Exhibit 4

Rep. Griffin: **[No dictation] [00:00:00 – 00:12:05]** So, I'll repeat that. Members have before them something marked replacement. This is the replacement map and data for the Rockingham County Commissioners that we reviewed yesterday. It was discovered that a Portsmouth ward had dropped. So, you can substitute this with what you have in your packet from yesterday. So, we kept that separate.

You also have in front of you something that's been passed out by Mapathon. They passed out something yesterday in regards to House districts. Today they have passed out something to you in regards to the congressional districts. You also have in front of you a map of Grafton County representatives as proposed by Rep. Fellows. That is separate from your committee packet information.

And then you should have a new spreadsheet which picks up off after – it continues from where we left yesterday and begins with what we will be doing today. You will note that No. 19 is there. You might want to go to the bottom of your stack of papers for today. 19 is the commissioner maps that Rep. Lane so kindly agreed would be provided. These represent a proposed map which is no change from the current map. So, you will now have the lines for the current map and the associated numerical calculation to companion with the proposed maps we reviewed yesterday. So, that's why that packet is designated 19. You can sort and compare as you desire.

Which leaves us No. 12 through 18 on your list to review. That would include county representatives for Grafton, Strafford, Hillsborough, Cheshire, Carroll, and Sullivan. And the congressional district maps. And you should have gotten emails for all of those yesterday. And you have hard copies before you today. For the Rep. maps, it is my understanding that the As are those proposed by the minority members of the committee. And the Bs are those maps proposed by the majority members. They do not have the names like they did yesterday. Does anyone have any questions in regards to the paperwork and follow up from yesterday before we get started today? Rep. Weber?

Rep. Weber: I just had one regarding the maps on the website. I understand that those are still not up there. I wondered if you could give us a briefing on what is going on with the website so that – We've been promised the maps would be there.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Weber, I don't know that anybody makes any promises. When

you are dependent on somebody else, promises are probably not a great thing. As you might know, though you were not here yesterday, we've been having some problems with the IT site since it was converted to a new format for the entire house. Yesterday, during the meeting, we managed to get solved the issues of finally getting the submitted testimony up. By the end of the meeting, when you clicked on the submitted testimony, you could actually open it.

There were discussions about communicating with IT. I take full responsibility for shutting my computer off at about 10:20 last night. When I was in bed and realized I had not officially sent an email request, I did not have the energy to get up and turn my computer back on. So, this morning, before I did anything else, I did turn my computer on and sent the email. IT was aware of the issue. I have proposed a format for the maps to be placed on the website.

It is my hope that that will be done by the end of our meeting today. But, again, I am entirely dependent on IT and their ability to address the issue. I know they have been told this is a priority to deal with this page. So, it is my hope that the maps as proposed by members will be up, certainly, by the end of the day, certainly by the end of the week. Rep. Weber, that's where we are.

Rep. Weber: Thank you, very much. I just am very mindful that the public needs to be able to see them to be able to present any kind of meaning commentary.

Rep. Griffin: And of course, we've had paper copies here available for people who are here. We expect the IT issues to be resolved today. But, then again, you're looking at the person who did sit at her computer at 10:00 on Monday night and clicked on the website and went oh no. So, we're making progress, everybody. We're doing the best we can. Anybody else have anything in follow up?

So, we will start with review of the maps for the representatives. I guess we'll just go alphabetically as we go through them. It will just make it a little easier to follow along. So, this isn't quite how it was put together today because I do think Carroll comes before Cheshire. But we will go with A, which would Cheshire. Cheshire should be 12 and there is a 12A and B. It is first on our list for today. Why don't we start with who is going to speak to the A map? Rep. Marjorie Smith, thank you.

Rep. M. Smith: Yes, thank you, very much, Madam Chair. And thank you for your

efforts to try to do what I think what we all want to have happen, and that's make this information available to the state. I am now presenting a proposal for House maps for Cheshire County. As an introduction, I want to say that as we worked on these maps, in addition to the constitutional and statutory requirements, we had some initial goals. One was to make House Districts as small as possible for many reasons. Many of the people who testified before our 10 listening sessions asked for that. The larger a district is, the more expensive it is for a candidate to won. Since, trying to get 800 highly qualified people to run in a small state is hard, the smaller districts are, the better.

I also want to make the point that as we try to make a fair map, we certainly do not claim to make a perfect map, particularly in small counties like Cheshire. There are a lot of problems because we can't cross county borders and because towns that are on the border of each county give fewer choices for combinations. So, understanding that we don't claim perfection, but we claim the best that we could come up with. The Cheshire map that we are presenting includes 18 total districts, 14 are base districts and four are floterial. That is for 22 seats.

I'm going to go quickly through them because I think it helps members of the committee as well as those who are listening. District 1 has two seats, and it's Gilsum, Surry, Walpole, and Westmorland. District 2 has one seat, Alstead, Marlow, Stoddard, and Sullivan. Districts 3-7 are the Keene wards. There are five wards and each one has one seat. District 8 is Dublin, Harrisville, Nelson, and Roxbury, one seat. District 9 is Jaffrey and Marlborough, one seat. District 10 is Rindge, one seat. This is a new town that gets its own based district, a goal that so many people asked us to follow.

District 11 is Fitzwilliam, Richmond, Swanzey, and Troy for three seats. Each of these towns, sends their high schoolers to Monadnock Regional High School. District 12, Chesterfield, one seat. That is also a new town that gets its own district. District 13 is Winchester, one seat, which is what exists now. 14 is Hinsdale, one seat. This is a new town that gets its own base district. Then we have District 15, which is a one seat floterial of Keene Wards 2 and 3 and Alstead, Marlow, Stoddard, and Sullivan. District 16 is a one seat floterial of Keene Wards 1, 4, and 5. District 17 is a two seat floterial of Jaffrey, Marlborough, and Rindge. Jaffrey and Rindge sent their high schoolers to Conant High School.

District 18 is a one seat floterial of Districts 11, 13, and 14. So, the net result is that this map increases the number of single seat districts from 11, as exists now, to 15. The total deviation for the proposed map is 7.62. And that is the best that we could do. If someone has some suggestions to make it better, we are always open to it. Thank you, very much.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you, Rep. Smith. The colors are helpful, but it is still hard to go back and forth. I just have a question, Rep. Smith, I thought at the beginning you said 14 based single districts. Is it 15 or 14?

Rep. M. Smith: Wait, I have to go back here.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Webber, do you have an answer to that?

Rep. M. Smith: I have 14 base and four floterial for a total of 18 districts.

Rep. Griffin: Okay.

Rep. M. Smith: Unless, of course, my math is off. And one of the floterials has two members, which is sometimes unusual but makes the numbers come out right.

Rep. Griffin: Any questions for Rep. Smith? Any comments on this proposal? I'm not seeing any. So, on Page 12B, there is a proposed map for House Representatives for Cheshire County. I'm going to ask the other Rep. Smith to address those. Rep. Steve Smith.

Rep. S. Smith: Thank you, Madam Chair. In public testimony in Cheshire, one of the things we heard was that the river town should be kept together. This plan accomplished that. It isn't a rule, but I don't like to treat city wards differently than others by peeling one or two off and combining them with other towns. We look for opportunities to do that, keep them to together. Honestly, in all parts of the state, that's just simply not possible. But in this one, it was. Keene's numbers, all by themselves, don't get them there. But if you add the town of Marlborough, you get a pretty good seven seat district. And advantage there is also since the community voted to use the equalized ward values. With this plan, we don't care how it ends up because it doesn't effect anything else.
There is only one floterial and that's at the bottom where the numbers were low, and we had to put a bunch of different towns together. But overall, it's laid out pretty well geographically. The blue towns, that's a four-seat district. Candidates will campaign up

and down the Connecticut River. The top are put together –

Rep. Griffin: Excuse me, Rep. Smith, I have to ask, by blue, do you mean purple?

Rep. McGuire: No, he means light blue.

Rep. Griffin: Oh, light blue, okay. Thank you.

Rep. S. Smith: Light blue. Oh, do we have two blues?

