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CHAIRMAN SIROIS: The Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee will come to order.

DJ, please call the roll.
THE CLERK: Chair Sirois.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Here.
THE CLERK: Vice Chair Tuck.
VICE CHAIR TUCK: Here.
THE CLERK: Ranking Member Skidmore.
DEMOCRATIC RANKING MEMBER SKIDMORE: Here.
THE CLERK: Representatives Benjamin.
REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Here.
THE CLERK: Brown.
REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Here.
THE CLERK: Fabricio.
REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Here.
THE CLERK: Fetterhoff.
REPRESENTATIVE FETTERHOFF: Here.
THE CLERK: Harding.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDING: Here.
THE CLERK: Hunschofsky.
REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Here.
THE CLERK: Joseph. Joseph.
Latvala.
REPRESENTATIVE LATVALA: Here.
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| 1 | THE CLERK: Maggard. |
| 2 | REPRESENTATIVE MAGGARD: Here. |
| 3 | THE CLERK: Massullo. Massullo. |
| 4 | McClure. |
| 5 | REPRESENTATIVE MCCLURE: I'm here. |
| 6 | THE CLERK: Morales. |
| 7 | REPRESENTATIVE MORALES: Present. |
| 8 | THE CLERK: Perez. |
| 9 | REPRESENTATIVE PEREZ: Here. |
| 10 | THE CLERK: Plakon. |
| 11 | REPRESENTATIVE PLAKON: Here. |
| 12 | THE CLERK: Silvers has been excused. |
| 13 | Trabulsy. |
| 14 | REPRESENTATIVE TRABULSY: Here. |
| 15 | THE CLERK: Truenow. |
| 16 | REPRESENTATIVE TRUENOW: Here. |
| 17 | THE CLERK: Williamson. |
| 18 | REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMSON: Here. |
| 19 | THE CLERK: Ex Officio Driskell. |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELI: Here. |
| 21 | THE CLERK: Ex Officio Leek. |
| 22 | REPRESENTATIVE LEEK: Here. |
| 23 | THE CLERK: Quorum is present, Mr. Chair. |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much, DJ. |
| 25 | Members, a few reminders before we begin. | Please silence all electronic devices, and if you're here today to give public testimony, please take time now to fill out an appearance form and turn it into the sergeant staff.

As a reminder for our members and speakers today, please turn your microphone on when you are speaking and off when you are finished.

Members, welcome back to special session. We have a lot of work ahead of us today. So let's jump right in.

For those of you who may be tuning in for the first time and as a refresher for the rest of it, I'd like to first take a moment to recap. We began our redistricting process back in September of 2021. Since then, we've debuted a website, a map drawing application, and held numerous committee meetings.

On March 4th, the House and Senate both passed Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 102. Now, from there, unlike what happens in our state legislative redistricting maps that receive Florida Supreme Court review, our congressional redistricting maps do not receive court review and instead move like a normal bill, which means they are sent to the Governor for approval or veto.

On March 29th, the bill was sent to the Governor, who vetoed it the same day, citing concerns with the United States Constitution. That same day, he issued a proclamation, calling the Legislature into special session to resolve these concerns and established Florida's 28 congressional districts to be used in the upcoming election cycle.

Chair Leek and I received a briefing from the Governor's Office about their proposed map. It is my understanding that the senator received a similar briefing. I'm glad to inform everyone that the Governor's Office is joining us today to provide that same briefing to all Committee members and the public, as well as be available for questions about the proposed map.

As the Speaker, as well as the Senate President, have stated, our goal during special session is to pass a new congressional map that will both earn the Governor's signature and withstand legal scrutiny, if challenged. This elected body is responsible to the citizens of Florida to complete our constitutional obligation to pass a congressional map.

Now, let's talk about the flow and the roadmap for today's meeting. We have one bill on
the agenda for consideration, House Bill 1-C by Representative Leek. I want to assure members and the public that I intend to allow for enough time for members to ask questions, to hear public testimony, and to allow for debate. I'll be tracking our time closely this afternoon and will keep the Committee informed as we move along.

Shortly, I will recognize Representative Leek to explain his bill, which contains the proposed congressional map, $\mathrm{P}-000 \mathrm{C} 0109$. As you may be aware, 10 districts of this map are from our previously passed legislative map, and 18 of the districts are being newly proposed by the Governor's Office.

Seeing as the House did not have a role in drawing those districts proposed by the Governor, we have invited their team to be present today to explain the map and answer questions from members afterwards. As is normal, we will move into public testimony and member debate before taking a vote on House Bill 1-C.

I'd like to take a moment to also address decorum. There's been a lot of chatter, speculation, and name calling over the last several weeks in anticipation of this special session and
the new proposed map that we'll be considering today. I want to be very clear. Today's meeting with proceed with professionalism, civility, and the decorum that Floridians expect of this legislative body. Members of this Committee and the public alike will keep their emotions and opinions respectable and thoughtful and not engage in personal or partisan attacks.

As we've talked about since last fall, there is no single correct redistricting map. There is no such thing as the best map. We are here to consider the next map that will govern elections in Florida for the next decade, and that is no small feat.

The last housekeeping item before we transition into our bill presentation is that, members, in front of you is the data packet for map P-000C0109. Similar to the packet produced for previous maps we reviewed, this packet contains information such as county and city splits, compactness scores, and functional analysis data. The bill text is also here in front of $D J$ in this binder if you would like to review it.

Members, up for consideration today is House Bill 1-C, establishing congressional districts
of the state. And as we've done for every other map presentation, $I$ will ask you to hold questions until all districts have been explained to ensure we get through a description of the entire state, and no one region is rushed.

Representative Leek, you are now recognized to present House Bill 1-C.

REPRESENTATIVE LEEK: Thank you, Chair Sirois.

Before I dive into the map itself, I want to echo Chair Sirois' comments from earlier. We as legislators should feel a strong sense of responsibility for passing redistricting maps out of this body. A narrative has started to proliferate that the Legislature has somehow ceded its map drawing responsibility to the Governor. I find that to be a false narrative and incorrect on its face. We have not ceded any responsibility. In fact, we have not -- we have done a responsibility once by passing maps during the regular session, and we will complete it again during this special session. The Governor has also fulfilled his responsibility and chose to veto our maps for reasons I believe his team will elaborate on today. Both branches of government have a role in
this process just like with any other bill. The only abdication of responsibility would be if we threw our hands up and sent an impasse to the courts, allowing them or third parties, all of whom are unelected, to draw our maps.

Instead, we have chosen to stay at the table, continue the conversation, and hear out the Governor and work together because that is not only -- not only our responsibility but what Floridians expect of us as their legislators.

Our goal for special session is to produce a work product that is legislatively passed and executively signed. It's through that lens that I hope we will all move forward with today's meeting.

Now, on to the presentation. Today, we will be presenting map $\mathrm{P}-000 \mathrm{C0109}$. This is the map reflected in the data packet in front of you, as well as being posted on www.FloridaRedistricting.gov.

As Chair Sirois mentioned, 10 of the districts in this map are exact copies of districts that the Legislature passed during the regular session. Those are Congressional Districts 1, 2, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, and 28. You can see those here on our screen.

The new proposed districts that will be presented by the Governor's Office today consists of Congressional Districts $3-19$ and 26 , as now seen on the screen. Given the new proposed districts are the focus of today's meeting, I would like to ask Chair Sirois to recognize the Governor's Office to explain these districts.

I'm more than happy to take questions on the Legislature's districts after the presentation but don't want to use our limited time redescribing configurations we've all previously heard several times.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much, Representative Leek.

Representative Skidmore?
DEMOCRATIC RANKING MEMBER SKIDMORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to move that the Governor's staff be put under oath while testifying in the Subcommittee today.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Skidmore, first of all, that procedure would be different from any of the testimony that we received in our Committee thus far, and as far as my length of service in the Legislature, I think that that would
be an extraordinary step that I don't feel is necessary and, frankly, I find absurd to seek to put a member of another branch of our government under oath.

So that is not well received by me, and as Chair, I will choose to decline your request. DEMOCRATIC RANKING MEMBER SKIDMORE: Follow-up?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Mr. Chair, point of --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Skidmore. DEMOCRATIC RANKING MEMBER SKIDMORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Pursuant to Rule 7.2, we have the ability to move to have members or guests who are testifying in committee to be put under oath, and I feel that it is a fair motion under the circumstances. And I'd like us to move through that process with a -if we could get a second and a vote on it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I second.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
Representative Skidmore, again, I'm going to voice that $I$ think that that is an extraordinary and unnecessary step for us to take. But I will put it to this Committee.




Committee and the record that would be appreciated. ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm Alex Kelly with the Executive Office of the Governor, and I'm a deputy chief of staff for the Governor. And I should say apologies for the PowerPoint. Obviously, I made the PowerPoint before House Bill 1-C was filed. So obviously, I'll be speaking to House Bill $1-C$ and $I$ guess obviously the identical content of Senate Bill 2-C today. But that's it again. Thank --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly, I'm sorry to interrupt you. If you could pull that microphone a little bit closer and just speak up a little bit.

