

**Senate Select Subcommittee on
Congressional Reapportionment
January 10, 2022**

Transcript of video recording available at:
<https://thefloridachannel.org/videos/1-10-22-senate-select-subcommittee-on-congressional-reapportionment/>

EXHIBIT

J91

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 Sen. Bradley: Well good morning, we will – the Select Subcommittee on Congressional
2 Reapportionment will now come to order. Dana, please call the roll.

3 Dana: Chair Bradley?

4 Sen. Bradley: Here.

5 Dana: Senator Bean?

6 Sen. Bean: Here.

7 Dana: Senator Harrell?

8 Gayle Harrell: Here.

9 Dana: Senator Rouson?

10 Sen. Rouson: Here.

11 Dana: Senator Stewart? A quorum is present Madam Chair.

12 Sen. Bradley: Thank you, Dana. Please silence all electronic devices. Anyone wishing to
13 speak before the committee should complete an appearance form and hand it to a member of the
14 Sergeant's Office. Should you select to waive your speaking time, your position will be included
15 in the committee meeting records. Members, based on the feedback and guidance we gave staff
16 at our last meeting, we have four additional staff-produced maps on our workshop agenda today
17 that have further improved upon the prior drafts we have reviewed. Senator Rouson has also
18 submitted a draft map for discussion today, as well, that is a variation of one of the staff-
19 produced maps. Because Senator Rouson's draft map is drawn to Plan 8042, I will wait and ask
20 him to explain his variations after staff has explained Plan 8042 in full. Our feedback should
21 continue to conform to the directives issued unanimously by the full committee. You'll find a
22 copy of the directives in your meeting materials. I would caution members in their questions,
23 feedback, or guidance to staff today, to express themselves carefully so that nothing said in this

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 meeting is misperceived as motivated by any impermissible purpose.

2 By the conclusion of this meeting, we will have reviewed 13 total plans. I propose that
3 before we adjourn that we submit a recommendation which will consist of a map or set of maps
4 to Chairman Rodrigues. I've been advised by counsel that these additional plans brought forward
5 by staff today comply with the complex layering of federal and state standards and contain trade-
6 offs within the co-equal Tier Two standards presented in each plan. Are there any questions
7 before we proceed to presentation and public comment? All right, Mr. Ferrin, you are recognized
8 for a walkthrough of the staff-prepared plans.

9 Jay Ferrin: Thank you Madam Chairman. This morning, we have four additional maps
10 for the select subcommittee to workshop. When preparing these plans, we reviewed the maps
11 from the last meeting of the select subcommittee, and as instructed, looked for improvements in
12 consistency in the application of the various trade-offs presented in the maps. When we talk
13 about consistency of application, we're referring to the treatment of one area of the state like
14 another. The maps we reviewed in November illustrated a few different ways of drawing districts,
15 and we went back and reviewed those to examine whether one of the variations was more
16 appropriate in terms of matching the methodology applied throughout the state. We also looked
17 for the opportunity to improve upon some of the Tier Two metrics, particularly compactness and
18 the utilization of political and geographic boundaries. This also had the effect of keeping some
19 additional cities whole. The plans being presented today present policy choices for the select
20 subcommittee, show improvements in the Tier Two metrics, and do not retrogress or diminish the
21 ability for racial and language minorities to participate in the political process and to elect
22 candidates of their choice. All of the congressional plans being workshopped today have one
23 African American majority-minority district in District 20, three effective minority districts for

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 African Americans in District 5, 10, and 24, and four majority-minority Hispanic districts in
2 Districts 9, 25, 26, and 27.

3 Our review of the prior plans also resulted in the narrowing of some of the options
4 previously workshopped. In making those recommendations, we referred to both the plain
5 language of Article III, Section 20 of the Florida Constitution, applicable caselaw, and the
6 directives of the committee that were issued on October 18th, 2021. As the Chair mentioned, a
7 copy of those directives are included in the meeting materials for reference. As with the plans
8 we've previously workshopped, we did not review any political data other than where a review
9 of the political data was required to perform the appropriate functional analysis to evaluate
10 whether or not a district denied or abridged a racial or language minority group's ability to
11 participate in the political process, or whether a proposed district diminished their ability to elect
12 representatives of their choice. As I've already mentioned, our conclusion is that the plans we'll
13 be reviewing today do not retrogress or do not diminish the opportunities for minority voters.