Rep. Griffin: No, I just wanted to make sure.

Female Speaker: The river's on the left.

Rep. Griffin: The river ones are blue.

Rep. McGuire: And the river ones are on the left.

Rep. S. Smith: They are. And those are some of the towns that have given rise that the best thing about Vermont is the view across the river. So, overall, that's it. We could accomplish this with only one floterial, which I like. That's the plan.

Rep. Griffin: Questions? Rep. Weber?

Rep. Weber: I just wondered, aside from the issue of the river towns, why the decision was made, even including the river towns, to reject the constitutional mandate of the areas that have enough to have their own reps, which has been rejected in the 13 of the 14 towns that really ought to have their own. I now it's mathematically impossible to do all of them. What was the thinking on those?

Rep. S. Smith: Do you have an example? I know a lot of people believed Walpole was, but it's not actually a constitutionally mandated town because it's not within what's generally accepted for a one district deviation. It's a little over.

Rep. Weber: I understand that. But the constitutional mandate makes no earthly sense if you hold that it means that only those towns which are within the exact deviation are entitled to local representation and that anything that exceeds that is not entitled to local representation, that seems to make a mockery of what, certainly, the people who talked to me when that was being voted in thought they were voting on.

I understand that Walpole is slightly too high. It is, alas, too high by only 16 people. I'm pretty sure that all 16 of those people would gladly agree to be underrepresented if they could have their very own district. I understand that thoughts differ on that. And I understand that the deviation needs to be accounted for. That's what happens in the other plan.

Rep. S. Smith: Yes, and I think we don't try to achieve that at the expense of the rest of the county or having the county numbers go over 10% overall. I respectfully think we just see it differently, probably.

Rep. Weber: I've made my point. We're good. Thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Anybody else on this, 12B for Cheshire? Or anything else in regards to either Cheshire plan?

Okay. The next one in our packet is Carroll. Why don't we start with 13B. Is that Rep. Turcotte?

Rep. Turcotte: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, everybody. Carroll County. Our map of Carroll County has a total of eight districts. It includes two floterials. The total deviation is minus 4.8 to minus 0.37 for an overall 4.47 deviation. The districts and the towns within the districts are laid out for us on the pages immediately following the map. Other than that, that's all I have for you.

Rep. Griffin: Any questions for Rep. Turcotte? There may be questions after that. Carroll County Representative Map A. Who would speak to that? Rep. Bergeron?

Rep. Bergeron: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll go through all the districts because I know anybody who may be watching this online now or later won't have maps to refer to. I'll make comments where I think it adds some relevant information. The proposed map includes 10 total districts, seven are based and three floterial, with a total of 15 seats. District 1 would include Bartlett, Hart's Location, and Jackson with one seat. And that's the same as the existing district. District 2, Albany, Chatham, Conway, Hales Location, and Sandwich with three seats.

District 3, Madison, and Tamworth. During the public input sessions, a speaker noted that Tamworth shared interest with Madison to the east and Sandwich to the west. So, those two towns are paired. District 4 would include Brookfield, Eton, Effingham,

Freedom, and Wakefield, which would receive two seats. District 4 would be Moultonborough, which is now eligible to receive its own base district, its own dedicated seat. District 6 would be Ossipee. Again, Ossipee is a town that now gets its own base district based on population changes.

District 7, Tuftonboro and Wolfeboro put together for two seats. Both towns send high schoolers to Kingswood High. Tuftonboro sits between three towns that could have their own districts based on population. So, the decision was to pair it Wolfeboro and give Moultonborough and Ossipee their own seats. District 8 is a one seat floterial of Districts 1 and 2. District 9 is a two seat floterial of Districts 3-5. And District 10 is a one seat floterial of Districts 6 and 7. All three towns in this floterial send their high schoolers to Kingswood High, so they have a common interest, common connection there, as well.

The map increases the number of districts in the county from eight to 10. Instead of one seven-town floterial and one 11 town floterial, the proposed map creates three floterials containing three towns, four towns, and eight towns. Total deviation for the proposed map is 6.44%. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Rep. Griffin: Thanks. Sorry, I'm writing. Questions or comments? I'm just flipping back and forth. Some of the districts are the same. Any questions or comments? Okay, I'm not seeing any. So, that is the maps for Carroll.

Next, we have Grafton. Who is going to be doing 14A, Grafton?

Rep. Bergeron: That would be me again.

Rep. Griffin: That's right. Rep. Bergeron.

Rep. Bergeron: Thank you, Madam Chair. The proposed map for Grafton includes 15 total districts, 14 base and one floterial, with a total of 26 districts. Again, I'll identify the contents of each district and highlight any elements that I thought led to the decision of pairing certain towns.

District 1 would include Littleton and Monroe with two seats. Bethlehem and Franconia for one seat are put together in District 2. Currently, they're in two separate districts. But both towns send their high school to Profile High. District 3, Easton, Landaff, Lisbon, Lyman, and Sugar Hill would have one seat. District 4 puts together

Bath, Benton, Haverhill, and Piermont with two seats. And all four towns send their highschoolers to Woodsville High. District 5 would be two seats containing Ellsworth, Lincoln, Livermore, Thornton, Warren, Waterville, and Woodstock.

District 6 would contain Orford, Rumney, and Wentworth for one seat. District 7 remains the same. Campton receives one seat. District 8 puts together Ashland, Holderness, and Plymouth with two seats. And all three towns send their high schoolers to Plymouth High School. District 9 pairs Bridgewater and Bristol for one seat. District 10 puts together Alexandria, Grafton, Groton, and Hebron, one seat. District 11, Cannon, Dorchester, and Orange, one seat. District 12 remains the same, Enfield receives one seat. It is what it is formed as now.

District 13, again, the same as it exists currently. It's Hanover and Lyme for four seats. Both towns send their high schoolers to Hanover High. Lebanon remains the same as a city district with four seats. District 15 is a one-seat floterial consisting of Districts 9-12 and all the towns that send highschoolers to Mascoma Valley Regional are included in this floterial.

The map prioritizes single seat districts as much possible. The total deviation for the proposed map is 7.48%. I also wanted to acknowledge the map that was emailed to the committee by Rep. Sally Fellows recently. We have copies on our tables. We get a massive amount of material. I'm only acknowledging because I'd like to percolate to the top of the massive volume of paper that we have before us. What I found interesting, or intriguing is the largest district in her proposal contains six towns. Whereas there's a 10 town floterial in both proposals 14A and 14B. She also creates fewer districts, 13 versus the 15 and 18 districts in the other two plans before us.

One of the downsides is the town of Enfield, which is entitled to a seat of its own is included in a six-town cluster. I've been taking the position that we should create districts for towns that have sufficient population for their own representative. That's been an important criteria for us in the development of maps. But again, I thought the approach was intriguing. There were fewer districts. There were smaller districts. I would encourage members to at least take a look at it and see if there's anything that appeals to them as we head towards our executive sessions on these bills. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you, Rep. Bergeron. Any questions on those Grafton county maps? I'm not seeing any. So, 14B, Grafton, Rep. Turcotte, I think you are speaking to this one.

Rep. Turcotte: Thank you, Madam Chair. Grafton County, we end up with 18 districts and two floats. Again, I am not going to read them all off. Hopefully, these will be up on the website soon for everybody who wants to look at them to see. Other than that, that's all I have. And the deviation range, sorry, minus 3.91 to 4.53 for a total deviation of 8.44.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Lane?

Rep. Lane: Yes, I realize he's not reading out the towns, but could you talk about what the priorities when you put together this map?

Rep. Turcotte: Our priorities were developing maps that meet all constitutional priorities along with a series of other parameters that we've set by vote in this committee. All our maps have been developed using the same criteria. Other than that, I'm not going to get into the minutia of the specifics of each one.

Rep. Griffin: Any other questions? Yes, Rep. Weber?

Rep. Weber: I think Rep. McGuire was before me.

Rep. Griffin: Sorry.