ALEX KELLY: Thank you, my apology.
Again, thank you, member -- thank you -thank you, Mr. Chair, members, and thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the Executive Office of the Governor on the -- the proposed congressional reapportionment plan and to discuss our work and our contributions to this compromise plan.

Just to give you a very brief introduction, you know. Frequently today, I'll refer to improvements in the plan, and I think obviously the Chair and the -- and the sponsor gave a great
introduction to the plan. I'll be really speaking to just the 18 districts that are different, although sometimes I'll very generically refer to the plan as a whole. But $I$ really am really referring to our specific and my specific contributions to those 18 districts.

And oftentimes throughout the presentation, I will compare very specifically this plan, Plan 0109, to the primary plan the Legislature passed, Plan 8019. Although there are some instances where I'll refer to both, and I'll try to remember to identify both when I'm making a comment that definitely refers to both.

So for the purpose of my introduction, so I am the map drawer of the 18 districts in this plan. Obviously, I assumed that context would be helpful. So I am the map drawer of these districts, and to give you just a little bit of background of myself, 10 years ago, I was the staff director of the House Redistricting Committee here in the Florida House of Representatives.

Starting in January this year, I initially served for our office in a role of just providing guidance and oversight to our in-house counsel and our contract counsel and also a contract map drawer
that we brought on board to help initially start our engagement in this process.

For reference, that contract map drawer that we brought on board -- his name is Adam Foltz -- the initial map that we submitted on behalf of our office, map 0079, was drawn by -- was authored by Mr. Foltz. For just a little context for his background, he has been a map drawer for state Legislatures in Wisconsin and Texas, and actually currently he's drawing maps for the state of Texas at this present time.

Much like your professional staff, myself, our map drawer who drew our original map, map 0079, we've only drawn maps on behalf of state government. Adam Foltz and I collaborated on our office's second contribution, map 0094, and, again, I alone authored the 18 changes -- the 18 districts that are changed in the map before you today and as to how they compare to map 8019.

Some additional notes I'll point out at the outset that will be helpful for today, one, no one directed me to favor or disfavor a political party or incumbent throughout this process, and I did not draw any districts or make any districts or make any contributions with the intent of favoring or

so.
Three, in drawing the compromised plan that you -- that you have before you here today in this legislation and contributing to office's two prior proposals and in the totality of our office's engagement in this process, I have not in any way consulted with anyone outside the Executive Office of the Governor, our contract counsel, our contract map drawer, the Legislature, and its counsel. So I've only worked within the parties here in the House, Senate, and our office and our contract counsel.

In other words, I can confirm -- said differently, I can confirm that I've had no discussions with any political consultant, no partisan operative, no political party official concerning any plans proposed by our office and plans considered by the Legislature. In effect, I have engaged in this process, including authoring this proposed compromise plan, in a manner that meets the same high standards that you set forth for your professional staff.

And this plan that you're considering today in House Bill 1-C, Plan 0109, is indeed a compromise. It is the product of consultation and
collaboration between our office and House and Senate leadership, and it incorporates portions of the plan passed by the Legislature.

As Chair Leek noted, Senate Bill 102, Primary Plan 8019, concepts, of course, from 10 districts are included block for block in their entirety in this map. This compromise plan also includes concepts from our two prior office's submissions, Plan 0079 and 0094.

It also includes concepts from the map that was actually referred out of this subcommittee, map -- or Plan 8011 prior to -- or I guess out of this Subcommittee on its way to the full committee and aligns in several other ways that I'll describe with plans considered and the style of the House and Senate's map drawing.

As we noted -- in fact, I think, Chair Leek, you did a great job of really summarizing this slide. So I can probably just -- probably just skip this. But, you know, again, in general, the main crux of it is that I'm going to really focus my comments today on the 18 districts that did change.

First, in an effort to create a collaborative product, I worked off the Legislature's primary plan 8019. So while I was
seeking to remedy the Governor's veto message and make improvements throughout the map, I began my work downloading Plan 8019 and subsequently making changes.

Regarding the proposed plan before you today, it maintains the same number of performing majority-minority seats. It retains the Legislature's exact configuration as was shown in the map of the Panhandle districts and also Southeast Florida, essentially st. Lucie through Monroe Counties.

For reasons set forth in the detailed memorandum that -- I think it may have been distributed to the members prior to the meeting -the detailed memorandum that our general counsel wrote to accompany the Governor's veto message, the compromise proposal eliminates the racially gerrymandered versions of Congressional District 5, which were included in Senate Bill 102, both the primary plan and the secondary plan. Members, that legal memorandum is included -- again, I think hopefully it's been distributed. That legal memorandum is available.

In summary, Congressional District 5 in both the primary and secondary maps enacted by the

Legislature violates the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution because it assigns voters primarily on the basis of race but is not narrowly tailored to achieving -- to achieve a compelling state interest.

Again, that memorandum otherwise fully explains the Governor's legal objections to both versions of that district in the primary and secondary maps as it passed the Legislature.

I will say because I am the map drawer, I am not legal counsel to the Governor. I'm going to be careful to really focus my comments today on the drawing of the map and not venture into that legal world. It's a little beyond -- it's probably a little beyond my training. So I'm really going to -- going to focus on the map itself and those 18 districts.

Plan 0109 creates two new districts,
Districts 4 and 5, in Northeast Florida consistent with maps previously proposed by our office with some minor improvements. These two districts are race neutral and overall more compacts than Districts 4 or 5 in the maps passed by the Legislature.

In addition to resolving federal
constitutional objections raised by the Governor, the proposed compromise plan makes overall improvements with respect to Tier 2 redistricting criteria relative to the maps passed by the Legislature by bringing together some of the best concepts from the Legislature's prior maps and our office's maps.

Plan 0109 adjusts the congressional districts in Tampa, for example, the Tampa Bay area and the larger Gulf Region, stretching from Citrus down to Lee Counties and impacting some inland counties to create a hybrid compromise of the Legislature's and our office's maps.

These changes improve overall visual compactness, have a net effect of reducing a county split, and significantly increase the usage of Tier 2 political and geographical boundary lines.

In the Central Florida region, Plan 0109 aligns more closely with the map that was referred out of this subcommittee, Plan 8011, with one distinction that aligns with Senate Plan 8060 as it passed the Senate.

With respect to the similarities with the House's Plan 8011, specifically with respect to Congressional District 10 , we accept the position
articulated by the House's professional staff in this Subcommittee in that meeting, that this district is not subject to the Florida Constitution's non-diminishment standard because the benchmark district does not contain an African American population sufficient enough, large enough to reliably elect a candidate of their choice.

We understand that the House and Senate disagree on this point. However, because districts cannot be drawn on the basis of race unless there is a compelling reason to do so, the absence of agreement between the House and Senate on the need to treat District 10 as a minority protected district under the state Constitution indicates that a compelling basis for using race is lacking. Essentially, the disagreement between the two chambers, as articulated in the testimony, is a reason for a lack of evidence.

Accordingly, the proposed plan defers to the House's stated testimony in that Committee meeting or Subcommittee meeting, and my changes to the districts in Central Florida region, including District 10, are drawn on race -- on race neutral principles.

Again, these changes in Central Florida
result in Tier 2 improvements for the Central Florida region. And the combination of these changes in Central Florida and the Gulf Coast counties result in some additional Tier 2 improvements for other impacted districts like Districts 3, 6, and 11.

Lastly, in-between the submission of our office's second map, Plan 0094, and my drawing of this plan, 0109, I received feedback from House and Senate staff regarding our second maps overreliance on the boundaries of census-designated places. I was encouraged to follow the House and Senate's preferred methodology of boundary usage to increase our usage of major roadways, waterways, and railways for Tier 2 compliance.

Our second map closely adhered to county and city lines. So that was not a concern, although less frequently to the other Tier 2 recognized boundaries. Therefore, throughout these 18 revised districts, I adopted the Legislature's -- the House and Senate's preferred and clear articulation of Tier 2 compliance. So even where I was trying to articulate a general concept from one of our office's prior maps, I made such revisions using the Legislature's preferred approach to Tier 2
compliance.
In the next few slides, I'll just walk you through some key points regarding those Tier 2 improvements. First, the proposed plan reduces by one the number of county splits from 18 to 17 by keeping Citrus and Sarasota Counties whole in lieu of Polk, effectively a two-for-one swap.

Furthermore, where there are county splits, the number of ways in which those counties are split is reduced. For example, probably the most visible of those changes in a larger county is reducing the number of districts within a portion of Hillsborough County from four to three.

Second, the proposed plan reduced reliance on nongeographic and nonpolitical boundaries from 12.5 percent to 11.5 percent, not a significant difference but nonetheless showing that effort to again utilize more frequently, well-recognized political and geographical boundary lines in that Tier 2 manner. In other words, when I mentioned previously that I adopted the House and Senate's preferred way to articulate compliance, this is the result of that.