14 The staff-drawn plans being workshopped today were published to
15 www.floridaredistricting.gov on Wednesday, January 5th, 2022, and they're numbered plans
16 S000C8036, 8038, 8040, and 8042. F e plan packets were published in the meeting materials and
17 are available in the select subcommittee's page of the flsenate.gov website. As we've discussed
18 before, these packets contain everything used to analyze a redistricting plan. Data comes from
19 the redistricting application, and is reformatted for easier consumption. On the front page of
20 these packets, there's a statewide map with insets of South Florida, Jacksonville, Tampa Bay, and
21 Orlando. F e second page contains census and boundary statistics that show the population
22 deviation, Black and Hispanic voting-age population, area, perimeter, the compactness scores,
23 counts of whole counties and cities, and the percentage of county overlap with existing political

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 and geographic boundaries. F is information is shown for each district, as well as for the plan
 2 overall. F e additional table on the census and boundary statistics page shows information about
 3 the number of whole cities and split cities and counties. Included here are plan-level counts of
 4 cities and counties with only one district, which means whole counties or cities by geography; a
 5 district with only one county, meaning that the district is contained entirely within a county;
 6 counties and cities with all population in a single district, which are whole cities or counties by
 7 population, and this is presented because the Florida Supreme Court has indicated that an
 8 unpopulated split should not be counted; aggregate number of city or county splits and an
 9 aggregate number of city or county splits with population, and these aggregate splits are counts
 10 of the number of times a political subdivision is split. So if a county has three districts in it that
 11 counts as three aggregate splits. If it has two districts in it, it counts as two. F e third and fourth
 12 pages in the packet list the counties and cities that are split and show the districts that split the
 13 subdivision, along with the percentage of its population and the percentage of the area within
 14 those districts.

15 F e remaining pages contain the functional analysis of the districts for which it is
 16 necessary to evaluate whether or not a proposed district denies or abridges a racial or language
 17 minority group's ability to participate in the political process or whether the proposed district
 18 diminishes the ability to elect their representatives of choice. Specifically, page 5 contains BVAP,
 19 which is census respondents who identified as being Black, either singly or in combination with
 20 some other race and or ethnicity, including Hispanic. And for HVAP, which are census
 21 respondents who identified as Hispanic, in any race or combination of races, including Black. It
 22 also has 2020 general election voter registration for registration by party, registration by race or
 23 ethnicity, registration by race or ethnicity and political party, and registration by party and race or

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 ethnicity.

2 Page 6 has the data needed for a functional analysis normalized and shown across all
3 available statewide elections to make it digestible and to help control for extraneous variables
4 that may have driven turnout or performance in a particular election. It contains the average voter
5 turnout in 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020 primary elections by party and race or ethnicity. It
6 also contains the average of voter turnout in 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020 general elections
7 by party, by party and race or ethnicity, and by race or ethnicity and political party. Finally, this
8 page contains information about districts' general election performance in statewide elections for
9 2012 through 2020. It shows the average performance, or the vote share, for the Democrat and
10 Republican candidate, count of wins in statewide contests for Democrat and Republican
11 candidates, the maximum margin of victory in a statewide contest for either the Democrat or
12 Republican candidate, the minimum margin of victory in a statewide contest for either the
13 Democrat or Republican candidate, the average margin of victory in a statewide contest for either
14 the Democrat or Republican candidate. So it has the maximum, the minimum, and the average.

15 Page 7 of the packet shows the percentage of votes received by each candidate in contests
16 for which there was a statewide primary election. Primary elections were held statewide in 2012,
17 2014, 2016, and 2018. And then finally, page 8 has the percentage of votes received by each
18 candidate in contests for which there was a statewide general, and that's all statewide elections in
19 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020. So if there are no questions about the materials, we can move
20 on to the maps.

