

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 1

Common Cause, et al.)

)

v.)

4:22-cv-109

)

Cord Byrd)

)

TRANSCRIPTION OF AUDIO FILE

Senate Select Subcommittee on Congressional

Reapportionment - The Florida Channel

January 10th, 2022

DIGITAL EVIDENCE GROUP

1730 M Street, NW, Suite 812

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 232-0646

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 2

1 (Beginning of Video Recording.)

2 CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: All right. Well,
3 good morning. We will -- the select
4 Subcommittee on Congressional Reapportionment
5 will now come to order. Dana, please call the
6 roll.

7 FEMALE VOICE: Chair Bradley.

8 CHAIRWOMAN BRADLEY: Here.

9 FEMALE VOICE: Senator Bean (phonetic).

10 SENATOR BEAN: Here.

11 FEMALE VOICE: Senator Harrell.

12 Senator Rouson. Senator Stewart. A quorum is
13 present, Madam Chair.

14 CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: Thank you, Dana.
15 Please silence all electronic devices. Anyone
16 wishing to speak before the committee should
17 complete an appearance form and hand it to a
18 member of the Sergeant's Office.

19 Should you select to waive your
20 speaking time, your position will be included
21 in the committee meeting records. Members,
22 based on the feedback and guidance we gave
23 staff at our last meeting, we have four
24 additional staff produced maps on a workshop
25 agenda today that have further improved upon

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 3

1 the prior drafts we have revied.

2 Senator Rouson has also submitted a
3 draft map for discussion today, as well, that
4 is a variation of one of the staff-produced
5 maps. Because Senator Rouson's draft map is
6 drawn to plan 80-42, I will wait and ask him
7 to explain his variations after staff has
8 explained plan 80-42 in full.

9 Our feedback should continue to conform
10 to the directives issued unanimously by the
11 full committee. You will find a copy of the
12 directives in your meeting materials. I would
13 cation members in their questions, feedback,
14 or guidance to staff today to express
15 themselves carefully so that nothing said in
16 this meeting is misperceived as motivated by
17 any impermissible purpose.

18 By the conclusion of this meeting, we
19 will have reviewed 13 total plans. I propose
20 that before we adjourn that we submit a
21 recommendation which will consist of a map or
22 set of maps to Chairman Rodriguez. I've been
23 advised by counsel that these additional plans
24 brought forward by staff today comply with the
25 complex layering of federal and state

26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 4

1 standards and contained trade-offs within the
2 coequal tier two standards presented in each
3 plan.

4 Are there any questions before we
5 proceed to presentation and public comment?
6 All right. Mr. Farren (phonetic), you are
7 recognized for a walk-through of the staff
8 prepared plans.

9 MR. FARREN: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
10 So this morning we have four additional maps
11 for the select subcommittee to workshop. When
12 preparing these plans, we reviewed the maps
13 from the last meeting of the select
14 subcommittee. And as instructed, looked for
15 improvements and consistency in the
16 application of the various trade-offs
17 presented in the maps.

18 When we talk about consistency of
19 application, we're referring to the treatment
20 of one area of the state like another. The
21 maps we reviewed in November illustrated a few
22 different ways of drawing districts. And we
23 back and reviewed those to examine whether one
24 of the variations was more appropriate in
25 terms of matching the methodology applied
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 5

1 throughout the state.

2 We also looked for the opportunity to
3 improve upon some of the tier 2 metrics,
4 particularly compactness and the utilization
5 of political and geographic boundaries. This
6 also had the effect of keeping some additional
7 cities whole.

8 The plans being presented today present
9 policy choices for the select subcommittee,
10 show improvements in the tier 2 metrics, and
11 do not retrogress or diminish the ability for
12 racial and language minorities to participate
13 in the political process and to elect
14 candidates of their choice.

15 All of the congressional plans being
16 workshopped today have one African American
17 majority/minority district in District 20; re-
18 effective minority districts for African
19 Americans in Districts 5, 10, and 24; and four
20 majority/minority Hispanic districts in
21 districts 9, 25, 26, and 27.

22 Our review of the prior plans also
23 resulted in the narrowing of some of the
24 options previously workshopped. In making
25 those recommendations, we referred to both
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 6

1 plan language of Article 3, Section 20 of the
2 Florida Constitution, applicable case law, and
3 the directives of the committee that were
4 issued on October 18th, 2021.

5 As a Chair mentioned, a copy of those
6 directives is included in the meeting
7 materials for reference.

8 As with the plans we've previously
9 workshopped, we did not review any political
10 data other than where a review of the
11 political data was required to perform the
12 appropriate functional analysis to evaluate
13 whether or not a district denied or abridged a
14 racial or language minority group's ability to
15 participate in the political process or
16 whether a proposed district diminished their
17 ability to elect representatives of their
18 choice.

19 As I've already mentioned, our
20 conclusion is that the plans we'll be
21 reviewing today do not retrogress or do not
22 diminish the opportunities for minority
23 voters. The staff-drawn plans being
24 workshopped today were published to
25 www.floridaredistricting.gov on Wednesday,
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 7

1 January 5th, 2022, and they're numbered plans
2 S00c, 8036, 8038, 8047, and 8042. The plan
3 packets were published in the meeting
4 materials and are available on the select
5 subcommittee's page of the flsenate.gov
6 website. As we've discussed before, these
7 packets contain everything used to analyze a
8 redistricting plan.

9 Data comes from the redistricting
10 application and is reformatted for easier
11 consumption. On the front page of these
12 packets, there's a statewide map with insets
13 of South Florida, Jacksonville, Tampa Bay, and
14 Orlando.

15 The second page contains census and
16 boundary statistics that show the population
17 deviation, Black and Hispanic voting age
18 population, area of perimeter, compactness
19 scores, counts of whole counties and cities,
20 and the percentage of boundary overlap with
21 existing political and geographic boundaries.

22 This information is shown for each
23 district as well as for the plan overall. The
24 additional table on the census and boundaries
25 statistics page shows information about the
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 8

1 number of whole cities and split cities and
2 counties.

3 Included here are plan level counts of
4 cities and counties with only one district,
5 which means whole counties or cities by
6 geography; a district with only one county,
7 meaning that the district is contained
8 entirely within a county; counties and cities
9 with all population in a single district,
10 which are whole cities or counties by
11 population, and this is presented because the
12 Florida Supreme Court has indicated that an
13 unpopulated split should not be counted;
14 aggregate number of city or county splits; and
15 aggregate number of city or county splits with
16 population.

17 And these aggregate splits are counts
18 of the number of times a political subdivision
19 is split. So if a county has three districts
20 in it, that counts as three aggregate splits.
21 If it has two districts in it, it counts as
22 two.

23 The third and fourth pages in the
24 packet list the counties and cities that are
25 split and show the districts that split the
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 9

1 subdivision along with the percentage of its
2 population and the percentage of the area
3 within those districts.

4 The remaining pages contain the
5 functional analysis of the districts for which
6 it is necessary to evaluate whether or not a
7 proposed district denies or abridges a racial
8 or language minority group's ability to
9 participate in the political process or
10 whether the proposed district diminishes the
11 ability to elect their representatives of
12 choice.

13 Specifically, page five contains BVAP
14 which is census correspondents who identified
15 as being Black either singly or in combination
16 with some other race and or ethnicity,
17 including Hispanic. And for HVAP which are
18 census respondents who identified as Hispanic
19 and any race or combination of races including
20 Black.

21 It also has 2020 general election voter
22 registration for registration by party,
23 registration by race or ethnicity,
24 registration by race or ethnicity and
25 political party, and registration by party and
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 10

1 race or ethnicity.

2 Page 6 has the data needed for a
3 functional analysis normalized and shown
4 across all available statewide elections to
5 make it digestible and to help control for
6 extraneous variables that may have driven
7 turnout or performance in a particular
8 election.

9 It contains the average voter turnout
10 in 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020 primary
11 elections by party and race or ethnicity. It
12 also contains the average of voter turnout in
13 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020 general
14 elections by party, by party and race or
15 ethnicity, and by race or ethnicity and
16 political party.

17 Finally, this page contains information
18 about districts' general election performance
19 in statewide elections for 2012 through 2020.
20 It shows the average performance for the vote
21 share for the democrat and republican
22 candidate, count of wins in statewide contests
23 for democrat and republican candidates, the
24 maximum margin of victory in a statewide
25 contest for either the democrat or republican
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 11

1 candidate, the minimum margin of victory in a
2 statewide contest for either the democrat or
3 republican candidate, the average margin of
4 victory in statewide contests for either the
5 republican or democrat candidate. So it has
6 the maximum, the minimum, and the average.

