body. We may have a couple of a retreads who are here when we went through that process in 2002, but I was not one of them and so I can't speak to that. There is nothing wrong with being a retread, Representative Frishe. [laughter]

**Speaker Cannon:** The record shall so reflect. Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** I like to refer to them as veterans, Chairman. [laughter] I'm sorry. If the district is composed of 70 percent voters of the same party as the incumbent, some might say that it's evidence of an intent to favor said incumbent. I was wondering if you could explain, why or why not, in your particular view.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that's a factor in whether or not the maps that we drew were compliant with Amendments 5 and 6 and the Federal Voting Rights Act. I mean, we have very clear standards both in statute, Federal statute—we have very clear standards in the State Constitution which we abided by. But one those standards is not whether or not a district looks anything similar to the way it looked 10 years ago when it was drawn. So, I guess I just don't follow that line of questioning.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Fair enough. Next question would be this—were there any iterations, models, of any maps that included any member's actual residence—intentionally placed there?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Very proud to say, absolutely not and I think a lot of the members in this Chamber could speak to that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** At least I can. Were there any discussions with members about whether their residence would be in a district with another residence of any other incumbent? Was the Democratic Party of Florida solicited to give their input or was the Republican Party of Florida solicited to give their input?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our job was to comply with the Amendments 5 and 6, and our Constitution, and to comply with the Federal statutes of the Voting Rights Act. Where people live was

inconsequential. We did not look at that information and I think that's reflected in our maps.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you. And then to the second part of that question would be—was there anyone reaching out, did anyone reach out, to the Florida Democratic Party or the Republican Party of Florida on behalf of this Chamber?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** No.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the final question that I have. Based on publicly available historic election data, as certified by our very own Secretary of State, the Senate plan overwhelmingly, it favors one particular party while creating only fourteen districts that would give the minority party a chance at winning. On a fair plan, based on a 50/50 statewide partisan vote in this state, wouldn't that allow for 20 and 20 and can you tell me why doesn't this plan shake out that way?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, I cannot speak for the Senate, but we certainly, and I agree with the Senate, I believe the Senate would say the same thing, that we did not use political data in drawing these maps and so it's kind of hard to answer a question about what we knew in regards to political data when we didn't use it. Nowhere in the standards to talk about trying to draw districts with any type of partisanship or any type of number involved, and very clear standards to talk about tier one standards of making sure there was no political intent, had very clear standards about preserving communities' ability to vote for a candidate of their choice, compactness, cities and counties, all those things. It doesn't talk about the question that you just asked.

**Speaker Cannon:** One more. Representative Jenne, you are recognized.

**Rep. Jenne:** I appreciate your indulgence, Mr. Speaker. Some of my colleagues started getting in my ear for a second; they wanted me to ask a follow up to a previous question. Before, I had asked if any information had been solicited from any political party. The question that I was asked to then reframe would be—was there any communication either between the House of Representatives, anyone working for the House of Representatives, and the Florida Democratic Party or the Republican Party of Florida via telephone, email, fax, Skype, anything at all?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** No—that I know of.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Cruz, for a question. You're recognized.

**Rep. Cruz:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question is about incumbency, also. Were members asked about how to improve a district?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I—maybe reframe that question. I'm not sure I understood it exactly.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Cruz.

**Rep. Cruz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Were any members asked about how to improve a district?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you're recognized.



**Rep. Weatherford:** I can speak for our committee. The conversations that we had, in regards to improvement—we had many conversations about improvement—but they were about improving the compliance with the standards that we have to follow, both with the Federal Voting Rights Act and with Amendments 5 and 6.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Cruz, for a follow up.

**Rep. Cruz:** Actually, Mr. Speaker, it's another question, not a follow up.

**Speaker Cannon:** All right. Another question.

**Rep. Cruz:** Were districts modified based on any member input?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I think districts were modified certainly by member input. They were modified based on public input. They were modified by maps that were submitted by members of the public. They were modified by discussions that took place within the committee. So there were many ways that the districts were modified. A lot of ideas were exchanged throughout the committee process. I think it's very well documented in this committee.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Cruz, you're recognized.

**Rep. Cruz:** Questions now on compactness. What definition of compactness was applied to constructing this plan?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Compactness is not necessarily determined by a single test or a measurement. Compactness—thank you, Representative—compactness can be in different forms. For example, you can look at a district and very clearly see if it's compact. I think there is an eyeball test that we would all recognize, whether or not something is compact. But it can also be something that is following a county boundary, or it can be a political or geographic boundary. Or it can be one which improves a citizen's ability to travel when it comes to the traveling distance of a district. So, there are lots of measurements. In fact, courts have used up to several dozen types of compactness measures. There is no one that is utilized as the standard, so to speak. But I do believe the basic—to break it down to very basic terms, I think you kind of know compactness when you see it. And I think that when you look at our districts, I do think they meet that test.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Cruz, you're recognized.

**Rep. Cruz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To that end, can you tell me how does this plan reflect your definition of compactness?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Cruz:** I said to that—

**Speaker Cannon:** Go ahead, Representative Cruz.

**Rep. Cruz:** I said to that end, can you tell me how this plan reflects your definition of compactness?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. By every measurement that we have and that we utilize. In fact, if you go to MyDistrictBuilder™, we have different ways and components to measure compactness by every form. It is more compact than it was 10 years ago, significantly more compact.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Cruz.

**Rep. Cruz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can you tell me, please, what reasons were there for districts that are not clearly compact?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I need you to be a little more specific than that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Cruz.

**Rep. Cruz:** Well, I'll ask the question again then. What reasons were there for districts that were not clearly, physically compact?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I hate to do this to you, Representative Cruz, but I'm going to repeat myself. I think you need to be a little more specific and give me a district you think does not meet the compactness requirements and I'll tell you why we, you know, that we felt that it was the most legally compliant form to draw that district.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Cruz.

**Rep. Cruz:** Can you tell me then why some districts were not drawn in a compact fashion?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I—Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I'm going to continue to say the same thing. It's not Groundhog Day, but I would need you to be a little bit more specific about what exact districts you're talking about that you feel are not compact.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Cruz, can you rephrase the question?

**Rep. Cruz:** Representative Weatherford, I'll follow up with you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Cruz, you have another question?

**Rep. Cruz:** Did staff have access to performance data?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Mr. Speaker, I feel like I've answered that question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Cruz.

**Rep. Cruz:** I'm recognized? How can we know if a plan favors or disfavors a party without performance data?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** It's a good question. I would like to also point out that the performance data—everyone has access to it. The question is whether or not you utilize it in drawing districts, which we most certainly did not. We did not use performance data to draw the districts around the state of Florida. And so, I think your question, which is asking me how can we draw districts without knowing the performance data, we draw districts based on what the standards in the law say. We draw districts based on what Amendments 5 and Amendment 6 said. We draw districts based on what the Voting Rights Act tells us we have to do. So what we do is we follow the law, we listen to the public, we utilize their public input, and we make sure that it falls in line with what the law says. And that's how we come up with districts—it's actually a pretty simple formula.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Cruz.

**Rep. Cruz:** Representative Weatherford, I'm going to go back to the reasons that districts are not clearly compact and ask you if you could explain to me a little bit about District 26 which is clearly expansive.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you want to yield that one to—you're recognized, Representative Weatherford?

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're pulling up that district and we may allow Representative Hukill to answer that question. She explained that district earlier and we'll allow her to answer that question.

**Speaker Cannon:** And, members, we are going to take our time on these. Don't worry, Representative Cruz and others. We'll make sure, much like we do on the budgetary process, we want to make sure everybody gets his questions answered and we have ample time for each chair and subcommittee chair to provide whatever data you need or, Representative Cruz, as you indicated, to get together one-on-one as needed.

Representative Weatherford, you're recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize, Representative Hukill—that was actually Representative Workman's. But I'll go ahead and answer the question. You know, in looking at the data of this district, it keeps five counties whole. It keeps DeSoto whole. It keeps Glades County, Hardee County, Highlands County, Okeechobee County whole. So, I think that's something we should be very proud of. And when I look at the cities that are kept whole in this district—Arcadia, Avon Park, Bartow, Bowling, Green, East Lake, Fort Meade, Frostproof, Highland Park, Hillcrest Heights, Lake Placid, Moore Haven, Okeechobee, Sebring, Wauchula, and Zolfo Springs, which is my favorite. And when I look at the district, both visually and when I look at the amount of cities and counties that are kept whole, I clearly think that is a very compact district.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Cruz.

**Rep. Cruz:** Representative Weatherford, could you speak to the compactness of District 24?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Hukill, you're recognized.

**Rep. Hukill:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very good question. Thank you so much, Representative. You know, we didn't draw this map. Obviously, it was the Senate map, but I'm going to give you the explanation that they have provided, which is their intent.

**Speaker Cannon:** Members in the back, if you could take your seats. Keep the aisles clear. Please give Representative Hukill your full attention. Representative Hukill, sorry, you're recognized.

**Rep. Hukill:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Basically, it says that it was the intent of the legislature to establish Senate District 24, which includes the portion of Manatee County not included in the minority opportunity district, with communities in eastern Hillsborough and western Polk County—includes all of the municipalities of Anna Maria Beach—Anna Maria, I'm sorry—Bradenton Beach, Holmes Beach, Mulberry, and Plant City is equal in population to other districts, follows political and geographical boundaries, follows the boundaries of Manatee County, follows highways and the outskirts of Plant City in Hillsborough County, and follows highways and passes between Mulberry and Bartow in Polk County.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Cruz.

**Rep. Cruz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, could you tell me if there are any districts that are not compact?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** The question is whether or not there are any districts that are not compact—is that the question? I think you'd have to define to me

what you believe is not to be compact. As I stated earlier, there is many different forms of compactness, but I believe our district is extremely compact. And, you know, members, sometimes we forget, but when you compare this map, this Senate map, or the House—or the Congressional map for that matter, the best comparison is the 2002 map. And so when you go back and you look at the Senate map in 2002, and you look at the compactness there, and then you compare it to this map, it is clearly far superior when it comes to compactness. But it's also clearly far superior when it comes to county splits and city splits. So I think it's a very legally compliant map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Cruz.

**Rep. Cruz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Gaetz, you are recognized for a question.

**Rep. Gaetz:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, one of the premises of the question that Representative Jenne asked was that the maps that were in the Senate Resolution that came over disproportionately favored one political party. My question is this, when the Senate Resolution was voted on in the Senate, how did the majority of the Democrats vote on that map?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you're recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Gaetz, my memory may be fogged, but I don't think it is. I believe that the majority of them actually voted in favor of the map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Berman, you are recognized for a question.

**Rep. Berman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, I'd like to ask you some questions about compactness. How many cities are split into multiple districts in the 2012 plan?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to have Representative Nehr answer that question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Nehr, you're recognized.

**Rep. Nehr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Don't know exactly how many are split, but the answer is that this is the State Senate map as passed by the Florida Senate. So, I would assume that their staff and members who drew the map know exactly. And we actually split 54 cities on the Senate map. Thank you.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Berman, you're recognized.

**Rep. Berman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representatives, how many cities are split into multiple districts in the 2002 plan?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're going to pull that data if you give us just one second. We will get that answer to you Representative.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Nehr, have you got that data? Representative Nehr you're recognized.

**Rep. Nehr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's 126.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Berman you're recognized.

**Rep. Berman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How many counties are split into multiple districts in the 2012 plan?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Nehr, you're recognized.

**Rep. Nehr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 31.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Berman, you're recognized.

**Rep. Berman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How many counties are split into multiple districts in the 2002 plan?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Nehr, you're recognized.

**Rep. Nehr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 45.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Berman.

**Rep. Berman:** Thank you.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Eisnaugle, you're recognized for a question.

**Rep. Eisnaugle:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairman, I know you were asked previously about communications with the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. I just wanted clarification on if whether during this process you heard from partisans on both sides, Democratic and Republican alike, about their wishes?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you're recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think, for all of us who traveled the state, with the 26 public hearings we certainly heard from both sides. But, of course, at no point did we utilize the political input to prompt an actual drawing of any district in this map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Thompson, you're recognized for a question.

**Rep. Thompson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chair Weatherford, there's been a lot of focus on giving minorities an opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice. When we look at Palm Beach County, which has a 14 percent black population and a 13 percent Hispanic population, there has never been an African-American or a Hispanic elected countywide. And my question is why is there no Senate district included in the maps that you are presenting that's designed to allow Palm Beach County to elect a candidate of their choice?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you're recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not have the answer to that question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Thompson.

**Rep. Thompson:** Thank you. Representative Weatherford, does this map represent the greatest number of minority or coalition districts that is possible and if not, why not?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I answered this question earlier, but we are not able to try to maximize minority representation. That is not something that we legally have a responsibility to do, in fact we should not do that. But I cannot speak to whether or not, in the process of the Senate, what their determination was as to how many minority districts they drew. I believe that what they did is the same thing we did in the House, which is to follow the standards that we have in the Florida's Constitution and follow the Voting Rights Act.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Thompson.

**Rep. Thompson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker and this is my final question. Then how do we know that we have given minorities the greatest opportunity to elect candidates of their choice?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the way we know, we go district by district, obviously. And we know that there are very clear standards that we have to follow, both at the Federal level and State level, and I believe there actually was a new Hispanic seat that was created in this map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Randolph for a question.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just wondering, during the public testimony period—maps submitted during that, maps submitted during the committee process, were there any maps that had fewer counties split and fewer municipalities split than the map before us now?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe there may have been some maps that focused solely on one area. For example, there may have been a map that prioritized city splits. But in that same map, which was the League of Women Voters map for example, they had more county splits in their compactness measures and were not nearly as good as the Senate map that you have before you today. And, so, different maps have priorities on certain areas. So, the answer to your question is yes, I do believe that there were some maps that were out there, but in whole as you're balancing out the standards and you're trying to comply with all the standards, I believe that our maps are far superior to anything that we received.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Randolph you're recognized.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The new requirements that were put into place by 63 percent of the voters in 2010—one of the new requirements in both standards, both the Congressional and State legislative, included a standard that required the districts to be "equal in population as practicable." Now under Federal litigation and the Federal case law that's "equal in population as practicable," that phrase itself has been used to determine at the Federal level that there be zero deviation in population. I'm curious as to why you believe that since that phrase was specifically used to also, now, be included for state legislative districts, why there, still, is almost a two percent deviation?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Very good question, Representative Randolph, I appreciate you asking it. The truth is that the standard for Congressional deviation is different for State and legislative. We try to keep the deviation as low as we possibly can, but we see an opportunity to keep a city whole, when we see an opportunity to keep a county whole, when we see an opportunity to make sure that we can create the most compact district as we possibly can. Sometimes you have to have a little bit of flexibility in deviation. Our maps, I believe the deviation now is better than it was 2002. So, certainly deviation is something we look at, we try to get it as low as we possibly can, but it can be utilized, you need some flexibility there to keep cities and counties whole.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Randolph you're recognized.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But the Congressional maps got down to a deviation of one. I believe, one person—not even one percent, one person on many of their maps. Which obviously has been the constitutional requirement at the Federal level for some time, because of the case law that says that Article 2, I believe, requires there be zero deviation at the Federal levels, but now we've got that in our State legislative levels and so, I'm curious then, at least with the phraseology of "equal in population as practicable," do you believe then that is a standard that falls below the other standards?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I believe that the standard in the State Constitution is not the same as Federal law for Congressional districts.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Randolph.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then can you tell me what you think the phrase, "equal in population as practicable," means?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The standard in the State Constitution is a second tier standard and so, when practicable, along with county lines, city boundaries, geographical boundaries, compactness; all these other measurements they all have to come into account. We try to do the best job we can to make districts compact, to follow city lines, to follow county lines, and to make the deviation as small as we possibly can. But to make it down to one, which is what it is with Congressional maps, we were not able to do that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Gibbons for a question.

**Rep. Gibbons:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, what is the definition of 'minority district' used to construct the 2012 maps?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel like I've already answered that question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Gibbons.

**Rep. Gibbons:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The language of the Constitution now requires that districts shall not be drawn to diminish the ability of minorities to elect candidates of their choice. Is it possible that packing minorities into one district violates this provision?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There has been no packing of minorities in these maps.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Gibbons.

**Rep. Gibbons:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, the language of the Constitution now requires that districts cannot be drawn to diminish the ability of minorities to elect candidates of their choice. If a district packs 80 percent minorities into one district, when data shows that those voters could elect two representatives, does that violate the Florida Constitution?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the answer to the prior question would be the same for this one and that is that, unequivocally, there was no packing in these districts.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Gibbons.

**Rep. Gibbons:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Final question, is it a violation of the Constitution to over pack a district with minority voters by placing more of them in a district than absolutely necessary to allow minority voters the opportunity to elect representatives of their choice and then violate other criteria of the process?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel like I've answered this question, but I'll say it one more time to be clear. There has been no packing in any of the maps that will be before you today.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Further questions? Representative Jones, for a question? No further questions? Representative Passidomo for a question.

**Rep. Passidomo:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, there have been several questions about 'intent.' I'm trying to understand what everyone means when they use the word 'intent.' Can you share with me what you consider how we determine 'intent'?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that question, Representative Passidomo. I think you can determine intent by looking at the compliance with the other standards enumerated in the Constitution—compactness, respecting city and county boundaries, respecting the rights of minorities to elect a candidate of their choice. I think that's the best way to determine that.

**Speaker:** Further questions? Are there amendments?

Representative Weatherford offered **Amendment 1** (Amendment Bar Code 601757), on February 2, 2012 (as previously shown in the *Journal* on pages 328-438).

The absence of a quorum was suggested. A quorum was present [Session Vote Sequence: 657]. (as previously shown in the *Journal* on page 438).

**Speaker Cannon:** All right, without objection, members, just to be very clear—and, I think, Representative Weatherford was very clear, but nevertheless, that's why I want everyone in their seats, members. Members, in your seats, please.

Without objection, we will revert to the order of business of—not the order of business—we will revert to questions on the amendment which, as Representative Weatherford explained, incorporates the House map as passed by the committee into the joint resolution previously passed by the Senate.