Third, although the mean compactness scores are largely equivalent to each other when comparing
my efforts in map 0109 and Plan 8019 as passed by the Legislature, the proposed plan improves the compactness score of the least compact district such that Plan 0109 would be, I believe, the first map considered by the Legislature where every district has a Reock and Polsby-Popper score greater than 0.2 .

I should say, moreover, visually we'll see in a few moments many of the districts are plainly just more circular, squared, more visually compact shapes that are more easily understandable.

Lastly, my changes to Plan 0109 stayed equal to the Legislature's achievement of only splitting 16 cities in primary plan 8019. There are some differences about which cities are split when comparing my revisions to the map passed by the Legislature, specifically I keep Cape Coral, Plant City, and Port Orange whole, whereas the Legislature kept Lakeland, St. Pete, and Longboat Key whole.

What I did take care to do in each of those cases was first to make sure that if there was a city split in that sort of three cities for three cities swap, to make sure that those cities nonetheless were still only contained within two districts, as the way the Legislature did, as the
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| 1 | way you did. |
| 2 | And additional -- and additionally, I tried |
| 3 | to make sure that those city splits still made |
| 4 | meaningful use of other Tier 2 metrics. For |
| 5 | example, as you know, Longboat Key is one of four |
| 6 | cities in the state that is itself split across two |
| 7 | different county lines. When I made the effort to |
| 8 | keep Sarasota county whole, that resulted in |
| 9 | splitting Longboat Key because both Manatee and |
| 10 | Sarasota were kept whole but kept whole in two |
| 11 | different districts, although certainly that was an |
| 12 | exchange of Tier 2 compliance that was well worth it |
| 13 | in order to keep an entire county whole. |
| 14 | I should say just as a disclaimer in saying |
| 15 | all of this, I don't mean to ever suggest -- and I |
| 16 | think, Chair Sirois, you got at this point -- I |
| 17 | don't ever mean to suggest there is a statistical |
| 18 | line in the sand for what Tier 2 -- Tier 2 compliant |
| 19 | compactness or county splits or city splits looks |
| 20 | like. |
| 21 | But at the same time, in authoring a |
| 22 | compromise plan, I recognized that I should author a |
| 23 | plan that recommends improvements and builds upon |
| 24 | the work of the Legislature, at the very least give |
| 25 | you a plan that never goes backwards and at least |

improves upon the work the Legislature has done, even though it's not necessarily, as you said, Chair, it's not a competition of statistics. And that is exactly what I've done.

So with that, I'm just going to proceed then to a more detailed visual explanation of the proposed compromise plan.

Statewide, the next two
slides -- really, the next four slides -- give you that view statewide. I don't think I need to cover these as much because you -- Chair, you covered these very much or Chairs, I should say, covered these very much in your opening.

But this is the statewide view, and then if you just scroll to pulling back the district labels, it was important for me, not just -- obviously we talked about statistics, not just to improve upon statistical goals in the map, like statistical compactness, but I also wanted these changes just to satisfy the eyeball test and offer some squaring up, circling up of the districts and greater usage of clear and visible boundary lines. And so the look and feel of the map mattered just as much as the statistics.

As you zoom in on just the districts that changed, I'll just skip a little bit again because
you just looked at something similar. One of the key facets of my work in the proposed plan was to make sure that there was no collateral, unintended consequences to my changes without making some sort of equal or better Tier 2 change.

So as I changed one part of the map -- for example, as you see, I split Polk County as part of the swap for keeping Citrus and Sarasota Counties whole. I get a little more in-depth as to exactly how that worked in a little bit. In doing so, I incorporated several Tier 2 changes to Polk County to make sure the new lines were still very meaningful.

And in saying that, two-thirds of the residents in proposed District 18 on the right are still coming from Polk County. Clearly, the Legislature was articulating options that centered a district largely around Polk County. And so even though I've split the county in order to pick up Sarasota and Citrus kept whole, I've done so in a way where Polk County is still the predominant twothirds of the population of a district.

Shifting to Districts 4 and 5 on these next couple slides, I already provided some context previously about the newly proposed composition of these two districts. Just some other general points that I didn't say earlier. The boundary lines between the two are mostly the St. Johns River.

As you know, Jacksonville is the one city in the state that is larger than a congressional district. So you must split it, and the river, which nearly equally divides the city, stands out as a logical, recognizable Tier 2 boundary. If you have to split the city somewhere, it stands out as maybe the most recognizable boundary to do so.

And in doing so, the maps on the right in Plan 0109 were overall the combined -- when you compare the compactness of the Districts 4 and 5 there compared to Districts 4 and 5 on the left, combined, they still improve the overall compactness of the two, even making the split through the river.

The southern boundaries of District 4 and 5
-- I should -- let me go back. The southern
boundaries of Districts 4 and 5 are still exactly as the Legislature proposed them. So the use of the Clay-Putnam line is the same as the Legislature proposed it, and where the split occurs in St. Johns County is exactly as the Legislature proposed it. So we didn't change the southern boundary. I didn't change the southern boundary of Districts 4 and 5 .

The last point about these two districts I want to make sure and show you, make sure you see, is that District 4 does need to cross the river at some point for the purposes of equal population, and that population difference was about 1500, 2000 residents. So knowing the district has to cross at some point, cross the St. Johns River, I tried to make that a meaningful crossing of the river.

Our original iteration of this crossing, I think, was less deliberate. In this improvement configuration, I used the bridges of the Arlington Expressway and Interstate 295 to literally allow a resident to not have to leave District 4 in order to traverse District 4. So again, just trying to use, even in the zero population work on a district, trying to use those boundaries in some kind of meaningful way.

The next few slides, slides 14 through 21, visualize my changes to the Gulf Counties from Citrus down to Lee and how those districts impact the counties inland to the east, north, and south. And I'm showing this in a way that I thought about it, trying to make Tier 2 improvements, how I thought and went through the map to make those changes. And essentially this is again a hybrid of
the Legislature's maps and our office's prior plans in this region.

In order to achieve worthwhile Tier 2 improvements to this region, I did have to revisit how the entire region was drawn. Slide 15, as this slide illustrates, the Legislature's decision to keep Broward, Osceola, and Polk Counties whole -nothing wrong with that decision. Obviously keeping counties whole is a great decision -- but the Legislature's decision to keep Broward, Osceola, and counties (sic) whole places limitations on what could be done in the Tampa Bay region and the counties to the north and south of Tampa Bay.

Keeping Broward -- I'm sorry -- Broward, Osceola, and Polk Counties whole creates effect -in effect -- I'm sorry. Go ahead -- in effect, creates a wall across three-quarters of the state. Breaking that wall in Polk County essentially gives the map drawer more flexibility in considering different options for drawing more compact districts and more adherence to political and geographical boundary lines in those Western Gulf Counties in the state of Florida.
So in effect, Polk County -- freeing Polk

County up then allowed additional considerations.

Otherwise, if it's kept whole, it limits what the map drawer can do in along Tampa Bay and north and south of Tampa Bay.

Slide 16, for example, this Congressional District 12 now includes all of Citrus County. In the Legislature's configuration, Citrus County was split. So now, Citrus County is kept whole in this district. Of course, obviously, now District 12 takes a much more squared-up, linear shape.

Just a few details about the district and the district just to the south of it, that pink district, District 15, District 12 is actually still a majority Pasco County seat, yielding about 141,000 Pasco County residents to District 15. The boundaries between 12 and 15 are almost entirely defined by state roads and municipal boundary lines. Zephyrhills is entirely included in District 15. Saint Leo, San Antonio, and Dade City are entirely included in District 12.

Taking a look then south of the Tampa Bay region, going down to Sarasota County, the changes I began in Polk also allowed keeping Sarasota County whole in District 17, which, like District 12, now includes two whole counties and portions of a third to get equal population.

line, as the Legislature did, and I largely utilized U.S. 19 as the southern divider. I get my equal population in that middle section of District 13, in the unincorporated Feather Sound area just north of St. Pete.

So while I split St. Pete, I'm doing so making a clear use of Tier 2 boundaries. As -- and as I built District 14 eastward and northward in Tampa Bay, again, I sought to ensure that the boundaries of the district were defined by clear, recognizable, Tier 2 boundaries like major roadways and as $I$ was trying to maintain something of a square or rectangular shape to District 14 to keep it compact.

You'll see in these next few slides where some of the linkage along predominantly roadways occurs between these districts, in this particular case, between the northern portion of Districts 14 and 15 and even District 12 in Pasco County. That's largely the Suncoast Parkway -- that's -- I'm sorry. It's largely the Suncoast Parkway squared off at a county road, as it essentially takes suncoast Parkway south.

You meet up with a county road, and then make a -- I guess if you were traveling south, you
make a left at Busch Boulevard, over to the municipality of Temple Terrace. And I have Temple Terrace highlighted on the map. The Legislature had a very similar configuration around Temple Terrace to accommodate the municipal boundaries wholly in a district.