7 Page 7 of the packet shows the
8 percentage of votes received by each candidate
9 in contest for which there was a statewide
10 primary election. Primary elections were held
11 statewide in 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2018.

12 And then finally, page 8 has the
13 percentage of votes received by each candidate
14 in contest for which there was a statewide
15 general and that's all statewide elections,
16 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020.

17 So if there are no questions about the
18 materials, we can move on to the maps.

19 CHAIRWOMAN BRADLEY: Let's proceed.

20 MR. FARREN: Thank you, Madam Chair.
21 We'll start with North Florida where all plans
22 being workshopped today have the same
23 configuration of Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
24 The top image on the slides here shows how
25 Districts one, two, and three are configured
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 12

1 in plans S00C, 8018, through 8022 -- or excuse
2 me, and in 8022. And those are from our last
3 workshop in November.

4 The bottom image shows how these
5 districts are configured in plans 8036 through
6 8042, which are the four we're workshopping
7 today. In the panhandle all workshops have
8 Districts one and two splitting Walton County
9 along State Road 83 and US highway 331.

10 In plans 8018 and 8022, which is the
11 top image, the boundary utilized in municipal
12 boundaries of DeFuniak Springs and Freeport,
13 keeping them whole. In the plan -- in the new
14 plans that we're workshopping today, the
15 boundary follows the static geographic
16 features through Walton County, deviated only
17 to balance population.

18 In plans 8018 and 8022 which are shown
19 on the top, District 2 gained its remaining
20 population in Alachua County, which added an
21 extra county split to the overall map. In the
22 revised plans today, District 2 gains its
23 remaining population in Marion County which
24 keeps Alachua County whole in District 3.

25 The configurations in District 1 and 2
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 13

1 and in Districts 2 and 3 reflect a consistent
2 application of methodology relative to the
3 other areas of the state where, one, static
4 geographic features were used as district
5 boundaries rather than impermanent municipal
6 lines, and two, where counties were kept whole
7 by moving the split to a neighboring county
8 that had already had multiple -- or multiple
9 districts in it. Excuse me.

10 An example of this would be in Pasco
11 and Pinellas where putting District 14 into
12 Pinellas allows Pasco to be kept whole and the
13 boundary between Districts 13 and 14 uses
14 major roadways and railroads.

15 And other example would be in Pulk and
16 Lake counties where putting District 28 into
17 Lake allows Hardy and Highlands to be kept
18 whole. This slide shows the tier two metrics
19 for Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, as configured
20 in the plans being discussed today in the top
21 table.

22 The bottom table shows the alternative
23 configuration previously workshopped. We can
24 see that the maps we're workshopping today
25 have improved compactness scores and
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 14

1 utilization of political and geographic
2 boundaries for District 1 where the
3 utilization rate of nongeographic features
4 have been reduced from four percent to two
5 percent.

6 District 2 also has its compactness
7 scores improved across all three mathematical
8 measurements. In plans 8036 through 8042,
9 these districts are collectively more
10 mathematically and visually compact while
11 splitting one less county in Alachua and
12 splitting one less municipality as well.

13 Although the previous workshop plans
14 that are being compared have slightly higher
15 average use of political and geographic
16 boundaries overall, keeping the additional
17 county whole is an appropriate trade-off as it
18 provides a more consistent application of the
19 methodology when considering the use of county
20 boundaries where feasible. This was as was
21 directed by the committee.

22 Those factors drove the decision to
23 include this configuration in all four of
24 today's plans.

25 Move down to Polk County in Central
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 15

1 Florida where all plans being workshopped
2 today have the same configurations of
3 Districts 11 and 28.

4 Unlike the previously workshopped plans
5 8020 and 8024 which are shown on the left,
6 today's plans keep Sumpter County whole within
7 District 11 and balances the population
8 between Districts 11 and 28 in Lake County.

9 A side effect of keeping Sumpter County
10 whole is that within Lake County today's keep
11 Mascot whole and have an unpopulated split in
12 this City of Clermont. The prior plans had
13 populated splits in Mascot, Groveland, and
14 Clermont.

15 When we turn to the table for Districts
16 11 and 28 is configured in the plans being
17 discussed today. That's on the top. And
18 compare that to the bottom table which shows
19 the alternative configuration in 8020 and
20 8024.

21 The alternative configuration had a
22 lower utilization of political and geographic
23 boundaries in addition to that populated split
24 that I mentioned in Sumpter County. So the
25 configurations being workshopped today end up
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 16

1 having a higher usage of political and
2 geographic boundaries and also keep Sumpter
3 County and additional cities whole.

4 This provides a more consistent
5 application of the methodology when
6 considering the use of county boundaries where
7 feasible, as was directed by the committee.
8 These factors drove our decision to include it
9 in all four of today's plans.

10 Districts 7, 9, and 10 are configured
11 differently in the plans that we're
12 workshopping today and present the committee
13 with a policy choice in plans 8036 and 8838,
14 which is the slide on the left.

15 District 7 includes a little more of
16 Eastern Orange County, which means that
17 District 9 takes more of Southern Orange and
18 pushed District 10 into further -- further
19 into downtown Orlando.

20 In plans 8040 and 8042, District 7
21 includes a little bit more of Central Orange
22 County which pushes District 10 south to the
23 B-line express way instead of San Lake Road.
24 The functional analysis from both
25 configurations show that 9 and 10 do not deny
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 17

1 or abridge the opportunity for minorities to
2 participate in the political process and do
3 not diminish their ability to elect candidates
4 of their choice.

5 The surrounding districts, Districts 6,
6 8, and 11 contain the same configuration in
7 all the plans that are being reviewed today.
8 These tables show the different configurations
9 of 7, 9, and 10 in the plans that are being
10 reviewed today.

11 The first table shows the metrics as
12 they appear in 8036 and 8038. The second
13 table shows the metrics for the three
14 districts in plans 8040 and 8042. And as you
15 can see in this table, 8036 and 8038 have a
16 slightly higher Black voting age population in
17 District 10 and a slightly higher Hispanic
18 voting age population in District 9.

19 Overall, plans 8040 and 8042 as shown
20 in the bottom graph have a lower use of
21 nonpolitical and geographic boundaries and
22 slightly more compact in two of the three
23 mathematical measurements.

24 All of the plans that are being
25 workshopped today have the same configuration
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 18

1 of Districts 18, 20, 23, and 24, but have
2 different arrangements of District 21 and 22.
3 This slide is going to show the differences
4 between the plans with the vertical
5 orientation of Districts 21 and 22 that we've
6 workshopped in the past.

7 Districts 18, 23, and 24 do have slight
8 configuration changes from the previous
9 workshops. And so District 18 contains all of
10 St. Lucie and Martin County and part of Indian
11 River and Palm Beach as it did before. The
12 boundary has moved a little bit in Palm Beach
13 County between Districts 20 and 18 where we're
14 keeping some additional cities whole by
15 following the municipal boundaries of West
16 Lake and Loxahatchee Groves in an area where
17 there was no available static geographic
18 boundaries.

19 Because it's a tier one district, this
20 does depart from some geographic features were
21 necessary to maintain the ability to elect.
22 We also made some changes to District 23 in
23 Southeastern Broward County. In Broward
24 County, the boundary now -- primarily follows
25 the municipal boundaries of Weston and
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 19

1 Southwest Ranches.

2 It keeps those cities whole within the
3 district and follows I-95, Sawgrass
4 Expressway, Sunrise Boulevard, Broward
5 Boulevard, the turnpike, State Road 84, and
6 State Road 824 which is Pembroke Road, where
7 it shares a boundary with District 24.

8 It's kind of hard to tell on this
9 slide, but there was some adjustments made to
10 District 24. There was a small portion where
11 we balanced the population North of Pembroke
12 Boulevard between Districts 23 and 24.

13 And there was a small indentation on
14 the image on the left where District 22 went
15 into -- kind of carved out a little section of
16 District 24. Both of those have been adjusted
17 in the image on the right to flatten out the
18 top -- the Northern boundary of District 24
19 where it borders District 23 and to fill in
20 the smaller area where we had balanced
21 population between Districts 22 and 24 in
22 Hallandale Beach.

23 These changes overall, the 18, 23, and
24 24, resulted in a more visually and
25 mathematically compact districts. We wound
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 20

1 with a lower usage of nonpolitical and
2 geographic boundaries and were able to keep an
3 additional nine cities whole within a single
4 district.

5 The functional analysis shows that the
6 new configurations for 20 and 24 do not deny
7 or abridge the opportunity for African
8 Americans to participate in the political
9 process and do not diminish their ability to
10 elect candidates of their choice.