Are there questions on the amendment? Representative Jones, you are recognized for a question.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Were any members asked about how they might be able to have their districts improved based on the numbers that they saw in their districts?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I want to apologize to the members for jumping the gun on the quorum call. So, for those of you who were enjoying a cold drink in the back, I'm sorry. Not that kind of cold drink, Mr. Speaker, I meant a soda, of course—but, it is redistricting.

But, no, to get to your question, Representative. No data was utilized in drawing these maps—no political data. So, no members came to ask for improvement because we didn't use it. The only improvements we ever made to these maps were how to make it more compliant to the law—how to utilize the public input more. So, all the improvements—the way that we judged if a map was improved was: is it a better reflection of what the public has asked for, and was it a better reflection of what the Federal Voting Rights Act said, and a better reflection of what Amendments 5 and 6 said?

REPRESENTATIVE MCKEEL IN THE CHAIR

**Rep. McKeel [The Chair]:** Representative Jones, you are recognized.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Were districts modified based on any member input?

**The Chair:** Representative Weatherford—repeat the question, Representative Jones.

**Rep. Jones:** Repeat the question? OK. Were any of the districts—as we see them today—modified based on any member input?

**The Chair:** Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the member input we had in the committee process was based off how to make the maps more compliant to the law. The member input we had during the committee process, which brings us here today, had everything to do with making sure the public input was put forth in the maps that are reflected here today. And so, the member input—of course we had conversations, many members in this Chamber sat on committees that dealt with these issues and looked at these maps. But, the input that we put the highest priority on for sure—and I think it's reflected in this map that we're talking about now—was the public input.

**The Chair:** Representative Jones, for a question.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just to be clear, I'm specifically speaking to the House maps. Did staff have access to any performance data as they put together these maps?

**The Chair:** Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I've answered that question, but again, the only time any type of data was utilized was when we were doing what the Department of Justice requires us to do, which is to do that analysis on those minority-majority seats to make sure that there's not retrogression. But, that being said, I want to point out something else I think I said before, but I want to make sure it's abundantly clear. At no time during this process, did we ever utilize what someone's residence was, where they lived, what they wanted, in the making of these maps. That was never a consideration and I think that's the first time in the history of Florida that we've done that.

**The Chair:** Representative Jones, for a question.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You've indicated that no data was used in making these maps. Did any groups or organizations, or associations—political parties—bring to staff or to you any information that would relate to performance data to sway you in drawing a map a certain way?

**The Chair:** Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The only organization that brought forth such a map was the League of Women Voters and it was voted down unanimously by both parties and every person on the committee.

#### SPEAKER CANNON IN THE CHAIR

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones, for a follow up.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How can we know if a plan favors or disfavors a particular party without performance data?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I've answered this question. In fact, a lot of the questions I'm hearing on this map are very similar to the ones that we heard on the last map, but we know by based on compliance with the law. Our job is to follow the standards that are very clearly set forth in the law.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones, you are recognized.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some of these questions may be very similar to what you heard in the previous questioning—and recognizing the fact that I think it's been stated here on the floor that the Senate map came over to us as the work of the Senate. So, right now, the questions that are

coming to you are specifically of the House and the work that we've done here in the House. So, I hope you will oblige us.

How can we know if a plan—we just did that one, I'm sorry. If in 2002, districts were drawn in order to preserve incumbency—which has been stated many times—or to help a particular party to make sure they maintain their position in dominance, was this particular map drawn based on the 2002 map, and if so, would we expect that we are keeping the 2012 map—I'm sorry, let me go back. Was this—is that something relevant to determining whether we can simply keep the 2012 map and the plans approximately the same as the configuration of the 2002 map?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think anything can be further from the truth. In fact, I don't think our map is a reflection of the 2002 map. And, in fact, the way we came about these districts, as I've stated numerous times, was based on the public input that we've received and based on what the standards in the law tell us. At no point in time, Representative, at no point in time were any decisions that were made for these maps based off anything political. And, by the way, that's the first time in the history of Florida that that's happened. And, I think as a Chamber, we should be proud of that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones, for a follow-up.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In terms of the 2002 maps and the minority districts within the 2002 maps, were the 2012 maps based on the 2002 maps as it relates to the minority districts?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly there is a reference point that it becomes, but at the end of the day you have to look at each individual district. And so, if a district is protected by Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, we certainly have to look at that and make sure that we don't have retrogression in that district. But, they are a reference point, they are not a replication of the district that it was in 2002 because, frankly, populations change and districts change.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones, you are recognized.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If a district is comprised of 70 percent voters of the same voting population and party as the incumbent, isn't it evident that the intent is there to favor that incumbent?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Can I get you to repeat that question again, Representative? I'm sorry.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones, you are recognized.

**Rep. Jones:** If a district is comprised of 70 percent voters of the same party as the incumbent, isn't it that evidence of an intent to favor the incumbent? Why or why not?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe it's irrelevant. What we have to look at is we have to look at the compactness of the district, we have to look at the geographic boundaries, we have to look at the cities and the counties where they kept whole, we have to look at the tier one standards and Amendments 5 and 6 and we have to look at the Voting Rights Act. And so, where people are and where they live and what their political registration is not something that we factor in to these decisions.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones, you are recognized.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Were there planned models that included member residence in the House maps that were drawn?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I think very, obviously, the answer to that is no.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones.

**Rep. Jones:** Were there any discussions with members about whether their residence would be in the district with the residents of any other incumbents?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Not sure I understand the question. Maybe if you could repeat it or expand on it a little bit.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If there were two members that ended up in the same district—were there any discussions about the fact that there are two residences of two incumbents that ended up in the same district?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I think, I think maybe the way you're framing the question—I think, if the question you're asking is were they drawn for that reason, then, I think, the answer is no. They were not drawn for that reason.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones.

**Rep. Jones:** Let me rephrase the question for you. Were there any discussions with members about whether their residencies would be in a district with the residence of any other incumbent?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I think most people in this Chamber found out where they were living in the district that they would be living in after the maps were produced on December 6th. So, I don't believe that those conversations took place before the maps came out. I think after they came out—certainly the media has reported a lot of data in this regard, but it was not utilized in making the maps.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was it utilized in making any amendments to the maps that were presented after December 6th?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** No.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones.

**Rep. Jones:** Based on publicly available historic election data, as certified by the Secretary of State, the House plan overwhelmingly favors Republicans, creating only 47 districts that would give Democrats a chance at winning. A fair plan by my definition, based on a 50-50 statewide, partisan vote, in this state, should allow for 60 Republicans and 60 Democrats. Why doesn't this particular map get us there?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It sounded a lot like debate as opposed to a question, but I'll answer the question. And the question that I believe that you're asking is—no, is the answer.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones, for a question.

**Rep. Jones:** Got it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In District 88—earlier you asked for specifics—in District 88, is District 88 a minority coalition or a minority access district?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that is a minority-majority district.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones.

**Rep. Jones:** Does District 88 violate the Constitutional mandate for compactness?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** The good news here is, no. It is actually much more compact than the configuration that was drawn in 2002. And, in doing so, we also continued to maintain its minority-majority status.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones.

**Rep. Jones:** Was there any attempt or effort to draw District 88 in a more compact manner?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I believe the two options that we had in the maps—there was one district that started on the east coast and moved to the west and went into the Glades. That district was far less compact than this configuration. Those were the only two configurations that the committees looked at and we chose this one because we believe that it follows the law more clearly and more carefully and it's a better map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones, you are recognized.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did you take a look at any of the other maps that were submitted, because—or would it surprise you to know that there were many maps that were submitted online by other organizations or members of the public that created a minority access seat without drawing the district through the middle of six cities and dividing neighborhoods?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I am very well aware of those maps that were submitted. The problem was in each and every one of those they violated federal law in the Voting Rights Act and we were not going to do that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jones.

**Rep. Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and this will be my final question. Palm Beach County has apparently 14 percent black population and 13 percent Hispanic population, yet has never elected an African-American or Hispanic countywide. Why is there no House—no, that will be it, that will be it.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Further questions? Representative Clemens, you are recognized for questions on the amendment.

**Rep. Clemens:** I defer to Representative Abruzzo.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Abruzzo, for a question.

**Rep. Abruzzo:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to clarify some of the remarks made about Palm Beach County in electing African-Americans and minorities. Palm Beach County did elect Arthur Anderson countywide in the 80s, in a five-way school board race where he got 52 percent and beat four Caucasians. Also, Arthur Anderson was then elected countywide as an African-American Supervisor of Election.

Our very own, Susan Bucher, who is a Hispanic, is also current[ly] elected Supervisor of Elections and also I.C. Smith, a judge from Palm Beach County, won for judge as an African-American. So, Palm Beach County has a rich tradition of electing minorities, including Mimi McAndrews, who used to occupy where Mark Pafford sits, in one of the highest Jewish per capita seats in the entire country. Mimi McAndrews was the first Korean elected to the Florida Legislature. So, I'm very proud of our tradition in Palm Beach County of electing minorities in all different types of districts. Thank you.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Further questions—Representative Clemens, for a question.

**Rep. Clemens:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are we still on questions, then?

**Speaker Cannon:** We indeed are.

**Rep. Clemens:** OK, fantastic. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for the delay. I'm going to defer to another member.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Clarke-Reed? Representative Clarke-Reed, for a question on the amendment.

**Rep. Clarke-Reed:** Thank, you Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, my questions are directed to the House map. What definition of 'compactness' was used in constructing this plan?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you're recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, very much. First of all, I want to thank Representative Clarke-Reed because she was one of the few people who went to every single public hearing around the state of Florida, so... [applause] You deserve a lot of credit for that, 'cause I honestly didn't go to every single one of those meetings around the state, but to answer your question—compactness is not determined by any single test of measurement. It includes a lot of numerous factors that, I think, I talked about in regard to the Senate map, as well.

**Speaker Cannon:** For a follow up, Representative Clarke-Reed.

**Rep. Clarke-Reed:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, what reasons were there for districts that were clearly not compact—what was the reasoning drawn? And I'm speaking directly to District 70.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for speaking directly to a specific district. It is my understanding that District 70 is a district that is protected by the Voting Rights Act. Hillsborough County is a Section 5 Voting Rights Act county that is protected by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and therefore, we cannot have the diminishment in that district and so, it is a protected seat according to the Voting Rights Act.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Clarke-Reed.

**Rep. Clarke-Reed:** Thank, you Mr. Speaker. How many cities are split into multiple districts in the 2012 plan, and how many were split in the 2002 plan?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Very happy to tell you that we've made great progress on that front. There were a 170 city splits in 2002 and in this map, before you today, we have 75.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Clarke-Reed.

**Rep. Clarke-Reed:** Could you please give me that same information as in reference to counties, how many counties are split in this 2012 plan and how many were split in the 2002 plan?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was 46 counties were split in 2002 and again, we made great progress in only 30 counties were split in this map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Clarke-Reed.

**Rep. Clarke-Reed:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's the end of my questions.

**Speaker Cannon:** Mine too. Representative McKeel, you're recognized for a question.

**Rep. McKeel:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, I feel like we've had a fair amount of questioning today, particularly in the last hour, and I feel like there's been a lot of beating around the bush about a specific point. And so, I thought I would just ask the question directly. Were the House maps drawn, in whole or part, by the Republican Party of Florida?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** No.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative McKeel.

**Rep. McKeel:** To that point—thank you, Mr. Speaker—when the committees drew the state House maps, did you incorporate, include, or otherwise contain any information given to you by consultants or employees of the Republican Party of Florida?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Absolutely not.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Clemens, you're recognized for a question.

**Rep. Clemens:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate your indulgence with my disorganization. Representative Weatherford, as it relates to the House districts, if it's statistically probable that minority voters will elect a candidate of their choice, with 40 percent minority voting age population, is it then constitutionally permissible that that district contain 55 percent or 65 percent minority voters?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, you know, as we stated earlier, I'm not going to violate the Voting Rights Act. And so, if it's a Section 2 district or a district that's protected by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, any diminishment there would be a violation. And so, certainly, we're going to protect from that. But also, you look at the State Constitution. Amendment 5 and Amendment 6 are extremely clear—that we do not need to have diminishment. And so, in my opinion, you actually—in factly, not in my opinion—I believe this to be fact, I think it is fact—that what Amendment 5 and 6 did was give Section 5 protections throughout the entire state of Florida in all 67 counties. And so, to try to give you a number, as of what number you could go down to and still elect the community to allow to elect a candidate of their choice, we're not going to play that game with a number because the Constitution is clear that we should have no diminishment. And we've defended that in these maps that are before you here today.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Clemens.

**Rep. Clemens:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, in your view, diminishment could mean a reduction from 70 percent to 69 percent?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll read from the Constitution what it says. It says that "districts shall not be drawn with the intent or result of denying or abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or to diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice." You know, that's what the Constitution says. I believe that we followed that extremely clearly—it does not have a number in there. There is no court case that has a specific number in there. There is no threshold, as we stated earlier. We are making sure that there is no diminishment in our minority districts and I think that's a very important thing that we should continue to do.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Clemens.

**Rep. Clemens:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it. So just to be clear, it's your—since there's no definition in any of these other places, it's your definition that going down from 70 to 69 percent would be diminishment?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I do not think that I said that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Clemens.

**Rep. Clemens:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll move on. Was election performance data, in as it relates to the House districts, used to determine if districts improved or diminished the ability of minorities to elect candidates of their choice?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** By State and Federal law, it was. Yes.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Clemens.

**Rep. Clemens:** Thank you. What data was used?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A whole plethora of data is utilized. It's a very complex analysis that you have to do on a district-by-district basis. But, certainly, you have to look at performance data. You have to look at turnout—there's a lot of different things that you have to look at to determine whether or not you're taking away a community's ability to vote for a candidate of their choice. It's a very complex process that is set forth by the Department of Justice that we follow to make sure that, as we turn these maps in to them for compliance, that we make sure there's been no diminishment.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Clemens.

**Rep. Clemens:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, last question. So as it relates to drawing those districts and using that data, if you had a district that, say, had a 52 percent Hispanic population but the actual regular voting data showed you that it was only maybe about 20 percent or 25 percent that actually voted, would that be considered a majority-minority district?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** If it's over 50 percent minority, then it would be considered a minority-majority district.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Rogers, for a question.

**Rep. Rogers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman. Just two questions—what is the definition of 'minority districts' used to construct the 2012 maps? Please remind me.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is no definition.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Rogers.

**Rep. Rogers:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What is the definition of 'retrogression' as applied to the plans?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's no particular definition.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Questions? Representative Rouson—no—Representative Waldman, for a question.

**Representative Waldman:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. Representative, at any time—either before, during, or after, were any members' homes plotted on any of the maps by staff?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** No.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Are there amendments to the amendment? Sorry. Representative Rouson, for a question.

**Representative Rouson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, you have weathered these questions, very greatly. What do you call the diminished psycho-cosmic retrogression manufactured drawing of lines which reveals such heavenly apportionment?

**Speaker Cannon:** OK, members, we're in questions, serious questions, not debate. Want to rephrase Representative Rouson?

**Representative Rouson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It took me all night to come up with that. Based on publicly available, historic election data, as certified by the Secretary of State, the plan appears to overwhelmingly favor Republican districts by 47. A fair plan, it appears, would be a 50/50 statewide partisan vote. Can you explain why this did not start out with 60 Republican and 60 Democratic seats?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Rouson. If you're saying that we should engineer a political result to come from these maps that is blatantly against the law. And that is a great reason why we did not do that. What we did do was we looked at the Constitution and we said, what does the Constitution say? And we have standards that are set forth in there that are very clear and we have Federal law that tells us how we have to draw minority-based districts that are very clear in the Voting Rights Act. And so we are not going to engineer any political result pro Republican, pro-Democrat, or-pro neutral—that is not a responsibility of this Chamber. The responsibility of us is to make sure we comply with the standards that are in the Constitution and are in the law.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Rouson.

**Representative Rouson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The language of the Constitution now requires that districts cannot be drawn to diminish the ability of minorities to elect candidates of their choice. Is it possible that packing minorities into one district violates that provision?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** The good news, Representative Rouson, is that there is no packing whatsoever in this map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Rouson.



**Representative Rouson:** Mr. Speaker. The language of the Constitution also requires that districts cannot be drawn to diminish the ability of minorities to elect candidates of their choice. So, if a district packs 80 percent minorities into one district, when the data shows that these voters could elect two representatives, does that violate the Constitution?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not a lawyer, but what I can tell you is that there is no packing whatsoever in this district. And in fact, I'm going to give you an example of something that we did do. There was a district in central Florida and there were two maps that we could choose from in central Florida, in Orange County, one map would have had an African-American district that would have been somewhere close to 70 percent, or above 70 percent, voting age population African-American. There was also another map that had two African-American districts, one that was a minority-majority district at just over 50 percent, and one that was over 40 percent African-American. What the subcommittee chose to pass and send to us in the full committee was the map that created two districts. So, that was just one example of what we did throughout this process, and Representative Rouson, I think, that even you would agree that there is no packing in this map whatsoever.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Rouson.

**Representative Rouson:** And to follow up on that, Representative Weatherford, was that decision based on performance data?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** That decision was not based on performance data. What the decision was made, based off of, was that we had the ability to create an opportunity seat. We had minority-majority seat that was close to 70 percent. You had another district that you could draw and allowing to have two districts that would have an opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice, we felt like that was better than one. And I think we should be proud of that decision that we made as a committee.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Rouson, you are recognized.

**Representative Rouson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Following up on that, does compliance with the Constitution require the use of minority voting data, majority voting data, performance in various elections, and the ability of minority voters to elect?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. State and Federal law require that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Rouson.

**Representative Rouson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, there was talk in committee about making preservation of minority districts a priority. Is there some numerical formula to determine if we are, in fact, diminishing minorities' ability to elect the representatives of their choice?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel like I've answered this question about five times in five different ways, but I'll say it again, Representative Rouson, in deference to you. I believe that what we did was we followed the Constitution very clearly. We did not diminish, in any form, and in some instances we were able create new minority-majority districts.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Rouson, you're recognized.

**Representative Rouson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is it a violation of the Constitution to over-pack a district with minority voters by placing more of them in a district than absolutely necessary to allow them, the voters, an opportunity to elect the representative of their choice? In other words, do you ascribe to any theory that you have to have 80 percent or 70 percent in order for voters to elect the representative of their choice?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I've answered that question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Rouson.