And you'll see that I continued on the Suncoast Parkway into Pasco County, so if you take Suncoast Parkway north into Pasco County and then turn on State Road 54, which is a little curvy but nonetheless a state road to divide Districts 12 and 13.

What you see here in the unincorporated Brandon area is also a point of emphasis that I achieved a few times when three districts would meet at a point. I essentially tried to make use of a clear -- of clearly recognizable roadways in a Tier 2 manner to be distinguishable dividers between districts. So in this case, that juncture of U.S. 301 North and South and State Road 60 East and West makes a clear boundary when these three districts meet.

And as I was drawing District 16 from Manatee County north into Hillsborough County, I really wanted to hold State Road 60 as a clear
divider that could later be utilized in Polk County, where Districts 15 and 18 would eventually meet. The resulting District 15 also keeps Plant City whole, and despite going into Pasco and Polk Counties, is still approximately two-thirds populated by Hillsborough County residents.

The next five slides visualize my changes to the Central Florida region, again, largely returning to the concepts that this subcommittee passed in Plan 8011 with one exception.

That one exception -- we'll start there. That one exception being that I followed more closely to the Senate's concept for Congressional District 8 in that rather than taking the district into southern Volusia to get the last bit of equal population necessary, I turned the district into eastern Orange. That means this proposed plan only splits Volusia County two ways rather than into three different districts, bringing District 7 down to the Volusia-Broward County line without increasing the number of districts in Orange County. Essentially, there as a turning of the wheel, if you will, as to where these districts' boundaries were to square them up, make them more compact, but not actually have any negative impact
on the boundary usage of Orange county but have a positive on the boundary usage in Volusia County.

Again, as I mentioned in my opening, I authored District 10 in the House's plan to look more -- I'm sorry -- this plan to look more like the House's plan, Plan 8011, as it passed the Subcommittee, very compactly keeping several cities whole in either Districts 9, 10, or 11.

And as you zoom in, I highlighted the municipality -- as you zoom in, I highlighted the municipality of Edgewood, and right next to that is Belle Isle, and both are kept whole in District 9. That explains how District 9 extends upward just slightly, again, utilizing predominantly major roadways, but it's to accommodate these two municipalities and either put them wholly in one district or the other. In this case, puts them wholly in District 9. Winter Park and Maitland are kept whole in District 10, and Ocoee, Apopka, and Winter Garden are kept whole in District 11.

The boundaries between these districts are almost -- are also very much defined by Tier 2, either keeping the aforementioned cities whole, utilizing county boundaries -- like you look at District 10. That boundary is the Orange-Seminole


10, 11, and 12 then allowed me to reduce the number of districts in Marion County from three to two. The result is that both Districts 3 and 6's boundaries follow State Road 301 north to south, similar to the way the Legislature defined the boundaries just a little further east -- the Legislature just used different roadways -- 301 north to south, loop around the boundaries of Ocala, and then -- which is wholly in District 3, and then continue down Interstate 75 , so again just using very clear, Tier 2 boundaries.

The borders between Districts 6 and 11, just for your reference, in the Lake County area is mostly defined by city boundaries and waterways with Lady Lake, Eustis, and Mount Dora entirely in District 6, while Fruitland Park, Leesburg, and Tavares are entirely in District 11. The work to get equal population -- I referenced that little piece that's in Lake County of that eastern, northeastern piece of District 11 that's in Lake County, the work to get equal population is largely done tracking right there along State Road 46 as it exits Lake County, and that work is largely in the unincorporated Sorrento area.

The totality of this and other changes that brought, for example, District 7 down to Volusia and Broward, resulted in District 6 taking a more compact, overall circular shape. When you pull back on the map, it has a much more circular shape.

Of course, several of these changes had impacts on Polk County, and I wanted to make this -those impacts beneficial in a -- in a Tier 2 context. So I factored in how Districts 9, 11, and 15 share boundaries with District 18 , which, again, District 18 is actually about two-thirds of the residents are from Polk County, one-third from six whole rural counties.

First, regarding District 9, I did a couple things that were both helpful in filling out and smoothing this visual and statistical compactness as well for District 9, including also picking up a portion of incorporated Poinciana and the lake that essentially represents that piece of Polk County that otherwise sticks into Osceola county. I also extended District 9 out slightly at the northwest Osceola border, utilizing Highway 27 and the Ronald Reagan Parkway.

So the overall idea here was threefold. It creates -- as you pull back from the map, it creates
a visual smoothing of the line, about as smooth as the Polk County-Osceola border will give you a chance to do, but it creates a visual smoothing of the line, which does help with statistical and visual compactness. It eliminates the visual and noncompact effects of that inlet between Polk and Osceola, which, again, contributes to the overall compactness.

And I was trying to get the population just right in Districts 9 and 18 so that District 11 could have that essentially sort of nearly flat, very roadway-bounded eastern wall abutting up to District 10 in Orange County. So the visual effect of what was achieved in Orange county and how the Districts 9 and 18 interacted in Polk County all had a -- all had a significant effect on each other, and there was a lot of give and take to make that effect work.

As I referenced the boundaries between
Districts 11 and 15 -- I'm sorry -- 11 and 18, generally speaking, those boundaries focus around Interstate 4. However, you do see some extensions on either side of Interstate 4 between Districts 11 and 18.

Polk City is entirely included in District

11, but there are a couple of pieces of Polk City that go across Interstate 4. Auburndale is included entirely in District 18, but there are a couple pieces of the city that go across the Interstate. And I mentioned earlier, while Lakeland is split in this map, I wanted to make sure it wasn't split in more than two districts.

So as you get close to District 15 there, where you see, again, another jumping across I-4, those are just boundaries of the city of Lakeland and then some of the zero-population work that I did as well.

And then when you look at the boundaries of District 11, 15, then back down to 18, U.S. Highway 98 is largely the vast majority of that boundary, really extending out of Pasco County into Polk County through Lakeland, utilizing U.S. Highway 98 for most of that.

The southern boundary, which I made reference to before when looking at the Hillsborough region, is state Road 60. As I mentioned previously, I wanted to hold that boundary line in Hillsborough County with 15 north of that boundary, 16 south of it, taking that boundary out -- boundary out of the county so that that southern connection
between 15 and 18 would still utilize State Road 60. And then zero population work there was done just north of the city boundaries of Mulberry in Polk County.

Again, as I mentioned earlier in my presentation, overall, this map equals the city splits, 16, of the Legislature's primary plan, but, of course, some of the splits are different. And, you know, and I referenced earlier that I made sure that where there was a split, a city was only split two days.

Furthermore, the resulting District 18 is again still a two-thirds Polk County district. I could clearly see that the Legislature was attempting to create in pretty much any map that was considered a majority Polk district. While this is a different configuration, I've still achieved the same overall goal of creating a majority Polk County district in District 18 with numerous Tier 2 considerations and improvements around it.

Just moving on to the last couple slides, looking at Southwest Florida, I had to make some decisions as a result of those decisions I discussed previously, largely in part due to the Tier 2 efforts to keep Sarasota whole and creating District
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| 1 | 17 with all of Sarasota, all of Charlotte, and |
| 2 | incorporated portions of Lee Counties. |
| 3 | My newly composed District 17 required me |
| 4 | to equal -- equalize population for District 18 |
| 5 | through the entirety of Hendry County and then |
| 6 | finding approximately another 4500 residents |
| 7 | elsewhere. |
| 8 | In our office's prior plan, I found those |
| 9 | residents in western Palm Beach County, in the |
| 10 | cities and around the cities around Belle Isle, |
| 11 | Pahokee, and that area. However, in this compromise |
| 12 | plan, as we discussed earlier, as the Chair |
| 13 | discussed, we were not affecting some of the |
| 14 | Southeast Florida districts. So I wanted to hold |
| 15 | the Palm Beach County line as the Legislature did in |
| 16 | its plan. |
| 17 | So zooming in a little more closely, as |
| 18 | you'll see on this last slide, I equalized the |
| 19 | population in Collier County, which was already |
| 20 | split once, extending District 18 along State Road |
| 21 | -- kind of that angle along state Road 82, down |
| 22 | State Road 29 North, and then east along County Road |
| 23 | 846 to get those additional 4500 residents for |
| 24 | District 18 and balance the population. |
| 25 | And for District 26, I had to further |

extend District 26's western boundaries closer towards unincorporated East Naples, utilizing roadways and waterways as boundaries between 26 and 19, except where necessary to equalize population. The resulting District 26 still has a Hispanic voting age population of 73.22 percent.

And with that said, Mr. Chair, that is my explanation of the changes in House Bill 1-C.

REPRESENTATIVE LEEK: Thank you, Mr. Kelly, for that presentation. Additionally, members, this bill appropriates $\$ 1$ million to the Department of State for expenses related to the litigation of the congressional map. The bill also includes language related to state courts. It requires any state court challenge to the congressional map to be filed in Leon County.