Rep. McGuire: Thank you. I just wanted to comment that the two maps are actually extremely similar. The minor changes in the float aside, the 14B has more districts because it gave Lebanon four districts instead of one, dividing each ward, and then a float. So, assuming their wards are good, their four representatives will run in four different districts rather than at large. It is remarkable how similar the two maps are, actually.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. Anybody else? Okay. The next one on our list is 15A. That's Hillsborough. I see two names on the list, Rep. Bergeron and Rep. Wilhelm.

Rep. Bergeron: I will defer to Rep. Wilhelm to take the lead on this. He's from the northern part of the county. I'll be happy to weigh in on the southern part.

Rep. Wilhelm: And I hope you do. Thank you, Madam Chair. So, my proposed House map for Hillsborough County, it includes 46 total districts, 48 base, eight floterial with a total of 123 seats. District 1 includes Antrim, Deering, Hillsborough, and Windsor for three seats. Hillsborough and Deering share a high school District 2 is Bennington, Frances Town, Greenfield, and Hancock. All four of those towns send their highschoolers to ConVal High School. District 3 is Ware. It's two seats. District 4 is Goffstown, which is four seats. District 5 is Lyndeborough, Mount Vernon, and New Boston for three seats. District 6 is Bedford for seven seats.

And then we start to get into Manchester. So, there are two seats for each ward in base district. Those are the same as existing. District 19 is Litchfield, two seats, same as existing. Merrimack is the same eight seats, same as existing. Amherst, three seats. Milford, four seats. Those are same as the existing districts. District 23 is Temple and Wilton. That is one seat. District 24 is Peterborough and Sharon for two seats. Both of those towns send their highschoolers to ConVal. District 25 is New Ipswich, one seat. And that is a new town that would get its own base district.

District 26 is Brookline, Greenville, and Mason for two seats. District 27 is Hollis, two seats. That's the same as existing. And then we start to get into Nashua. It's three seats in each ward. And those are the same as existing. Fast forward to District 37, Hudson, six seats. This is a new town that would get its own base district. District 38 is Pelham for four seats. Another town that would get its own base district. District 39 is where we start to get into floterials. So, there's a two-seat floterial that's Goffstown and Ware together. Is that right?

Rep. Griffin: Are we okay?

Rep. Wilhelm: I want to make sure we get it right.

Rep. Griffin: I got my head down, I'm sorry, everybody. I'm going back and forth. So, if you have any –

Rep. Wilhelm: And let me know if I'm going too fast. So, that was 39, floterial, Goffstown and Ware. District 40 is where we get into floterials for Manchester. Now, I'm right now in District 42, my floterial would change. In fact, it's a little bit harder for me to seek reelection. This is a good fair map. District 40 is a three-seat floterial that's

composed of Manchester Wards 1 and 2 and 4 and 6. District 41 would be a three seat floterial, Manchester Wards 5 and 7-9, so it's 5, 7, 8, and 9. The new District 42 would be a three-seat floterial, which would be Manchester Wards 3, so that's downtown, the mill yard, and all of the west side, Wards 10, 11, and 12. So, they all share the river there.

District 43, a two-seat floterial composed of Hudson and Litchfield. District 44 would be a one-seat floterial composed of Amherst and Milford. District 45 would be a one-seat floterial composed of New Ipswich, Temple, and Wilton. And last, but not least, District 46, a one-seat floterial, composed of Brookline, Greenville, Hollis, and Mason. Hollis and Brookline, they share a high school.

So, a few features of this map, the map keeps Nashua and Manchester completely separate from other towns and base districts and in floterials, which we feel is a good thing. The map separates Pelham and Hudson, something we heard a lot about not just during this process but over the last decade. And the map also increases the number of towns with their own base districts. There are 15 total in this map. Total deviation, 9.17%. Just to note about Manchester, our total population is 115,844. You divide that by our magic number of 3,444 and you get just over 33. So, both 33 or 34 reps for Manchester within that 10% range of deviation. I'm obviously pretty partial to it because it keeps Manchester whole. I'm pretty excited about that.

Anything to add, Rep. Bergeron?

Rep. Bergeron: Actually, you did a very good job. The only thing I might point out is 26 of the 46 districts are unchanged. I think given the volume of seats we're dealing with, that's pretty significant.

Rep. Griffin: Okay. Anybody else on 15A, Hillsborough County Reps? Rep. Porter?

Rep. Porter: I don't know if I'm on or not.

Rep. Griffin: Red button down.

Rep. Porter: I don't have a red button.

Rep. Griffin: Christina, can you hear Rep. Porter?

Rep. Porter: Can you hear me now?

Rep. Griffin: Yes, that seemed to amplify it.

Rep. Porter: I wanted to make a mention here, given that northern part of Hillsborough County is what I represent. So, I have a pretty good feel for what's going on when I look at this map. I'm very grateful to see that the 10-town floterial district that includes Hillsborough, currently, goes from Hillsborough all the way down to Greenville, is eliminated on this map. 10 towns for a floterial is a huge thing. I'm glad to see that in this map, it's gone. It was hard to represent all those 10 towns.

And I'm pleased to see that it was a consideration to include the town of Deering with the towns of Hillsborough and Windsor because we have a lot of common interest. They really do belong together. They are almost one community. So, I want to say thank you in this plan to those considerations because they make a big difference in whoever is elected to represent that area of the state. Thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you, Rep. Porter. Anybody else on 15A? Turning to 15B, a Hillsborough map for county representatives, also. Rep. Turcotte or Berry? Turcotte?

Rep. Turcotte: Thank you, Madam Chair. Hillsborough County, we have it at a total of 45 districts, total of floats. One note on the City of Manchester, instead of floating four cities together – four wards, sorry. Instead of floating four wards together, we floated three together. Of course, Nashua, each one of those wards gets their own representative. Our overall deviation on here is negative 5.01 to positive 4.94 for a total of 9.95. Thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Questions for Rep. Turcotte? Rep. Wilhelm?

Rep. Wilhelm: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm curious, your map has, I think 32 seats, is that right, for the city of Manchester?

Rep. Turcotte: That's correct.

Rep. Wilhelm: Okay. I guess I'm curious, it seems like either 33 or 34 would be appropriate based on population size. Both 33 or 34 would be within generally accepted deviation. Is there a reason that Manchester appears to be slightly underrepresented?

Rep. Turcotte: Manchester, the deviation on the individual wards come in at 4.94%,

which is within the deviation ranges that we're using.

Rep. Griffin: As compared to the overall deviation, is that what you're talking about Rep. Wilhelm?

Rep. Wilhelm: Yeah, just overall deviation within the county.

Rep. Griffin: So, it's a question versus individual versus overall. Rep. Porter, did you have your hand up?

Rep. Porter: Thank you for taking my question. Again, I want to bring up the fact that in this map, there is a nine-town floterial. It is not as geographically spread out as the 10-town floterial that is current. However, it is a lot of towns and difficult to represent. So, I am concerned about that.

Also, looking at these maps, I'm seeing some districts that are becoming more of one color in terms of political point of view than they had been in the past. Just knowing this area of the state pretty well, I'm pretty concerned about the grouping of certain towns together and the reasons why that was occurring. I just want to bring that forward. I know we don't try to get ourselves reelected, but it seems like something like that might have been in the works with looking at this map. Thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Anything else on these? Okay. That was 15. That was Hillsborough. Next, we have Strafford. Rep. Turcotte. Oh, I'm sorry, Rep. Wilhelm. There I am with my head down again.

Rep. Wilhelm: I just have a question. One thing I'd be curious to know, with all of our maps, is if there are any – I think there are minority majority districts. Because we're talking about Hillsborough County, I'd just be curious to know if we've taken a look at that to make sure that we're in compliance with federal laws. Specifically, Nashua, I think that's where it might exist.

Rep. Berry: Madam Chairwoman, I'd be able to give some insight into that.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you, Rep. Berry.

Rep. Berry: Yes, Rep. Wilhelm, I believe it was the first or second one of our meetings, you guys made reference to this. So, I loaded up the database into an access program. I ran every voting location, ward, town in the state to see what is – This is obviously an extremely

sensitive issue, but the least white. And the most racially diverse area in the state that I was able to find was actually Manchester's Ward 5, which was 55% white. That was when you removed Hispanic and Latino. The census will put Hispanic and Latino into the white categorization. So, it's actually Manchester. It's actually our home city. It's Manchester Ward 5.