21 Sen. Bradley: Let's proceed.

22 Jay Ferrin: Thank you Madam Chair. We'll start with North Florida, where all plans
23 being workshopped today have the same configuration of Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The top

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 image on the slides here shows how Districts 1, 2, and 3 are configured in plans S000C8018 and
 2 in 8022, and those are from our last workshop in November. F e bottom image shows how these
 3 districts are configured in plans 8036 through 8042, which are the four we're workshopping
 4 today. In the Panhandle, all workshops have Districts 1 and 2 splitting Walton County along State
 5 Road 83 and U.S. Highway 331. In plans 8018 and 8022, which is the top image, the boundary
 6 utilized the municipal boundaries of DeFuniak Springs and Freeport, keeping them whole. In the
 7 new plans that we're workshopping today, the boundary follows the static geographic features
 8 through Walton County, deviating only to balance population. In plans 8018 and 8022, which are
 9 shown on the top, District 2 gained its remaining population in Alachua County, which added an
 10 extra county split to the overall map. In the revised plans today, District 2 gains its remaining
 11 population in Marion County, which keeps Alachua County whole in District 3. F e
 12 configurations in District 1 and 2, and in Districts 2 and 3, reflect a consistent application of
 13 methodology relative to the other areas of the state where – one – static geographic features were
 14 used as district boundaries rather than impermanent municipal lines, and – two – where counties
 15 were kept whole by moving the split to a neighboring county that had already had multiple
 16 districts in it. An example of this would be in Pasco and Pinellas, where putting District 14 into
 17 Pinellas allows Pasco to be kept whole, and the boundary between Districts 13 and 14 uses major
 18 roadways and railroads. And another example would be in Polk and Lake Counties, where
 19 putting District 28 into Lake allows Hardee and Highlands to be kept whole.

20 F is slide shows the Tier Two metrics for Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 as configured in the
 21 plans being discussed today in the top table. F e bottom table shows the alternative configuration
 22 previously workshopped. We can see that the maps we're workshopping here today have
 23 improved compactness scores and utilization of political and geographical boundaries for District

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1. For the utilization rate of non-geographic features, has been reduced from 4% to 2%. District 3 also has its compactness scores improved across all three mathematical measurements. In plans 8036 through 8042, these districts are collectively more mathematically and visually compact, while splitting one less county in Alachua, and splitting one less municipality as well. Although the previous workshop plans that are being compared have slightly higher average use of political and geographic boundaries overall, keeping the additional county whole is an appropriate tradeoff, as it provides a more consistent application of methodology when considering the use of county boundaries where feasible. F is was as directed by the committee. F ose factors drove the decision to include this configuration in all four of today's plans.

Move down to Polk County in Central Florida, where all plans being workshopped today have the same configurations of Districts 11 and 28. Unlike the previously workshopped plans 8020 and 8024, which are shown on the left, today's plans keep Sumter County whole within District 11, and balances the population between Districts 11 and 28 in Lake County. F e side effect of keeping Sumter County whole is that within Lake County, today's plans keep Mascotte whole and have an unpopulated split in the City of Clermont. Prior plans had populated splits in Mascotte, Groveland, Clermont. When we turn to the table for Districts 11 and 28, as configured in the plans being discussed today, that's on the top, and compare that to the bottom table, which shows the alternative configuration in 8020 and 8024. F e alternative configuration had a lower utilization of political and geographic boundaries, in addition to that populated split that I mentioned in Sumter County. So the configurations being workshopped today end up having a higher usage of political and geographic boundaries, and also keep Sumter County and additional cities whole. F is provides a more consistent application of methodology when considering the use of county boundaries where feasible, as was directed by the committee. F ese factors drove

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 our decision to include it in all four of today's plans.

2 Districts 7, 9, and 10 are configured differently in the plans that we're workshopping
 3 today, and present the committee with a policy choice. In plans 8036 and 8038, which is the slide
 4 on the left, District 7 includes a little bit more of eastern Orange County, which means that
 5 District 9 takes more of southern Orange and pushes District 10 further into downtown Orlando.
 6 In plans 8040 and 8042, District 7 includes a little bit more of central Orange County, which
 7 pushes District 10 south, to the Bee Line Expressway instead of Sand Lake Road. F e functional
 8 analysis for both configurations show that 9 and 10 do not deny or abridge the opportunity for
 9 minorities to participate in the political process, and do not diminish their ability to elect
 10 candidates of their choice. F e surrounding districts, District 6, 8, and 11, contain the same
 11 configuration in all the plans that are being reviewed today. F ese tables show the different
 12 configurations of 7, 9, and 10 in the plans that are being reviewed today. F e first table shows the
 13 metrics as they appear in 8036 and 8038. F e second table shows the metrics for the three
 14 districts in plans 8040 and 8042. And as you can see in this table, 8036 and 8038 have a slightly
 15 higher Black voting-age population in District 10, and a slightly higher Hispanic voting-age
 16 population in District 9. Overall, plans 8040 and 8042, as shown in the bottom graph, have a
 17 lower use of non-political and geographic boundaries, and are slightly more compact than two of
 18 the three mathematical measurements.