11 Turning to the table for this
12 configuration we see that these show different
13 versions of 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, both
14 with a vertical orientation. So the first
15 table shows the metrics for these six
16 districts as they appear in 8036 and 8042.

17 And the second table shows the metrics
18 for plans 8018 and 8024 which were workshopped
19 at our last meeting on November 29th.

20 In the first table we see that the --
21 the plans 8036 and 8042 are more
22 mathematically compact in 2 of the 3 scores,
23 keep, as I mentioned, 9 additional cities whole
24 and decrease the average use of nonpolitical
25 and geographic boundaries by 4 percentage
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 21

1 points from 19 percent down to 15 percent.

2 Plans 8036 and 8032 provide a more
3 consistent application of the methodology when
4 considering mathematical and visual
5 compactness in the use of geographic
6 boundaries where feasible as directed by the
7 committee.

8 The next slide we have to review is the
9 same configuration of Districts 8020, 23, and
10 24 but with the horizontal orientations for
11 Districts 21 and 22. We've done the
12 functional analysis on Districts 20 and 24 and
13 confirmed that that -- neither of those deny
14 or abridge the ability for minorities to
15 participate in the political process.

16 And the left picture shows the
17 horizontal orientation of Districts 21 and 22
18 that were in 8020 and 8022. And the right
19 shows it in 8038 and 8040. These tables show
20 the different versions of 18, 20, 21, 22, 23,
21 and 24 but with the horizontal orientation.

22 The first shows the metrics of the six
23 districts as they appear in 8038 and 8040.
24 And the second table shows the metrics for the
25 plans in 8020 and 8022. In the first table,
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 22

1 plans 8038 and 8040 are more compact in all
2 three mathematical measures, keep ten
3 additional cites whole, and decrease the
4 average use of nonpolitical and geographic
5 boundaries by three percentage points.

6 It goes from 18 percent down to 15.
7 8030 and 8040 also provide a more consistent
8 application methodology when considering
9 mathematical and visual compactness in the use
10 of geographic boundaries where feasible as was
11 directed by the committee.

12 This slide shows the new versions of
13 the South Florida configuration and compares
14 the vertical, side by side orientation to the
15 horizontal, stacked configuration. You've got
16 the vertical one on the left and the stacked
17 one on the right.

18 The surrounding districts, as I've
19 stated, are all the same. And so when we
20 review the table here, what we can see is the
21 comparison between the vertical and horizontal
22 orientations for these districts. The top one
23 being the vertical configuration that appears
24 in 8036 and 8042. And the bottom is the
25 horizontal one in 8038 and 8040.

26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 23

1 We can see that the horizontal stacked
2 configuration is more compact in the three
3 mathematical measurements and has one less
4 aggregate county split and one less city
5 split, but both configurations do achieve the
6 same usage rate for political and geographic
7 boundaries.

8 Then we have a table that shows the 12
9 congressional plans for which this committee's
10 workshopped. As shown in the plan column, the
11 first four plans, which is 8002, 8004, 8006,
12 and 8008, those were presented to the
13 committee on November 16th. The second set
14 consisting of 8018, 8020, 8022, and 8024 were
15 presented to the committee on November 29th.

16 And then plans 8036 through 8042 were
17 released on January 5th for today's
18 discussion. The table really shows us how the
19 iterative improvements in the tier two metrics
20 were made throughout the subcommittee process.

21 It's consistent with the subcommittee's
22 directive to seek out improvements and
23 consistency in applying the various trade-offs
24 presented in the maps. All plans released by
25 the staff contain a total deviation of one
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 24

1 person as was directed by the full committee
2 and show an improvement in the mathematical
3 compactness for both the Polsby-Popper and
4 Reock scores, while the Convex Hull score
5 remains the same throughout the 12 plans.

6 Additionally, the overall comparison of
7 the 12 plans shows improvements in the use of
8 political and geographic boundaries with
9 today's plans having the lowest percentage of
10 nonpolitical and geographic boundary usage at
11 eight percent.

12 Also in all four plans of today's
13 plans, we have the highest number of counties
14 kept whole within a single district at 48.
15 And then today's plans also have the highest
16 number of cities that are kept whole. But it
17 should be noted that according to the Census
18 Bureau's voluntary boundary and annexation
19 survey, for which we received some updated
20 data over the break, since January 2020, which
21 is the deadline for this redistricting cycle's
22 geometrical definitions, we've had 92 of
23 Florida's municipalities change their
24 boundaries. And that amounts to about 22
25 percent of our cities in the state.

26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 25

1 And so while we talk about the cities
2 that we've kept whole, it's entirely possible
3 that some of those cities are going to end up
4 being split by the time y'all get back home to
5 your constituents because the cities will have
6 changed their boundaries from the definitions
7 that we're able to use for redistricting.

8 And so the last slide that we have here
9 is also related to the usage rates for
10 political and geographic boundaries. And
11 we've got here a count of districts that fall
12 within this specific range of nonpolitical or
13 geographic boundary usage.

14 And the reason we use the non-boundary
15 usage score is because that is a good
16 indicator of where it was not feasible to use
17 such a feature. And so the three workshops
18 show a narrative improvement in the range and
19 distribution of these scores.

20 And for example, the number of
21 districts with a nonpolitical or geographic
22 score below 20 percent rose from 22 to 23
23 districts in the first iteration of the plans
24 to 26 or 27 districts in the plans being
25 presented today.

26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 26

1 Additionally, over three-quarters of
2 districts presented in today's plans achieved
3 scores equal to or greater than 90 percent of
4 boundary usage. And only two districts in
5 today's plans score higher than 20 percent in
6 that non-boundary usage. And those are
7 Districts 7 and the vertical configuration of
8 District 21.

9 District 7's configuration scores, you
10 know, relatively low on that because it's
11 affected by the two tier one protected
12 districts to its South and has to balance its
13 population in and around the cities of DeBary
14 and Deltona, where no major roadways or
15 geographic features exist for us to use.

16 The vertical configuration of District
17 21 in plans 8036 and 8032 is affected by
18 District 20, which is also a tier 1 protected
19 district. And its boundaries follow the Lox
20 Ashely National Wildlife Refuge, which is not
21 classified as a geographic boundary within our
22 dataset.

23 Also, due to classification of road
24 data from the Census Bureau, Jog Road, which
25 is used as a boundary in that configuration,
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 27

1 doesn't count as a primary or secondary road
2 even though it's a locally known six-lane
3 highway -- well-known local road.

4 And so as a result, due to the
5 classification for our political and
6 geographic boundaries, a lot of which we've
7 derived from the Census Bureau, certain
8 boundaries may not meet our strict
9 requirements for inclusion but are widely
10 known as major geographic features in the
11 area.

12 And so our boundary analysis is a
13 conservative estimate in the boundary usage.
14 But we still feel confident in its ability to
15 indicate compliance with the constitutional
16 provisions.

17 And Madam Chair, the last thing that I
18 would add is that, you know, while we've
19 talked a lot about the iterative improvements
20 in these plans, we would still feel pretty
21 strongly that all of the plans we've drawn and
22 workshopped before the committees are, in
23 fact, constitutional and defensible plans.

24 We just have followed the committee's
25 instructions to continue looking for
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 28

1 opportunities to improve those metrics and to
2 improve the consistency of application
3 throughout the map.

4 CHAIRWOMAN BRADLEY: Thank you, Mr.
5 Farren, and I will say, thank you again. Now,
6 we cannot thank you enough, you and your
7 staff, for the incredible effort that has gone
8 into making this iterative process. Every
9 time we meet, we see maps that are improved
10 and better and better.

11 And so thank you to your team members.
12 Are there any questions on any of the maps
13 that were presented? Any discussion? Because
14 we have -- we have four base -- we're looking
15 at four maps now. And there's really two
16 areas where they differ.

17 One being in Central Florida with CD 7,
18 9, and 10. And the other in Southeast Florida
19 with 21 and 22. And I just did have a few
20 thoughts on the 21 and 22. We see two maps
21 that have a vertical orientation and two with
22 a stacked orientation.

23 And as I look at the data, the stacked
24 orientation is clearly superior in terms of
25 compactness. And I also think about the -- it
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 29

1 wasn't a holding by the Court, but we did have
2 some guidance from the Supreme Court last
3 cycle as they considered -- they considered
4 the stacked versus vertical.

5 And they didn't mandate a certain
6 approach. But there certainly was a
7 preference for recognizing the preferred --
8 the compactness improvements of the stacked
9 orientation. And I'm not sure if the rest of
10 the committee has a -- has a thought on that.

11 I prefer for those reasons, because the
12 Court has expressed a preference, if we
13 could -- that may even be too strong, but they
14 certainly expressed a -- favored the stacked
15 because of the compactness scores.