Because there is, to my knowledge at least, the analysis I did, there is no single voting location in the state that has a majority minority population. That may change in 10 years for Manchester's Ward. You guys made mention of that, that you would like to look at that. So, I went, and I looked at it and I don't know how you would do it without actually going in and breaking up a ward. Once again, that could change once they redraw the ward lines. But we're operating underneath the current ward lines.

Rep. Wilhelm: So, maybe there could be a provision within the House bill that looks at the House maps to account for that. It may not be necessary this time around. So, are you saying it's not necessary in this redistricting, but it could be in 10 years?

Rep. Berry: Absolutely in 10 years because we don't know what the future will hold. The state went from, I think 92 or 93% white to 87.9 or something like that overall. My quick analysis of that change was that it was done, basically on – the largest growth was Hispanic and mixed-race. But I believe No. 2 was the ward in Nashua. And ward escapes right now. If I recall, and I'm kind of digging in the cobwebs, it's been a couple months since I've looked at this, that ward was in the 60s in terms of total percentage white.

But I don't know how, to your point about a provision or a clause, I don't know how we would be able to predict the future of what they're going to do this time around. But to your point about in 10 years, it absolutely could be something to look at in 10 years. But that's a problem – not a problem, but that's an issue for 10 years down the road.

Rep. Wilhelm: Just a quick follow up?

Rep. Griffin: Sure.

Rep. Wilhelm: Is there any guidance that we should be providing the cities of Manchester or Nashua as they redraw their lines as it relates to this?

Rep. Berry: I would leave that to the individual cities. On my opinion, I'm not ready to issue guidance to any city or town to draw lines around race. That's something that makes me very uncomfortable.

Rep. Griffin: I believe that would be far beyond the jurisdiction of anything this committee does.

Rep. Wilhelm: Thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. Anybody else on issues before we move on to Strafford? And it's my intent that we are going to take a short break after this map. Rep. Turcotte?

Rep. Turcotte: Thank you, Madam Chair. Strafford County, we developed a map with 21 districts, four floterials. We had an overall deviation of minus 4.2 to plus 4.97 for a 9.16 overall deviation for Strafford County. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Rep. Griffin: Any questions? We're going to move on to 16B.

Rep. Weber: 16A?

Rep. Griffin: Oh, 16A, sorry. That will be Rep. Marjorie Smith.

Rep. M. Smith: Thank you, very much, Madam Chair. As a proud resident of Strafford County, I'm delighted to present this to you. I want to stress again that in addition to the constitutional and legislative requirements we worked very, very hard to have smaller districts, to have single member districts, to make it easier for citizens to relate to their representatives. And we acknowledge that these maps are not perfect.

I do want to make one additional comment. In terms of the state constitutional requirement about ensuring that any district that meets the appropriate number is entitled to have its own district, I believe that we will find that there's a little difference of opinion here. There are some people who seem to think that the county of that particular town would have to be exactly the number, which in this case, as you know, is the 3,444 number. But in fact, I believe that the intention is that that is a minimum. It is not to say that if you were over that, you couldn't have your one and then the additional are handled the way we handle everything, combining in some ways with other districts.

So, following that, we have 25 total districts, 18 base and seven floterial districts. That is a total of 38 seats. District 1 is Farmington, Middleton, Milton, and New Durham for four seats. District 2 is, I'm very pleased to say, Strafford for one seat. This is a new town that gets its own base district and is no longer connected by a point on a square within another town in order to create a larger district. District 3 is Barrington with two seats, which is the same as the existing district. And District 4 is Lee with one seat, again the same as the existing district. Durham and Madbury have five seats, again the same as the existing district.

In Rochester, each of the wards, and there are six wards, have one seat, the same as the existing district. In Dover, there's a slight difference. In Dover, Wards 1 through 4 each have one seat, which is the same as the existing district. But also, we add Dover Ward 5 with one seat and Dover Ward 6 with one seat, where in the past, they have been combined with other jurisdictions. Rollinsford and Somersworth have four seats together. And they are not combined with Dover, which seems to us to be a much more fair and equitable distribution of seats.

Then we have the floterials. District 19 has one floterial that's made up of Districts 1 and 2. District 21 has one floterial which is Rochester Wards 1 and 2. District 22 has one floterial of Rochester Wards 3 and 4. District 3 is one floterial of Rochester Wards 5 and 6. District 24 has two seats floterial composed of Dover 1, 5, and 6. And the last district is 25 with a two-seat floterial composed of Dover Wards 2 and 4.

This map separates Dover, Somersworth, and Rollinsford, something that has been an issue in the existing map, and it keeps Rochester separate from other towns in any base or floterial district. And it separates, as I said before, Strafford from New Durham and the base district, which currently only connects geographically at a single point. It is my hope that my distinguished colleague who was the clerk of Judiciary Committee is listening to this and is secretly, or publicly, cheering that we have recognized that Strafford should be there on its own.

The total deviation for the proposed map is 9.85. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. He probably is listening. Questions? Rep. McGuire?

Rep. McGuire: Just one minor correction. Rollinsford is not separate from Somersworth, it's combined with it. It's the same district that the other map has. They are separate from Dover, that's correct.

Rep. M. Smith: This has to do with, I think is referred to as the Oxford comma or is it the Cambridge comma, in that by that statement, those two are the together and then Dover is. The and without the comma makes things confusing.

Rep. McGuire: Exactly. I just wanted to clarify that point because a lot of people were concerned about that at the listening session.

Rep. M. Smith: Thank you, very much.

Rep. Griffin: Anybody else? That's 16A and 16B. So, we have 17A and B and 18A. And we are going to take a short break. We will be back here at 11:10. Thank you. **[No dictation] [01:06:24 – 01:20:11]**

Thank you, everybody for that recess, which of course, like all recesses, went longer than I said it would. I apologize. It is now 11:15. We left off with 16. We are now on 17. This Sullivan County. And I am going to turn to Rep. Steve Smith for Sullivan 17B.

Rep. S. Smith: Thank you, Madam Chair. Sullivan has challenging geography. One of the first things I notice is the two largest municipalities, by far, Claremont and Newport like a wall down the middle. It is challenging to make better numbers by combining northern and southern towns. One of the things we heard was that Grantham should have its own representative. They are just a smidge over a one percent deviation. They should. This plan does that. We heard multiple people testify that Sunapee should have its own representative. They are under three percent off from being perfect. This plan gives them their own representative.

We also heard that Claremont should stay together. This plan does that. There's literally no change to the voting districts in Claremont. Separating them from the towns is important. People know a lot about Headline News. But what happens at the county level is our pitched battles are over. Whether the Fall Mountain Food Shelf gets the county grant, or the Claremont Soup Kitchen does. Local transportation issues, the city and the towns often have widely disparate viewpoints on that. If I represented both Claremont and one of the towns when we had one of our biggest battles over local buses, I would have had to ask myself which of my constituents do

I ignore because they are on opposite sides. So, this plan makes good sense that way.

What stays the same? At the bottom of the county, currently, Charlestown, all of those orange towns that you see in the plan, and Goshen are one district with Unity and a floterial. And then the orange ones plus Goshen without Unity would be a separate district. The only change there at all is that Goshen and Unity are swapped. This makes good sense because Newport and Goshen have very close ties. Goshen kids go to Newport schools. A lot of people live in Goshen, work in Newport. It's right down the road.

That leaves somethings to deal with. Oh, another thing, the last criticism of the current state of affairs we had was a giant floterial, ignore the colors, but notice where Claremont is. Now, start right above that, those towns are on the Vermont border. Go all the way right to the Merrimack County border, down, and then come back under Claremont, almost back to the Vermont border. That's currently a nine-town floterial. Nobody likes it. We heard the representative that represents it doesn't like it. I don't like it. It's just the fallout from dealing with the numbers last time.