**Representative Rouson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does this map represent the greatest number of minority or coalition districts that could have been drawn?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank You, Mr. Speaker. I believe I've answered that question, too, but I'll say it again. There is no requirement by law to do that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Rouson.

**Representative Rouson:** Last question, Mr. Speaker, thank you. What is the definition of 'minority district' as used to construct the 2012 maps?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** There is no definition.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Rouson.

**Representative Rouson:** Thank you for your courtesy, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Saunders, for a question.

**Rep. Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Despite the fact that during the committee meetings we heard the word 'retrogression' quite a bit, I believe earlier, in response to a question, you stated there is no definition, in your mind, of 'retrogression.' Is that what your statement was?

**Speaker:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just believe there is no statistical threshold that you could utilize unilaterally to create that definition.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Saunders.

**Rep. Saunders:** Let me ask if you would agree. Last year, you were kind enough to send me this NCSL Redistricting Law and there is a definition. I want to see if you agree or disagree that this would be a good definition of the word retrogression. That retrogression, a plan would be likely to cause fewer minority representatives to be elected than before. Would you agree that is a good definition of retrogression?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Again, I said I didn't think there could be a statistical definition, but certainly if there's a diminishment of a community's ability to elect a candidate of their choice—a minority community's ability to elect a candidate of their choice—that would be a diminishment. That would be retrogression and nowhere in our map does it do that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Saunders, you are recognized.

**Rep. Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But, I know that you looked at retrogression as respecting a particular district. I am saying, from a statewide

perspective, would it be retrogressive that the ability of minorities being elected, overall, would be diminished? In other words, not any particular district but, statewide.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Speaker, I'm not sure I understand the question entirely, but what I will say is that this map actually increases minority representation across the state of Florida.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Steinberg, for a question.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairman, were members of the House notified prior to the maps becoming public by you, or staff, or anyone, that they might find themselves in the same district as another incumbent?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I believe that the night before the maps were released, there were some members that knew that they would not be living in their district.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Speaker. Before, you said that there was nothing with pins on the map or anything to indicate where incumbents live. How could those calls be made if there was nothing that created a correlation between the maps that were coming out and where members resided?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Because they looked at the map and they knew where they live.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I mean, Mr. Speaker. Sorry about that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before, though, you said, or I asked a question, before the maps were made public. If the maps weren't public, how would the members have seen those maps to know that—the question that I asked originally was whether members were contacted to alert them of that fact?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll answer your question by this—you live in Miami-Dade County, is that correct? Do you have any idea where Representative Luis Garcia lives? No idea? Do you know where any members of Miami-Dade County live? You know where you live, that's good. [laughter]

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to understand how that answers my question. If I don't see the map, because it's not public yet and I don't have access to it, how would I have any way to know that the map that's coming out has me outside my district, in a district with someone else? The original question was: were members told before the maps were made public that they might find themselves living in another district?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I think a lot of members looked at the map and the maps being proposed because, as you know, there were multiple maps being proposed, and they figured out very quickly whether or not they were living inside one district or the other.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me ask it kind of directly, because I'm getting answers that don't seem to be consistent. Did you, staff, or anyone reach out to members to indicate to them, prior to the maps becoming public, that they would find themselves either in a district with another member, or outside, or without a district at all?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'll give you an example. Obviously, in developing the map and working with staff to make sure that we'd made maps that were the most legally compliant as we possibly could—we have members like Representative Precourt, who is the vice chair of our committee. He saw the map, was familiar with what was going to be put forth. You have Representative Eisnaugle, who sits on the full committee as well. And would you know that Representative Eisnaugle and Representative Precourt actually live in the same district? They knew it, but they still live in the same district—no changes were made. And so, whether or not someone knows or has some type of knowledge that they potentially could be in a district with another member or not—the good news is that information never impacted the decisions that were made by this committee, by the chairman, by the sub-chairman, or by this body today. It was never utilized—knowledge is not intent. Some people may have knowledge, but there was never intent.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try the question one more time. Did you, or anyone of your staff, call up members or otherwise notify members prior to the maps becoming public to indicate to them whether they would find themselves in the same district as another member?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I've answered that question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Saunders.

**Rep. Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a follow up on those questions. The original House map came out of committee, or was proposed in committee, and there were subsequent amendment—there was an amendment. What was the basis for that amendment? Was it because certain members were placed in districts or was there another rationale—what was the rationale for the amendment? I know that it was said because Supervisor of Elections, etc., may have had input, but was any of the input based upon where your members or our members may be presiding?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There have been a couple amendments along the way, I was just talking with staff, I think two amendments in total, but usually when we made amendments—not usually, when we made amendments, what they were was improvements to make sure that cities were whole. In fact, the last amendment we had, I don't know the full number, but over a dozen or maybe two dozen cities were made whole in that process to try to maximize the amount of cities we could keep together. We tried to reduce the amount of counties that were split. We tried to make sure that the districts were more compact. And so, all the amendments that we put forth, it was an evolving product, so to speak—this map. Because we continued to seek public input, we continued to look at better ways to comply with the standards that we have to comply with, and because of that the map improved over time.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Saunders.

**Rep. Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Because we are going into some intent here, it's your position that there is no intention to correct any type of placement of members in the same district. You're saying that the sole reason for any amendments to the House map was to address those concerns? That

there was no intention to remedy a situation where, maybe unintentionally, two members were drawn into the same seat?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The answer is no, but I'd like to recognize Representative Dorworth, if he could, to add on to that answer.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Dorworth, you are recognized.

**Rep. Dorworth:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had the privilege of serving as a co-chair of that committee and as such I was also the person who filed the amendment to this and just to give you the absolute clarity of the fact that there was no intention to do that—in the amendment that I filed, I bunched myself into the same district as Representative Legg. So, be very clear, be very certain that there was absolutely no desire or intent to do that. It was a decision that was based on making the districts more compact and legally compliant.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make sure I clarified my answer when I said no, but basically what I was saying to make sure I understood the question—I want to make sure I understood the question right—what I was saying is that at no time was any decision that we made, during this process, have anything to do with where anyone lived, any political reasoning whatsoever. It was all based on how we could make the map more legally compliant and how we could bring in more public testimony into the map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Randolph.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I noticed that there are several minority districts that will now have a higher percentage of voting age minorities in them over the 2002 maps. Is that in order to offset the likely effects that HB 1355 will have on their ability to vote in 2012?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're not talking about HB 1355 and so, I'd ask you to keep it tailored to the map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Randolph.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is a point there. The point being that...

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Randolph, points are for debate. Questions should pertain to the amendment.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then why did you feel the necessity to keep the voting age minority percentage in these districts?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can you point to a specific district so we'll have a reference point of what you're talking about?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Randolph.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There were several in the statistical analysis, so, I don't have the maps in front of me, but there were at least a few.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Why don't you work on getting a couple of those maps and then we'll talk again here in a few minutes?

The House recessed at 4:00 p.m.

The House was called to order by the Speaker at 4:28 p.m. A quorum was present [Session Vote Sequence: 658] (as previously shown in the Thursday, February 2, 2012 *Journal*, page 393).

**Speaker Cannon:** Members, we're back in session. Please find your seats. Everyone has done an outstanding job, I think, giving the attention that this process deserves, and as much as it happens once a decade, I appreciate your respect for the gravity and the hard work of all of the members.

We are resuming in questions. Further questions? Representative Randolph, you indicated you are finished. Further questions on the amendment? Seeing none...Representative Crisafulli, you are recognized for a question.

**Rep. Crisafulli:** Representative Weatherford how many counties were split in the House maps?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe there were 30 counties split, which is a significant improvement from the 2002 map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Crisafulli, for a follow-up.

**Rep. Crisafulli:** And how did you go about this process?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Well, we mathematically looked around the counties and tried to make sure it was a priority for us to make sure that we follow city and county lines and, I think, mathematically the most you could possibly have is 29 and we got as close as we possibly could to that number and we're very proud of it.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Crisafulli.

**Rep. Crisafulli:** At any time, was public input used?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Yes.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Crisafulli.

**Rep. Crisafulli:** And how do you define 'public input?' No, that was a joke.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Crisafulli.

**Rep. Crisafulli:** Ten years ago when this process took place, did this same attempt—was this part of the process, as far as taking public input, in this part of the process?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I cannot speak to what the process was like 10 years ago. What I can tell you is that the product we have before us today is a significant improvement, at every level. Whether you're talking about compactness, whether you're talking about city lines, whether you're talking about county lines, everything about this map is an improvement to the 2002 map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Adkins, for a question.

**Representative Adkins:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, can you tell me how many cities are split in the proposed House map?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have 70 cities split—or 75 cities split, but I believe in the map from 2002 we had 170 plus cities that were split, so a significant improvement on that as well.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Baxley for a question.

**Representative Baxley:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think you may have sort of addressed this, but just for clarity and for the record and my own mind—the minority districts in the proposed House map that we're looking at, are they more compact? And based on the various compactness measures that you've shared that we used, but are they more compact?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Baxley, they are substantially more compact than what they were 10 years ago. It's a great improvement.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Lopez-Cantera.

**Representative Lopez-Cantera:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairman Weatherford, how many public maps were submitted this year in relation to previous years?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had over a 177 maps produced and given to the legislature this year which is a tremendous feat considering 10 years ago there were only four maps that were given to the legislature. So, I think that what we set forth to do at the very beginning of this process, which was to make it as open and transparent as possible and to engage the public in a way that it had never been done before, we feel like we have achieved that and I think 177 maps that were submitted to us speaks to it.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Lopez-Cantera.

**Representative Lopez-Cantera:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And if I may, chairman, ask a question about the software and the program used that was made available to the public. How does that compare to any other states in the nation that have similar programs?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Most states have actually contracted out and bought software from somewhere else, we only know of two other states that have ever done anything similar to what we did. We feel like MyDistrictBuilder™ is the most sophisticated system that exists. I give a lot of credit to our staff and our software developers who worked extremely hard to help make it happen.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Saunders.

**Representative Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For clarification, when you're looking at these districts, do you look at just voting age population or do you look at the actual voting performance population? People who actually vote or voting age population?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** If you're speaking, Representative, to minority districts, then we look at performance and voting age population.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Saunders.

**Representative Saunders:** Most of the growth in our population in the last 10 years, or a lot of it, was Hispanic. Can you tell us how many more Hispanic House seats were created in this map as opposed to 2002 and does

that reflect a proportionate increase in the number of seats related to the population?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that at least one, in Osceola County, a new majority-minority Hispanic seat. There is another Hispanic seat that I believe is a majority seat in Palm Beach County. Again, you know, one can never guarantee what the election results will be, but certainly it's an opportunity seat there for a minority.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Saunders.

**Representative Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When you say minority, can you be specific? How many additional Hispanic seats versus how many African-American seats? When you say a minority, I'm not sure what you're referring to. So, can you be specific as it relates to population growth of the last 10 years. If there was 'x' percent increase in the Hispanic population is that reflected in a proportionate increase in House seats that may be likely to be held by a Hispanic?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When it comes to Hispanics, specifically, two. So, the one in Osceola County. Then there is an opportunity seat there, it's actually a majority seat, but like I said you never know how it will perform. You cannot predict that entirely, but there is a seat that is newly created down in Palm Beach County. Also, when it comes to African-American seats, there is one new African-American opportunity seat which is in Orange County, right next to a minority-majority seat.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Horner, for a question.

**Representative Horner:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairman, you had a whole series of questions asking about member addresses, and some of those questions left me confused. Would you mind clarifying, for me, how member addresses were used in drawing these maps?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Representative Weatherford:** Thank you very much, Representative Horner. Addresses were not used in drawing these maps. What I can tell you is that once all the options were coming out and we knew what maps would be set forth in the process, we had five maps if you remember correctly. Once that was done and we were locked in, you know, I have a lot of friends in this room I've been to a lot of people's houses for dinner so, certainly as a courtesy, there were some members who received a phone call after the decisions had been made and we had locked in the maps, but they had not been made public which was coming out the night before. As a gesture of respect, they received a phone call, but never, and I want to really emphasize this, never during this process was where someone lived, what someone's political affiliation, or what the performance of a district would be was ever factored into the decisions that we made. That was not a factor and I think we need to be clear about that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Waldman, for a question.

**Rep. Waldman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I asked earlier if at any time—either before, during, or after—any of the member addresses were plotted on a map by staff and you indicated the answer was no. At what point did you take a look at those member addresses and determine that there were members living in different districts?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Waldman:** I've never looked at them on a plotted map and I have no reason to believe that our staff did. But Representative Waldman, like you, I

have a lot of friends in the Legislature, I'm not a loner. So, I have been to some people's homes. Maybe, if my friends in the Minority Caucus would invite me over for dinner, I would know where some of you live too. But, the truth is, the truth is, that certainly, I think everyone here has an idea of where some people live within this caucus and I knew that. But the thing is, even though I knew it, I didn't let it affect my judgment. Even though the committee knew it, even though Representative Precourt knew we were drawing him into a district with another member of the same party and a friend of his, we did not allow that to impact our decision. We followed the law anyway and that's representative of the fact that as media has reported, almost a third of every person in this room—as I look around this room I see a lot of eyeballs, a lot of faces—one out of every three of the people in this room are in a district with someone else and that's according to the media. So, to me, I think that's a very clear indication that addresses and where people lived was not a factor in the maps that we drew.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Waldman.

**Rep. Waldman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you for that answer Representative. Turning back a little bit to some of the African-American districts. Were there any African-American districts where the composition was increased from the number? So, for instance, if it was at 52 percent it increased to 57 percent African-American?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I may need a few minutes to check on that, I do not know the answer right off the top of my head. If you give us a few minutes, if you have another question, or if anybody else has a question, we can get back to you. I'm going to ask staff to look at that and we will come right back to you with an answer.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Waldman, you want to ask a follow up or a different question?

**Rep. Waldman:** Thank you, no. I just specifically direct his attention to what I believe 94 and 95 might show that, but I don't know. I've been told that that might be something, but I am interested specifically in the south Florida area for the most part.

**Speaker Cannon:** All right, we'll take a moment, Mr. Waldman. Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am told that there are some of the non-majority seats, that historically perform for a minority candidate or an African-American candidate, that some of those, the numbers, may have gone up a little bit. I will give you a specific number before we finish here today, but I don't have it in front of me right now.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Waldman.

**Rep. Waldman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then the question I would ask after, once you get that information, is why was that increase?

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Further questions? Oh, Representative Weatherford, you're recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Representative, I think I can answer your second question. I don't have the data in front of me, but I think the answer to your question, which is if there was an increase in any numbers in any district, why would we do that? I think the answer is that it's the byproduct of following the law. In drawing a very compact district, in following a district that followed geographic boundaries, and drawing a district that didn't have any political intentions, in doing all those things, if a district happened to go up with one minority representation or not that would have been a byproduct of drawing a legally compliant map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Are there amendments to the amendment?

**Reading Clerk:** None on the desk, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Waldman?

**Rep. Waldman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. He was working on getting me an answer, so, I, we were just waiting for the answer for the question about how many districts and which ones.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Waldman, that's going to take a few minutes. Now, we've got an option, we've been in questions, now, for several hours, we actually even came back to questions on this amendment. Do you need that data to sufficiently get all your questions answered? Because I will not move forward in this process until everyone gets a chance to ask every question they want, but, I do not want to unnecessarily delay everyone while we wait for that fact. Representative Waldman?

**Rep. Waldman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, we can get the answer tomorrow before we vote on the whole bill.

**Speaker Cannon:** Very well. Are there further questions? Are there amendments to the amendment?

**Reading Clerk:** None on the desk, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Are there substitute amendments?

**Reading Clerk:** None on the desk, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** All right, is there debate? Seeing none, Representative Weatherford, you are recognized to close on your amendment.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've enjoyed this afternoon. I don't know about you guys, I don't know if it's been as much fun, but I've enjoyed having a chance to talk about this process and, frankly, I give a lot of credit to members of both caucuses and the members of this Chamber for dealing with this in a very deliberate and serious manner. I think this is something worth talking about for two or three hours. I think it's that important and I could save my close for tomorrow, after the full bill is being voted on, but I'd like to speak for just a moment, specifically to the House maps. Tomorrow, when we take a vote on this bill, it will be on the whole bill which will be the House map and the Senate map. And certainly, we've shown a lot of deference to the Senate in drawing the Senate map. But I'd like to speak a little bit about the House map.

As it's been stated many a times in committee and right here on this floor, this has been a very difficult process. Difficult for me, difficult for the sub-chairs, difficult for you, difficult for every member—this has not been easy to have the uncertainty of what district you're going to run in. That's not an easy thing to deal with. But I've got to tell you, I am so proud of the outcome that we've had. I'm so honored that the outcome that we've had has reduced city splits by almost two-thirds. I'm honored that we have county splits that went from over 45 down to 30. I'm very honored and very happy about the determination that we had to not diminish minority representation and, in fact, as I just talked about, we have the opportunity for three more potential minority seats. And I think that's something we should be proud of.

Members, I've spent a lot of time talking to everyone in this room, in this Chamber, has had an opportunity for me to come to you and ask you for your vote. And I understand that there are people, in this Chamber, who plan to vote "no" and have not even considered voting "yes." And I'd just like to ask you to think about that vote. I understand if you want to vote a different way tomorrow when the bill you're voting on—the House and the Senate—maybe you don't like the Senate map, I don't know. But to me, this is an opportunity to show some unity—that the process, under which we drew these maps, was a fair process, that it was an open process, that it was a transparent process, because that's exactly what it was and we made sure of that.

The decision we're making today, which is probably one of the hardest decisions that any legislature has ever made without a court order, is not something to sneeze at. And, in fact, it's bigger than today and I talked about this in committee, but many of you weren't there to hear this, but I'm going to say it again for the benefit of everyone—the way we're handling the map-making process today is going to dictate the way it is handled in the future. We are setting an example for the way these maps will be drawn in 10 years, and in 20 years, and in 30 years—we are the first ones to have to draw maps based on what the Constitution says with Amendments 5 and 6. We are the first ones and it hasn't been easy. And I stated earlier, that the expedient thing to do, the easy thing to do, would have probably been to ignore what the law says and just figure out a way to draw a map that makes everybody in here happy. That would have been easy to do. Nobody would have complained.