16 So I -- you know, with regard to 21 and
17 22, if there was any other. You're
18 recognized.

19 SENATOR HERRELL: Thank you very much,
20 Madam Chair. And I agree with you. I
21 believe, as our staff did mention, it does
22 keep more cities, several cities whole in the
23 area. And again, because of the compactness
24 and also the -- I'm very concerned about, if
25 possible, keeping cities whole.

26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 30

1 And that entire area is totally
2 incorporated. So the more you can do that,
3 the better. So I would agree with you on
4 that. I do represent parts of Palm Beach
5 County currently. So I do really speak with
6 people in that area.

7 And keeping cities whole is a major
8 concern for folks there.

9 CHAIRWOMAN BRADLEY: And now Senator
10 Rouson, you are recognized to explain map
11 S00C8052.

12 SENATOR ROUSON: Thank you very much,
13 Madam Chairman. I've submitted this map in
14 consult with my staff. And I want to thank
15 Jay and his staff for their overall hard work
16 that they've done from the beginning to
17 improve and make better these maps.

18 The intent of C8052 is to make a
19 recognizable Tampa area instead of splitting
20 Tampa Bay, as some of the current proposed
21 maps have done. It's identical to C8042 that
22 we -- that we have discussed today, except the
23 region where I drew Congressional District 12
24 through 15 to prioritize two things.

25 First, District 14 remains solely in
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 31

1 Hillsborough County. And second, District 13
2 in Pinellas County keeps cities whole. And
3 we've heard today that the map submitted by
4 staff, all of them seek to have the highest
5 number of cities and counties kept whole.

6 This map keeps all of the 24 cities
7 Pinellas County whole, or at least 98 percent
8 whole. The map also keeps 100 percent of
9 District 14 in Hillsborough County and most of
10 the City of Tampa, which is about 88 percent
11 in 8052.

12 It utilizes existing political
13 geographic boundaries, county and city lines,
14 and complies with tier two standards that
15 districts be compact, and where feasible,
16 using existing political and geographic
17 boundaries.

18 And I think it comports with
19 mathematically and visual compactness. And
20 the rest of the map doesn't deviate from what
21 has been previously workshopped or submitted
22 by staff expect for Tampa Bay region.

23 CHAIRWOMAN BRADLEY: Thank you,
24 Senator, for that explanation. Members, are
25 there any -- any questions under Rouson's map.
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 32

1 Senator Harrell?

2 SENATOR HERRELL: Thank you very much.
3 And on Senator Rouson's map, you do keep 21
4 and 22 vertical as opposed to horizontal. And
5 I have just expressed an opinion saying that I
6 do believe, because it does keep more cities
7 whole, that my preference would be to use the
8 horizontal configuration. I don't know if
9 you're amenable to considering, perhaps
10 adjustment there.

11 SENATOR ROUSON: Thank you, Madam
12 Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: You're recognized.

14 SENATOR ROUSON: Yeah. I am open to
15 considering that.

16 CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: Anything additional?
17 Any other questions. Okay. Senator Rouson,
18 when I'm looking at the -- at your map, 13,
19 District 13 becomes more compact. But
20 District 15 and 12, their metrics for
21 compactness appear to backslide. And
22 visually, those two districts are not as
23 compact visually in that map.

24 And it also doesn't adhere to the
25 political and geographic boundaries to the
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 33

1 same degree that the Senate maps do. Is --
2 can you tell me if that's a -- was that a
3 balance for your tier two? Or tell me how --
4 how -- what your thought was on the
5 compactness. Was that a decision to balance
6 tier two in some way? Or -- because those --
7 the compactness scores go down in your
8 version.

9 SENATOR ROUSON: Thank you, Madam
10 Chair, for the question. It was an attempt to
11 balance the compactness and not so much to
12 impact 15, but necessarily to make 14 wholly
13 within Hillsborough County.

14 CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: Thank you. And
15 the -- the other concern is that right now,
16 and we see it through the map, is that we've
17 concentrated our splits in denser counties.
18 We saw it with Alachua County where we put the
19 split in Marion in order to keep Alachua
20 whole.

21 And right now, the iterations of that
22 area have the splits concentrated in Pinellas
23 in order to keep Pasco whole. And so that's
24 a -- that's another factor that I'm thinking
25 about as I -- as I review your map. Any
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 34

1 additional comment? Rouson -- Senator Rouson,
2 do you have anything additional to add?

3 SENATOR ROUSON: No, thank you, Madam
4 Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: Thank you. All
6 right. We will turn to public comment. We
7 have one appearance card today with Cecile
8 Scoon, president of the Florida League of
9 Woman Voters.

10 MS. SCOON: Good morning. My name is
11 Cecile Scoon. I'm president of League of
12 Woman Voters of Florida. And I want to say,
13 very much appreciate the Senate's efforts, and
14 their staff's efforts, to be transparent and
15 to lay out the guidelines that you use.

16 It's helpful when, you know, third
17 party groups, such as the League, are trying
18 to follow what you're doing. Very, very
19 helpful. And I appreciate also the discussion
20 about the functional analysis. It's answered
21 a few of my questions.

22 I still have a couple of questions,
23 though. And from prior presentations at the
24 hearings, it was stated that the districts
25 that were chosen as to be checked for
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 35

1 functional analysis, was based on the
2 benchmark districts as determined by the
3 litigation of Florida Supreme Court of 2015.

4 And at that time, of course, this
5 Florida Supreme Court was using 2010 Census
6 information. So my question is, if you are
7 basing looking at particular districts based
8 on the 2015 case and the decision which was
9 looking backwards at 2010 Census, how are you
10 incorporating the 2020 Census in terms of
11 determining which districts to look for to
12 confirm that the tier one mandatory
13 requirements of essentially equal access
14 opportunity for minority groups to select a
15 representative of their choice, how are you
16 bringing in the 2020 Census information if you
17 are only relying on the benchmark districts,
18 which were determined in 2015. In other
19 words, how are you looking forward?

20 CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: Ms. Scoon, we want
21 to hear from you. We want -- this is your
22 time to present.

23 MS. SPOON: Okay. Well, I would like
24 the staff and Senate to incorporate the 2020
25 Census information, which shows, of course,
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 36

1 changes of the population in the state, growth
2 in some areas, you know, lowering in some
3 other areas.

4 I would like those bread crumbs to be
5 laid out as you have in some of your other
6 criteria, certainly very well in the tier two
7 criteria. It's very clear what you're doing
8 and the improvements and everything. And that
9 was well presented today.

10 So I'm asking for that same kind of
11 focus to make sure that the mandatory
12 requirements of tier one, which are no
13 political, you know, favoritism and the
14 opportunity for racial and language minorities
15 to have an equal opportunity to select a
16 representative of their choice, that that be
17 tested using the most recent 2020 Census.

18 And since it was stated it was the
19 districts that were chosen were only based on
20 benchmark, that means it was based on the old
21 Census information.

22 CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: Thank you.

23 MS. SCOON: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN BRADLEY: Okay. Seeing no
25 further public comment, is there any
26

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 37

1 additional comment from the committee? All
2 right. Well, members, I want to thank you for
3 your important work on this select committee,
4 subcommittee. I propose that we submit a
5 recommendation to Chair Rodriguez that Plans
6 38 and 40 most consistently adhere to the
7 directives issued to the staff and that these
8 plans should be taken into consideration for
9 the substance of his bill that will be before
10 the full committee Thursday.

11 Seeing nothing further, Senator Harrell
12 moves that we adjourn. Seeing no objection,
13 we are adjourned.

14 (End of Video Recording.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

CERTIFICATE

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 38

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I, Wendy Sawyer, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and transcribed the foregoing recorded proceedings, and that the transcript is a true record, to the best of my ability.

DATED this 5th day of March, 2023.