So, what this plan does is we have smaller floterials. There are two. No way to do Sullivan without them. They are comprised of towns. We don't use Claremont wards, peel it apart, and piece those anywhere. I think this makes good sense. I don't know what to call the color, it's kind of pink at the top, that is a product of carving Grantham out for its own rep and then making sense of what remains.

People may question whether or not Newport and Cornish are contiguous. They are. In town records going back many decades, apparently when perambulation happens, when the town officials are supposed to walk the borders, they would meet out there and have lunch. That was pretty cool. There's a marker in the ground out there. And one property owner owns land in three of the towns. It certainly meets the definition. Is it ideal? No. But I think that the other considerations I cited at the beginning are the important ones and the priorities. Doing this was necessary to accomplish that.

Overall deviation is 7.47. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. I always like to hear about perambulation. I have done a few myself. They are quite an exercise. And I believe there have

been attempts to get rid of it here at the statehouse a couple of times over the years. It never succeeds. Questions for Rep. Steve Smith on Sullivan? And if there are none, I think we are going to Rep. Marjorie Smith.

Rep. M. Smith: Thank you, very much. The Smiths have cornered the market on Sullivan County. We agree on the underlying point that it is unbelievably difficult to do Sullivan County. You wonder why? On the one hand this, and on the other hand, that. Some of the changes that we've made in our proposal are the same changes that my colleague made. But not all of them. And again, we are trying to keep these districts as small as possible. It just doesn't necessarily work. We can end up with a very good deviation range of 3.73 total, which is wonderful, but there are problems getting to it.

We have eight total districts. Six base and two floterial. And we have a total of 13 seats. District 1 is Cornish and Plainfield. District 2 is Grantham, one seat. This is a new town that gets its own base district. The other map that was just proposed does exactly the same thing. District 3 is Springfield and Sunapee with one seat. District 4 is Claremont and Croydon with three seats. It keeps Claremont together, which is difficult to accomplish, but not Claremont alone, I'm sorry to say.

District 5 is Charlestown, Newport, and Unity for three seats. Six is Acworth, Goshen, Langdon, Lempster, and Washington for one seat. And then the floterials, District 7 is a one seat floterial with Cornish and Plainfield. I'm drowning in papers. I'm sorry. Where is my five? I'm sorry, and Charlestown. Charlestown, Cornish, Newport, Plainfield, and Unity. Is that it? I'm sorry. And District 8, which is a whole lot with two seats. So, it's tough. We agree on that. We did the best that we can do. We'd be happy for some suggestions for getting it better. And I'm delighted for Grantham that we both agree, we all agree that that's a good place to have a seat all by themselves. Thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. Just because Rep. Smith had papers, the bigger float, I believe is Acworth, Claremont, Cordon, Goshen, Langdon, Lempster, Springfield, Sunapee, and Washington.

Rep. M. Smith: Which is a mouthful. No wonder I couldn't say it.

Rep. Griffin: Exactly. Happy to help out so people could understand what it was. Any questions for either of the Smiths on Sullivan County? Rep.

Lane?

Rep. Lane: I have a question. I noticed with Rep. Steven Smith was speaking about Claremont and keeping it together, the differences, and we tried to do that as well, but that didn't seem to hold in Strafford County when we talked about Rochester and Dover. I guess this is really more of a question for Rep. Turcotte, was there a way to do that, to keep Dover and Rochester together without including border towns? I'm just asking that question. I know we all were trying to do that.

Rep. Turcotte: We're talking about Strafford County now?

Rep. Lane: I'm sorry, I'm backtracking. I was just listening –

Rep. Turcotte: That's fine. I think in just about every county, we could come up with variations of putting this town with that town or this town with that town ward. It doesn't work the same in every county. Could it have been done in Strafford? I'm sure there's some possibility of doing that. That doesn't necessarily mean that that option is any better than any particular other option.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Steve Smith, please.

Rep. S. Smith: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yeah, I think what I said is it's something we want to do but sometimes we're prevented. Like Keene, there was no way to make Keene its own thing. So, you had two options, you could peel off the wards and put them with other things or just add the one, I don't remember what the town was, to it. **[Inaudible] [01:30:53]**. Thank you. Everyone knows but me and I was presenting, awesome. That just seems to work out that way. It's a good tradeoff.

Rep. Griffin: Other questions, Sullivan County, but others to the extent we can remember because it has been a lot of paperwork. All right, I'm not seeing any, so we're going to move on to the last map on the agenda for today. That would be No, 18, the whole state, the congressional district. We have a few more pages to this because, of course, it's every community listed in the paperwork. Why don't we start with Rep. Wilhelm.

Rep. Wilhelm: Thank you, Madam Chair. So, if you look at the congressional district, it will look a lot like the map as it currently exists. Goals here were to keep both congressional districts in a way to remain

competitive, mirroring the state as a whole. There have been minimal changes in population between the existing districts since the last Census. So, the map should also make minimal changes The existing congressional districts have remained very, very similar for the last 14 decades, 140 years. And the only changes that have been made to balance – the only real changes that have been made over the last 140 years have been changes to balance the population between the two districts.

As the maps are currently drawn, as of the 2020 elections, the population of CD1 is 17,945 people, larger than Congressional District No. 2. So, in order to balance the populations of the two districts, this proposed map moves a single town, Hampstead, population 8,998, from CD1 to CD2. The resulting difference in population is just 51 people now between the two districts.

This proposed map continues to keep both districts competitive and continues with the long history of not making changes in the districts other than balancing population. Thanks.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. And the print is really small. Nothing that you had any control of. So, can you just point out which blue spot is Hampstead?

Rep. Wilhelm: Let me get out my magnifying glass.

Rep. Griffin: If anybody can.

Rep. Berry: Hampstead is in the southern tier. So, it's going to be next to the town of Derry. It's wonderful town, Madam Chairman. Hampstead is a wonderful town.

Rep. Griffin: I'm seeing somebody just hit a goal down there with Rep. Simpson.

Rep. Simpson: It's like a square except that it opens up like this at the top. **[Inaudible] [01:34:23]**.

Rep. Griffin: So, somebody just hold up a map and point to the general area that it is. So, is it a light blue on this map or this one?

Rep. Simpson: Light blue.

Rep. Griffin: So, it's the little light blue that goes just like Rep. Simpson says ta dah.

Rep. Berry: No, it's saying ta dah, here I am. I am Hampstead and I am moving.

Rep. Griffin: All right. So, that's the change from CD1 to CD2. Okay. Questions for Rep. Wilhelm on the CD map? The other proposal, 18B. Rep. Berry.

Rep. Berry: Yes, Madam Chairman, thank you. This map is another congressional district map that has a deviation of 0.0%. It's a deviation from zero is 88. 88 in one and 89 in the other because if you take the state's population and divide it by two, you get a not whole number. So, with this map, Madam Chairman, things that we considered were we look at the current way that the maps are situated, which is you have – let's take my state rep district, not that we consider state rep districts inside of other districts. We didn't do that for county commissioners. But I represent Southern Manchester and the town of Litchfield.

Manchester is in CD1, and Litchfield is in CD2. That's because over the years, as Rep. Wilhelm acknowledged, over 140 years, these districts have grown and mutated. The southern tiers continue to be divided in an attempt, as he says, to balance it out, which ends up with a district, as it is today, with its jagged edges and its inclines. I look at it and I say okay, why can we not put the majority of Manchester southern tier back together? So, I say okay, let's get Hudson, Windham, Litchfield, Pelham, and Salem, and Atkinson back together with the rest of Rockingham County and the rest of southern Hillsborough, with the exception of Nashua because of population differences.

As. Rep. Wilhelm said, the population differences from the existing districts were already off by, you have the exact number, but let's say 18,000 for the sake of simplicity. That means that CD1 already had to give 9,000 people over to CD2. Then we bring in the other southern tier towns that I just mentioned. So, now we must balance that out. The thing about what makes congressional districting mapping difficult is that New Hampshire gets two congressional seats. We also use the component method. This committee voted unanimously that we do not break up towns. We do not put half of Derry into one and half of Derry into another. So, because of that, you're moving large puzzle pieces.