We have had a lot of tough conversations with people in this room—both parties. But at the end of the day, this decision is bigger than us. This map is bigger than us. The Constitution is bigger than any one of us. And as I stated earlier, as I look around this room knowing that one out of the every three of you is running in a district that is with someone else, or you're running in a district that you don't live in anymore, that's a very hard thing to deal with and I just want to say, from the bottom of my heart—and I mean this with all sincerity—the dignity and the integrity of which many of you have handled, probably the worst news you've ever been given in your political life, gives me hope for the future of Florida. You owe yourselves a lot of credit for the way that you've handled this process. The conversations that many of us have had, post these maps being finalized, have not been easy. But I got to tell you that I'm proud of each and every one of you and the way that you have handled this, the way that our chairmen, our co-chairmen, have handled this process.

There's a lot of stories in this room that we could tell, but I'm only going to put a face on one, and I mentioned it earlier briefly. The vice chairman of the committee that I am chairing knew very early on in this process that he would be drawn into a district with somebody else. Not only would he be drawn into a district with somebody else, he'd be drawn into a district with a good friend of his, in Representative Eisnagle. He knew that. Never once, never one single time, did Representative Steve Precourt ever come to me and ask for a favor—did he ever come to me and ask me, could you move this here, could you move that there, can you split us apart, can you find a way to use politics to solve this problem—never once. And that's just one story, but that's endemic of how this process has ran.

We have run it with integrity. We have run it with the ability to follow the law and make it transparent. And for that reason, for the first time in the redistricting process in the history of Florida, we are putting principle over politics. This is not a bumper sticker solution. This is a hard solution and for that I think to vote against it is to vote against something that I think has had a lot of integrity. It's to vote against something that I have worked extremely hard on with all of you, and I would just ask that you seriously and strongly consider voting for this amendment. I think it's a fair amendment, I think it represents our state very well, and I think the integrity of the process and how we went through it holds true. So, with that, I ask you to vote for this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [applause]

The question recurred on the adoption of Amendment 1 [Amendment Bar Code: 601757], which was adopted on February 2, 2012 (as previously shown in the *Journal* on page 393).

**Speaker Cannon:** Well done, Representative Weatherford. Read the next amendment.

Representative Jenne offered **Amendment 2** (Amendment Bar Code: 756455) on Thursday, February 2, 2012 (as previously shown in the *Journal* on pages 393-393).

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne is recognized to explain the amendment.

**Rep. Jenne:** Mr. Speaker, as always, thank you. Members, this is really just a small amendment, fixing a couple small problems. It will adjust the county split in Pasco County so that it is now split along an east-west orientation compared to what we see now with the north-south split. Residents of Pasco County made very clear at public hearings that residents of coastal Pasco County form a distinct community of interest from the more rural east Pasco County. My amendment will also reunite the City of Lakeland into one Senate district. As you all know Lakeland is a city just under 100,000 residents and it was split into three districts on the Senate map, which deluded effective representation of Lakeland and Polk County. Lakeland is the largest city in the I-4 Corridor, in-between Tampa and Orlando, but was placed in a district designed to unite agricultural communities of interest. This amendment places Lakeland, instead, with similar communities of interest such as Winter Haven, Auburndale, Solivita, and Polk City—along with rural Osceola County. I feel that this actually brings the Senate plane more into compliance with Amendment 5. It reduces the number of counties split from 31 all the way down to 30, that magic number, while reducing the number of V.T.D.'s, that's voter tabulation districts, from 421 to zero. It also moves Plant City, for those of you who don't know—a Tampa rural exurb, back into Hillsborough/Tampa suburbs. It also removes it from the Manatee County based district—that would be District 24. Mr. Speaker, that is the amendment.

**Speaker Cannon:** Are there questions of the sponsor—questions of the sponsor? Representative Weatherford, for a question.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Jenne, Thanks for bringing forth this amendment. I appreciate your willingness to try to improve the map. I think that's a noble thing. When I take a look at the map and your amendment and I compare it to the map in the bill, it appears that you split an extra thirty-nine cities—more than the current map. Could you give us some reason as to why you did that?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Really, it was just to make sure—I didn't want to see that community shortchanged. If you look at it, I feel that it—I was there at those meetings in Wesley Chapel and I just don't think it is a good way to reflect a community and that's not what I heard the people speak up and say at that meeting. They were very clear that they wanted Pasco split east-west. I had the opportunity to sit with a representative from Pasco during that meeting and I was able to get a lot more details. Like I said, at the end of the day, it just doesn't make sense based on that and I just don't want that community shortchanged.

**Speaker Cannon:** For a follow up, Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a follow up, Representative Jenne, when I look at the districts in the Section 5 counties, such as Hillsborough and Collier, they have noticeably lost some of the minority rep. populations, but I didn't see any other districts that make up for that loss. So when we're in the pre-clearance process with the Department of Justice, which I know you're familiar with and that we have to go through, how are we going to justify to them the reductions in the minority populations in those Section Five counties?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Jenne.

**Rep. Jenne:** Thank you, luckily I'm not that familiar with the Justice Department, but really, more so than anything else, I know there were a lot of members on this floor who were hoping to see different maps and were hoping to see different variations of maps—and that's just what we wanted to do. Really, to get back to it, we just wanted to make sure that no community was shortchanged. We just didn't feel it was a good way to reflect the community, and again, it's not the way people spoke up at that hearing.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Further questions? Are there amendments to the amendment?

**Reading Clerk:** None on the desk, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Are there substitute amendments?

**Reading Clerk:** None on the desk, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Is there debate on the amendment? Representative Weatherford, you are recognized in debate.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to say, I really appreciate Representative Jenne for, again, bringing forth that amendment that makes an attempt to improve the map, but unfortunately, it does not do that. Right now, in the bill, there are 54 city splits. This would put us at 93. I don't see how that's any improvement to the map. On top of that, your District 19 would reduce the black voting age population in the Hillsborough County Section 5 district from 39 percent in the 2002 map to less than 32 percent, which is in this amendment. Also, the District 40 which reduced the black voting age population in Monroe, Collier, and Hendry—which is a Section 5 V.R.A. District—from 29 percent to 20 percent. Basically, what that means is this map, I think, would be illegal according to the Department of Justice and therefore, I don't think we can support it. I would urge you to vote no.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further debate? Representative Saunders, in debate.

**Rep. Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since we're trying to find some agreement today, I want to say I agree with Chair Weatherford and I will also be voting against this amendment. Thank you, chair—and I think all the other Democrats will too. We did just want to show there are some ways to accomplish certain things—and that we think that maybe, perhaps, in the original map things could have been differently, but since we see the amendatory process on the Senate map, it's probably not going to be successful for any amendment. We will probably go along with your recommendation on this amendment as well.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further debate? Seeing none, Representative Jenne, you are recognized to close on your amendment.

**Rep. Jenne:** Mr. Speaker, thank you. I believe that this amendment vastly improves some sections of the map. We do fix the Pasco problem, we do fix the Lakeland problem, and I feel we move the map towards better compliance with the fair districts amendments. But alas, I think I have to agree with Representative Weatherford. It only moves us towards compliance and doesn't take us all the way there. So for that reason, members, I urge you—I urge you—vote no on this amendment. [laughter] Because while this map does improve the situation, members, there is no amendment that can completely fix this map and all of the problems it possesses. So, with that, members, I urge you—do like me. Hit that red button. [laughter]

The question recurred on the adoption of **Amendment 2** (Amendment Bar Code: 756455), which failed of adoption on February 2, 2012 (as previously shown in the *Journal* on page 399).

**Speaker Cannon:** Show that bill rolled over for third reading. Read the next bill.

**CS for SB 1174** was read the second time by title on Thursday, February 2, 2012 (as previously shown in the *Journal* on page 399).

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Legg, you are recognized to explain the Senate Bill.

**Rep. Legg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the spirit of the American screen actor, Bill Murray, and it being Groundhog's Day; let's do this one more time. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, CS for SB 1174, the proposed Congressional map as passed by the Florida Senate. This map has differences to the Congressional map that our Redistricting Committee passed as CS/HB 6005. Representative Homer walked you through those differences earlier—in the earlier presentation. Mr. Speaker, that is the bill.

**Speaker Cannon:** All right, members, to get us into the proper posture, we're going to take up the strike-all amendment that contains the House language—the House proposal—and then you'll have the opportunity to ask questions regarding both the House and Senate Congressional maps. Everybody got that? All right. Are there amendments?

**Reading Clerk:** On the desk, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Read the first amendment.

Representative Weatherford offered **Amendment 1** [Amendment Bar Code: 832579] on Thursday, February 2, 2012 (as previously shown in the *Journal* on pages 399-438).

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you are recognized to explain the amendment.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, this amendment would strike the Congressional map proposed by the Florida Senate and replaces it with the proposed Congressional map from CS/HB 6005, the map that was presented earlier today. This amendment also strikes the "whereas" clauses in the bill and replaces them with "whereas" clauses that correlate to Congressional map from CS/HB 6005. This amendment does not make any changes to the Congressional map as it passed the House Redistricting Committee. That is the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Members, are there questions? Representative Taylor, for a question. This can be questions regarding the Senate or House map. Representative Taylor, for a question.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, you said—and as I understand it—it doesn't change the same map that was passed out of our subcommittee that I sat on. There was mention that there would be conferencing committees, possibly to establish a committee that will work out the differences. Are we still working on having a conference committee to work out the Congressional differences?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know of anyone who told you there'd a conference committee. I certainly never said that. What this amendment is is the bill that we passed out of the full committee last week.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor, for a follow up.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, in many of the meetings that I sat on, I always asked about the process on how the differences were going to be ironed out between the two chambers and I was told that this was going to be set up similar to the way that we worked out our differences on the budget. So, now are we saying that this is going to be something that's totally different? Will this be the two presiding officers or will this be the two chairs that will iron out the specific differences on the Congressional map?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I may ask Representative Legg to address this if I don't adequately answer your question, but I think what Representative Legg said is that there could be a conference, certainly, if there were to iron out differences between the House and the Senate Congressional map. Luckily for us, here we are in the fourth week and we have an agreement on a map. And I think that what the agreement is, is that, we wanted to make a map that was the most legally compliant map that we could possibly do and we feel like we've done that. And so, there's no need for a conference committee. I don't believe it was ever stated that there would be one. I think that it was just stated—and I will ask Representative Legg to clarify—that there could be one.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, you're saying that the differences have been resolved between the two chambers and this is the actual map that—I'm guessing you're nodding your head so—when and who decided that this would be the actual Congressional map?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, Senator Gaetz and I discussed the differences between the two maps. Something that I think is very important for you, Representative Taylor, and others in the Chamber to know and understand is that about 90 percent of the Congressional map is the map that was originally filed. And so our map, the map that passed out of the subcommittee that we identified as the one most likely that we would move forward with, 90 percent of that map is this map. And so, certainly there were some differences with the Senate that we had to work on, but in general, the map is very similar to the map that we passed out at the subcommittee and out of the full committee.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to move on to a couple of other questions that I have of Representative Weatherford. And I was, I closely listened to your definition of retrogression and what Leader Saunders read as far as a definition. Was there any definition applied to the maps, in any way, to determine whether we were regressing or we are in compliance?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I feel like I've answered this question and just to be clear, the answer is the same for the House map as it is for the Senate map as it is for the Congressional map—which is that there is no threshold. There is no numerical definition for retrogression.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But if there is no definition, how would one know that they are regressing?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** We do that by a very fact specific district-by-district analysis.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now what I asked, because there was mention earlier that there was no particular definition for minority districts and minority could be defined in several different ways. It can also include white female. So, how would you know that you have actually created minority districts if there was no specific definition applied to how you were going to draw these maps?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that there is historical case law that speaks to that. But, to be clear, we have very specific standards in our constitution. I'm going to go back and I've done this before, if I can find it—a copy of what Amendments 5 and 6 said, but here's what it says in regards to diminishment. It says that, "districts should not be drawn with the intent or result of denying or abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or to diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice." I think that's pretty clear and I think that Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is pretty clear and I think Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act is pretty clear.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And would you consider this to be fact-based or just your opinion about whether or not these were actual minority districts?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I think we have a lot of historical data that shows whether or not a district has performed for an African-American, or a Hispanic, or a minority candidate.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Representative Weatherford. So, the data that was used—the performance data that was used to determine whether or not this was a minority district is what was used to construct the actual districts themselves?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** You already have members of the Congressional delegation of African-American, Hispanic descent so, I mean, what you have is, as I stated earlier when we were talking about it in either House or Senate Maps, is that you have a reference point of what the district currently looks like. It is currently represented by a minority. In some cases, it's a minority-majority seat. In some cases, it's not. But our focus, as I've stated many times, is to make sure that we continue to abide by the tier one standard of non-diminishment. And I think that we've done that in this Congressional map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And one of those particular members of Congress, Representative Weatherford, was an African-American that was voted in a district that actually only had 4 percent African-American. Would you consider that a district that would be access for African-Americans?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** No.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And there was also a district that's in this particular plan that has actually 28 percent African-American. Would you consider that a part of this, African-American seats that are constructed for that particular district?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Taylor, could you be more specific about the exact district you're talking about? Because I'm not exactly sure which one you are referring to.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe it's actually district number 3, it's either 2 or 3. It's the one district that encompasses Leon County here in this area.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** So I'm looking at that district, Representative Taylor. I see that District 2 has a 23.8 percent African-American voting age population and your question is, is that enough to elect a minority candidate of choice? Is that what you're asking me? Because if that's what you're asking me my answer would be I guess not, because currently the congressman who represents that district now is not a minority. But that being said, this is a new district and there is no way to predict how the voters will vote. As you stated earlier, there was a member of congress who is African-American and has a 4



percent African-American voting age population in that district. So, I cannot predict for you what the voters will do.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, there were two additional seats that we had to develop within this actual Congressional map. Are there any Federal standards outside of Amendment 6 of this state? Are there any Federal standards that need to be applied that weren't applied within the construction of this particular map?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We don't have two new districts in the state of Florida, we have 27 new districts. Because every district—and because of the fact that we did get two new districts apportioned to the state of Florida—it changed the composition of all the districts in the state of Florida. So we don't have two new districts, we have 27.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I said two additional districts that we had to incorporate within what we were trying to accomplish here on the Congressional map. I was trying to determine if there were any specific standards that the Congressional map needed to have that the House and Senate map did not have.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I can tell you one standard we did follow was 'one-person, one-vote.' We followed the Amendments 5 and 6 and the standards that are set forth in the Constitution. And I believe that's it. As far as—I may need more clarification if you are looking for more than that, but that's what we did.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'm going to move on to just one other line of questioning. I sat on this particular Congressional subcommittee and I attended approximately 20 to 21 of these different meetings. And in these meetings that you chaired with Senator Gaetz, you often talked about how we were putting the cart before the horse whenever it came to the public having maps. Everywhere we went, there were questions about, 'Where are the maps? Where are the maps? Where are the maps?' And, consistently, you made that statement that we're putting the cart before the horse. Now that there are Congressional maps and I know you're going to say—or some folks have said that we don't have time now. But, why haven't those maps been back to the public the same way, in the same intensity, that it was when we went out soliciting their input?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And you hit on a great point here, because I think what we should all be most proud of when it comes to these maps, and even in particular these Congressional maps, is the amount of public testimony that we have gotten—the 5,000 people who showed up to go those committee hearings that you went to and I went to. That took four months. We started in June and we went all the way through September and took public testimony. We incorporated the public testimony into the maps. We can document the actual incorporation of the public comment and how it correlates to a lot of these districts. But what we've also done is we've made this process so transparent and open and engaging that even after we put the maps out on December 6th, I think we had seven Congressional maps when we started on your subcommittee. We have continued to get feedback. We've had more maps to be offered. We've had more public testimony. We've had more emails that have been sent in. We've had more folks who have reached out to us, in many different ways, to give us their thoughts on the maps. Whether or not there was time to go out and spend four months asking for input, again, after the maps—I don't know about you, but I know that we've

had a lot of Supervisors of Elections who had asked us to be time sensitive. There is a reason we are having this debate in week four and not in week nine. And the reason for that is because what we also heard at every public hearing around the state is that we need to pass the maps as quickly as we can, but also as diligently as we can. And I think we've achieved both.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you, Representative Weatherford. It was mentioned earlier that there were members notified on the House maps early on, before they came out. Were there any members notified in that same example on the Congressional side by either members of subcommittees, staff, or anyone?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You mentioned early on that Representative Precourt knew so if these maps were—before they were made public, people were notified, for what purpose did they need to be notified before the maps went public?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Mr. Speaker, I think we are talking about the Congressional map. I think the question he's asking pertains to the House map and I think I've answered that question, but I'll answer it again. Representative Precourt, which I spoke about a couple of times tonight, is the vice chair of the committee. And so, certainly, he was aware of the way that the maps—once we finalized the map—he was aware of the final product. And it had him paired up with another member. But again, whether we're talking about Congressional, whether we're talking about State, whether we're talking about the House maps, at no point did we allow someone's address of where they lived impact the decision that was made. At no point did we do that. And I think that needs to be very clear.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Saunders.

**Rep. Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You stated that this is an amendment because the product that came out of the subcommittee has been changed. And you said the reason for the change, today, is that you want to make improvements to the product that came out of our subcommittee over here. Can you be specific as to whatever deficiencies there were in the product produced by the subcommittee and the reason for any changes that are now reflected in the amendment before us today?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are no changes to this amendment. It is the substance of the bill that we passed out of the committee that I chair, last Friday.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Saunders.

**Rep. Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe my question goes to the fact that there was another version of the Congressional map that was considered in our subcommittee and that has been changed. I thought what you had said was that the changes were made to improve the product and we want to know, specifically, what were the improvements that were made and the reasons for them.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Horner probably can speak to some of the differences between the two maps, but while he's getting ready for that, what I'll talk to you about myself,

is—certainly, when we were working with the Senate, they had their own version of a map, we had a version of a Congressional map, and we worked with them to come up with the best product that we thought possible. And so, that's what we did. There are improvements to the map, I think, and one of those improvements to the map, that I think is in the House map, is that District 5 is a minority-majority seat and becomes a protected Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, protected seat. But as far as, if you want to know the differences between what the Senate passed and sent to us versus what we have and passed out of subcommittee, Representative Horner can speak to some of those as well.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Horner, you are recognized.