19 All the plans that are being workshopped today have the same configuration of Districts
 20 18, 20, 23, and 24, but have different arrangements of Districts 21 and 22. F is slide is going to
 21 show the differences between the plans with the vertical orientation of Districts 21 and 22 that
 22 we've workshopped in the past. Districts 18, 20, 23, and 24 do have slight configuration changes
 23 from the previous workshops. And so District 18 contains all of Saint Lucie and Martin County,

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 and part of Indian River and Palm Beach as it did before. F e boundary has moved a little bit in
2 Palm Beach County between Districts 20 and 18, where we're keeping some additional cities
3 whole by following the municipal boundaries of Westlake and Loxahatchee Groves, in an area
4 where there were no available static geographic boundaries. Because it's a Tier One district, this
5 does depart from some geographic features where necessary to maintain the ability-to-elect. We
6 also made some changes to District 23 in southeastern Broward County. In Broward County, the
7 boundary primarily follows the municipal boundaries of Weston and Southwest Ranches; it
8 keeps those cities whole within the district. It follows I-95, Sawgrass Expressway, Sunrise
9 Boulevard, Broward Boulevard, the Turnpike, State Road 84, and State Road 824, which is
10 Pembroke Road, where it shares a boundary with District 24. It's kind of hard to tell on the slide,
11 but there were some adjustments made to District 24. F ere was a small portion where we
12 balanced the population north of Pembroke Boulevard between Districts 23 and 24. And there
13 was a small indentation on the image on the left where District 22 went into, kind of carved out a
14 little section of District 24. Both those have been adjusted in the image on the right to flatten out
15 the top, the northern boundary of District 24, where it borders District 23, and to fill the small
16 area where we had a balanced population between Districts 22 and 24 in Hallandale Beach.
17 F ese changes, overall, the 18, 23, and 24, resulted in more visually and mathematically compact
18 districts. We wound up with a lower usage of non-political and geographic boundaries, and we
19 were able to keep an additional nine cities whole within a single district. F e functional analysis
20 shows that the new configurations for 20 and 24 do not deny or abridge the opportunity for
21 African Americans to participate in the political process, and do not diminish their ability to elect
22 candidates of their choice.

23 Turning to the table for this configuration, we see that these show different versions of 18,

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

20, 22, 23, and 24, both with a vertical orientation. So the first table shows the metrics for these six districts as they appear in 8036 and 8042. And the second table shows the metrics for plans 8018 and 8024, which were workshopped at our last meeting on November 29th. In the first table, we see that the plans 8036 and 8042 are mathematically compact, and two of the three scores keep, as I mentioned, nine additional cities whole, and decrease the average use on political and geographic boundaries by four percentage points from 19% down to 15%. Plans 8036 and 8032 provide a more consistent application of the methodology when considering mathematical and visual compactness and the use of geographic boundaries where feasible as directed by the committee.

The next slide we have to review is the same configuration of Districts 8020, 23 and 24, but with the horizontal orientations for Districts 21 and 22. We've done the functional analysis on Districts 20 and 24, and confirmed that neither of those deny or abridge the ability for minorities to participate in the political process. The left picture shows the horizontal orientation of Districts 21 and 22 that were in 8020 and 8022. And the right shows it in 8038 and 8040. These tables show the different versions of 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, but with the horizontal orientation. The first shows the metrics of the six districts as they appear in 8038 and 8040, and the second table shows the metrics for the plans in 8020 and 8022. In the first table, plans 8038 and 8040 are more compact in all three mathematical measures, keep ten additional cities whole and decrease the average use of non-political and geographic boundaries by three percentage points, it goes from 18% down to 15%. 8030 and 8040 also provide a more consistent application of methodology when considering mathematical and visual compactness and the use of geographic boundaries where feasible, as was directed by the committee.

This slide shows the new versions of the South Florida configuration and compares the

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 vertical side-by-side orientation to the horizontal stacked configuration. We got the vertical one
2 on the left, and the stacked one on the right. F e surrounding districts, as I've stated, are all the
3 same. And so, when we review the table here, what we can see is the comparison between the
4 vertical and horizontal orientations for these districts. F e top one being the vertical
5 configuration that appears in 8036 and 8042, and the bottom is the horizontal one in 8038 and
6 8040. We can see that the horizontal stacked configuration is more compact in the three
7 mathematical measurements and has one less aggregate county split and one less city split. But
8 both configurations do achieve the same usage rate for political and geographic boundaries.