All changes based on state law -- or excuse me -- all challenges based on state law to be filed in state court, rather than federal court, permits any state court challenge to raise both state law claims and, to the extent the circuit court has jurisdiction, federal law claims, and finally makes explicit that nothing in the bill precludes federal courts from deciding challenges based on the federal law.

Mr. Chairman, that is the bill.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much, Chair Leek.

For the members of the audience, I noticed several more folks have joined us. Just as a matter of housekeeping, if you would like to provide public testimony today, please fill out a speaker form with the Sergeant at Arms. They have those available.

Members, we're now going to move into questions on the bill. I would ask that all questions go through the Chair, and I want to offer my reminder once again about my expectation for decorum and civility in this Committee.

Members, again, just kind of looking at the clock, we can remain in questions -- maybe we'll give it to about 5:05, 5:10, see where we're at. I want to make sure that we have plenty of time remaining to receive that public testimony.

Ladies and gentlemen, we appreciate you being here today with us.

And with that, we will move into questions.
Representative Hunschofsky.
And, members, just kind of to roadmap
things out, what I'd like to do is give members a couple of bites at the apple, perhaps a couple of
questions and a follow-up. And then to make sure everybody has had an opportunity, we'll rotate through and then entertain a second round of questions, time permitting.

Representative Hunschofsky, you are recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Thank you, Chair Sirois. And how many questions is that, that we're allowed in our first round? Just out of curiosity.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Go for it.
REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Okay. I'll go
for it.
Thank you very much for presenting the map that you drew. You mentioned that this was a compromise map. Yet when we voted on the maps that we passed, we had a map, and we had a secondary map, one map, not -- so I'm not understanding how this is a compromise. Could you explain what you mean by that? Because I thought the secondary map was the compromise and even the first map.

ALEX KELLY: Chair?
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Sir, you're recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you.
At that time, our office had not agreed on
either of those two maps. There were obviously pieces of those two maps that we've incorporated here, of course, 10 of those districts exactly from 8019, and there are concepts from those two maps that we've sort of hybrided (sic) with concepts from the maps that our office previously published. But we didn't come out and support either of those two maps.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: And to offer further clarification, the map that is being presented today by Chair Leek and the Governor's Office has provided us with commentary on includes many portions of what the Legislature passed.

Representative Hunschofsky, you're recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Thank you, Chair Sirois.

So we had a whole bunch of meetings during committee weeks about all the Tiers, and it was drilled into us the Tier 1 and the Tier 2. I noticed in your presentation there was a strong concentration on Tier 2 , which we were all told in every single committee meeting we've been in, that those are only to be looked at after the Tier 1 standards have been satisfied.

And one of the Tier 1 standards that came up when we had Mr. Popper (phonetic) was the fact that districts shall not be drawn -- and I'm reading this from what was presented to us from the House staff as backup -- districts shall not be drawn with the intent or result of denying or abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or to diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice. A Tier 2 standard is districts shall, where feasible, utilize existing political and geographical boundaries.

So with that, I ask, why were the changes made to Districts 4 and 5 looking solely at Tier 2 standard, even though a Tier 2 standard is after a Tier 1 standard has been met, and yet the Tier 1 standard that I talked about doesn't seem to be met with the line that you drew? So what was -- why was a Tier 2 standard given priority over a Tier 1 standard in that case?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly, you're recognized.

ALEX KELLY: Thank you.
And first and foremost, I did note in my testimony that we didn't draw any districts with the
intent of favoring or disfavoring an incumbent or political party, and that is a Tier 1 standard. In addition, all the districts that we've drawn are contiguous, and that is a Tier 1 standard.

The other Tier 1 standard regarding diminishment, of course, was the major focus of the Governor's veto message and really the major focus of discussion. And after reviewing your work, the work of the Legislature overall, it was clear that a district couldn't be drawn to both satisfy the U.S. Constitution and the court's and the Legislature's understanding of the state Constitution. In such a situation, the federal Constitution has to prevail.

A plain language -- as I'm not -- as I'm not an attorney, a sort of plain language way of saying that is there was no obligation to redraw District 5 as it was -- as it was drawn in the benchmark. There was no obligation. There was no lawfully drawn district to not diminish from. REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Chair?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative
Hunschofsky, one final question, and then I'd like to move on to make sure we have adequate time for all members.

REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: All right.


1 Mr. Chair.

And obviously, you know, in terms of compactness, as the Chair noted in the beginning, there's no -- there's no one right redistricting map. That said, the districts that you're referencing are significantly more compact, significantly more compact in the benchmark. Visually, statistically, they are more compact than the maps that passed this Legislature. So they are more compact districts, and there was a rational choice to be made.

As I noted in my comments about those districts, Jacksonville is the lone city in the entire state that is larger than a congressional district. So it's a city you're going to divide, and a logical division to consider is the St. Johns River, which happens to almost divide the city in half on its own naturally. So it's a very logical dividing line.

It's clearly well-recognized in the community. So clearly, a constituent would have no question -- are they a voter in District 4? Are they a voter in District 5? -- which is the point of drawing a clear boundary line that follows a major roadway, a highway, or so -- or a waterway and so
forth. So it was a very logical and compact choice to make, and we had already satisfied Tier 1 concerns.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, sir.
Ranking Member skidmore, you are recognized in questions.

DEMOCRATIC RANKING MEMBER SKIDMORE: Thank you, Chair Sirois.

Thank you, Mr. Kelly, for being here today. This is -- I'm going to go a little slow because it's a lot to digest. It was a lot of -- a lot of changes. So does 109 split as many counties as 8019 or more or less?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly, you're recognized.

ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
It splits one less county, and also in addition to that, for those counties that are -that are split, it splits those counties fewer times. So it makes a couple types of county improvements. It keeps Sarasota and Citrus whole in exchange for splitting Polk. So it picks up a single county split -- or, I'm sorry, a single county whole. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Skidmore,


There were other opportunities for Tier 2 improvements throughout the rest of the map.

And so a veto message, of course, the veto message spoke to the Governor's most significant concern throughout the map, but it wasn't a secret that we had already published two complete maps before and made other recommendations throughout the rest of the map.

So with the opportunity to take a look at the rest of the map, obviously we deferred to the Legislature exactly block for block in 10 of those seats, but as I articulated, there were a number of opportunities, keeping counties whole -- sorry -keeping counties whole, the visual compactness of the map as well, and just overall a more clear usage, a more consistent usage of political and geographical boundary lines. So there were a number of improvements throughout the map.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Representative Skidmore. Let's do a follow-up.

And then we have Representative Benjamin next on my list, and we'll come back to you in the next round.

DEMOCRATIC RANKING MEMBER SKIDMORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you -- thank you for the response. I'm going to pick -- I have to pick which question I'm going to ask. So the Governor's position is that there was no compelling reason to keep CD 5, but wasn't CD 5 actually drawn by the court? And is that not a compelling interest?

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
The court got it wrong.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Benjamin.
REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Benjamin, I apologize.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are many new members of the audience that have joined us. I just want to offer a reminder again about the decorum that we have in this Committee. We don't have loud reactions in this Committee. We have business to conduct. We are pressed for time.

Representative Benjamin, you are recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You represented earlier that the law and constitutional arguments are somewhat outside of your purview, but yet you've told us now that the court got it -- got it wrong. And -- but in that decision, the court was attempting to reconcile the federal Constitution and the State Constitution. Would that be a fair statement?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Sir.
ALEX KELLY: Mr. Chair.
I'm not aware, although I'm happy to defer to counsel to fill out this answer, but I'm not aware of where the state court -- the state supreme Court was attempting to reconcile something between federal and state law. But I'm happy to defer to counsel if there is something I'm unaware of.

REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Benjamin.
REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Thank you.
Can you then tell me how did the court get it wrong?

ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly.

ALEX KELLY: And I'll -- and I'll offer sort of, you know, I think a two-part answer here. One, I walked through in my testimony that that was
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| 1 | a seat drawn predominantly based on one criteria, |
| 2 | based on race. It is a racial gerrymander, and |
| 3 | there was a failing to demonstrate that compelling |
| 4 | state interest in doing so. |
| 5 | The other side of this, I can speak to from |
| 6 | my time at that time working in the Legislature from |
| 7 | 2009 to 2012. The driving question behind Fair |
| 8 | Districts was a district -- the poster child |
| 9 | district was a district that sprawled from |
| 10 | Jacksonville to Orlando. And in the end resolution |
| 11 | a few years later, the court drew a district that |
| 12 | sprawls from Jacksonville to Gadsden County. It |
| 13 | didn't remedy the issue. It just replaced one |
| 14 | gerrymandered district with another. |
| 15 | REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Mr. Chair? |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN SIROIS: (Indiscernible) |
| 17 | REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Thank you. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Benjamin, |
| 19 | you're recognized. |
| 20 | REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Thank you. |
| 21 | Are you aware that compliance with the |
| 22 | Voting Rights Act by the courts has been considered |
| 23 | a compelling state interest? |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly. |
| 25 | ALEX Kelly: Thank you, Mr. Chair. |

That's a great question, and, again, you know, I'm not counsel for the Governor. But I'll speak to the extent of my knowledge of the Voting Rights Act. The Voting Rights Act speaks to districts where the minority community is 50 percent or more of the total community in the district, so in other words, if the African American or Hispanic voting age population of the district is 50 percent or more of the voting age population in the district.