**Rep. Horner:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I'd like to just go ahead and repeat some of the key changes between the two maps, if that would be helpful.

**Speaker Cannon:** Sure. Representative Saunders, is that responsive to what you're asking? OK, Representative Horner, you are recognized.

**Rep. Horner:** Great. Some of the overall differences between the two maps are the Senate's version of the Congressional map splits 24 counties and 46 cities. The House version only splits 21 counties and 27 cities throughout the entire map. First area I want to cover is Congressional District 9 in Osceola County. Both the House and Senate maps drew the districts in the similar way including all of Osceola County, portions of Orange and Polk County. But District 9 in our bill is noticeably more compact than its Senate counterpart.

The next area is the Pasco/Hernando area in the Tampa Bay region. The Senate's version of the Congressional map, Hernando and Pasco counties are linked together which pushes the district to the north, containing Citrus and Sumter County further into Lake County. As a result, the Senate's version of the map has a Congressional district that entirely spans northern Pinellas and Hillsborough County. In the House's version of the Congressional bill, Hernando County is joined with Citrus and Sumter County. Whereas, Pasco County is in a district that also has portions of north Pinellas and Hillsborough County. This configuration also creates a district that is mostly in eastern Hillsborough and western Polk counties keeping Plant City, Lakeland, and Bartow wholly within the district.

The next difference is also in the Tampa Bay region. In the House map, District 14 does not go into Manatee County. So, the district is wholly and more completely, excuse me—more compactly located in Pinellas and Hillsborough counties. The Senate version of this Congressional district dips into Manatee County.

Moving south along the Gulf Coast, the House version of the Congressional map keeps Sarasota County whole, along with the majority of Manatee County. The most similar district in the Senate's version of the Congressional map splits Manatee, Sarasota, and Charlotte counties with the coastal side being in one district and the rural side being in another district.

Moving to District 17, the House's proposed Congressional map. Essentially, the Senate's version splits Charlotte and Okeechobee counties. The House version keeps those counties whole.

The final area of significant differences are the two districts in south Miami-Dade County and Monroe County. Both maps connect Monroe County with Miami-Dade County. However, the Senate's version of the map connect Monroe County with eastern Miami-Dade County, while the House version creates what turns out to be a more compact design connecting Monroe County with western Miami-Dade County. Those are a summary of some of the key differences.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Horner for speaking to some of those changes and I'm going to come back to the question again and maybe answer it, also, with some specifics. The map that you see before you now has 21 county splits and 27 city splits. The map that the Senate sent over to us had 24 county splits and 46 city splits. The map that you voted for out of the subcommittee—I don't know if you voted for it, but some people voted for it—had 22 county splits and 39 city splits. So, the reason I give you that data is that this map before you is, actually, the best map we had of any map that's been out there when it comes to city and county splits. So, significant improvement when it comes to those standards in law that they ask us to consider.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Saunders, you are recognized.

**Rep. Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since we are here, in part, to determine legislative intent. I just want to make it clear that one of the reasons there was a change in the Congressional map was in no way related to the fact that perhaps an incumbent Congressman's percentages were subject to change. Because we've read in the papers that, I won't mention any names, but let's say a certain, several incumbent Republican Congressmen's districts significantly improved by virtue of this amendment. So, you're saying that had nothing to do—it was totally based on the information you just discussed?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've actually never heard that before or haven't read it anywhere. I would love you to send me the article if it's out there, but it's not true. The fact of the matter is that we drew these maps based on the public input and how to make sure that we follow the Constitution and the Federal Voting Rights Act—just like we did the House maps, just like we did the Senate did the Senate maps. At no point were these maps drawn with any political intent.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Saunders.

**Rep. Saunders:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since we want to be specific, I served with Congressman Webster. He is currently in the Congress. It was my information that in some of the versions his district was not as Republican as this amendment reflects. So, are you saying that any improvement, if any, to Congressman Webster's district was not based on the fact that that was meant to improve his chances as an incumbent of winning. It was solely, those changes are solely done to reflect the county splits or the other issues that you brought up—is that correct?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Representative Saunders, I don't know any of that information and have no reason to believe that, but I can tell you, one thing I do know, I think it has been reported that Congressman Webster, actually, doesn't live in the district that we drew. So, you know, again if you're trying to insinuate that there was some type of intent in these maps, I can tell you that was not the case, at any point in time.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Steinberg, for a question.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Chairman Weatherford, I'm going to—these [questions] are going to be the Congressional maps, and some of them are going to be a little redundant, although it is Groundhog Day today, so maybe it's a little bit appropriate, but these are focused to the Congressional map. When drafting the maps, was there any conversation between you, or staff, or anyone in the process here with people at the Republican National—I'm sorry, the Republican National Committee, the RNC, as far as how to draft these maps?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe that you actually forbid the staff and this Chamber of even talking to anyone at that

level. I never had any conversations. I believe the answer is unequivocally, no, we did not have any.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And same question, but not to the RNC, but RPOF. Were there any conversations with people, directly or indirectly, at RPOF regarding the makeup of this map?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** No.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was that conversation also forbidden?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I believe it was and I think it was forbidden for the Florida Democratic Party, as well.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Were there any conversations with members—current members of Congress—about how this map should be made up during the time that the map was in consideration?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** No. No, and in fact, I want to reiterate what I stated earlier which was that, you know, at no time was there any indication, or were there any phone calls made to any congressmen letting them know about what their district would or would not look like prior to them being finalized and being submitted to the public.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'm not sure if you understood my question. I'm trying to understand, was there any input either sought or given by members of Congress, for example—I don't want to name names—but did congressman or congresswoman so and so reach out to you or staff or anyone that you know and say, you know, 'it would look great if the district in my area looked like this,' or, 'it would be really bad if you did that. Don't do this, do that,' or any conversations along those lines from any members of our delegation?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** We all certainly bump into members of our delegation from time to time, but I can assure you, every time anyone, whether House member, Senate member, or a Congressional official, ever wanted to have that conversation about redistricting, I would stop them at the door because it was not the type of conversation that was appropriate. We didn't want to know what they wanted. That was not something we were willing to take into account. Our job was to draw maps that were legally compliant and factored in the public comment.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the, 'not wanting that conversation to occur,' but my question is more, I guess, did it occur?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Not with me, and I can tell you that. I can only speak for myself. But, I think, it's also been documented in quite a few newspaper articles and, maybe, some famous radio hosts about members who were actually complaining about their lack of access and the lack of

responsiveness of this Chamber. And so, I think, I can very easily state to you that there was no intent whatsoever, at any point, during this process of drawing these Congressional maps.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And on that point, this will probably be my last question. You said, "Not to you there were no conversations." Were you aware of any conversations with staff or anyone that was involved in the process of drawing the maps along those lines?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Absolutely not.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And this is, specifically, on this map, although I know it's already been asked of others. Did staff have access to performance data, as it relates to the Congressional maps?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Everyone has access to the data. The only time it was ever utilized was for minority districts to make sure that the analysis could be done so that we were in compliance with the Federal Voting Rights Act and the Justice Department and, frankly, the State Constitution.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Chairman, if the 2002 maps were drawn in order to preserve incumbency at the Congressional level, or to help a party in power preserve its numerical dominance, is that something relevant to determining whether we can simply keep 2012 districts—or districts that look very similar to the 2012 districts—in this plan?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I have no idea what the intent of the framers of this map—the Congressional map was in 2002—but I can tell you, with certainty, that there was no political intent in the maps that we drew.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But, clearly, the media has indicated—and there's been a lot of conversation about the gerrymandering process in the State of Florida in days gone. In fact, I think, it's clear that the amendments that were on the Constitution, the way the voters voted, probably is indicative of the voters—believe that as well. So, with that knowledge, does it make sense to use maps from 2002 that have been reportedly overwhelming, throughout the state and throughout the nation, as being malapportioned and with an electorate who appears to have thought that way by putting in standards because they didn't feel that the maps were being drawn in a way that didn't favor or disfavor a political party. Would it be right for us to draw maps based—or a portion of the maps—based on those maps?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under the premise that you can believe everything that you read in the newspaper, which I'm not sure is entirely true—no offense to our friends—but let me speak, specifically, to a couple of points that, I think, are important here when you're talking about the makeup of our map. The old district, for example, that went from Palm Beach to Charlotte County—gone, doesn't exist. The old district that went from Duval County to Leon County—gone, that district does not exist anymore. The old district that went from Marion County to Osceola County—gone, doesn't exist. The arm of the district that used to cut through Martin County to Fort Pierce—gone, doesn't exist. Lastly, the district that started in Winter Park and went all the way to Ponte Vedra—gone, doesn't

exist. So, the premise that you started with, that somehow these maps were a reflection of the maps of 2002, frankly, just isn't true. Now, these maps are significantly different, significantly more compact, significantly more compliant with the standards of [Amendment] 5 and [Amendment] 6 when it comes to following geographic boundaries in cities and counties. So, I guess I just don't agree with the premise of your question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Don't some of the minority access districts, in particular, seem to mirror closely the 2002 maps?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** There's only one district. I'm assuming you're speaking to District 5?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have the maps in front of me. Obviously, you're much more familiar and actively involved in this for a number of months, if you're saying District 5 is one, I guess that could be an example. If that map was drawn with that intent and to pack a district in that sense, would that mean that we can't do so today?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I've said this on numerous occasions, today, but clearly it's not resonating. So, I'm going to say it again. We have not packed any maps, any districts—there is no packing throughout this process, particularly with this Congressional map. What you have with District 5 is a map that was created by the Federal court back in 1992. This is a map that was created by the court 20 years ago. It is a minority opportunity seat, or has been represented by a minority—African-American for 20 years. And the way it's drawn today—it is actually drawn with just above 50 percent, which would actually give it protection under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And on another note, I guess, tracking back to some of my other questions as far as conversations that were had with people outside of our body. Were there conversations that you're aware of with either yourself or staff or anyone involved in drawing the maps—with the Chamber [Florida Chamber] or AIF [Associated Industries of Florida]—in proposing this map or any of the other maps?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I have not had any conversations like that nor do I know of anyone on our staff, or anyone associated with this Chamber, that has had conversations like that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Chairman, if a Congressional district is composed of 70 percent voters of the same party as an incumbent, isn't that evidence of an intent to favor that incumbent?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I've answered that question several times today. Before, I answered it in regard to the Senate and House map and I think the answer stays the same, which is, the way we draw the map, there is nothing in the standards that call us to look at anything that is partisan in nature. What it calls us to look at is, does it follow the Federal law? Does it follow the compactness measures that are called for in the Constitution? Does it follow geographic boundaries that it calls for us to utilize, when we can? Does it follow the tier one standard of making sure

there's no diminishment? Does it follow the tier one standard of making sure that it's not drawn with any political intent? And so, to me, you know, I think I've answered that question. But, again, those are the standards we're utilizing to draw districts. We're not paying attention to what the political data has, nor have we ever.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Chairman, the standards of [Amendment] 5 and [Amendment] 6 both provide that districts can't be drawn with the intent to favor or disfavor an incumbent or with the intent to favor or disfavor a party. So, if a district is drawn with 70 percent of the party of an incumbent, is that evidence of an intent to favor that incumbent?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** You're a lawyer, so maybe I should ask you, if you could, define that for me. But, the way I define a map and whether it is compliant with the law is whether it's compact, it follows geographic boundaries, how it utilizes cities and counties, if it follows the tier one standard of making sure there's no diminishment. That's the way I make a determination of whether or not a map is compliant. We're not even looking at the data, so I wouldn't even know if a district was 70 percent Republican—I have no idea. We're not looking at that data. So, I guess, I'm not sure I can answer your question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, let me see if I understand this. If a district—or, frankly, if a map as a whole—performs heavily in favor of one party or another, that doesn't matter? That's not something we should be looking at?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** That's not something we should be looking at. As it was stated earlier, someone made the suggestion that maybe for the House we should've drawn 60 Republican seats and 60 Democratic seats and somehow that would be fair. The reason we did not do that—and the same reason we didn't do that with the Congressional maps is that then we would be using political intent to create an outcome, which is the opposite of what the voters who voted for Amendment 5 and Amendment 6 wanted. They don't want political intent. We're not legally allowed to utilize political intent and so, for us to look at the data and make a determination based off that would be against the law.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I know this question was asked to the other maps, but I just want to ask it to this map specifically. Was residency of the incumbents taken into account in the modeling of how districts were drawn?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Absolutely not.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Were there any discussions with members as to whether or not their residence would be in or out of districts?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** No, and frankly, I think if you're reading the same news clips I am, there's probably some congressmen out there that aren't very happy.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Based on publicly available historical election data certified by the Secretary of State, the Congressional plan overwhelmingly favors Republicans, creating nine districts that would give Democrats a chance of winning. A fair plan, based on a 50/50 split, would obviously create 50/50 districts. Why doesn't this plan do that?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford, you are recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** I'm glad that you have all this political data, unfortunately, I haven't used it—I haven't look at it. So, I can't speak to the validity of the data you just stated. But, again, it has not been utilized in this process. And for us to use it, in any way, shape, or fashion, would be in violation of the Constitution. And we're not going to do that—we have not done that, and I feel like I've answered this question 47 times and I probably won't answer it again.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And that was the reason, probably; you are getting multiple questions that are similar is there are three different maps—so, yeah, people are asking questions, too, that are different based on the individual maps. But, at any time, either during the drawing of the maps or after that, between now and then, have you looked at the performance data of the districts? I know before you said you did on the minority access districts, but have you looked on the other districts or the maps, as a whole, to see how they perform from a partisan nature?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** No. I've never looked at the performance of the minority districts. I've never looked at the performance of the other districts. I've never looked at the performance of any districts.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has staff looked at that information?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Our staff and our counsel looked at that information, in regard only to the minority districts, to make sure that we were in compliance with the Department of Justice, the Voting Rights Act, and the State Constitution.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to clarify this, so, on the other districts—the non-minority districts—that information was not looked at by staff or by legal counsel?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** That is correct. That information was not looked at by staff or legal counsel in regard to any districts aside from those minority districts.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg.

**Rep. Steinberg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has anyone reported to you or to staff what the performance of the other districts or the maps as a whole are?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** No, not until you just did.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Steinberg. Further questions, further questions? Representative Reed, for a question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Reed, for a question.

**Rep. Reed:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairman Weatherford, ah look a great smile, thank you. [laughter] How are people housed at a jail counted for the purpose of redistricting? I have a brand new question.

**Speaker Cannon:** Thank you, Representative Reed. Representative Weatherford, you're recognized.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Everybody knows I love me some Mrs. Betty Reed, she's a wonderful lady. [applause] She keeps us all out of trouble back in Tampa Bay. Steve Precourt has been feeling lonely over here to my left, so I'm actually going to allow him—since he's paired up with another member, I feel like we owe it to him. We should at least allow him to answer a question. So, Representative Precourt, if you could enlighten us on that.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Precourt, you're recognized.

**Rep. Precourt:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you for the opportunity to shine. Appreciate that. I believe the question was where are the prisoners counted?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Reed, you're recognized.

**Rep. Reed:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How are people housed at a jail counted for the purpose of redistricting?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Precourt.

**Rep. Precourt:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The census gets data from our prison system to use so that we know how many people are there in order to have them counted. So, we use the data from the census that is provided.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Reed.

**Rep. Reed:** Are they counted from their home district or are they counted from the district where they are located at that time?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Precourt.

**Rep. Precourt:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They are counted from the district where they're located at the time.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative A. Williams, for a question. Did you have another question Representative Reed?—OK—you're very welcome. Representative A. Williams, for a question.

**Rep. A. Williams:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairman Weatherford, I'm going to ask this question as it relates to Congressional compactness—and you may have answered this, I had a family emergency and had to step out the Chamber for a few minutes. But, could you tell me what is the definition of compactness as it relates to this map, or at least to this plan, and how was it applied to constructing this plan?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think my answer would be the same to this question that I gave it for the House and Senate map and that is that compactness is not determined by a single measurement. There's different ways to look at it but, I can tell you in all the measurements that we have utilized, we have found that this map is far superior to the map that was made in 2002.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative A. Williams.

**Rep. A. Williams:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for that response Chair Weatherford. How does this plan reflect your definition or the definition of compactness? How does this plan specifically reflect your definition of compactness?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just say that in regard to how we measure, there are different measures. But on the measurements for example, travel distance from one side of a district to another, the radius of a district, the geometric distance around—from basically in a circle all the way around. Those are some of the ways that you can look at compactness in ways that are actually chartered. I think we have that data, we can provide that data to you and every member of this caucus. I think it's actually publicly available on the web if you'd like to see it.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative A. Williams.

**Rep. A. Williams:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Chair Weatherford. As it relates to the 27 Congressional districts, what were the reasons for the districts not being clearly as compact or not being clearly compact?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Could you speak to a specific district that you feel is not compact and maybe I could react to that?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative A. Williams.

**Rep. A. Williams:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As it relates specifically to Congressional District 10, the one that was on the map that was kind of the Pepto-Bismol color. The Pepto-Bismol pink.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I actually think it's very compact, I'm looking at it and it represents kind of the heart of central Florida there—as parts of Orange County. It appears to keep Lake County whole and then comes into Polk County. But just to give you an idea that the amount of cities that are kept whole, I won't read them all off, but it looks like it's almost close to 20 cities that are kept whole.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative A. Williams.

**Rep. A. Williams:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess what I was referring to when you looked at Congressional District 10, how it kind of horseshoed around downtown. Can you, kind of, share with us the justification for those boundaries?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Based on compactness measures this district is actually much more compact than the current district. So, it's a significant improvement to what the current map is now from the 2002.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative A. Williams.

**Rep. A. Williams:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Chair Weatherford.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Representative Clarke-Reed, for a question.

**Rep. Clarke-Reed:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Weatherford, how do we account for those prisoners and I'm going to follow up on Representative Reed's question, those prisoners who may have been moved since the census was taken and we are drawing districts now. How does that account for the one-man one-vote when you move these prisoners and you're going to another district?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Precourt, you're recognized.