9 F en we have a table that shows the twelve congressional plans for which the committee
10 has workshopped. As shown in the plan column, the first four plans, which is 8002, 8004, 8006,
11 and 8008, those were presented to the committee on November 16th. F e second set, consisting
12 of 8018, 8020, 8022, and 8024, were presented to the committee on November 29th. And then
13 plans 8036 through 8042 we released on January 25th for today's discussion. F is table really
14 shows us the iterative improvements in Tier Two metrics were made throughout the
15 subcommittee process. It's consistent with the subcommittee's directive to seek out
16 improvements and consistency in applying the various trade-offs presented in the maps. All plans
17 released by staff contain a total deviation of one person, as was directed by the full committee,
18 and show an improvement in the mathematical compactness for both the Polsby-Popper and
19 Reock scores, while the Convex Hull score remains the same throughout the twelve plans.
20 Additionally, the overall comparison of the twelve plans shows improvements in the use of
21 political and geographic boundaries, with today's plans having the lowest percentage of non-
22 political and geographic boundary usage at 8%. Also, in all four plans of today's plans, we have
23 the highest number of counties kept whole within a single district at 48, and then today's plans

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 also have the highest number of cities that are kept whole. But it should be noted that according
2 to the Census Bureau's voluntary boundary and annexation survey, for which we received some
3 updated data over the break, since January 2020, which is the deadline for this redistricting
4 cycle's geometrical definitions, we've had 92 Florida municipalities change their boundaries, and
5 that amounts to about 22% of our cities in the state. And so, while we talk about the cities that
6 we've kept whole, it's entirely possible that some of those cities are going to end up being split
7 by the time you all get back home to your constituents, because the cities will change their
8 boundaries from the definitions that we were able to use for redistricting.

9 And so the last slide we have here is also related to the usage rates for political and
10 geographical boundaries. And we've got here a count of districts that fall within the specific
11 range of non-political or geographic boundaries usage, and the reason we used the non-boundary
12 usage score is because that is a good indicator of where it was not feasible to use such a feature.
13 And so, the three workshops show an area of improvement in the range and distribution of these
14 scores. And for example, the number of districts with a non-political or geographic below 20%
15 rose from 22 to 23 districts in the first iteration of the plans to 26 or 27 in the plans being
16 presented today. Additionally, over three-quarters of the districts presented in today's plans
17 achieved scores equal to or greater than 90% of boundary usage. And only two districts in
18 today's plans score higher than 20% in that non-boundary usage. And those are District 7 and the
19 vertical configuration of District 21. District 7's configuration scores relatively low on that
20 because it's affected by the two Tier One protected districts to its south, and has to balance its
21 population in and around the cities of DeBary and Deltona, where no major roadways or
22 geographic features exist for us to use. The vertical configuration of District 21 in plans 8036 and
23 8042 is affected by District 20, which is also a Tier One protected district. And its boundaries

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 follow the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, which is not classified as a geographic
2 boundary in our data set. Also, due to classification of road data from the Census Bureau, Jog
3 Road, which is used as a boundary in that configuration, doesn't count as a primary/secondary
4 road, even though it's a locally-known six-lane highway, well-known local road. And so, as a
5 result, due to the classification for our political and geographic boundaries, a lot of which we've
6 derived from the Census Bureau, certain boundaries may not meet our strict requirements for
7 inclusion, but are widely known as major geographic features in the area. And so our boundary
8 analysis is a conservative estimate in the boundary usage, but we still feel confident in its ability
9 to indicate compliance with the constitutional provisions.

10 And Madam Chair, the last thing that I would add is that while we've talked a lot about
11 the iterative improvements in these plans, we would still feel pretty strongly that all the plans
12 we've drawn in workshop before the committees are in fact constitutional and defensible plans,
13 we just have followed the committee's instructions to continue looking for opportunities to
14 improve those metrics, and to improve the consistency of application throughout the map.