And as we know, different towns have different density populations. So, when you move the residents of Salem, Windham, Litchfield, Pelham, and Atkinson over, you have to backfill that. And there's really one place to go. That is the densely populated towns of

Portsmouth, Dover, Durham, and Rochester. And that is how this map was arrived to. It meets the constitutional requirements of one man, one vote. 88 people. It meets the constitutional requirements for the state of New Hampshire. It is perfectly contiguous. So, that is the map.

Rep. Griffin: Okay, thank you. Questions? Rep. Smith, Marjorie.

Rep. M. Smith: Thank you very much for that explanation. Using the vernacular –

Rep. Berry: I'm sorry, Representative, I can't hear you.

Rep. M. Smith: Let's try this. Am I on now? Thank you. Using the vernacular, can you tell me why we don't adopt the principle of it ain't broke it, don't fix it? When we can, by moving one town, and keeping everything else basically the way it has worked well over the years, with districts going back and forth in terms of outcome, recognizing that we are a purple state, why would we do something as dramatic as this? And although it is true that every town in each color, whether it's light blue or dark blue does touch another one, having this constructions just come up through the middle of the state seems a little strange to me.

Understanding that in order to get from my town of Durham to other towns in that district, you'd have to cross the width of the other district. I go back to my initial question, if it ain't broke, why fix it?

Rep. Berry: So, a couple of things to that point, Representative. The first is the premise is it's not broken. My definition is I wanted to see the rest of the southern tier put back together. I consider that broken. To your point about driving from one part of the district to the other, I've heard this one a lot. I'd like to propose a road trip from Salem to Berlin under the current map. You will start in CD2. You will go into CD1 up 93. Then you'll go back into CD2. Then you'll go back into CD1. And then you'll go back into CD2. That's a trip from Salem to Berlin, north to south.

As I said earlier, we have two congressional districts. There is no map that you can make that you would drive from part of the state to the other where you will not come in and out of a congressional seat. It's just by virtue of the state's population. So, I enjoy the road trip theory. If we're using the road trip theory, then the current map must change.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Porter?

Rep. Porter: Thank you, Madam Chair. Am I on or off?

Rep. Griffin: Put it closer.

Rep. Porter: Now is it on?

Rep. Griffin: Yes.

Rep. Porter: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Representative. So, if I'm understanding you correctly, your sole criteria for changing this map was to make sure those southern tier towns are back connected with Manchester. That was your main criteria. And in order to do that, it meant taking a whole bunch of towns out of the district along the seacoast and up into Maine. Is that what you're telling me?

Rep. Berry: No, Representative. As I said in the beginning, my main criteria was for the committee to create a district that met the constitutional requirements of the United States of America and the New Hampshire State Constitution. After that, obviously, a variety of other factors come into place. I do represent the southern tier of New Hampshire, a part of it, not all of it. So, it was close to home for me. As somebody who currently represents two congressional districts in the southern tier, it was definitely a factor of consideration.

Rep. Porter: Thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Weber in a minute. Maybe I'll go to Rep. Wilhelm and maybe Rep. Berry, I'm finding this if it ain't broke, don't fix it argument sort of curious because I don't know how you determine whether it's broke or not. I mean, are you determining whether it's broke or not by the partisan result? Because it would seem to me that would be the only measurable criteria to make that determination. And then the other question I had was Rep. Wilhelm, I had no idea these districts had these type of align for so long. Do you know how this type of align was developed in the first instance?

Rep. M. Smith: Madam Chair, can I answer, since I was the one who said if it ain't broke. I don't want to put that burden on anyone else. So, if I could respond to that? And what I meant –

Rep. Griffin: No, I believe Rep. Wilhelm referred to the fact that it worked well. But go ahead, Rep. Smith, I'll defer to you as I see Rep. Wilhelm

nodding.

Rep. M. Smith: I'm sorry, I missed that. I said it because the population difference was 18,000 in a state with 1.3 million people. So, it meant that the smallest possible adjustment could result in the district numbers being evened with the smallest number of towns and cities having to make any changes. And it was, perhaps, it was too glib of me to say it in that way. But what I meant is a very small adjustment, in this case, one town, could give us the right number with the right deviation. And in that case, I thought the simplest approach was the best approach.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. Because then that's consistent with, I believe, Rep. Bergeron's comments yesterday about not wanting to confuse voters by changing the districts too much. Because under the logic that you are just doing a population would allow you to draw a line in any direction through the state when you only have two districts. But Rep. Wilhelm, if you wanted to add anything to that question or as to the origin of the original district, that would be helpful.

Rep. Wilhelm: I think the origins of the original district, I think we should go to House research. I think we should look it up.

Rep. Griffin: No, I thought you might know because you happened to know it was 140. I had no idea.

Rep. Wilhelm: I just know there have been minor changes made over the last several redistricting cycles. I do think that when we talk about the districts as they exist right now, we've seen pretty competitive congressional elections where voters have a clear choice between the two major parties. And ultimately, I think that serves democracy pretty well.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. Rep. Ross, do you have an answer to either one of those questions?

Rep. Ross: Yes, Madam Chairman. I'm not going to hold myself up as an expert into the 140-year history of the congressional districts. But in my research, and this is cited in multiple websites, you can go look, my understanding is Manchester and Nashua were split intentionally to dilute the Catholic vote and the white ethnic vote. Please go look it up. It happened many, many, many years ago. It was, from my understanding, it's something that if any elected body attempted to do today, it would be ruled grossly unconstitutional. But it's one of

those things that derives when you have something that old, is you run into things like that where you have lines drawn to dilute religious populations. Which, by the way, is not something we would support.

Obviously, the map that this side of the committee is bringing forward still splits up Manchester and Nashua. But I assure you, it is not to dilute the Catholic vote.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Weber?

Rep. Weber: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I assure you that our maps were not drawn to dilute any one group of particular person's votes as they stand now, either whatever the historical reality was.

What I want to ask is I keep hearing the phrase keep the southern tier together, and as I'm looking at this map, I'm wondering what the heck the southern tier is because if we look at the most southern border, there are about nine or 10 towns that are abutting Massachusetts, which don't seem to be part of the southern tier. And yet, the southern tier goes almost halfway up the map into territory that's, for those of us who do live in the southern part of the state, seems fairly far north. I'm just wondering about the fact that at least half of the lower third is not in the southern tier.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Berry?

Rep. Berry: Yes, Madam Chairman. Perhaps I chose my words poorly. The concept is still the same. I wanted to bring Hudson, Pelham, Litchfield, Salem, and Windham back together into one seat with the towns that they neighbor. But you still have to consider the population as a whole. It's just one of those things that when you look at a map, if people want to believe that somehow the population is evenly dispersed across the entire state, that is not the reality. Rep. Wilhelm and I live in a city that has 115,000 people. Geography-wise, we touch towns that are the same amount of land mass that have a population a third of that.

You can imagine going across the state, and across the southern tier, the sort of problems that creates. As I said in the beginning, my goal was to bring the towns I just mentioned together. We had to find a way to backfill that population.

Rep. Weber: As a follow up, Madam Chair?

Rep. Griffin: Follow-up, Rep. Weber.

Rep. Weber: I would just say that backfilling towns together by also joining together towns that are as disparate as the one's that have been joined in this town seems objectionable to me. I thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. Rep. Bergeron.

Rep. Bergeron: Thank you, Madam Chair. Rep. Berry, I was going to ask a similar question that Rep. Weber asked, that essentially your proposal reduces the cohesiveness of the southern tier since, under your proposal, everything from Nashua to the western border is now a southern tier where previously it was started further east. Be that as it may, you said that you wanted to bring Hudson, Windham, and Salem together again. I'm curious as to how they were ever together in the first place.

Rep. Berry: If I said again, I'm sorry. I didn't mean again if I did say again. I'm not saying I didn't say. I don't recall saying it. But I wanted to bring them together.