**Rep. Precourt:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative we're required to use data from a snapshot in time from the census, from the 2010 census, and that's for everyone not just the prisoners.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Clarke-Reed for a follow up.

**Rep. Clarke-Reed:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions. Representative Saunders, for a question.

**Rep. Saunders:** Apparently, in the Senate Redistricting Committee, residents in Taylor County felt they had more in common with the Nature Coast than they do with Tallahassee, but apparently in this map Taylor County is included with Tallahassee, but yet you split Madison County. Can you explain to us why the wishes of the Taylor county residents were not reflected in this map?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Look, certainly common interests and communities of interests, or whatever term you want to utilize, can be looked at, but it's a sub-standard to the standards in the Constitution. One of those being a Federal requirement that we have to have very precise deviation in the districts. So, the reason it stops right there in Madison County is because if you were to go further over there, you would be overpopulated. So, to keep population exactly equal, which we have to do in the Congressional map, we stopped it right there, but it was able to keep the entire county of Taylor County whole which I think is important. I mean, you look at the map, it's an extremely compact map, and I think is a significant improvement to the current map that we have now.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions. Representative Randolph, for a question.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to go back to Congressional District 10, real quick. With the arm that wraps around from west Orange County and now splits the city, not only splits the city of Orlando, but because thanks to that arm, splits Winter Park—a city of 44,000 into two, if not three Congressional districts. I'm wondering why we chose to split Winter Park into three Congressional districts.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually, you're wrong. Winter Park is kept whole in this map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Randolph.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From what I can tell, Winter Park is split between; well I don't have a number on this, the district currently represented by Congresswoman Adams and now Congressman Webster. So, is Winter Park not split there between those two cities?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Winter Park is not split, that is right.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Randolph.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then why split the city of Orlando into that district, Congressional District 10, with that arm all the way over there?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, there's two things going on there, of course. First, you have the minority-majority District 5 which comes through into Orange County which District 10 is adjacent to,

but you also have District 9 which is a Hispanic opportunity seat in District 9 and if you didn't have it drawn the way it is currently drawn, if this district did not go into Osceola County, you would be a below 40 percent V.A.P. Hispanic district. So, to truly give a Hispanic district, in what is a very compact seat, to give a Hispanic a true opportunity to win that district, this allowed it to get over 40 percent.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Randolph.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, then, it's your position then that the downtown Orlando area, which is right next to Winter Park, that the downtown Orlando area has more in common with Umatilla in Lake County than it does in Winter Park, right next to it? Why not move that district over there which is much more compact than an arm and a district that stretches all the way to Fruitland Park and Umatilla?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There was actually an amendment that was voted on in this chamber that actually would have allowed us—to allow us—to consider communities of interest on the Constitution. It would have been at the same standard as all the other standards that we're abiding by, but that is not the law. It did not go through so, communities of interest are something we look at, but it is a sub-standard to tier one, which is to make sure that there is no political intent, and to make sure there is no diminishment. It is a sub-standard to compactness to geographic boundaries, to city lines, to county lines. So, this map, I think, is the best reflection of all those standards. And particularly, it was important to Senator Gaetz that that Hispanic opportunity seat got over the 40 percent threshold.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Randolph, for a question.

**Rep. Randolph:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, then, you had no other data before you, or no other proposed map, or nobody submitted anything that would have put, that would have taken that arm out and put that in a more compact district with either the district that includes Winter Park or the district to the east?

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, one thing I've come to learn in this process, I came into this as a neophyte when it came to redistricting, and I've learned quite a bit. One thing that I've learned that I think is extremely important and I think is relative to this case is that there is more than one way to draw a compliant map. So, I'm not going to sit here and tell you that there's not another way we could reconfigure this part of the state and it would not also be compliant. However, in working with our partners in the Senate and making sure that we have communities that have an opportunity to vote for a candidate of their choice in District 5, to try to have an opportunity district at District 9, to try to keep District 10 as compact as we possibly can and factor in all the standards that we have to abide by, this is what we came up with. I think it's extremely compliant. I think it follows the standards of the law. I think it follows the Voting Rights Act, and for that reason, that is the map that is before you today.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further questions? Any questions?

**Speaker Cannon:** All right, members, as before, if there is debate, please coordinate through your respective leaders. We're moving into debate. Is there any debate on the amendment? This is debate on the amendment. Going once. Seeing none, Representative Weatherford, you are recognized to close on your amendment. And we will do a quorum call when you're done, Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, I, again, ask that you support the House's proposal. In this case, it's a proposed Congressional map. The amendment would reduce the county splits from 30 to 21. This amendment would reduce the city splits from 110 to 27. Every time I hear

that statistic, I think that's overwhelming. I mean, the fact that our staff was able to reduce from 110 to 27, I think, is overwhelming. This Congressional map improves the compactness of Florida's Congressional map in all the various ways we've looked at compactness—geographic measurements, functional compactness, measurements, use of county boundaries. And frankly, when you look at the map, it just looks better—cosmetically.

I said this earlier, but I'm going to say it again because I think it's important for the record to state this—the old district that went from Palm Beach to Charlotte County that didn't look so good—gone. The district that went from Duval County to Leon County that didn't look so good—gone. The old district that went from Marion County to Osceola County—doesn't exist. The arm from a district that used to come through Martin County to Fort Pierce—gone. The district that went from Winter Park all the way to Ponte Vedra—gone. And yet, and yet, while making the districts compact and more adherent to the county and city lines, we maintained the strength and the diversity of Florida's Congressional delegation. I think that's something we should be proud of. As such, I would ask everyone to please support this bill—this amendment.

**Speaker Cannon:** All right, members, before we vote on the amendment we're gonna have a quorum call. The Clerk—this is a quorum call, quorum call preceding the vote. The Clerk will unlock the machine and then members will record their presence. Quorum call.

The absence of a quorum was suggested. A quorum was present [Session Vote Sequence 661] (as previously shown in the *Journal* of Thursday, February 2, 2012, page 438).

**Speaker Cannon:** The question now recurs on the adoption of the amendment. The Clerk will unlock the machine and the members will proceed to vote. Have all members voted? Have all members voted?

**Amendment 1** [Amendment Bar Code: 832579] was adopted (as previously shown in the *Journal* of Thursday, February 2, 2012, pages 438-439).

**Speaker Cannon:** Show that bill rolled over for third reading. Read the next bill.

**Speaker Cannon:** All right, members please—we're moving into reapportionment bills. Read the next bill.

**CS for SJR 1176** was read the third time by title on Friday, February 3, 2012 (as previously shown in today's *Journal*).

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Nehr is recognized to explain the bill.

**Rep. Nehr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, CS for SJR 1176 is the proposed State Senate and House maps that we discussed yesterday. That is the bill, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** All right. Members, yesterday we had a pending question that Representative Weatherford is prepared to answer. Representative Weatherford, I want to recognize you to answer Representative Waldman's question from yesterday.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative Waldman, I apologize. Yesterday, you asked a very good question and I did not have the answer in front of me. It took a little bit of time to get the data, but in order that we give you correct data, I thought we'd give it today before we go into debate. Just to remind the membership, Representative Waldman asked which minority districts in the proposed State House map had an increase in their voting age population as compared to the House map drawn in 2002. So, I'm going to give you a list of those and the numbers that correlate to them.

The first one was District 20, formerly District 23, which is located in Alachua County and Marion County. It went from 30.94 percent African-American V.A.P. to 31.20 percent African-American V.A.P., which is voting

age population. District 62, formerly District 58, is a Section 5 protected district and a very compact district in Hillsborough County, went from 49.82 percent Hispanic voting age population to 51.89 percent Hispanic voting age population.

District 94, formerly known as District 93, in Broward County, went from 50.94 percent black voting age population to 54.56 black voting population and also became, significantly, more compact.

District 101, formerly District 105, is a Broward County seat. It went from 34.05 percent black V.A.P. to 36.37 black V.A.P., and frankly, it's probably one of the most compact districts on the entire map. It looks almost exactly like a brick. The increase in black V.A.P. just coincides with the more compact design.

District 108, also formerly known as District 108, in Miami-Dade County, went from 57.97 percent black V.A.P. to a 62.88 percent black V.A.P. This is now the only African-American district in the whole map with a greater than 60 percent black voting age population. Formerly, there were three districts like that as the map was drawn in 2002. This district also, significantly, is more compact than the existing district.

District 109, formerly known as District 109, in Miami-Dade County went from 49.53 percent black voting age population to 50.63 percent black voting age population. This district makes much better use of roadways and geographic boundaries than its predecessor in part due to a public request from the Mayor, El Portal—I hope I'm saying that right—Portal?—Portel?—Portal? Thank you.

In terms of Miami-Dade Hispanic districts, they are so dramatically different in the way that they were drawn from 2002. We didn't feel that we could bring an accurate characterization of those districts as being predecessors of others throughout the county. So, that is the answer to your question, Representative Waldman. I hope that it answers it. Thank you.

**Speaker Cannon:** Thank you, Representative, Speaker-designate Weatherford. Are there amendments on the desk?

**Reading Clerk:** None on the desk, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** All right, members, as a reminder, if you wish to be recognized to speak in debate, please notify your respective leaders. We're now going to move into debate. Representative Baxley—now here—Representative Eisnaugle, you're recognized in debate.

**Rep. Eisnaugle:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to simply address a point that came up, an allegation that came up in committee, as I recall, in some of the interrogation yesterday, that somehow politics had anything to do with the map before us today. And I felt like, that I had to stand up and simply note, as probably everybody in this room, if we're being honest, knows that is simply, patently absurd. Members, I'm sure everybody in this room has seen the news articles and the blogs that lay out what is happening in the House map, and the newspaper accounts that show, that list, the nearly a third of the members in this Chamber are paired with another member in this current map. I think that's obvious. I think we all know about that. And it's Republicans, it's Democrats, it's freshman members, committee chairmen, it's across the board. It's well documented. But members, I'm here to tell you as a member who is paired with a friend in this House map—that's what should have happened. If you do this the right way, that is what will happen, because when you follow the law, when you follow the legal standards that we have in our State Constitution and under Federal law, the results don't take into account individuals. They just don't. The results have nothing to do with what I want, or what you want, or what any of us want. They have to do with cities, counties, voting rights, State and Federal law. It's plain and simple. And so I stand here today, as one of those members paired up with another member, drawn into the same district as another member and I'm here to tell you that these maps are done right. This is exactly the result that we should have, because we followed the law and I am personally proud of the job the

committee's done and Chairman Weatherford has done, and I am proud to support this bill today.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Thurston, in debate.

**Rep. Thurston:** Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, we have a unique and historic opportunity, and the public and the nation is watching. Never before have we had this opportunity. But we have an opportunity to make a difference here in the State of Florida and to get this done the right way. Florida voters in the last election demanded by over 63 percent that we do redistricting different. They asked for fair districts, members. They want fair districts, overwhelmingly. Because these maps have clearly been drawn in violation of those two requirements, I will not be able to vote for these maps. I did not serve on the Redistricting Committee, even though I wanted to, but I have—this will be my first time having an opportunity to speak on these maps. I, like Representative Eisnaugle, also teamed up with one of the incumbents. I appreciate the work that was done by Representative Weatherford and the time that he put in on these maps. The staff—certainly, although I'm not taking a shot at the staff—I think that Alex Kelly, Jeff Silver, Jeff Takacs, and Jason Poreda really put some awesome time in this—and the committee who traveled across the state. Although, I will not be advocating these maps, I think that we certainly owe them a debt of gratitude. They went to a number of hearings, they went across the state, and they had that listening tour.

What are my concerns? First, the House map is, unquestionably, intended to give Republicans a two-to-one advantage on Election Day. This is not what our voters asked us to come and do. They asked us to create fair districts. We have an opportunity. And you may say, well, what is 'fair district?' But we don't have to take my word or listen to what I say fair districts are. We can just listen to the justices of the 11th Circuit when they say what a fair district is. The provision seeks to maximize electoral possibilities by leveling the playing field. These maps don't level the playing field, members. But that's not—those are not my words, those are the words of the court.

Secondly, I really don't know the basis of these maps. Although I wasn't on the committee, I served and I went to a number of the hearings. I saw the maps that were prepared. When I look at the maps that we are voting on, those are not the maps. So, I don't know what happened between the community submitting a map and the maps that we have that appear here today. I know there were a lot of suggestions by members. There was some suggestion of nesting the three House seats into a Senate seat. There were all types of suggestions that doesn't appear here. So I don't know what happened between what was happening on the listening tour and what we have here.

Thirdly, members, I think that the sight unseen agreement between the Senate and the House—for us to just accept the Senate map was terrible, terrible agreement that we made. We agree in essence to advocate our responsibility to the Senate. And what did we get? The most incumbent protection maps that I've ever seen. A pig in a poke. That's what the Senate sent us. And we've already agreed that we're going to accept that. And when I say we, members, we didn't agree to it back here. We weren't in the room when that was happening. But that's an abdication of our responsibility. And if they would have gave us a—clearly, we didn't know that that's what they were sending, I would agree with that, but having agreed to it, now we're stuck with it.

Members, we heard some great details yesterday about the maps and we saw a great presentation. But what did we not see, members? What is it that was missing on yesterday? I'll tell you what was missing—the indication of the partisan performance of the districts. That's what's missing. The partisan performance of the districts tells you that Amendments 5 and 6 have not been applied to these maps. And how do we get there? We get there by starting with a presumption that we have to go along with what was done in 1992 and 2002. And how do we know that? And what was done? I think it's unquestionable back in '92 and 2002, there was packing of minority districts. And what would that lead to? That would lead to bleaching of the districts that are surrounding



those districts. And why are we saying we have to maintain that? Well, we're saying, well, the Voting Rights Act requires that. So, we're starting with that presumption. That presumption leads us to the same problem that we have that we had before. Clearly, if you're going to maintain that and not look at the voting patterns, not look at the fact that we could—we do not have to have 80 members, 80 percent minorities in a district to elect a representative. Representative Gwyn Clarke-Reed can establish that by her current district. Representative Joe Gibbons can establish that. We don't have to have 80 percent minority in a district to elect a representative of our choice.

You know, there was a discussion the other day about architects and Representative Rouson say, well, why are you so interested in helping the architects? They didn't come and ask for your help. That seems to be a pattern. The union members didn't ask for your help. The Black Caucus members voted with a redistricting over 63 percent. We voted 90 percent. Ninety percent—we want fair districts. Just give us a fair district. We'll run and we'll win. We're not asking for 90 percent members to be packed in a district.

We, like the people of the state of Florida, want to see a change. We want to see it done right. They're counting on us. We have a unique opportunity. The whole nation is watching what we do. I can assure you, you're going to see other Amendments 5 and 6 across the nation, because they're watching. It's not just that you're in charge and therefore you're seeking to increase your political clout. When the Democrats was in charge, we did the same thing. But, the people are saying that's not what they want, Republicans, Independents alike. They're saying do the districts fair. Let's be fair about it. Let's have 50/50, if that's what the state's make-up is. Members, we can do better than this. Members, the people of the state of Florida deserve better than this, but more importantly, the Constitution requires us to do this—and I urge you to vote no on these maps. Thank you. [applause]

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Baxley, you are recognized in debate.

**Rep. Baxley:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The first thing, it's great to rise in support of this great resolution and to be a part of this process of delivering this product. Even in addition to the great support, we owe the staff members who worked so diligently—our leader, Will Weatherford, really led us in the right direction. And it's also a comfort, as I hear testimony and debate, that I'm not the only one moving. I hope it'll help the housing market in Florida, what we're doing here today. But, in fact, I see very little protection for anybody, but instead a great adherence to where we're headed.

I did a little math—I was actually here when we did the map last time. And I did some contrast on how our adherence to this emphasis on abiding by things like county boundaries after the adoption of Amendments 5 and 6 and here's what I found. The State House map drawn 10 years ago, when I was here, created 59 districts that were entirely located within the boundaries of a single county. The proposed State House map that we vote on before us today creates 86 districts that would be entirely located within the boundaries of a single county. Folks, greater than two-thirds of the members in this Chamber would serve only a single county. Now, that's what I heard as we travel the state and listened to the people. A very common theme everywhere we go, from both sides of the isle, from all different groups was—we want to be closer, we want somebody from our county or our community. And clearly, clearly as much as possible, we have abided by that desire and that input from these public meetings all summer and we have, looking at that map, done a great deal to bring representation locally home, back to the home county.

Floridians want legislators who are closer to home that they can feel connected to. Well, those numbers that I just shared are pretty convincing evidence that we followed the law, we listened to the people, and I'm happy to support this great bill. Thank you, sir.

**Speaker Cannon:** In debate. Representative Nuñez, in debate.

**Rep. Nuñez:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, I have two levels of appreciation for these maps. First of all, I think it absolutely adheres to the requirements of the law in ensuring and preserving the opportunity for people to elect the candidates of their choice, particularly in Miami-Dade County.

Secondly, I don't think there is anyone in this Chamber that can logically dispute that these maps are absolutely more compact. I also think that there is a general misperception about what a minority district is and that's unfortunate. But these maps here, they are a game changer and I can assure you whether your concern is voting rights or whether your concern is compact districts, that this map gets it right on both counts and for those reasons, members, I am proud to support these maps. Thank you.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Fresen. I'm sorry, Representative Wood, in debate. You are recognized, Representative Wood.

**Rep. Wood:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, as I look around this great Chamber at all my fellow Representatives and how we all are so different, how we reflect the diversity of this great state that we live in. How my district can send a member of Cuban ancestry, named John Wood—it's a great day to be here and to participate in this process. And, thank God, that as in our state we have a division of labor so, we have a division of labor in this House. I chose not to be involved in the redistricting process. I did not serve on the committees, I did not attend one meeting around the state. I left that to the members that chose to be part of that process. And so, my first awareness of this process has been yesterday and I sat and I listened, very carefully, to the presentation of Chair Weatherford, to the comments around the Chamber from both sides, and I'm approaching this on the representations that were made in this Chamber that this has been a, strictly, apolitical process and for that I want to thank the process for listening to the people of my great county—imperial Polk County. My county commission passed a resolution asking that the State House map have five districts that represent their county and I'm happy to see that we have five districts—four of which are entirely or almost entirely within the boundaries of my county. And for that, I want to express that gratitude for listening to the input of the people of my county.