15 Sen. Bradley: Thank you Mr. Ferrin, and I will say thank you again. Now, we cannot
16 thank you enough, you and your staff, for the incredible effort that has gone into making this
17 iterative process. Every time we meet, we see maps that are improved, and better and better. And
18 so thank you to your team members. Are there any questions on any of the maps that were
19 presented? Any discussion? Because we have four bases, we're looking at four maps now and
20 there's really two areas where they differ, one being in Central Florida, CD 7, 9, and 10, and the
21 other in Southeast Florida with 21 and 22. And I just did have a few thoughts on the 21 and 22.
22 We see two maps that have a vertical orientation and two with a stacked orientation, and as I look
23 at the data, the stacked orientation is clearly superior in terms of compactness. And I also think

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 about the, it wasn't a holding by the court, but we did have some guidance from the Supreme
2 Court last cycle, as they considered, they considered the stacked versus vertical, and they didn't
3 mandate a certain approach, but there certainly was a preference for recognizing the preferred –
4 the compactness improvements of the stacked orientation. And I'm not sure if the rest of the
5 committee has a thought on that. I prefer, for those reasons, because the court has expressed a
6 preference – if we could – that may even be too strong – but they certainly expressed a – favored
7 the stacked because of the compactness scores. So I, you know, with regard to 21 and 22, if there
8 was any other – you're recognized.

9 Rep Harrell: F ank you very much Madam Chair. And I would agree with you. I
10 believe, as our staff did mention, it does keep more cities, several cities whole in the area, and
11 again, because of the compactness, and also the – I'm very concerned about, if possible, keeping
12 cities whole, and that entire area is totally incorporated. So the more you can do that, the better.
13 So I would agree with you on that. I do represent parts of Palm Beach County, currently, so I do
14 really speak with people in that area. And keeping cities whole is a major concern for folks there.

15 Sen. Bradley: And now, Senator Rouson, you are recognized to explain map
16 S000C8052.

17 Sen. Rouson: F ank you very much Madam Chairman. I've submitted this map in
18 consultation with my staff. And I want to thank Jay, and his staff, for their overall hard work that
19 they've done from the beginning to improve and make better these maps. F e intent of C8052 is
20 to make a recognizable Tampa area instead of splitting Tampa Bay as some of current proposed
21 maps have done. It's identical to C8042 that we have discussed today, except the region where I
22 drew Congressional District 12 through 15 to prioritize two things. First, District 14 remains
23 solely in Hillsborough County, and second, District 13 in Pinellas County keeps cities whole.

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 And we've heard today that the maps submitted by staff, all of them seek to have the highest
2 number of cities and counties kept whole. F is map keeps all of the 24 cities in Pinellas County
3 whole, or at least 98% whole. F e map also keeps 100% of District 14 in Hillsborough County,
4 and most of the City of Tampa, which is about 88% in 8052. It utilizes existing political
5 geographical boundaries, county and city lines, and complies with Tier Two standards that
6 districts be compact where feasible using existing political and geographical boundaries. And I
7 think it comports with mathematical and visual compactness. And the rest of the map doesn't
8 deviate from what has been previously workshopped or submitted by staff except for Tampa Bay
9 region.

10 Sen. Bradley: F ank you Senator for that explanation. Members, are there any questions?
11 Senator Harrell?

12 Sen. Harrell: F ank you very much, and on Senator Rouson's map, you do keep 21 and
13 22 vertical as opposed to horizontal, and I've just expressed an opinion saying that I do believe
14 that because it does keep more cities whole that my preference would be to use the horizontal
15 configuration. I don't know if you're amenable to considering perhaps adjustments there.

16 Sen. Rouson: F ank you, Madam Chair.

17 Sen. Bradley: Recognized.

18 Sen. Rouson: Yeah, I am open to considering that.

19 Sen. Bradley: Anything additional? Nope, good. Any other questions? Okay. Senator
20 Rouson, when I'm looking at the – at your map, District 13 becomes more compact, but District
21 15 and 12, their metrics for compactness appear to backslide. And visually, those two districts are
22 not as compact visually in that map. And it also doesn't adhere to the political and geographic
23 boundaries to the same degree that the Senate maps do. Can you tell me if that's a – was that a

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 balance for your Tier Two or tell me how – what your thought was on the compactness? Was that
2 a decision to balance Tier Two in some way, because the compactness scores go down in your
3 version.

4 Sen. Rouson: F ank you Madam Chair for the question. It was an attempt to balance the
5 compactness, and not so much to impact 15, but necessarily make 14 wholly within Hillsborough
6 County.