WENDY SAWYER, CDLT

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 1

A	Alachua 12:20 12:24 14:11 33:18,19 allows 13:12,17 alternative 13:22 15:19,21 amenable 32:9 American 5:16 Americans 5:19 20:8 amounts 24:24 analysis 6:12 9:5 10:3 16:24 20:5 21:12 27:12 34:20 35:1 analyze 7:7 annexation 24:18 answered 34:20 appear 17:12 20:16 21:23 32:21 appearance 2:17 34:7 appears 22:23 applicable 6:2 application 4:16 4:19 7:10 13:2 14:18 16:5 21:3 22:8 28:2 applied 4:25 applying 23:23 appreciate 34:13 34:19 approach 29:6 appropriate 4:24 6:12 14:17 area 4:20 7:18 9:2 18:16 19:20 27:11 29:23 30:1,6 30:19 33:22 areas 13:3 28:16 36:2,3 arrangements	18:2 Article 6:1 Ashely 26:20 asking 36:10 attempt 33:10 AUDIO 1:12 authorized 38:3 available 7:4 10:4 18:17 average 10:9,12 10:20 11:3,6 14:15 20:24 22:4	B B-line 16:23 back 4:23 25:4 backslide 32:21 backwards 35:9 balance 12:17 26:12 33:3,5 33:11 balanced 19:11 19:20 balances 15:7 base 28:14 based 2:22 35:1 35:7 36:19,20 basing 35:7 Bay 7:13 30:20 31:22 Beach 18:11,12 19:22 30:4 Bean 2:9,10 beginning 2:1 30:16 believe 29:21 32:6 benchmark 35:2 35:17 36:20 best 38:5 better 28:10,10 30:3,17 bill 37:9 bit 16:21 18:12 Black 7:17 9:15 9:20 17:16	borders 19:19 bottom 12:4 13:22 15:18 17:20 22:24 Boulevard 19:4 19:5,12 boundaries 5:5 7:21,24 12:12 13:5 14:2,16 14:20 15:23 16:2,6 17:21 18:15,18,25 20:2,25 21:6 22:5,10 23:7 24:8,24 25:6 25:10 26:19 27:6,8 31:13 31:17 32:25 boundary 7:16 7:20 12:11,15 13:13 18:12,24 19:7,18 24:10 24:18 25:13 26:4,21,25 27:12,13 Bradley 2:2,7,8 2:14 11:19 28:4 30:9 31:23 32:13,16 33:14 34:5 35:20 36:22,24 bread 36:4 break 24:20 bringing 35:16 brought 3:24 Broward 18:23 18:23 19:4 Bureau 26:24 27:7 Bureau's 24:18 BVAP 9:13 Byrd 1:6	candidate 10:22 11:1,3,5,8,13 candidates 5:14 10:23 17:3 20:10 card 34:7 carefully 3:15 carved 19:15 case 6:2 35:8 cation 3:13 Cause 1:2 CD 28:17 CDLT 38:23 Cecile 34:7,11 census 7:15,24 9:14,18 24:17 26:24 27:7 35:5,9,10,16 35:25 36:17,21 Central 14:25 16:21 28:17 certain 27:7 29:5 certainly 29:6 29:14 36:6 CERTIFICATE 37:26 certify 38:2 Chair 2:7,13 6:5 11:20 27:17 29:20 32:12 33:10 34:4 37:5 Chairman 2:2 2:14 3:22 4:9 30:13 32:13,16 33:14 34:5 35:20 36:22,24 CHAIRWOM... 2:8 11:19 28:4 30:9 31:23 change 24:23 changed 25:6 changes 18:8,22 19:23 36:1 Channel 1:14 checked 34:25
----------	---	--	---	--	--

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 2

choice 5:14 6:18 9:12 16:13 17:4 20:10 35:15 36:16 choices 5:9 chosen 34:25 36:19 cites 20:23 22:3 cities 5:7 7:19 8:1,1,4,5,8,10 8:24 16:3 18:14 19:2 20:3 24:16,25 25:1,3,5 26:13 29:22,22,25 30:7 31:2,5,6 32:6 city 8:14,15 15:12 23:4 31:10,13 classification 26:23 27:5 classified 26:21 clear 36:7 clearly 28:24 Clermont 15:12 15:14 coequal 4:2 collectively 14:9 column 23:10 combination 9:15,19 come 2:5 comes 7:9 comment 4:5 34:1,6 36:25 37:1 committee 2:16 2:21 3:11 6:3 14:21 16:7,12 21:7 22:11 23:13,15 24:1 29:10 37:1,3 37:10 committee's 23:9 27:24 committees	27:22 Common 1:2 compact 14:10 17:22 19:25 20:22 22:1 23:2 31:15 32:19,23 compactness 5:4 7:18 13:25 14:6 21:5 22:9 24:3 28:25 29:8,15,23 31:19 32:21 33:5,7,11 compare 15:18 compared 14:14 compares 22:13 comparison 22:21 24:6 complete 2:17 complex 3:25 compliance 27:15 complies 31:14 comply 3:24 comports 31:18 concentrated 33:17,22 concern 30:8 33:15 concerned 29:24 conclusion 3:18 6:20 confident 27:14 configuration 11:23 13:23 14:23 15:19,21 17:6,25 18:8 20:12 21:9 22:13,15,23 23:2 26:7,9,16 26:25 32:8 configurations 12:25 15:2,25 16:25 17:8 20:6 23:5 configured	11:25 12:5 13:19 15:16 16:10 confirm 35:12 confirmed 21:13 conform 3:9 congressional 1:13 2:4 5:15 23:9 30:23 conservative 27:13 consideration 37:8 considered 29:3 29:3 considering 14:19 16:6 21:4 22:8 32:9 32:15 consist 3:21 consistency 4:15 4:18 23:23 28:2 consistent 13:1 14:18 16:4 21:3 22:7 23:21 consistently 37:6 consisting 23:14 constituents 25:5 Constitution 6:2 constitutional 27:15,23 consult 30:14 consumption 7:11 contain 7:7 9:4 17:6 23:25 contained 4:1 8:7 contains 7:15 9:13 10:9,12 10:17 18:9 contest 10:25 11:2,9,14	contests 10:22 11:4 continue 3:9 27:25 control 10:5 Convex 24:4 copy 3:11 6:5 Cord 1:6 correspondents 9:14 counsel 3:23 count 10:22 25:11 27:1 counted 8:13 counties 7:19 8:2,4,5,8,10,24 13:6,16 24:13 31:5 33:17 counts 7:19 8:3 8:17,20,21 county 8:6,8,14 8:15,19 12:8 12:16,20,21,23 12:24 13:7 14:11,17,19,25 15:6,8,9,10,24 16:3,6,16,22 18:10,13,23,24 23:4 30:5 31:1 31:2,7,9,13 33:13,18 couple 34:22 course 35:4,25 Court 8:12 29:1 29:2,12 35:3,5 criteria 36:6,7 crumbs 36:4 current 30:20 currently 30:5 cycle 29:3 cycle's 24:21	26:24 28:23 dataset 26:22 DATED 38:6 day 38:6 deadline 24:21 DeBary 26:13 decision 14:22 16:8 33:5 35:8 decrease 20:24 22:3 defensible 27:23 definitions 24:22 25:6 DeFuniak 12:12 degree 33:1 Deltona 26:14 democrat 10:21 10:23,25 11:2 11:5 denied 6:13 denies 9:7 denser 33:17 deny 16:25 20:6 21:13 depart 18:20 derived 27:7 determined 35:2 35:18 determining 35:11 deviate 31:20 deviated 12:16 deviation 7:17 23:25 devices 2:15 differ 28:16 differences 18:3 different 4:22 17:8 18:2 20:12 21:20 differently 16:11 digestible 10:5 DIGITAL 1:23 diminish 5:11 6:22 17:3 20:9 diminished 6:16
--	--	---	---	---