At the same time, I want point out that the Senate map reduces the voice of the people of Polk County. And you know what? I'm OK with that because it was an apolitical process and that's what we are here to do, is to listen to the will of the people of Florida, to pass their districts based on an apolitical process. And for that, I plan to support the bill. Thank you for your attention.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Fresen, in debate. Representative Fresen, you're recognized.

**Rep. Fresen:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to just briefly address—and I'll emphasize briefly—certain points that were made yesterday that I think were a little bit flawed. I think it's impossible for me to articulate or better explain how it is that our maps and our process and certainly the work that our chairs and our vice chairs and co-chairs and staff did on these maps, so I'll just be brief.

But, there was one statement that was made several times that, I think, had a fundamental flaw in the line of questioning and that had to do with the purported, intentional intent that was suggested by some members in the back row that somehow the minority populations were intentionally reduced. Now, this is what is called voter dilution, members, and while voter dilution has always been federally prohibited, it is now also prohibited by State law. And what I can tell you is this, to purposely dilute a district, a minority district which is close to our heart—and just to dovetail off of Representative Nuñez's point—to dilute a minority district is to take a district that is currently at 40, or 45 percent, or 50 and reduce that down to a further point.

Nothing in these maps could be further from the truth. The notion that a State House district's minority voting population be intentionally diluted flies in the face of the process that happened here and certainly flies in the face of what is reflected by the maps that we'll be voting on today. I'm happy to vote for the State House map because it does not follow that line of thinking.

Rather, this map follows the letter of the State law, of the Federal law, and preserves the minority access that we have not only in Miami-Dade, but all throughout the state of Florida, to have the opportunity to elect minorities and to have the opportunity to elect those that we would like to vote in. So, what I would say to you members is look at the maps, look at the process, and you can see that suggestion, that assertion, could not be further from the truth. And for that reason, I ask you to support these maps.

**Speaker Cannon:** In debate. Representative Taylor, in debate.

**Rep. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, it's the next bill.

**Speaker Cannon:** Ah, OK. Representative Soto, in debate.

**Rep. Soto:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, members, we often rank a lot of things in this House. Whether it be teachers, whether it be insurance companies, so I wanted to give you my top ten concerns about redistricting this year.

Concern number ten is that this Chamber attempted to pass Amendment 7 to undermine Amendments 5 and 6. My ninth concern is that it took an Appellate Court loss for this House to stop its lawsuit against...

**Speaker Cannon:** Hey, members, take your seats. Excuse me, Representative Soto, just one moment. Members, please give Representative Soto your full attention. Take your conversations to the bubble. Keep the center aisle clear. Representative Soto, you may continue.

**Rep. Soto:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My ninth concern is that it took an Appellate Court loss for this House to stop its lawsuit against Amendment 6. Concern number eight is that there are no returning incumbents that were displaced in the State Senate maps. My seventh concern is that a Congressional district sneaking from Jacksonville to Orlando does not comply with Amendment 6. Concern number six is that certain members, by admission, yesterday, had information early on in the process, before the maps were drawn. My fifth concern is that we had a listening tour, prior to constructing maps, but no tour after they were drawn. Concern number four that many of these maps appear to favor one political party over another, by wide margins and numerous districts. Concern number three, seeing members explain to ethnic minority members the importance of complying with the Voting Rights Act. Concern number two, that the changes to the maps between the House and the Senate were agreed to without conference and without amendments. And my number one concern in this whole process is that the no diminishment clause is being used to undermine the entire fair district amendment process. As a result, I believe, strongly, that these maps will not survive scrutiny at the Florida Supreme Court or upon Federal review.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further debate. Representative Frishe, in debate.

**Rep. Frishe:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, I'd like us to reflect a little bit on some of the comments from yesterday, and there was one in particular. It was a very misleading question being asked about districts that were 70 percent similar to districts from the 2002 State House map and I'd like to review some of those facts.

District 6 in Bay County is a district that is greater than 70 percent similar to a district drawn 10 years ago. It's a district that's entirely within the boundaries of Bay County and includes multiple whole cities and is clearly, if you look at it, it's very compact. District 8 and the Big Bend is a district that is greater than 70 percent similar to a district drawn 10 years ago. It's a majority-minority district that includes the entirety of Gadsden County. District 9 in Leon County is a district that is greater than 70 percent similar to a district drawn 10 years ago. It's a district entirely and very compactly included within the boundaries of Leon County. District 20 in Alachua and Marion counties is a district that is greater than 70 percent similar to a district drawn 10 years ago. It's a district that historically elects African-American candidates. It was redrawn to do exactly the same thing, as the Federal law requires, while it also includes seven whole cities. District 23 in Marion County is a district that is greater than 70 percent similar to a district drawn

10 years ago. It is a district that looks like a square and is entirely located in Marion County.

District 34 and 35 in Citrus and Hernando counties are districts that are greater than 70 percent similar to districts drawn 10 years ago. But again, there's a catch. They are the entirety of Citrus and Hernando counties. District 38 is a district that is greater than 70 percent similar to a district drawn 10 years ago. But again, there's a catch, it's practically the shape of a square drawn entirely in a single county. District 41 in Polk County is a district that is greater than 70 percent similar to a district drawn 10 years ago. But again, there's a catch. It's a very compact district located entirely in Polk County with six whole cities contained in the district.

Now I'm not going to go through 120 districts, like we had to yesterday, because I think you get the point. The point being in most of these districts we're talking about either minority districts or districts that were drawn very compactly within the borders of a single county. Frankly, if by your questions you are suggesting that we shouldn't draw compact districts that follow county lines, you are actually suggesting that we gerrymander. Members, that is not the path that this Chamber should be willing to go down. Furthermore, these percentages are also misleading because if a district was overpopulated and had to shrink in size it is highly likely to include a significant portion of a previous district. With that, members, I am very proud to support this bill and these maps for the State House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Corcoran, in debate. You are recognized.

**Rep. Corcoran:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First and foremost, I just want to compliment Speaker-designate Weatherford. I actually—even though I'm not a veteran or a retreat, I actually was a staffer in '90, and in 2002 I was outside counsel. So, I've been through several redistricting processes. Never has it been this open, and transparent, and fair. And your adherence to Amendment 5 and 6 is exemplary and I just want to thank you for that as now, a member.

But I want to address—yesterday we heard a lot of comments about 'packing,' and I just want to clarify what that term means. It's not some ethereal term that we pull out of thin air. It's something that finds itself in a litany of case law regarding the Voting Rights Act. And you can read any of those cases and it will give you the clear definition of what packing is. And it's simply this: it's when you have two neighboring majority-minority districts—you have a majority-minority district, with a neighboring area with more minority population and you take that population and you put it in the other district where it's already 50 percent. You take it up to 80 percent and you water down what was left in the other district, so that you cannot have two majority-minority districts when you could have and should have—that's packing. It's that simple. That's the term and that's what it means.

And I will tell you, in the House plan; in no place anywhere in the state does it occur. Not one place. You cannot put one single place where it occurs. It does not exist. And really, to suggest that, what you would do by diluting that majority-minority population when you could have drawn another district, what you're really suggesting, is you're saying let's have the Legislature violate the Federal Voting Rights Act. And, furthermore, let's have the Legislature remove any future Federal Voting Rights Act protections that those districts should have.

And so, I would tell you when you're making your final decision here and you're debating just remember this: when the Florida State Conference of the NAACP submitted maps to the Legislature, they didn't take a single majority-minority district below 50 percent. And I would suggest that we do the same. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** In debate, Representative Weatherford. You are recognized in debate.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. Before I get into the debate and start talking about some of the points that have been brought forward this

afternoon, I want to really thank the co-chairs of both the Senate and the House committee. The Co-Chair Nehr and Co-Chair Hukill, they did a phenomenal job throughout this process. I really appreciate their leadership. I appreciate the amount of effort and work that you put into this process. And Representative Schenck and Chair Dorworth also worked extremely hard to make sure that the maps that became before this committee, our full committee and then ultimately to the floor—that it was a great product. You did the bulk of the work and I really appreciate the efforts by them. I want, Representative Thurston, I want to thank you for taking the time to thank our staff. I thought that was a classy thing to do. They have worked extremely hard to provide us with as much data and detail as they possibly could—26 meetings around the state. They worked very hard. Thank you for taking the time to recognize them for that.

Our agreement on these maps may start at that point, though. We may have some points of contention that I would like to point out myself. Numerous times today people have brought forth that somehow a political outcome is necessary to dictate a fair map. I don't know where this thought process came from. It's nowhere in the Constitution. I think if the drafters of Amendments 5 and 6 wanted 60 Republicans and 60 Democrats, they would have just stipulated that and put it in the Constitution. But the reason they didn't do that and the way that our Constitution reads, to get a political outcome violates the law. I thought Representative Precourt made a great, did a great job of explaining that, but just let this sink in. To create any type of political outcome, whether it's for fairness reasons or whatnot, violates the letter of the law. So, therefore, we're not going to do it. And we didn't do it. We're not going to engineer anything that will violate the law. We can't tell Democrats to vote for Democrats and we can't tell Republicans to vote for Republicans. Somehow, the thought that we can control the outcome of an election by controlling what the voter registration is in a district is absurd. And I think Representative Precourt talking about the statewide elections of 2010 spoke to that as well. There have been numerous accounts today talking about how the maps have been redrawn according to media records, to have a two-to-one favor for one party over the other. There was an article today in the *Orlando Sentinel* that clearly stated that, in fact, Orlando has gone Democrat. There are now more Democratic districts in Orlando than there were and, under the current map, more than there are Republican. So, somehow, the thought that what you're saying to be true and what the facts are just don't line up.

Somebody brought up the notion of nesting—I think it was Representative Thurston brought up the notion of nesting. Nesting is nowhere in the Constitution. Again, if the framers of Amendments 5 and 6 wanted nesting to be in our Constitution, they would have put it in there, but they didn't. There's a couple problems with nesting. First of all, it can serve to be a vehicle of incumbent protection, which is something that we cannot do. It would be really hard for a House member who is running for a Senate seat, that his seat is entirely encompassed in, to run against someone else who may be just a citizen legislator and wants to run for the Senate. It would also be really hard for someone to defeat a Senator who's running for a House seat that is wholly encompassed within his Senate seat. It could breed incumbent protection and for that reason, I think, that's a good reason why we did not incorporate it. There's also studies that have been done that have shown that by utilizing nesting, you can actually infringe on minority rights. To draw a Senate district first and then say we're going to put all the House maps inside of that district, no matter what the impact is to minorities' ability to vote for a candidate of their choice, that's a problem. So there's a reason we didn't do that.

And lastly, the reason we didn't do it is because there was an amendment in my committee last Friday that would have allowed nesting and everybody voted no—including the members of the minority caucus. So, if you cared that much about nesting, you would have voted yes on the fair map that came from the leak.

Next, people have been talking about the Senate map and making all kinds of accusations about it. Up until yesterday, there had never been an amendment filed by anyone on the committee to make a change to the Senate map. And if people had such great problems with the Senate map, why would

they not bring forth an amendment? And then yesterday, Representative Jenne took it upon himself to file his own amendment, which I commend you for. The problem was, if our map is so flawed, why would you file an amendment and then have everybody in the caucus vote no? So there was an opportunity to improve a map that you said was flawed, which I disagree with, but then in the time when you presented an amendment, you voted no on it. That doesn't make any sense.

Someone talked about 80 percent black V.A.P. districts. I think it was Representative Thurston. There are no 80 percent black V.A.P. districts in this map. There is no packing in this map. In fact, what this map did is it increased minority opportunities. It increased two new Hispanic seats—one in South Florida and Palm Beach County, one in Orange County. It also created a new African-American seat in Orange County. We should be proud of that. The last thing that we would ever want to do is pack and we did not do that—not in any shape or form.

I'm going to tell you what we did do. It's very simple. We started with the Federal law. One person, one vote—the Voting Rights Act, the 14th Amendment of the Constitution. We then went to the tier one standards of Florida's Constitution that prohibited intentional political favoritism. We followed that. It prohibits the ability to diminish a minority's opportunity. We followed that. It said you have to be contiguous. We followed that. Then, there's tier two of Florida's Constitution. It talks about compactness. We followed that—significant improvements over 10 years ago. It talked about equal population. We followed that—significant improvements. Feasible political and geographical boundary lines—we followed that. Less cities and counties were split. That's it. That's all we did. If you want unfair districts, unfair districts would be a February surprise, would be a strike-all on this fall—on this floor—that redraws all the districts. But there was no February surprise. There was no 'gotcha' moment. What we said we would do, we actually did. And in politics, that's rare. Unfair districts are districts that would show political intent. Our maps did not do that. Unfair districts are districts that would dilute minority representation. Our districts did not do that. Unfair districts would disregard cities and counties and geographic boundaries. Our districts did not do that.

If you're voting no simply because an attorney who doesn't—is not a part of this process and a part of this Chamber is telling you to vote no, that's wrong. That should not be the reason you're voting against this amendment. If you're voting against this amendment and this bill, it should be because you actually think there are fundamental flaws in the House or the Senate map. I can respect that. I can respect a decision based on policy. But if the decision is based on politics and you're pushing that red button because an attorney told you should—I can't respect that. So, ladies and gentlemen, I would please ask you to vote for this bill. Thank you very much. [applause]

**Speaker Cannon:** Further debate? Seeing none, Representative Nehr, you are recognized to close on the bill.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further debate? Seeing none, Representative Nehr, you are recognized to close on the bill.

**Rep. Nehr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, thank you. In closing, I'd like to walk you, quickly, through analysis of our State House map. You know, Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act provides legal obligations and protection for our state's majority-minority districts and therefore, we've drawn them, consistently, with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. In Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act provides legal protections and obligations for minority districts in Collier, Hardy, Hendry, Hillsborough, and Monroe counties and therefore, we've drawn them consistently with that provision in mind. And State law prohibits drawing our districts with a political intent and we have followed the law.

Newspaper accounts of the profound impacts of our State House map point to a drawing of this map without intent. And the reality, members, is that because we have followed both Federal law and our State Constitution, some

of us in this Chamber won't be coming back. And it has nothing to do with term limits.

State law also requires that we not diminish existing opportunities for racial and language minorities and to diminish the likelihood of something means to make it less likely or less able. And that, also, has not occurred in this State House map. In addition, State law requires districts to be contiguous and we've done that in every district on these maps. You know, those that are first tier standards in our state law and the second tier standard in our state that requires equal population, compactness, and where feasible, adherence to political and geographical boundary lines within our districts. And those three things are put on equal footing based on the language in the third paragraph of our new State law.

Members, our population deviation in these maps is only 3.97, well within the ten percent range permitted in case law. And that deviation is directly tied to the effort to use county lines and something that our new state law is on equal footing to equal population. Regarding the compactness of our districts, you can see just by looking at the maps that many of them look like squares and rectangles and the travel time and distance of the districts has been reduced from that of the district drawn 10 years ago. Compared to previous maps, they are more compact based on every perimeter test and width-height test we've looked at and they make significant use of county lines. Once again, we followed the law.

In speaking of better districts, you have to split up 29 counties in the State House map and we drew a map that only splits 30. Only one above the minimum. And we also drew a map that reduce city splits from previous 170, from the map 10 years ago, to just 75. Members, the compliance of our state map is something that we can all be proud of and when this legislation passes this Chamber, Florida will become the national model of how redistricting should be accomplished. These maps conform to all the legalities of Amendment 5. These maps conform to the requirements of the Voting Rights Act. These maps were drawn by the most open, transparent, and bipartisan method in our history. Now, all of you know that we've had dozens of meetings, all the way from the Panhandle to the southernmost part of our state in Key West, and we listened to hundreds of hours of public testimony. We received hundreds and hundreds of suggestions and we received over 170 maps inputted from the public. But most important, we actually used many of those ideas suggested from our citizens when the final maps were drawn.

Members, in a moment, you'll be voting on one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before us in the last 10 years. And with that, I urge each of you to vote "yes" for SJR 1176 and send a clear message that the Florida House rose above the rhetoric and created legally compliant districts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [applause]

The absence of a quorum was suggested. A quorum was present [Session Vote Sequence: 669] (as previously shown in today's *Journal* on page 472).

**CS for SJR 1176** passed, as amended, and was certified to the Senate [Session Vote Sequence: 670] (as previously shown in today's *Journal* on page 472).

**Speaker Cannon:** Read the next bill.

**CS for SB 1174** was read the third time by title on Friday, February 3, 2012 (as previously shown in today's *Journal*).

**Speaker Cannon:** Members, as before, if you wish to be recognized to speak in debate, please notify your respective leaders. We're now going to move into debate. I'm going to begin by recognizing Representative Adkins to begin in debate. You are recognized.

**Rep Adkins:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, as a resident of Nassau County, I want to say just how much I appreciate and how much I support this Congressional map. The map that was drawn 10 years ago connected my

community right there at Atlantic Beach, or at the Atlantic Ocean, with areas of Tallahassee within one single district. And I know for those of you who were here on June the 20th, when we had that first redistricting committee, you will remember that we had many members of the public who spoke and said, 'please do not have a district that goes all the way from the Atlantic Ocean to Tallahassee.' And so, members, I am glad that we listened to that public input and we're now connected in a much more localized district. What that means for my county is that our representative will be able to spend more time in our community listening to our needs, and that we'll have more time to spend with our representative to hear their vision for our community and for our country. This bill is a major improvement for Northeast Florida and I ask that you support it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further debate—Representative Caldwell, you are recognized in debate.

**Rep Caldwell:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, when people voted in favor of Amendment 6, one of the things they were telling us was to draw compact districts. This can be a difficult task when you're dealing with districts 700,000 people in size. And then you have to achieve the exact ideal population. However, this map demonstrates that it can be done. And in every way possible, the measure of compactness—whether it's geometric measures of compactness, functional compactness scores, or even simple things like how long it takes to drive across the district—this map is dramatically different than the ones that we saw 10 years ago. I remember on several occasions during public meetings, people saying that their vote November 2010 was all about the public input we needed. In terms of creating a more compact map, I think in this bill we've demonstrated that we've achieved compactness. Thank you.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further Debate? Representative Frishe, in debate.