That's not the end of that analysis, but that is a sort of introduction to that analysis. The district in question does not meet that threshold. So I don't see any scenario in which the Voting Rights Act is implicated by Congressional District 5.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Benjamin, let's have one follow-up in this round, and then we're going to move to Representative Joseph. Thank you, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In determining that it's not -- it was not narrowly tailored to be a compelling state interest, was it that it wasn't narrowly tailored or was it
that it wasn't a compelling state interest? Which 14th Amendment or strict scrutiny analysis are we looking at?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Mr. Chair.
I'm not sure I could answer that question directly. I can just say, in general, the obligation to define that compelling state interest is an obligation the map drawer has. So I, as someone who am saying that that district didn't define that, whoever drew that district has to meet that obligation, not me.

Counsel could probably elaborate a little bit further on the question if you want.

REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: I would want.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: If you have -- if your counsel is present --

ALEX KELLY: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: -- they can speak to the remaining portion of Representative Benjamin's question, and then we'll move on to Representative Joseph.

ALEX KELLY: Ryan Newman, the Governor's general counsel will hopefully help answer the remainder of the question.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Newman, you're recognized.

RYAN NEWMAN: Great. Thank you. Sure, I'd be happy to answer that. CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Forgive me. Representative Benjamin.

REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Mr. Chair, can you have him go over the how the court got it wrong more specifically (Indiscernible)

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: If you would speak into the microphone and offer that -- offer that question please.

REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Can you give us more of a legal analysis as to the Governor's constitutional challenge to the -- to the map?

RYAN NEWMAN: Sure. So --
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Newman, you're recognized.

RYAN NEWMAN: Thank you.
Sure. On the issue of the federal constitutionality of District 5 as it was originally configured, the Florida Supreme Court never actually addressed that question. That question has never been resolved by the federal -- by the -- by the Florida Supreme Court as to whether or not District


Supreme Court has only assumed that compliance with the Voting Rights Act is a sufficient compelling interest to justify a race-based district. That's very narrow, and the supreme Court has only been willing to assume that much. It's never actually definitively held that.

So with respect to compliance with the Voting Rights Act, okay, there's two components to the Voting Rights Act. There's Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, and there's Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act no longer applies in this context because of the Shelby County case, right, which wiped out Section 4.

So Section 5 is no longer operative, but I do want to make an important point here. Section 5 never applied to the state of Florida as a whole. It never has. So there was never -- even back, you know, in 1968 or whatever, you know, back when the, you know, the evidentiary basis for the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was being assembled, there was never sufficient evidence to determine that the entire state of Florida should be subject to the Voting Rights Act. It was only determined that five counties, none of which are in Northern Florida,
were subject to the Voting Rights Act for section 5.
So Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, I guess my point is, that's just out of the picture, all right. So that just leaves us then with section 2, okay. So does Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act require that District 5 in Northern Florida be drawn? And the answer has to be no. Why? Because of the Gingles preconditions that are required for making out a Section 2 claim.

You can't even make out a section 2 claim unless you satisfy the Gingles precondition. The first precondition -- and this is what Alex was trying to get to. The first precondition is, is there a minority population that's reasonably compact, in a reasonably compact geographic location that constitutes a majority of the district?

And District 5, notwithstanding the fact that it's gerrymandered. I mean, the district was drawn for the specific purpose of connecting African American populations in Jacksonville with the African American population in Tallahassee and Gadsden Counties.

And even then that district is not a majority-minority district. It only got up to 44 percent or so, 44, 45 percent if my -- if my memory
serves. And that's even without respecting traditional districting criteria.

So that district cannot be -- is not required by the Voting Rights Act, and because it's not required by the Voting Rights Act, it doesn't -cannot serve as a compelling interest to justify the drawing of a district in Northern Florida based on race, okay.

So the only -- the only question then is whether or not mere compliance with the Florida Constitution alone by itself is a compelling interest to justify a race-based district.

And in this context, where you're having to ignore all traditional districting criteria, which is what the federal courts look at to determine whether or not, you know, the district is necessary, it cannot be a compelling interest, for the same reason that we would never say that, if Florida had a law segregating the schools, that that would somehow trump the Equal Protection Clause. Why? Because, you know, the Florida Constitution says so. The only point -- my only point is mere reliance on the Florida Constitution cannot by itself be enough. Now, don't get me wrong. That's not to say that there are other applications of the

Florida Constitution's non-diminishment standard that could be or that could survive strict scrutiny.

One example would be if you had a sufficiently compact African American community, right, in a district. You can't necessarily just carve up that district. That perhaps -- that perhaps could satisfy strict scrutiny.

But what does not and cannot satisfy strict scrutiny is trying to cobble together disparate minority communities from across Northern Florida to cobble together a district that might perform for the minority community.

And I think that -- that's where District 5 goes wrong because it's clearly cobbled together. It's clearly a gerrymander, not unlike the preceding district that went from Jacksonville down to Orlando, you know, as a salamander-type district that went from Jacksonville down to Orlando. But that's the -- that's the fundamental problem. There's no compelling interest here because the Voting Rights Act does not require this district to be drawn in Northern Florida, and mere compliance alone without more of the nondiminishment standard in the Florida Constitution cannot satisfy strict scrutiny, at least as the

Supreme Court has explained it.
And just to put a bell on all of this, I mean, the Supreme Court just spoke again just a matter of weeks ago and slapped down a Wisconsin map for containing, you know, improperly racially drawn districts because the --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Sir, if you'd -- if you'd bring it in for a landing for us, we have members with other questions.

RYAN NEWMAN: Thank you. I could go on and on. To -- yeah. So the Wisconsin -- the Supreme Court came in, sort of struck down the Wisconsin -you know, a summary reversal of the Wisconsin maps for not satisfying strict scrutiny.

So strict scrutiny is a very, very high -very high standard, and it just wouldn't satisfy it in this context.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
Representative Benjamin, I've put you on the list for our second --

REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Well --
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: -- round of questions.
REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: -- I don't -- I
don't have -- well --
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Let me --

REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: -- just thank you, Mr. Chair, because that's the heart and the crux of the changes that were made, and I think that analysis was much needed. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Representative Benjamin.

Representative Joseph, you're recognized.
REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Wow, so many questions. Earlier, you were asked in the Senate to define race neutral in your approach in drawing these maps. Can you define that for us please?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Essentially not factoring in race as I'm drawing a district.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Joseph.
REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: What, if any,
analysis did you do regarding retrogression in creating these maps to analyze both black representation and Hispanic representation or Latino representation?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Great question. And I didn't have a need to with the districts that $I$ was drawing. So I didn't do any kind of analysis like that. Like I didn't do any kind of functional analysis.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Joseph.
REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Looking at your version of, I guess, CD 26, which spans from the Everglades to Collier County in Miami all the way to Hialeah, talk to us about your premise in drawing that particular map in crossing over the way you did.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
So that district -- if you -- and if you think about it in the context of the district that the Legislature drew and where I made changes, the eastern boundaries of the district in Miami-Dade County are identical to the boundaries that the Legislature drew. The western half of the county is the portions of the -- portions of the district, I should say, that I drew.

So as I was approaching that area with
District 18, I described earlier that I was in need of population to complete District 18 , and $I$
assigned Hendry County, the totality of Hendry County as a whole county, to district 18. And using some major roadways in the unincorporated Immokalee area of northern Collier, I then moved a little bit of Collier County into District 18 as well, again though using those major roadways, not splitting any cities in the process.

The result of that, I made changes to District 26 exclusively in the -- in the Hendry County side, pulling that district out of Hendry County in its entirety and moving that district, District 26 then, further east into unincorporated East Naples basically and utilizing the major roadways there. There's a few waterways as well, so trying to utilize some clear, natural boundaries. Overall, as I mentioned earlier in my testimony, the Hispanic voting age population of the district is still quite high. It's a little more than 73 percent Hispanic voting age population. So again, I didn't change any of the boundaries in the Miami-Dade County side of the district, just exclusively in the Collier and Hendry side of the district.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Joseph. REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you,

Mr. Chair.
So when you say you were in need of population, you were specifically referring to the Latino population to create this district.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Really both. I was in need of population initially just because $I$ was taking the district out of Hendry County and then also out of part of the Immokalee -- unincorporated Immokalee area. The total population shift there was roughly -- my math may be a little bit off -- but about 45,000 people.

So, in effect, I needed people for equal population, first and foremost, to complete the district, which meant that I had to push a little further, draw a little further into -- into sort of the coastal side of Collier County but obviously not that far.