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 3

diminishes 9:10	31:15 32:22	1:23	2:11	37:11
directed 14:21	34:24 35:2,7	examine 4:23	FILE 1:12	
16:7 21:6	35:11,17 36:19	example 13:10	fill 19:19	G
22:11 24:1	districts' 10:18	13:15 25:20	finally 10:17	gained 12:19
directive 23:22	doing 34:18 36:7	excuse 12:1 13:9	11:12	gains 12:22
directives 3:10	downtown 16:19	exist 26:15	find 3:11	general 9:21
3:12 6:3,6 37:7	draft 3:3,5	existing 7:21	first 17:11 20:14	10:13,18 11:15
discussed 7:6	drafts 3:1	31:12,16	20:20 21:22,25	geographic 5:5
13:20 15:17	drawing 4:22	expect 31:22	23:11 25:23	7:21 12:15
30:22	drawn 3:6 27:21	explain 3:7	30:25	13:4 14:1,15
discussion 3:3	drew 30:23	30:10	five 9:13	15:22 16:2
23:18 28:13	driven 10:6	explained 3:8	flatten 19:17	17:21 18:17,20
34:19	drove 14:22 16:8	explanation	Florida 1:14 6:2	20:2,25 21:5
distribution	due 26:23 27:4	31:24	7:13 8:12	22:4,10 23:6
25:19		express 3:14	11:21 15:1	24:8,10 25:10
district 5:17,17	E	16:23	22:13 28:17,18	25:13,21 26:15
6:13,16 7:23	easier 7:10	expressed 29:12	34:8,12 35:3,5	26:21 27:6,10
8:4,6,7,9 9:7	Eastern 16:16	29:14 32:5	Florida's 24:23	31:13,16 32:25
9:10 12:19,22	effect 5:6 15:9	Expressway	flsenate.gov 7:5	geography 8:6
12:24,25 13:4	effective 5:18	19:4	focus 36:11	geometrical
13:11,16 14:2	effort 28:7	extra 12:21	folks 30:8	24:22
14:6 15:7	efforts 34:13,14	extraneous 10:6	follow 26:19	go 33:7
16:15,17,18,20	eight 24:11		34:18	goes 22:6
16:22 17:17,18	either 9:15	F	followed 27:24	going 18:3 25:3
18:2,9,19,22	10:25 11:2,4	fact 27:23	following 18:15	good 2:3 25:15
19:3,7,10,14	elect 5:13 6:17	factor 33:24	follows 12:15	34:10
19:16,18,19	9:11 17:3	factors 14:22	18:24 19:3	graph 17:20
20:4 24:14	18:21 20:10	16:8	foregoing 38:3	greater 26:3
26:8,9,16,18	election 9:21	fall 25:11	form 2:17	GROUP 1:23
26:19 30:23,25	10:8,18 11:10	Farren 4:6,9	forward 3:24	group's 6:14 9:8
31:1,9 32:19	elections 10:4,11	11:20 28:5	35:19	groups 34:17
32:20	10:14,19 11:10	favored 29:14	four 2:23 4:10	35:14
districts 4:22	11:15	favoritism 36:13	5:19 12:6 14:4	Groveland
5:18,19,20,21	electronic 2:15	feasible 14:20	14:23 16:9	15:13
8:19,21,25 9:3	entire 30:1	16:7 21:6	23:11 24:12	Groves 18:16
9:5 11:23,25	entirely 8:8 25:2	22:10 25:16	28:14,15	growth 36:1
12:5,8 13:1,9	equal 26:3 35:13	31:15	fourth 8:23	guidance 2:22
13:13,19 14:9	36:15	feature 25:17	Freeport 12:12	3:14 29:2
15:3,8,15	essentially 35:13	features 12:16	front 7:11	guidelines 34:15
16:10 17:5,5	estimate 27:13	13:4 14:3	full 3:8,11 24:1	
17:14 18:1,5,7	et 1:2	18:20 26:15	37:10	H
18:13 19:12,21	ethnicity 9:16,23	27:10	functional 6:12	Hallandale
19:25 20:16	9:24 10:1,11	federal 3:25	9:5 10:3 16:24	19:22
21:9,11,12,17	10:15,15	feedback 2:22	20:5 21:12	hand 2:17
21:23 22:18,22	evaluate 6:12	3:9,13	34:20 35:1	hard 19:8 30:15
25:11,21,23,24	9:6	feel 27:14,20	further 2:25	Hardy 13:17
26:2,4,7,12	EVIDENCE	FEMALE 2:7,9	16:18,18 36:25	Harrell 2:11

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 4

32:1 37:11 hear 35:21 heard 31:3 hearings 34:24 held 11:10 help 10:5 helpful 34:16,19 HERRELL 29:19 32:2 higher 14:14 16:1 17:16,17 26:5 highest 24:13,15 31:4 Highlands 13:17 highway 12:9 27:3 Hillsborough 31:1,9 33:13 Hispanic 5:20 7:17 9:17,18 17:17 holding 29:1 home 25:4 horizontal 21:10 21:17,21 22:15 22:21,25 23:1 32:4,8 Hull 24:4 HVAP 9:17	28:1,2 30:17 improved 2:25 13:25 14:7 28:9 improvement 24:2 25:18 improvements 4:15 5:10 23:19,22 24:7 27:19 29:8 36:8 include 14:23 16:8 included 2:20 6:6 8:3 includes 16:15 16:21 including 9:17 9:19 inclusion 27:9 incorporate 35:24 incorporated 30:2 incorporating 35:10 incredible 28:7 indentation 19:13 Indian 18:10 indicate 27:15 indicated 8:12 indicator 25:16 information 7:22,25 10:17 35:6,16,25 36:21 insets 7:12 instructed 4:14 instructions 27:25 intent 30:18 issued 3:10 6:4 37:7 iteration 25:23 iterations 33:21 iterative 23:19	27:19 28:8 <hr/> J Jacksonville 7:13 January 1:15 7:1 23:17 24:20 Jay 30:15 Jog 26:24 <hr/> K keep 15:6,10 16:2 20:2,23 22:2 29:22 32:3,6 33:19 33:23 keeping 5:6 12:13 14:16 15:9 18:14 29:25 30:7 keeps 12:24 19:2 31:2,6,8 kept 13:6,12,17 24:14,16 25:2 31:5 kind 19:8,15 36:10 know 26:10 27:18 29:16 32:8 34:16 36:2,13 known 27:2,10 <hr/> L laid 36:5 Lake 13:16,17 15:8,10 16:23 18:16 language 5:12 6:1,14 9:8 36:14 law 6:2 lay 34:15 layering 3:25 League 34:8,11 34:17 left 15:5 16:14	19:14 21:16 22:16 Let's 11:19 level 8:3 lines 13:6 31:13 list 8:24 litigation 35:3 little 16:15,21 18:12 19:15 local 27:3 locally 27:2 look 28:23 35:11 looked 4:14 5:2 looking 27:25 28:14 32:18 35:7,9,19 lot 27:6,19 low 26:10 lower 15:22 17:20 20:1 lowering 36:2 lowest 24:9 Lox 26:19 Loxahatchee 18:16 Lucie 18:10 <hr/> M M 1:24 Madam 2:13 4:9 11:20 27:17 29:20 30:13 32:11 33:9 34:3 maintain 18:21 major 13:14 26:14 27:10 30:7 majority/mino... 5:17,20 making 5:24 28:8 mandate 29:5 mandatory 35:12 36:11 map 3:3,5,21 7:12 12:21	28:3 30:10,13 31:3,6,8,20,25 32:3,18,23 33:16,25 maps 2:24 3:5 3:22 4:10,12 4:17,21 11:18 13:24 23:24 28:9,12,15,20 30:17,21 33:1 March 38:6 margin 10:24 11:1,3 Marion 12:23 33:19 Martin 18:10 Mascot 15:11,13 matching 4:25 materials 3:12 6:7 7:4 11:18 mathematical 14:7 17:23 21:4 22:2,9 23:3 24:2 mathematically 14:10 19:25 20:22 31:19 maximum 10:24 11:6 meaning 8:7 means 8:5 16:16 36:20 measurements 14:8 17:23 23:3 measures 22:2 meet 27:8 28:9 meeting 2:21,23 3:12,16,18 4:13 6:6 7:3 20:19 member 2:18 members 2:21 3:13 28:11 31:24 37:2 mention 29:21 mentioned 6:5
--	---	---	---	---