**Representative Frishe:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, I just wanted to highlight one part of this redistricting process that I think really worked, and it's embodied in this Congressional map. When the map came to our redistricting committee, District 14 encompassed greater portions of St. Petersburg and Pinellas County than the bill does now. Numerous constituents in Pinellas County asked for a shift in these maps and that request was accommodated, shifting a greater balance of District 14 into Hillsborough County. Interestingly enough, it better aligned the cities and neighborhoods in Pinellas County as the public had requested, and that shift also resulted in keeping the city of Gulfport whole and better aligning District 14 with the Federal Voting Rights Act. Overall, District 14 is dramatically more compact than its predecessor that was drawn 10 years ago. Members, I think when we can align or marry up the public input with the legal requirements of the law, I think we've done exactly what we were called here to do. And I just want to thank Chair Weatherford and our committee for making that change. I'm very happy to support the Congressional maps and I recommend that the entire body does. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Representative Snyder, you are recognized in debate.

**Representative Snyder:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, I just want to offer a simple observation about the Congressional district lines that affect my home county in this bill. In the map that was drawn 10 years ago, we were given two Congressional districts—one that is largely based out of Palm Beach and Broward counties with a finger that extended through Martin County, and another that wrapped around that district going from Palm Beach County all the way to Charlotte County. The bill before us has a compact district with the entirety of Martin County, St. Lucie County, and southern Palm Beach County in the map. This is a dramatic improvement and I think it will be a dramatic improvement for my county and our neighboring counties. And so I would therefore urge everyone to support this bill and vote for it. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Speaker Cannon:** Very well. Representative Taylor, in debate. Representative Taylor.

**Rep. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to thank you for something else, Mr. Speaker. You appointed me to this Congressional subcommittee, and I want to thank you for that opportunity. I took my appointment just like all the others that you've appointed me to—very, very seriously. One of the things that I wanted to report to you, and I believe this entire chamber could agree on, is that at every meeting and at every stop, the Sergeant's staff and staff was always there prepared and on time to do what you've asked them to do. And for that, I believe they deserve a round of applause. [applause]

Now, Mr. Speaker, we went to these meetings. We drove mile after mile. We sat through numerous hearings getting information from the public, asking them what they thought their maps should look like. And often, at every meeting, people would ask, 'Where are the maps? Where are the maps?' You are asking us to give you input on something that they cannot see. We didn't give them a map. You didn't show them anything, but you asked them for their input and they did give you that. Now, at no time, Mr. Speaker, did anyone say that they would not be back with the final product, giving the opportunity to the people to see what was developed by all of their ideas. You didn't take it back to them. You didn't show them your final product. This is an important element. They were shortchanged the opportunity for them to make their comments, and their suggestions, and their recommendations on what it is that was actually produced. Now, it was often said that they had that opportunity to look at it on emails, or to comment on emails, or to look at it on the website, but we didn't ask them to do that when we were visiting their locations. You didn't ask them to do that, only. We could have done that in the very beginning and saved a lot of money and then took the map back out to them, but you didn't do it. Now, there are some theories, there are some people who believe that you just didn't want to do it. And I have my own belief, Mr. Speaker. I have my own belief and my belief is this: the reason why you didn't go back is because you knew that the people would not like these maps. And for that reason I'm urging you to vote no.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further debate? Representative Corcoran in debate.

**Rep. Corcoran:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, earlier when we were talking about the House map and there was discussion of an excellent point that was raised about the realities of these maps—the issue is political intent. When you hear all the stories in the media, even from the likes of Rush Limbaugh, in the blogs and so forth, the inconvenient realities of what happens when you draw more compact districts that adhere to our city and county lines, you have this outcry. And it makes it clear that there was no political intent involved. And the fact is that the potential impacts of these maps have affected Republicans and Democrats. Several of these proposed districts are very different from their predecessors. The reality of this proposed Congressional map is that it was drawn with the legal standards in mind and it was drawn without the intent of political favoritism. And for this reason I ask you to support the Congressional map.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further debate? Representative Bileca, you are recognized in debate.

**Rep. Bileca:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What caught my attention was the map's attention to the city re-boundaries. The final product before us keeps 384 of Florida's 411 cities whole. Ten years ago the legislature drew a map that split 110 cities. This bill splits only 27 cities. That's a dynamic shift in the way people will be represented. And that's enough proof that this chamber listened to the public, that the law was followed, and that everyone in here should support this good bill.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further debate? Further debate? Representative Weatherford, you're recognized in debate.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, I'm going to be very brief on this one. I know you all are probably tired of seeing my face and hearing my voice so, I'll be brief. I do want to take a moment to thank, again, the co-chairs who worked extremely hard on this—to Chair Legg and Chair Holder, you guys did a tremendous job and I want to thank you for your

efforts. And I know you're going to get to close, but Representative Legg you really have done a wonderful job here. And again, you all did the lion's share of the work that got before the committee, and so, we appreciate that.

I also want to say thanks to Senator Gaetz. Senator Gaetz and I worked very closely. Historically, the train wreck of redistricting usually comes into play during the Congressional map. And the fact of the matter is that we were able to work out a way to not only negotiate a map that we could agree on, but in doing so, reduce the amount of county splits, and the city splits, and make it a more compliant map, legally speaking. So, with that, I ask that you support this map. I think it's a good one and I think it's a good opportunity for us to show future legislatures how to draw a Congressional map. Thank you.

**Speaker Cannon:** Further debate? Seeing none, Representative Legg is recognized to close on the bill.

**Rep. Legg:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I get into the end of the close, I just want to take a minute to say thank you to a couple of folks. First is Chair Holder and Chair Horner for all their hard work traveling around the state, but I'd also like to say thank you to Representative Taylor and the other Democrats in our committee for your hard work in that committee process too—spending time with us, and asking questions, and being involved in the process, and trying to work alongside of us.

There's three points I want to make here at the close. And the very first one is, I think, a very important point and that is—what did we do? We followed the plain language of the Constitution. We've heard that phrase several times, and what do I mean by the 'plain language of the Constitution?' The plain language of the Constitution said, where possible, to leave cities and counties whole. If you look at this map, 27 cities are remained whole compared to 110, 10 years ago. That's an 80 percent decrease. That is, simply, following the law. If you look, we kept 46 counties whole.

Members, the other part that I think is getting in the crossfire of politics quite a bit, is this phrase that is simple language that is in the Constitution that says do not diminish. You know, when the proponents and the groups out there were advocating for this Constitutional amendment and they were asked, 'what does the phrase do not diminish mean?' they said it means 'do not diminish.' They kept over and over and over saying that it means 'do not diminish.' Now all of a sudden, when we're drawing the maps, the words 'do not diminish' to them means something different—it means 34, 35. They're putting some numbers on it outside this Chamber, trying to stick a number to it, and their story has changed. What they told the voters when they were advocating for it versus what they are saying now is two different stories. Members, that simply is not acceptable. When the voters said, where they were given this amendment, and they said 'do not diminish' means 'do not diminish,' I believe that's what the voters meant, and that's what they passed.

The second issue I wanted to bring to your attention is that never before, never before, I believe, in the history of the United States and, for sure, the state of Florida has so much public input and public comment went into creating the map. Each and every one of you should be commended for that. We went 26 plus cities to hear public comments. Over a hundred maps were produced. Never before has so much went into public comment have went into creating these maps. That is where staff started. That is how staff generated these maps—adhering to the Constitution and listening to the public. That is where these maps were generated from.

The final thing that I want to bring to your attention that often gets overlooked, and I want to put this in perspective and really drive this home, whether it was 10 years ago, 20 years ago, 30 years ago, 40 years ago—in this process it is very, very difficult to separate politics of personal ambition, to separate politics from policy. Many of you may not know this, and maybe some of you know—I know Representative Corcoran does—when the redistricting process comes around, it is anything—anything, from what Representative Schenck has said, but boring. Without a doubt, redistricting is one of the most explosive, controversial, gut-wrenching processes that tears chambers apart whether you're Democrat, whether you're Republican, no

matter what, it rips it to shreds and usually, usually it comes because of the presiding officer. Because they have some personal ambition, because they want to extract some sort of revenge or they want to cajole or influence members. I will tell you that this Chamber has a lot to be proud of. It was a boring process. And why was it boring? Because it was transparent, it was well organized, there was no January or February surprises, and—more importantly, more importantly—because we had a Speaker who asked us to do one thing. It wasn't for him, it wasn't for some one of his buddies, it was one simple thing and it was for the people of Florida. He told Chair Weatherford, he told myself, one thing: follow the law. Follow the law. That's all you do. Follow the law. You follow the law and we will have good maps.

Members, I am proud to be a House member. We did not have the excitement that other chambers have had. We have not had the excitement of decades past. And you know why we haven't had that excitement? Because it started from our presiding officer making sure, making sure, that it was clear and simple that we followed the Constitution. We adhered to the law. We did it in a transparent process, that it was well organized, that everyone had a seat to speak and to debate and to do what was right. Members, you may not vote for this bill, but I will tell you what—I am proud to be a member of the Florida House because I've never seen in my, this is the third redistricting process that I've watched. I've never seen a process where it has been so open, and so organized, and there have been no surprises. And, Mr. Speaker, with that, I want to say thank you for setting the tone and allowing me to be proud to be a House member. And with that, members, I would ask every one of you to support this great map. [applause]

**Speaker Cannon:** Members, before we vote, let's do a quorum call. The Clerk will unlock the machine and the members will record their presence. Recording their presence for a quorum call. Have all members recorded their presence? Quorum call members, quorum call. The Clerk will lock the machine and announce the presence of a quorum.

**Reading Clerk:** One hundred seventeen members voting, a quorum is present, Mr. Speaker. [Session Vote Sequence: 671] (as previously shown in today's *Journal* on page 472).

**CS for SB 1174** passed, as amended, and was certified to the Senate [Session Vote Sequence: 672] (as previously shown in today's *Journal* on page 473).

**Speaker Cannon:** So the bill passes. [applause] Members, I'd like to ask you all to take your seats for a moment because what we have just done is historic and truly rare. And I want to allow Chair Weatherford a moment of personal privilege because—and I want to say some remarks about you, sir, and your team in a moment—but I wanted to first recognize and thank you and allow you a moment to thank your team and say a few words. So, Representative Weatherford.

**Rep. Weatherford:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to be brief. I know that this has been a long two-day process. Actually, it's been about a long nine-month process, but Speaker, you are the tip of our spear and the—I talked a lot over the last 48 hours about how proud I am of the Florida House. You've given me that honor to chair this committee. It's been a challenging task, and when you told me I was going to chair it you were laughing at the same time. I wasn't sure why, but now I understand. But truthfully, the tone that you set for this Chamber—not only on this issue but throughout last session and this session, particularly on something as complicated and historically what has been a political process, but it's not this year, starts with you. And to have the faith that you put in me and into our chairs and our co-chairs, I just want to thank you for being the great leader that you are for this Chamber. Thank you, Speaker. [applause]

I know we've mentioned some of the names and Representative Thurston mentioned them again, but I've asked our staff to come out on the floor, and our staff has had no personal life for about the last year. They have, literally, been married to their jobs here. I know all of your wives, and kids, and girlfriends, and boyfriends, and everything else are looking forward to

actually seeing you again. But, to Alex Kelly, and Jeff Takacs, and Jason Poreda, and Jeff Silver, Ben Fairbrother, Katie Crofoot, I think I said Jeff Silver. I call them—it's the army of six that we have over there. And the amount of work, the amount of sheer work that came out of these six people—I've never seen anything like it in my life, and I'm just proud that we've had a chance to work with you. We thank you for the honor that you've bestowed upon us by dedicating yourselves to a process that is extremely complicated, but also, you did such a thorough job of making sure that everyone had a voice, that we did follow the law, and everything we did today would not have been possible without you. So, thank you all for everything you've done. [applause]

And, Mr. Speaker, also, just last but certainly not least, there are some other organizations who really contributed to this journey that we've been on. The Sergeant's Office—Sergeant, thank you for everything you did. All 26 trips around the state, you and your staff did just a phenomenal job. Our House Office of Public Information, making sure that the information was out to the membership and to the media. The House Administration, putting everything together that it took. The Florida Channel, who partnered with us for the first time and televised every single presentation we had around the state, thank you. And to the Speaker's Office, and everyone, this has just been such a team effort, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for dedicating the resources and the time that you did to make sure that this was done right. But, thank you for the personal privilege. Thank you all that we mentioned for making this a good process and a fair process, and with that, I'm very grateful to have chaired such a wonderful committee. Thank you. [applause]

**Speaker Cannon:** Chairman Weatherford, I want to thank some of the same people. I want to begin and end with you, sir. As I watched yesterday in questions and answers, and today as you and your team and your leadership of this process for the House, it reminded me that although much has been made of the fact that redistricting is a once-in-a-decade event, we need to celebrate the once-in-a-decade effort that has gone into this process—led by you and fulfilled and carried out by those you mentioned.

I will admit to more than a little disappointment in those members who, in their desire to turn this conversation into a partisan conflict, have failed to acknowledge what should be so clear to anyone without an agenda. And that is that this redistricting process, in this House, has been a triumph for this House and for the Constitution that I love so much and that we all took an oath to uphold. The process we undertook was without precedence. It started over two years ago. During the census data collection phase, the House developed a website to serve as a point of coordination for the entire state. And for the first time, I think, in any state, in any process, allowed Floridians to report homes or neighborhoods that were missed by the census. We published the general historical, public historical references on redistricting, recommendations on how to effectively participate in the process, and the population data.

Rather than simply buying a commercial product off the shelf for software, we designed, developed, and custom built—in-house—MyDistrictBuilder™, which is our very own internet-based redistricting tool that gave not only every member, but frankly, every single Floridian access to map drawing technology. Not only did we have a record shattering number of public submissions—177—but over two-thirds of those submissions came in through MyDistrictBuilder™.

And we didn't just build the tools, we then actively engaged the public. We developed and pushed public service announcements to increase awareness of the process, we pushed out the social media, alternative media, and as a result, our public hearings exceeded all expectations—and I know there were a lot of them, and I know that you all put a lot of miles on your cars and a lot of hours on your calendars to do that. We had over 5,000 attendees, cumulatively, and over 1,600 speakers at meetings held throughout the entire state. None of that would have been possible without the extraordinary effort, dedication, and skill of our staff. And, guys, I'm going to recognize you again—that's got to begin with Alex Kelly, the staff director of Redistricting Committee.

Alex's tireless dedication, your incredible diligence, creativity, and machine-like command of even the most minute details or piece of data are apparent to anybody who dealt with you. And that he has all of those qualities and also manages to be one of the most honest, sincere, hardworking, and enthusiastic people I know is a testament to your character and a credit to this House. So, we thank you, Alex. [applause]

You're team, the rest of the gang of six, Chairman Weatherford, deputy staff director Jeff Takacs, Jason Poreda, Jeff Silver, Ben Fairbrother, and Katie Crofoot—everyone who worked with you said to me, 'Wow, your team is responsive. Your team is diligent. Your team takes their job very seriously.' And I think one of the reasons that I would put the House staff up against any other team around is that you all, and I think our whole House staff, demonstrated a gift for teamwork that is often missing from government and that makes us very proud.

For that reason, as you mentioned, Chair Weatherford, I also want to thank Erin Rock and her team at the Office of Public Information, who traveled the state and took the House's public outreach to new levels.

Sergeant Sumner, you and your staff always, always represent us, no matter where we are—in what city, on the Floor, or in Tallahassee—with efficiency, courtesy, and professionalism.

Scott McPherson and the House IT team for their assistance in pushing the technology envelope, as we did.

And I'd also want to join you all in thanking and acknowledging the work of Beth Switzer and the Florida Channel for being such enthusiastic partners in our public outreach effort. [applause]

We set out this process and my charge to Chair Weatherford and to the other chairs was to fulfill a single goal, which is to fulfill our constitutional duty to the best of our ability and to honor and respect the rule of law. We established a careful, thoughtful, and deliberative process, and despite all the pressure to rush or cut corners, we never did. We followed our rules, we respected the process. And the maps and the quality of the product reflects it.

I remember, curiously, the first time our maps were made public in the House, and there were members in this Chamber who claimed that these

maps could not possibly be the real maps. I don't know if you remember that, Chair Weatherford, that there was no way the Republican majority would put forward maps that had members in the same districts. The not so subtle insinuation, frankly, being that there was no way that the Republican majority in this House would follow the law. And I cannot tell you—I cannot tell you how proud I am to say that those members were wrong. The maps drawn by this house were done so in full compliance with the requirements of our State Constitution and Federal and State law, and this Chamber honored that obligation and that oath that we all took, the voters, and, frankly, to the Constitution to uphold it.

I want to thank each and every House member who, having had an exhaustive 2011 session, then spent their summer and fall traveling the state attending the meetings. I know that was a lot of work. Our team leaders on redistricting demonstrated exemplary leadership qualities and total dedication to the task, and so, I want to recognize and specifically thank the co-chairs of the Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee, John Legg and Doug Holder, and Vice Chair Mike Horner. I want to recognize the co-chairs of the House Redistricting Committee, Rob Schenck and Chris Dorworth, and the co-chairs of the Senate Redistricting Committee, Dorothy Hukill, and Peter Nehr, and Vice Chair Ritch Workman, and also Vice Chair Jim Frishe of the House Committee, and our overall Redistricting Committee chair, Representative Precourt. All of you led with grace, and with strength, and with dignity. And you represented us well.

And most of all, I want to thank you, Will. Chairman of our Redistricting Committee and my long-time friend, Will Weatherford, who's our Speaker-designate. You have conducted yourself with integrity, with clarity, with good humor and thoughtfulness, and a lot of grace through what was, without a doubt, not only the most complex, but the most difficult reapportionment because of the burden that you had to bear. You truly have validated the faith and confidence that your fellow members have placed in you to lead this Chamber and you've represented us all very, very well. You set an example, frankly, that all of us should emulate. And so, to you, to the chairs, to the team, to all the people I have mentioned, I want to say well done, and you've made us all very, very proud. Thank you. [applause]