Rep. Bergeron: Okay. And then my question is why did you want to do that? We know in redistricting, once you make one change, it has a cascading effect. By putting those large towns together, you created this cascading effect, which creates a district right in the middle of the state with the other district enveloping it or enveloping it on both sides. It's kind of bizarre. But be that as it may, if you could as the question, why you chose to make that big change, create the cascade effect and, in effect, change 18,000 people instead of the 10,000 that a one town change would have made.

Rep. Berry: Correct. Remember, Representative, this is the majority committee's map. It's not my map. You have to remember, we're dealing with the population. Western Rockingham and south and easter Hillsborough County, in my opinion, up until a certain point of Rockingham, represent what I consider the southern tier of New Hampshire, the distinct region of it. They have been further and further apart. The map that your party has proposed further separates them by removing Hampstead. Those sort of things are going to continue as the population shifts. It's just a matter of priorities. These towns have been apart for some time. And I think it's time that all that area gets put back – not put back together but gets put together.

Rep. Griffin: Other questions? Rep. Simpson?

Rep. Simpson: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mine is more of a comment. Is that all right?

Rep. Griffin: Sure.

Rep. Simpson: Which is I'm from the seacoast region of the state. I just want to point out that this map presented by the majority really breaks up the seacoast, that has been together in the 1st Congressional District. The city of Portsmouth and Durham and other towns surrounding it have a great affinity and shared, maybe most importantly, at least, greatly an economy together. They have a lot of things in common. But economically, we talk a lot about the seacoast, as opposed to just the towns of the seacoast. Just to be clear, some of the towns in the southern tier breaks up the region of the seacoast. Thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Okay, I saw another hand over here that I haven't heard from. Rep. Lane?

Rep. Lane: Actually, I was going to bring up the same point that Rep. Simpson brought up, which was you are breaking up an entire area of the state with this map, the seacoast area. When you look at it, I don't understand how you can say it's the southern region when there are towns that are southern of the northern most parts of the state. The logic escapes me. I know this is mathematically driven. But we also want to take into communities of interest. I don't see how the seacoast have the same concerns as Keene and Plymouth and all these others that are included here. It is a question of why was that not taken into consideration, that you are breaking up an entire area of the state?

Rep. Griffin: I'm going to represent Rep. Steve Smith.

Rep. S. Smith: Yeah, so I live seven miles from the Vermont border. We're talking a lot about what goes on in the southern right corner of the state. I'd kind of like to offer my perspective and maybe it will put some of those in context. I think Rep. Berry, we're picking on the word he used, southern tier, and then trying to define that. He listed the communities. Agree or disagree with his strategy, I think he was fairly specific. So, for me, I'd like to stop picking on the words and just accept his argument for which communities he wanted to put back together. I say that as someone who will never get a good solution out of these maps.

The town of Lempster, which is probably 20 miles from the Vermont border, has a traffic light. It's a blinking one, but by God, they got one. That's the area I represent. My congressmen also represents Nashua. What kind of sense does that make? Or Salem or Colebrook. You can literally drive through one of the most populous cities in the state – I don't know is Nashua the most populous?

Rep. Berry: It's the second most populous. Manchester is probably most populous.

Rep. S. Smith: Okay, either way, second most populous in the state all the way to the Canadian border through Massachusetts and you pass through where I live. So, maybe for me, the community arguments, they just don't swing that much weight because CD2 is, and always will be if we do it this way, the most screwed up district there is.

While I'm criticizing, I tried doing congressional maps myself to get what I wanted. I don't want to be in a district with Nashua. I don't want to be in a district with Salem. I don't want that. Can I make a map of mostly smaller towns? No, I didn't. It was going great and then I think what happens when you make these maps is you get to the end, and you have that unacceptable level number of people that you just can't get rid of without starting at the very beginning. I spent a lot of time doing that.

So, I accept Rep. Berry's argument. He has a rational for what he did. You can disagree with it, but he has one. And recognizing that if you fix that, you're still never going to solve my problem. That's just how it is.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. Rep. Marjorie Smith?

Rep. M. Smith: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I heard something that Rep. Berry said, and I'm concerned that we're not being fair to one of our colleagues. Unless I misheard, Representative, this isn't your map. And if that's so, I don't think you should have to take the slings and arrows. And that concerns me. I then want to know whose map it is. I heard that comment and I felt bad for you.

Rep. Berry: First of all, Representative, thank you. Sometimes drawing the short straw means that you draw the short straw.

Rep. Griffin: I'll just pipe in and that I was contacted by somebody who apparently got the map on the PDF file and saw my name on it and attributed it

to me. So, depending on the moment in time, I guess we're attributing maps to whoever is the closest name.

Rep. Berry: As we've conducted these work sessions, Rep. Marjorie Smith, I'll use your first name because Rep. Steve Smith is here.

Rep. M. Smith: He doesn't want to be confused with me. I know that.

Rep. Berry: As we've been doing these, we've been doing, and you're side has been doing as well, one representative presenting one map. So, once again, short straw. I knew when I drew this one that no one would be interested in this and that everyone was really here to talk about the state rep seats and the county commissioner seats. And this was kind of going to be an afterthought. That was a joke. We can laugh.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Lane?

Rep. Lane: Thank you, Madam Chair. With all due respect to Rep. Steven Smith, no one has answered my questions, which is why would you want to separate an entire section of state away and divide it up in connection when you don't have to?

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Lane, I think I'll come back to the legal principle that you don't always get the answer you want to a question, but you get the answer. Rep. Berry, I'll go to that. But I will also point out that there are no defined sections of the state. We have a state. We have to create two congressional districts. We have Health and Human Service districts, which are different from County districts, which are different from town line, which are different, of course, from the lines within them. So, when one talks about a section, it is hard to do that without defining a section. I know that Rep. Simpson referred to the seacoast area. But I'm sure there are towns that might say they are or are not.

I know for years, I have gotten in discussions with people about what states are in New England. I'm sure many of you have been into that, as to whether there are four or five or six states in New England. Rep. Berry?

Rep. Berry: To that point, Madam Chairman, one of my favorite things about living in New Hampshire is if you ask somebody from the northern part of the state if they live in the North Country, the answer is, "Of course, I live in the North Country." Until you talk to somebody who lives in the town just north of them and they say, "No, no, I live in the North Country. That's not the North Country down below." It's

all relative.

But the current map that your party has brought forward does, in fact, split up regions of the state. Once again, going back to the populations. We have, for whatever reason, prioritized the southeast corner forever. And maybe it's time that some of these other towns and sections of the state get put together instead of just one section. You're trying to balance the population.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Wilhelm?

Rep. Wilhelm: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to point out and I don't have the exact numbers on me, but it appears approximately 25%, about a quarter of the state is moving from one congressional district to another. This is a pretty dramatic difference from the current maps. I took Congressional Elections when I was in grad school at UNH. My professor, Dante Scala tweeted out this morning, he said that he and his research assistant had been drawing maps and they could not draw a map that had more partisan advantage than this one right here. I just want to state that for the record. It's concerning to me. It's a massive overhaul of what we have. And it's very concerning to me.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. Rep. Berry?

Rep. Berry: To that point, we discussed yesterday, maybe Rep. Wilhelm would like to point out, where is the legal standard to consider the current map? It does not exist? The courts have ruled against it multiple times. And in fact, this very committee discussed yesterday that it was not a factor. I believe we talked about – your side was talking about drawing districts around incumbents. And we refuted that.

Several Voices: No, we didn't.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Porter?

Rep. Porter: Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't think that's what we were saying yesterday, Representative. I'm sorry, I feel like I've been misrepresented in that. I simply made a comment yesterday. I'm wondering, I'm not a political scientist and I haven't been part of this whole deliberation that you're doing, but I do know that when it comes time to run for office, there are people who tell me a number that goes along with my district. It might be R plus 3 or D plus 1 or D neutral. When both sides were configuring this congressional

map, were you using numbers like that to help you make your decision? Thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Rep. Smith – Oh, Rep. Lynn, sorry.

Rep. Lynn: I was not involved in the details of the drawing of the map. I have to tell you, unlike some of my colleagues, on both sides, I don't know – if you asked me before this exercise, let's say was Conway a republican or democratic leaning town, I think I would have said republican. I've since learned that it's not. It's actually a democratic leaning time. That's sort of my ignorance, generally. Now, if you ask me my town of Windham, sure, Windham is a republican leaning town. I ran in Windham. So, I understand that.