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 5

6:19 15:24 20:23 methodology 4:25 13:2 14:19 16:5 21:3 22:8 metrics 5:3,10 13:18 17:11,13 20:15,17 21:22 21:24 23:19 28:1 32:20 minimum 11:1,6 minorities 5:12 17:1 21:14 36:14 minority 5:18 6:14,22 9:8 35:14 misperceived 3:16 morning 2:3 4:10 34:10 motivated 3:16 move 11:18 14:25 moved 18:12 moves 37:12 moving 13:7 multiple 13:8,8 municipal 12:11 13:5 18:15,25 municipalities 24:23 municipality 14:12	13:7 neither 21:13 new 12:13 20:6 22:12 nine 20:3 non-boundary 25:14 26:6 nongeographic 14:3 nonpolitical 17:21 20:1,24 22:4 24:10 25:12,21 normalized 10:3 North 11:21 19:11 Northern 19:18 noted 24:17 November 4:21 12:3 20:19 23:13,15 number 8:1,14 8:15,18 24:13 24:16 25:20 31:5 numbered 7:1 NW 1:24	33:23 orientation 18:5 20:14 21:17,21 22:14 28:21,22 28:24 29:9 orientations 21:10 22:22 Orlando 7:14 16:19 overall 7:23 12:21 14:16 17:19 19:23 24:6 30:15 overlap 7:20	9:1,2 11:8,13 20:25 22:5 24:9 perform 6:11 performance 10:7,18,20 perimeter 7:18 person 24:1 phonetic 2:9 4:6 picture 21:16 Pinellas 13:11 13:12 31:2,7 33:22 plan 3:6,8 4:3 6:1 7:2,8,23 8:3 12:13 23:10 plans 3:19,23 4:8,12 5:8,15 5:22 6:8,20,23 7:1 11:21 12:1 12:5,10,14,18 12:22 13:20 14:8,13,24 15:1,4,6,12,16 16:9,11,13,20 17:7,9,14,19 17:24 18:4 20:18,21 21:2 21:25 22:1 23:9,11,16,24 24:5,7,9,12,13 24:15 25:23,24 26:2,5,17 27:20,21,23 37:5,8 please 2:5,15 points 21:1 22:5 policy 5:9 16:13 political 5:5,13 6:9,11,15 7:21 8:18 9:9,25 10:16 14:1,15 15:22 16:1 17:2 20:8 21:15 23:6 24:8 25:10	27:5 31:12,16 32:25 36:13 Polk 14:25 Polsby-Popper 24:3 populated 15:13 15:23 population 7:16 7:18 8:9,11,16 9:2 12:17,20 12:23 15:7 17:16,18 19:11 19:21 26:13 36:1 portion 19:10 position 2:20 possible 25:2 29:25 prefer 29:11 preference 29:7 29:12 32:7 preferred 29:7 prepared 4:8 preparing 4:12 present 2:13 5:8 16:12 35:22 presentation 4:5 presentations 34:23 presented 4:2,17 5:8 8:11 23:12 23:15,24 25:25 26:2 28:13 36:9 president 34:8 34:11 pretty 27:20 previous 14:13 18:8 previously 5:24 6:8 13:23 15:4 31:21 primarily 18:24 primary 10:10 11:10,10 27:1 prior 3:1 5:22 15:12 34:23
N name 34:10 narrative 25:18 narrowing 5:23 National 26:20 necessarily 33:12 necessary 9:6 18:21 needed 10:2 neighboring	O objection 37:12 October 6:4 Office 2:18 Okay 32:17 35:23 36:24 old 36:20 open 32:14 opinion 32:5 opportunities 6:22 28:1 opportunity 5:2 17:1 20:7 35:14 36:14,15 opposed 32:4 options 5:24 Orange 16:16,17 16:21 order 2:5 33:19	P packet 8:24 11:7 packets 7:3,7,12 page 7:5,11,15 7:25 9:13 10:2 10:17 11:7,12 pages 8:23 9:4 Palm 18:11,12 30:4 panhandle 12:7 part 18:10 participate 5:12 6:15 9:9 17:2 20:8 21:15 particular 10:7 35:7 particularly 5:4 parts 30:4 party 9:22,25,25 10:11,14,14,16 34:17 Pasco 13:10,12 33:23 Pembroke 19:6 19:11 people 30:6 percent 14:4,5 21:1,1 22:6 24:11,25 25:22 26:3,5 31:7,8 31:10 percentage 7:20	plan 3:6,8 4:3 6:1 7:2,8,23 8:3 12:13 23:10 plans 3:19,23 4:8,12 5:8,15 5:22 6:8,20,23 7:1 11:21 12:1 12:5,10,14,18 12:22 13:20 14:8,13,24 15:1,4,6,12,16 16:9,11,13,20 17:7,9,14,19 17:24 18:4 20:18,21 21:2 21:25 22:1 23:9,11,16,24 24:5,7,9,12,13 24:15 25:23,24 26:2,5,17 27:20,21,23 37:5,8 please 2:5,15 points 21:1 22:5 policy 5:9 16:13 political 5:5,13 6:9,11,15 7:21 8:18 9:9,25 10:16 14:1,15 15:22 16:1 17:2 20:8 21:15 23:6 24:8 25:10	portion 19:10 position 2:20 possible 25:2 29:25 prefer 29:11 preference 29:7 29:12 32:7 preferred 29:7 prepared 4:8 preparing 4:12 present 2:13 5:8 16:12 35:22 presentation 4:5 presentations 34:23 presented 4:2,17 5:8 8:11 23:12 23:15,24 25:25 26:2 28:13 36:9 president 34:8 34:11 pretty 27:20 previous 14:13 18:8 previously 5:24 6:8 13:23 15:4 31:21 primarily 18:24 primary 10:10 11:10,10 27:1 prior 3:1 5:22 15:12 34:23

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 6

prioritize 30:24	9:7 36:14	relative 13:2	roadways 13:14	36:15 37:3
proceed 4:5	railroads 13:14	relatively 26:10	26:14	Senate 1:13 33:1
11:19	Ranches 19:1	released 23:17	Rodriguez 3:22	35:24
proceedings	range 25:12,18	23:24	37:5	Senate's 34:13
38:4	rate 14:3 23:6	relying 35:17	roll 2:6	Senator 2:9,10
process 5:13	rates 25:9	remaining 9:4	rose 25:22	2:11,12,12 3:2
6:15 9:9 17:2	re- 5:17	12:19,23	Rouson 2:12 3:2	3:5 29:19 30:9
20:9 21:15	really 23:18	remains 24:5	30:10,12 32:11	30:12 31:24
23:20 28:8	28:15 30:5	30:25	32:14,17 33:9	32:1,2,3,11,14
produced 2:24	Reapportion...	Reock 24:4	34:1,1,3	32:17 33:9
propose 3:19	1:14 2:4	represent 30:4	Rouson's 3:5	34:1,3 37:11
37:4	reason 25:14	representative	31:25 32:3	Sergeant's 2:18
proposed 6:16	reasons 29:11	35:15 36:16	S	set 3:22 23:13
9:7,10 30:20	received 11:8,13	representatives	S00c 7:2 12:1	share 10:21
protected 26:11	24:19	6:17 9:11	S00C8052 30:11	shares 19:7
26:18	recognizable	republican	San 16:23	show 5:10 7:16
provide 21:2	30:19	10:21,23,25	saw 33:18	8:25 16:25
22:7	recognized 4:7	11:3,5	Sawgrass 19:3	17:8 18:3
provides 14:18	29:18 30:10	required 6:11	Sawyer 38:2,23	20:12 21:19
16:4	32:13	requirements	saying 32:5	24:2 25:18
provisions 27:16	recognizing 29:7	27:9 35:13	Scoon 34:8,10	shown 7:22 10:3
public 4:5 34:6	recommendati...	36:12	34:11 35:20	12:18 15:5
36:25	3:21 37:5	respondents	36:23	17:19 23:10
published 6:24	recommendati...	9:18	score 24:4 25:15	shows 7:25
7:3	5:25	rest 29:9 31:20	25:22 26:5	10:20 11:7,24
Pulk 13:15	record 38:4	result 27:4	scores 7:19	12:4 13:18,22
purpose 3:17	recorded 38:3	resulted 5:23	13:25 14:7	15:18 17:11,13
pushed 16:18	Recording 2:1	19:24	20:22 24:4	20:5,15,17
pushes 16:22	37:14	retrogress 5:11	25:19 26:3,9	21:16,19,22,24
put 33:18	records 2:21	6:21	29:15 33:7	22:12 23:8,18
putting 13:11,16	redistricting 7:8	revied 3:1	second 7:15	24:7 35:25
	7:9 24:21 25:7	review 5:22 6:9	17:12 20:17	side 15:9 22:14
Q	reduced 14:4	6:10 21:8	21:24 23:13	22:14
question 33:10	reference 6:7	22:20 33:25	31:1	silence 2:15
35:6	referred 5:25	reviewed 3:19	secondary 27:1	single 8:9 20:3
questions 3:13	referring 4:19	4:12,21,23	section 6:1 19:15	24:14
4:4 11:17	reflect 13:1	17:7,10	see 13:24 17:15	singly 9:15
28:12 31:25	reformatted	reviewing 6:21	20:12,20 22:20	six 20:15 21:22
32:17 34:21,22	7:10	revised 12:22	23:1 28:9,20	six-lane 27:2
quorum 2:12	Refuge 26:20	right 2:2 4:6	33:16	slide 13:18 16:14
	regard 29:16	19:17 21:18	Seeing 36:24	18:3 19:9 21:8
R	region 30:23	22:17 33:15,21	37:11,12	22:12 25:8
race 9:16,19,23	31:22	34:6 37:2	seek 23:22 31:4	slides 11:24
9:24 10:1,11	registration	River 18:11	select 1:13 2:3	slight 18:7
10:14,15	9:22,22,23,24	road 12:9 16:23	2:19 4:11,13	slightly 14:14
races 9:19	9:25	19:5,6,6 26:23	5:9 7:4 35:14	17:16,17,22
racial 5:12 6:14	related 25:9	26:24 27:1,3		small 19:10,13