7 Sen. Bradley: F ank you, and the other concern is that right now, and we see it through
8 the map, is that we’ve concentrated our splits in denser counties. We saw it with Alachua County,
9 where we put the split in Marion, in order to keep Alachua whole. And right now, the iterations
10 of that area have the splits concentrated in Pinellas in order to keep Pasco whole. And so that’s a
11 – that’s another factor that I’m thinking about as I review your map. Any additional comments?
12 Senator Rouson, do you have anything additional to add?

13 Sen. Rouson: No, thank you Madam Chair.

14 Sen. Bradley: F ank you. Alright, we will turn to public comment. We have one
15 appearance card today, with Cecile Scoon, President of the Florida League of Women Voters.

16 Cecile Scoon: Good morning. My name is Cecile Scoon. I’m President of the League of
17 Women Voters of Florida. And I want to say very much appreciate the Senate’s efforts and their
18 staff efforts to be transparent and to lay out the guidelines that you use. It’s helpful when, you
19 know, third party groups, such as the League, are trying to follow what you’re doing, very, very
20 helpful. And I appreciate also the discussion about the functional analysis. It has answered a few
21 of my questions. I still have a couple of questions though. And from prior presentations at the
22 hearings, it was stated that the districts that were chosen to be checked for functional analysis
23 was based on the benchmark districts as determined by the litigation of Florida Supreme Court

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 2015. And at that time, of course, the Florida Supreme Court was using 2010 Census
2 information. So my question is if you are basing looking at particular districts based on the 2015
3 case, and the decision, which was looking backwards at 2010 Census, how are you incorporating
4 the 2020 Census in terms of determining which districts to look for to confirm that the Tier One
5 mandatory requirements of essentially equal access opportunity for minority groups to select a
6 representative of their choice, how are you bringing in the 2020 Census information if you are
7 only relying on the benchmark districts which were determined in 2015? In other words, how are
8 you looking forward?

9 Sen. Bradley: Ms. Scoon, this is, we want to hear from you. F is is your time to present.

10 Cecile Scoon: Okay, well I would like the staff and Senate to incorporate the 2020
11 Census information which shows, of course, changes of the population and the state growth in
12 some areas, lowering in some other areas. I would like those breadcrumbs to be laid out as you
13 have in some of your other criteria. Certainly very well in the Tier Two criteria, it's very clear
14 what you're doing and the improvements and everything, and that was well presented today. So
15 I'm asking for that same kind of focus to make sure that the mandatory requirements of Tier One,
16 which are no political favoritism, and the opportunity for racial and language minorities to have
17 an equal opportunity to select a representative of their choice, that that be tested using the most
18 recent 2020 Census. And since it was stated, the districts that were chosen were only based on
19 benchmark, that means it was based on the old census information.

20 Sen. Bradley: F ank you.

21 Cecile Scoon: F ank you.

22 Sen. Bradley: Seeing no further public comment, is there any additional comment from
23 the committee? Alright, well members, I want to thank you for your important work on this

Senate Congressional Subcommittee - Jan. 10, 2022

1 select committee – subcommittee. I propose that we submit a recommendation to Chair
2 Rodrigues that Plans 38 and 40 most consistently adhere to the directives issued to the staff, and
3 that these plans should be taken into consideration for the substance of his bill that will be before
4 the full committee on Thursday. Seeing nothing further, Senate Harrell moves that we adjourn.
5 Seeing no objection, we are adjourned.



Vanan Online Services, Inc.
Think Service Think Vanan

Certificate of Transcription

Transcription of “**1-10-22-senate-select-subcommittee-on-congressional-reapportionment**”

We, Vanan Online Services, Inc. a professional transcription company, hereby certify that the above-mentioned document(s) has/have been transcribed by our qualified and experienced transcriber(s) is/are accurate and true transcription of the original document(s).

This is to certify the correctness of the transcription only. Our transcriber is in no way related, by immediate family ties or marriage, to any parties related to the materials transcript.

A copy of the transcription is attached to this certification.

Danny Negley, Production Manager.



Date: 12th November 2024

Vanan Online Services, Inc.
EIN 81-3795675
ATA Member #266532
ISO 9001:2015

Vanan Online Services, Inc.
10711 Spotsylvania Ave., Suite A
Fredericksburg VA 22408
Office: (888) 535-5668
Email: support@vananservices.com
Website: www.vananservices.com