I guess if your question is were political considerations something that were in the mix? Of course they were. This is a political process as the Supreme Court has said repeatedly, both the New Hampshire Supreme Court and the US Supreme Court. This is a political process. That's why it's done by the legislature. Was that something that was taken into account? Of course it was.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. Follow up before Rep. Lane. I'm going back to Rep. Wilhelm who said that he felt the current map was a very good map and produced good results. I know I'm sort of paraphrasing. But you went back to talk about how you felt as a base district to work from, the current CD produced results that indicated they were good. I'm paraphrasing, which is why I'm coming back to you for that.

Rep. Wilhelm: I think I talked about the competitiveness and how the competitiveness serves our democracy well because then it's a battle of ideas between the two parties, the two candidates who will emerge as the nominees for the general election. I think that's a good thing.

Rep. Griffin: And so, was competitiveness a factor that you used in regards to the composition of the maps? And if so, how did you measure it?

Rep. Wilhelm: I think **[audio cuts out] [02:04:59]** them to be competitive. I know the two districts, that they're consistently called by the two parties, they say we're going to compete in New Hampshire, in both CD1 and CD2, cycle after cycle.

Rep. Griffin: So, what have the results been in CD1 and CD2 since the last redistricting to show that they're competitive?

Rep. Wilhelm: I'd have to look back. I think you can look at the results and I don't know that they've been blowouts. And I'm concerned that the maps that are presented, there are going to be blowouts in both CD1 and CD2.

Rep. Griffin: So, your concern is as to the results of a particular race? And if so, did that logic carry through for all of the maps?

Rep. Wilhelm: Are we still talking about the congressional maps?

Rep. Griffin: Well, in the first instance. But if competitiveness is shown by close results, is that a factor – since that was a factor – are you saying it was a factor in this map? Or you just know it to be true?

Rep. Wilhelm: I know it to be true. I think we could look back at the last cycle and we would see that to be true. That's what my gut tells me. I'm just being honest with you.

Rep. Griffin: Where was the other hand? Rep. Weber? I'm sorry, Rep. Lane, you were – Go ahead, Rep. Weber.

Rep. Weber: Well, I'm just sort of trying to think off Rep. Lynn's comment. Having been involved in redistricting 10 years ago, there was a republican House and legislature that was three to one. They could've controlled, they had a majority that didn't have to think about a gubernatorial veto. And they could have passed any map that they wanted to. But they chose to keep the maps relatively close to what they had been and just make minor adjustments for population. So, I'm wondering why the majority tried to take a completely different approach this time.

Rep. Griffin: I would have no way of actually allowing that question to be answered by anybody on this committee unless they were on that committee because I am not aware of any guidance issued.

Rep. Weber: I'm just asking about the basis for current action.

Rep. Griffin: Were you on – I think you were involved in that process.

Rep. Weber: I am the last survivor.

Rep. Griffin: So, as the last survivor, you raised the question , do you have any knowledge of –

Rep. Weber: I am asking about not what happened then, but I am using it for a basis to ask about what's happening now.

Rep. Griffin: I think Rep. Berry already presented that answer as to what his approach was in explaining the map that's being presented for CD. Rep. Lane, I think I just passed you over. I apologize, Rep. Lane.

Rep. Lane: That's okay. To Rep. Lynn's point, yes, it is a political process. But yesterday, the majority several times spoke about how incumbents and about how fair maps were to be drawn, ignoring the political piece of it as much as possible. So, I would just remind the majority that was said when we were reviewing maps yesterday for the House.

I also just want to make it clear that when Rep. Piedra spoke about, it was in the commissioner maps, that it would not require any of the incumbents to not run, it just happened. It was not an intent. And I think he made that clear. And I would really appreciate it if people would stop referring to the fact that we drew maps around incumbents because I could tell you there are people in our party who were not happy with our maps. Thank you.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you for the clarification. It doesn't take long for me to perhaps remember exactly the same something that was said as the person sitting next to me. Thank you for your clarification of what was said. Rep. Berry?

Rep. Berry: Yes, to respond to Rep. Lane, that was how I interpreted his remarks. I'm sorry that's how I misinterpreted. We did probe him, and I was one of the people that probed him on that point about looking at districts and the current incumbents. And that's what we took away from it. I would never to intend to mischaracterize your position. But that is what I took away from it. You're saying now that that's not and that I misinterpreted that. And I take that as a good faith statement.

Rep. Lane: Yes, I'm saying that you interpreted it.

Rep. Griffin: Okay. Then a number of us probably did. So, we will take that consideration. Other hands on this? Rep. Lane?

Rep. Lane: Earlier this summer, the governor said that he if it didn't pass the smell test that he would reject a map. Has anyone consulted the

governor on this proposal? Does it pass the smell test?

Rep. Griffin: I am going to say that is beyond the consideration of this committee. The governor is part of the executive branch. This is the legislative branch. The press or anyone as an elected member is free to contact the governor's office in regards to this map. This is a consideration for this body going forward. And to not go down the line of possibly speaking of anything, I will just say that I have certainly not spoken to the governor or anybody in the governor's office on this.

This is a legislative body. I can tell you I spend much time admonishing my colleagues in regards to continue to recognize the separation that the constitution has provided us. I think all members of each parties around this table, regardless of who is sitting in the corner office across the street is always aware of the road ahead and what bumps, twists, and turns may be coming.

Further question?

Rep. Lane: Follow up. So, are you saying that – I know you said you haven't –

Rep. Griffin: I'm going to rule that question out of order. That is as to a different branch. Just as I would rule out order a question as to whether or not the chair of – I'm not even going to go there. Rep. Wilhelm? All right. Thanks. Anybody else?

I just checked on my phone for the website to see if there had been progress made in posting these maps online. I do not see them yet. I am going to follow up with that now. The next session is going to be in Reps Hall. We will be together in Reps Hall next Tuesday at 10:00. That should be in the calendar today, which same calendar just reminded me I have something I have to get done by the cutoff. Rep. Turcotte, briefly.

Rep. Turcotte: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to make a quick comment about the county maps I presented. My personality is to be as judicious with our time as possible. I chose not to read in all the districts on those maps. I have no problem reading those into the record. My assumption was those maps would be posted online. We would receive public input on them next week at our public input sessions. And the following week, we would be having a robust discussion about the differences in the maps presented. So, I'm not opposed to reading them in if you'd like to hear them.

Rep. Griffin: No, we're not going to do that now, Rep. Turcotte. We have moved on. Rep. Weber? I think that was a hint.

Rep. Weber: Given your ruling, I don't need to comment further on it.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. Rep. Porter?

Rep. Porter: I just wanted to say thank you to the members of the committee for welcoming me in and accepting my questions.

Rep. Griffin: Thank you. It's always a pleasure to have you. I know your district and I was happy to hear your comments on it. All right, we are finished with business for today. I will see you or a member, hopefully Rep. Simpson, who at this point is Member 15A of the committee, next Tuesday at 10:00 –

[End of Audio]

Duration: 135 minutes

GMR Transcription

Transcription · Translation · Editing · Proofreading

CERTIFICATION OF AUTHENTICITY

Date: April 26, 2022

Client: Michelle DePass

Audio File Transcribed by GMR Transcription Services, Inc.:
File Name: 316988_NH1.mp4

To Whom It May Concern:

I, Beth Worthy, President at GMR Transcription, do hereby certify under the penalty of perjury, under the laws of the state of California, that:

The transcript provided by GMR Transcription Services, Inc. is a full, true, and correct transcription of the audio file mentioned above, having been transcribed and reviewed by GMR Transcription to the best of the company's ability. I further certify that neither I, nor the transcriber, have any personal association with the case; nor am I, nor the transcriber in any way interested in the outcome thereof.

Executed this 26th day of April, 2022.

Sincerely,

Beth Worthy
President
Email: Beth@gmrtranscription.com
Phone: (714) 202-9653