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 7

smaller 19:20	34:24 36:18	takes 16:17	12:7,14,22	updated 24:19
solely 30:25	statewide 7:12	talk 4:18 25:1	13:20,24 15:2	usage 16:1 20:1
south 7:13 16:22	10:4,19,22,24	talked 27:19	15:17,25 16:12	23:6 24:10
22:13 26:12	11:2,4,9,11,14	Tampa 7:13	17:7,10,25	25:9,13,15
Southeast 28:18	11:15	30:19,20 31:10	25:25 30:22	26:4,6 27:13
Southeastern	static 12:15 13:3	31:22	31:3 34:7 36:9	use 14:15,19
18:23	18:17	team 28:11	today's 14:24	16:6 17:20
Southern 16:17	statistics 7:16,25	tell 19:8 33:2,3	15:6,10 16:9	20:24 21:5
Southwest 19:1	Stewart 2:12	ten 22:2	23:17 24:9,12	22:4,9 24:7
speak 2:16 30:5	Street 1:24	terms 4:25 28:24	24:15 26:2,5	25:7,14,16
speaking 2:20	strict 27:8	35:10	top 11:24 12:11	26:15 32:7
specific 25:12	strong 29:13	tested 36:17	12:19 13:20	34:15
Specifically 9:13	strongly 27:21	thank 2:14 4:9	15:17 19:18	uses 13:13
split 8:1,13,19	subcommittee	11:20 28:4,5,6	22:22	utilization 5:4
8:25,25 12:21	1:13 2:4 4:11	28:11 29:19	total 3:19 23:25	14:1,3 15:22
13:7 15:11,23	4:14 5:9 23:20	30:12,14 31:23	totally 30:1	utilized 12:11
23:4,5 25:4	37:4	32:2,11 33:9	trade-off 14:17	utilizes 31:12
33:19	subcommittee's	33:14 34:3,5	trade-offs 4:1,16	
splits 8:14,15,17	7:5 23:21	36:22,23 37:2	23:23	V
8:20 15:13	subdivision 8:18	thing 27:17	transcribed 38:3	v 1:4
33:17,22	9:1	things 30:24	transcript 38:4	variables 10:6
splitting 12:8	submit 3:20 37:4	think 28:25	TRANSCRIP...	variation 3:4
14:11,12 30:19	submitted 3:2	31:18	1:12	variations 3:7
SPOON 35:23	30:13 31:3,21	thinking 33:24	transparent	4:24
Springs 12:12	substance 37:9	third 8:23 34:16	34:14	various 4:16
St 18:10	Suite 1:24	thought 29:10	treatment 4:19	23:23
stacked 22:15,16	Sumpter 15:6,9	33:4	true 38:4	version 33:8
23:1 28:22,23	15:24 16:2	thoughts 28:20	trying 34:17	versions 20:13
29:4,8,14	Sunrise 19:4	three 8:19,20	turn 15:15 34:6	21:20 22:12
staff 2:23,24 3:7	superior 28:24	11:25 14:7	Turning 20:11	versus 29:4
3:14,24 4:7	Supreme 8:12	17:13,22 22:2	turnout 10:7,9	vertical 18:4
23:25 28:7	29:2 35:3,5	22:5 23:2	10:12	20:14 22:14,16
29:21 30:14,15	sure 29:9 36:11	25:17	turnpike 19:5	22:21,23 26:7
31:4,22 35:24	surrounding	three-quarters	two 4:2 8:21,22	26:16 28:21
37:7	17:5 22:18	26:1	11:25 12:8	29:4 32:4
staff's 34:14	survey 24:19	Thursday 37:10	13:6,18 14:4	victory 10:24
staff-drawn 6:23		tier 4:2 5:3,10	17:22 23:19	11:1,4
staff-produced	T	13:18 18:19	26:4,11 28:15	Video 2:1 37:14
3:4	table 7:24 13:21	23:19 26:11,18	28:20,21 30:24	visual 21:4 22:9
standards 4:1,2	13:22 15:15,18	31:14 33:3,6	31:14 32:22	31:19
31:14	17:11,13,15	35:12 36:6,12	33:3,6 36:6	visually 14:10
start 11:21	20:11,15,17,20	time 2:20 25:4		19:24 32:22,23
state 3:25 4:20	21:24,25 22:20	28:9 35:4,22	U	VOICE 2:7,9,11
5:1 12:9 13:3	23:8,18	times 8:18	unanimously	voluntary 24:18
19:5,6 24:25	tables 17:8	today 2:25 3:3	3:10	vote 10:20
36:1	21:19	3:14,24 5:8,16	unpopulated	voter 9:21 10:9
stated 22:19	taken 37:8	6:21,24 11:22	8:13 15:11	10:12

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 8

voters 6:23 34:9 34:12	14:13	16th 23:13	23 18:1,7,22	80-42 3:6,8
votes 11:8,13	workshopped	1730 1:24	19:12,19,23	8002 23:11
voting 7:17	5:16,24 6:9,24	18 18:1,7,9,13	20:13 21:9,20	8004 23:11
17:16,18	11:22 13:23	19:23 20:13	25:22	8006 23:11
W	15:1,4,25	21:20 22:6	232-0646 1:25	8008 23:12
wait 3:6	17:25 18:6	18th 6:4	24 5:19 18:1,7	8018 12:1,10,18
waive 2:19	20:18 23:10	19 21:1	19:7,10,12,16	20:18 23:14
walk-through	27:22 31:21	2	19:18,21,24	8020 15:5,19
4:7	workshopping	2 5:3,10 11:23	20:6,13 21:10	21:9,18,25
Walton 12:8,16	12:6,14 13:24	12:19,22,25	21:12,21 31:6	23:14
want 30:14	16:12	13:1,19 14:6	25 5:21	8022 12:1,2,10
34:12 35:20,21	workshops 12:7	20:22	26 5:21 25:24	12:18 21:18,25
37:2	18:9 25:17	20 5:17 6:1 18:1	27 5:21 25:24	23:14
Washington	wound 19:25	18:13 20:6,13	28 13:16 15:3,8	8024 15:5,20
1:24	www.floridare...	21:12,20 25:22	15:16	20:18 23:14
wasn't 29:1	6:25	26:5,18	29th 20:19 23:15	8030 22:7
way 16:23 33:6	X	20036 1:24	3	8032 21:2 26:17
ways 4:22	Y	2010 35:5,9	3 6:1 11:23	8036 7:2 12:5
we'll 6:20 11:21	y'all 25:4	2012 10:10,13,19	12:24 13:1,19	14:8 16:13
we're 4:19 12:6	Yeah 32:14	11:11,16	20:22	17:12,15 20:16
12:14 13:24	Z	2014 10:10,13	331 12:9	20:21 21:2
16:11 18:13	0	11:11,16	38 37:6	22:24 23:16
25:7 28:14	1	2015 35:3,8,18	4	26:17
we've 6:8 7:6	1	2016 10:10,13	4 11:23 13:19	8038 7:2 17:12
18:5 21:11	1 11:23 12:25	11:11,16	20:25	17:15 21:19,23
24:22 25:2,11	13:19 14:2	2018 10:10,13	4:22-cv-109 1:4	22:1,25
27:6,18,21	26:18	11:11,16	40 37:6	8040 16:20
31:3 33:16	10 5:19 16:10,18	202 1:25	48 24:14	17:14,19 21:19
website 7:6	16:22,25 17:9	2020 9:21 10:10	5	21:23 22:1,7
Wednesday 6:25	17:17 28:18	10:13,19 11:16	5 5:19 11:23	22:25
well-known 27:3	100 31:8	24:20 35:10,16	13:19	8042 7:2 12:6
Wendy 38:2,23	10th 1:15	35:24 36:17	5th 7:1 23:17	14:8 16:20
went 19:14	11 15:3,7,8,16	2021 6:4	38:6	17:14,19 20:16
West 18:15	17:6	2022 1:15 7:1	6	20:21 22:24
Weston 18:25	12 23:8 24:5,7	2023 38:6	6 10:2 17:5	23:16
wholly 33:12	30:23 32:20	21 18:2,5 20:13	7	8047 7:2
widely 27:9	13 3:19 13:13	21:11,17,20	7 11:7 16:10,15	8052 31:11
Wildlife 26:20	31:1 32:18,19	26:8,17 28:19	16:20 17:9	812 1:24
wins 10:22	14 13:11,13	28:20 29:16	26:7 28:17	824 19:6
wishing 2:16	30:25 31:9	32:3	7's 26:9	83 12:9
Woman 34:9,12	33:12	22 18:2,5 19:14	8	84 19:5
words 35:19	15 21:1 22:6	19:21 20:13	8 11:12 17:6	88 31:10
work 30:15 37:3	30:24 32:20	21:11,17,20		8838 16:13
workshop 2:24	33:12	24:24 25:22		9
4:11 12:3		28:19,20 29:17		9 5:21 16:10,17
		32:4		16:25 17:9,18

1/10/2022

Common Cause, et al. v. Cord Byrd

Audio Transcription

Page 9

20:23 28:18
90 26:3
92 24:22
98 31:7