That said, knowing that this is a
historically performing majority-minority Hispanic seat, I was watching those numbers carefully to make sure that in terms of the overall Hispanic voting age population, I was staying very close to the benchmark seat, which $I$ think is maybe a little bit more than 74 percent.

So the seat that I drew, the percentage is around 73, still very high, still at a threshold that should perform for Hispanic -- a majority Hispanic voting age population seat.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Joseph, let's do a follow-up, and then I'm going to move to Representative Brown, and we'll try to come back.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you.
So your analysis basically presumes that the Latino voters vote cohesively. And you may or may not be aware of this, but in that area, you have lots of different kind of Latino groups, and I don't know if your analysis, based on what you're telling me, you did not take that into account.

So my question for you is this map basically takes the same approach as the House and Legislature's previous maps for District 21 , but these two Latino electorates are separate in terms of how they tend to perform.

So I guess what I'm asking is, is that thinking correct, that this map basically takes the same approach as the House and Legislature's previous maps for District 21 and District 28. And in terms of CD 26 that I'm specifically asking about, it's motivated by that same idea of Latino
cohesion in terms of how they perform?
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And I think I can answer the question, although I will concede -- in terms of your reference to the prior district numbers, I'm not totally clear which maps you're referring to.

But in -- but in general, I was fairly confident that a Hispanic voting age population that's higher than 73 percent is still going to maintain that historical performance for this district that has performed Hispanic for, to my knowledge, at least a couple decades. So I was fairly confident that with such a high Hispanic voting age population, even though it was a slight drop, that overall, it wouldn't -- it wouldn't warrant any concerns.

And obviously I had to -- I had to get equal population as well, and no matter what I did, I was also wanting to make sure that if I was assigning Hendry County to a different district, I wanted to make sure that, one way or another, I kept Hendry County whole.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
Representative Brown.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Mr. -CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Questions.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As it relates to -- I know there was -- in your presentation, you talked about improving the maps. And so specifically to district 10 here, the little barbell-shaped lob, I wanted to know -- can you explain sort of the Orange County configuration and whether or not -- or how it's more Tier 2 compliant than the other vetted alternatives that we have done or developed or even debated?

And specifically recognizing the political and geographical boundaries for its perimeter. I believe right now it's 63 percent, and I know for the 8019 for CD 10, I believe it was 82 percent. So we're talking about improving. It seems as though it's going backwards. When we look at even the 8060 map that we've also kind of reviewed, it also used those boundaries, but it recognized it as a 92 percent, so I mean, stellar boundaries. How is this particular configuration compliant and an improvement?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Sure. Thank you.

comes up into District 10, and it's -- the wall of that is a significant roadway. And on this side and on this side, in-between are two municipal boundaries. Some of the zero-population work is done just to the north of that.

As you go east of those two municipalities, it's just following one nice, clear roadway. It then follows -- I think it's actually the eastern end of that Orange County section of leading out of 10, still follows major roadways and waterways as well, but the eastern boundary between 10 and 8 is predominantly roadways and waterways.

Most of these boundaries are defined in Tier 2. I don't know if the application picks up all of them and gives us credit for the statistics on all of them, but the boundaries of this district, outside of equal population, are exclusively Tier 2 boundaries. The district is very compact, and it overall allowed some other districts around it to become more compact.

One of the things that $I$ did was the portions of District 9 -- and obviously, you know, you always have to look at any district, you know, in respect to what it also causes around it. The portions of District 9 as the Legislature passed them were more on the eastern side of that Orange County.

Going north, I pulled those portions more flat and spread across, which helps with your circular test, so like a Reock test or a PolsbyPopper. It's not a massive difference, but it is a little bit of a difference the way that it's drawn. And again those are just predominantly absent some of the zero population work, just major roadways defining those boundaries.

The other visual effect here that $I$ really
like is how District 11 now -- you know, District 11, when it comes from sort of the Lake-Seminole area, it just follows along the seimone county border. It then goes under the city boundaries of Apopka. Obviously, I didn't want to break the city of Apopka. It goes under the city of Apopka, follows predominantly one roadway. I did note in my testimony that that roadway actually has a break in it. So you couldn't follow that roadway the entirety of the western wall of District 10 .

But, in effect, District 11 in the configuration -- in fact, I'll take one step back. In the configuration considered by the Legislature, District 11 , because 10 is centered really around

Apopka, I believe Ocoee, Winter Garden, that area, District 11 has to then have this arm underneath District 10.

Because I was able to create that more, you know, flat use of boundary space between 7-11, 1011, 9-11, in effect, there's no arm then anymore to District 11, and that contributed, along with what $I$ did in Citrus County, to being able to square up District 11 as well.

So the changes that I made were never in respect to just one district, although I did use district -- I did use clear roadway boundaries and municipal boundaries almost exclusively and county boundaries with District 10 , but the changes were made in respect to all the districts so that all of the districts took on a little more of a statistical, aesthetic compactness and again overall just tried to use those clear boundary lines between them.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Brown, before you continue, thank you, sir.

Members, just to kind of give you a sense of where we're at. We're coming up on a period where we need to wrap up questions. We have significant public testimony, our citizens here with
us today at the capital. We also have an amendment. We have debate and want to give Chair Leek and opportunity for final comments as well.

So Representative Brown, you are recognized to continue in questions, but, members, please be mindful of our time.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I definitely will keep that in mind because I actually do have questions surrounding when we're speaking of those surrounding districts. I have quite a few questions based off of the percentages and points there compared to 8060. But I'll just ask this question so that my other colleagues can have an opportunity at this apple.

I know the Governor stated written objection to 8019, and in that written statement, he focused on 4 and 5. And so why are we here messing with the Orlando area, particularly District 10, in ways that clearly worsen the compliance to the constitutional criteria?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly, you're recognized.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And I should start maybe in reverse order
of the question. I would disagree with the last point that was made. I do believe this composition -- and this composition is very similar to what this Subcommittee passed in Plan 8011. I believe really demonstrates strong compliance with the law, and I believe actually this composition, again, similar to the product passed out of this Subcommittee, I think was actually better than the final product passed out of the Legislature overall.

So going back to this subcommittee work and this Subcommittee's work was similar to the earlier plans that we submitted out of our office. Your question is similar to that of which Representative Skidmore asked earlier. And while the Governor's veto message was driven largely by what was happening in Northeast Florida, we were never secret about submitting maps.

We submitted public maps before out of our office. Those maps articulated thoughts and ideas for consideration by the Legislature all around the state. And so obviously the major significant constitutional concern centered around Districts 4 and 5 in Northeast Florida.

As though we looked at the Legislature's final composition ideas that we had prior to that,
it was clear that I could go into the map and make improvements and really in many cases taking some hybrids of ideas that, as Chair Sirois said earlier, some hybrids of ideas that really combine some of the best work product of the Legislature and maps that we proposed and really trying to pull those ideas together to get the best out of these maps.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: All right. Thank you, Representative Brown.

Representative Driskell, you're recognized in questions.

REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Are you saying that because the Governor doesn't like CD 5 as it currently exists that you don't have to regard CD 5 as a benchmark district for which a functional analysis is required?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: You're recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Not exactly the way that you said that, but the crux of the argument -- and Ryan laid out the argument in detail well earlier -- the crux of the argument is that the district violates the U.S. Constitution. So if the district violates federal law, there's no district with which there is an
obligation to look at diminishment. The district was unlawful to begin with.

So at that point, the Legislature had no obligation to consider that question. At that point, the Legislature just has Nassau County, Duval County, Clay County, St. Johns County, which in those four counties alone you could fit two whole congressional districts plus start a third district very compactly, very adherent to standards in the State Constitution.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Driskell.
REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

But that's your opinion, correct? That's not actually the current legal standard. The current legal standard, as $I$ understand it, is that when there's a benchmark district, you're supposed to perform a functional analysis; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
No. No. There's no obligation to perform a functional analysis on that district, and as our general counsel noted, as the memorandum notes, as I summarized earlier, that district as drawn in the benchmark violates the Equal Protection Clause of
the United States Constitution. Attempts to redraw that district in various configurations violated the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution.

So there's no need to do a functional analysis for a district that, on its face, is unlawful, and the Legislature was not obligated to redraw. And that's really the analysis that Mr. Newman gave, our -- our legal memorandum gave.

REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: I just -- I don't want to beat a dead horse --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative, just go one more -- one last follow-up, and then we're going to move on.

REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay. Not a follow-up, new question about Tampa Bay.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: You're recognized.
REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So if we follow the map that you've prepared and that we're reviewing today, it actually follows the exact -- the net effect is that it looks like it's following the exact same strategy that led to what was determined to be a partisan gerrymander that was struck down last decade, packing Democrats


15, just meet along major roadways. So they're just nice, clean, compact seats that follow those major roadways. I'm unaware of the data you're referencing.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
Representative Hunschofsky, you're recognized for one brief question.

REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: I'll try my best, Chair Sirois. Thank you.

I have a -- I'm going to put it kind of, I guess, all together. We talk constantly about the Tier 2, and I keep going back to the Tier 1 that was told to all of us from multiple times in our committees. And the Tier 2, we're picking bodies of water in certain places, but in other places, it doesn't seem to bother us that we cross bodies of water.

My question is -- and this is all related in one, Chair Sirois, how are you defining race neutral, where did that term come from, and how do you -- how do you explain CD 20, for example, when you say that?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative
Hunschofsky, I think the initial part of your question has been asked and answered in the
testimony that's been offered.
Mr. Kelly, if you'd like to speak to Congressional District 20, you're recognized.

ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And I really can't speak to Congressional District 20. We didn't draw Congressional District 20. So I think I would have to defer to your professional staff or the Legislature as a whole, but we didn't draw Congressional District 20.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative
Hunschofsky, can you repeat your question as it relates to Congressional District 20?

REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Yes. I guess my question, I keep going back to, as I did the last time we had a map in front of us that we were voting on, Tier 1 criteria, the one that I mentioned before, versus the Tier 2 criteria. You bring up the term race neutral. I'm not really sure what that means, and I'm not really sure where that comes from.

The map you presented to us has a district that does move around and is obviously done so to protect a racial group from being able to pick a candidate of their choice. So how do you explain that as part of what you were talking about before?

I don't know if that's making sense.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Staff is recognized.
Ms. Kelly.
LEDA KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you, Representative, for the question.

So for -- and I'll kind of piece together a couple of things that have been mentioned today already with regards to District 20.

So in the Legislature's perspective, that's a protected black performing district. So we performed our functional analysis on the benchmark district and then recreated it to ensure that that minority group can elect a candidate of their choice.

One difference that I'd say between Congressional District 20 and, I guess, previous iterations of Congressional District 5 is the threshold of the voting age population. So you've heard the Governor's Office elude several times today to the Voting Rights Act and Section 2 analysis.

The first condition of the Gingles prerequisite is to have a majority-minority district. In the benchmark district and in the one that's recreated in this plan and prior iterations,

CD 20 is above 50 percent and does meet that first criteria for if someone was to bring a Section 2 violation against the map. So we're obviously aware of that and wanted to recreate it to be in alignment with that law as well. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Can I -CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much. Members, I apologize. We have an amendment -- we have an amendment that we need to take up. We have members of the public that have traveled here today to be with us. We need to -- we need to move, Representative Joseph, into your amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: (Indiscernible)
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Joseph, you are recognized to present your amendment. Members, this is amendment barcode 959221. Representative Joseph, you are recognized. REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So in this bill, at lines 3627 through 3647, it creates Section 7, which limits venue for legal actions challenging federal congressional districts to state court. That makes no sense to me. The question I would have asked had I had the opportunity to do so was, what was the rationale for
that?
So this basically -- this amendment is quite simple and straightforward. It removes those lines, such that these congressional federal seats can be challenged in federal court. That is the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much. Having explained the amendment, members, are there questions on the amendment? Questions on the amendment?

Seeing none, is there public testimony on the amendment?

We have none submitted, ma'am. We're on the amendment now, but we're going to get to public testimony on the bill in just a moment. I appreciate you being here today. Just one moment.

Seeing no public testimony on the amendment, members, is there debate on the amendment?

Ranking Member Skidmore, you are recognized to debate on the amendment.

DEMOCRATIC RANKING MEMBER SKIDMORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thank you, Rep Joseph, for the amendment.

I too was unsure why we needed to do this and why we would want to try and circumvent the federal courts and an opportunity for individuals to work through that process? I don't think it's -this is necessary. We've managed for hundreds of years without, you know, weaponizing the process. I'm not sure why we need to do it now.

We have only had these maps for a few hours. We are still trying to wrap our heads around them. We don't need to bog this whole process down with this unnecessary language that gives us all a lot of heartburn and is likely to be unconstitutional for us to tell people whether they can work through the federal court system or not.

So I support your amendment. I think it's a. good one, and I would ask everyone else to vote up on this amendment.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Benjamin, recognized in debate.

REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: (Indiscernible)
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: The amendment.
REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And just to reiterate that point, we've been arguing now about a federal question, the 14 th

Amendment -- how does the 14 th Amendment apply in this case? And so if we're talking about a federal question, whether or not our maps violate the 14th Amendment, how can you preclude the federal court from weighing in on that? It's a federal question, which is a requirement to enter into state -- enter into federal court in the first place. So we cannot preclude the federal court from determining what is, in essence, a federal question. So that is my debate. We should vote down on this amendment -- I mean, excuse me -- vote up on this amendment.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Any other members in
debate?
Seeing none --
REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: No. No.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Driskell
in debate.
REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Sorry, Mr. Chair. Just very, very, very briefly.

And, yeah, I just want to echo back to something that we talked about when we were in regular session, which is this concept of weaponing procedure, and if we believe that, you know, the maps that we pass are going to be constitutional, if we believe that they're going to stand, there's no
need to weaponize procedure in this way.
Previously, it was -- first, it was the statute of limitations and limiting that. Now, it's choice of venue. What's next? It's a very slippery slope, and it's something that we should all be concerned about. And we need to be down on this, thank you -- I mean, up on this amendment, thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Members in debate?
Seeing none, Representative Joseph, you are recognized to close on the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This amendment is very straightforward. I mean, it's a federal question, federal courts. It really just makes sense. So the portion restricting the jurisdiction, it's in direct conflict with the Voting Rights Act and 28 USC 1367, which provides supplemental federal jurisdiction over state law claims that are closely related to federal claims.

As such, the supremacy clause controls and the state law must concede that federal law, which states that federal courts have jurisdiction over these maps. I mean, it's not even complicated. It's not even close.

So we have to ask ourselves what's really going on. Why would we want to limit challenging federal congressional seats to state courts? I think many of us have ideas as to what the answer is to that question, but even that notwithstanding, let's talk about what the 14 th Amendment is, which is the basis for these new maps, as has been espoused to us. The 14 th Amendment is one of those remedial statutes in the Post-Reconstruction Era that allowed for more black representation, and but for that law and several others, we would have less black representation.

So now, we have the Governor using that same law to turn it on its face, and he wants you to believe that somehow, under some universe, that he is protecting us against segregation, which is straight foolishness because $I$ didn't get into all of the questions that I --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Joseph, I apologize for --

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Okay.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: -- interrupting. We are very pressed for --

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: I understand. CHAIRMAN SIROIS: -- time. Let's --

do what we're substantively able to do.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Representative Joseph.

Having closed on the amendment, members in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.
(Multiple ayes)
Those opposed, no.
(Multiple nos)
The amendment fails.
We are now on public testimony.
Ladies and gentlemen, we appreciate you being here today for public testimony. We have a lot of pulblic testimony to get through. What I would like to do is, once I call your name, please approach the podium, if you'd like to speak. I will call the next person to speak as well. They are on deck if they would like to move forward in the room. You are also welcome to waive in support or waive in opposition in order to save time.

Members of the public joining us today, I'd like to spend the next 40 to 45 minutes receiving your public testimony, which is very important to us to have, and then we'll move into member debate and
the bill sponsor's close. With that, I'd like to ask LaShonda Holloway, a citizen from Jacksonville, to please approach the podium. If you would please state your name, I'm sure that I pronounced it incorrectly, and then next on deck will be Nancy Staats from Atlantic Beach.

You are recognized.
LASHONDA HOLLOWAY: Thank you.
Good afternoon to this Committee. First and foremost, I want to thank you for your work, but I must say that $I$ am in utter shock that that last amendment was not approved.

I would urge each of you to vote no on this bill. If congressional seats are federal, then the Equal Protection should be -- law should be heard by federal courts and not by the lower courts. Moreover, as a fourth generation Floridian who is not only a constituent in the 5th Congressional District, I am a stakeholder as a candidate to represent the people of the 5th Congressional District.

Furthermore, understand that this particular map that the Governor has proposed, it uses Tier 2 metrics. It does not even use the
federal standard. It used the preferred standard. So not only should we be using United States census numbers, we should also be using Tier 1 standards, and we all know that Tier 1 says you cannot favor a political party.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you. Thank you, ma'am. That's --

LASHONDA HOLLOWAY: My two minutes are up?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Please continue. My mistake. You have two minutes. Proceed. LASHONDA HOLLOWAY: Thank you so -- thank you so very much.

Furthermore, we know that Mr. Kelly stated that this particular -- these particular maps affect 18 districts, and as a result of that, it would favor 20 Republican districts and 8 Democratic districts.

The citizens of the state of Florida voted for Fair Districts. So not only does it violate the will of the people, it also violates the Equal Protection Clause. The second section of the 14 th Amendment strictly states that you must not prohibit voting practices or procedures that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or membership in one
minority language.
Last and not -- certainly not least, I
would say to you we must protect minority access districts from retrogression. We must protect minority access districts from retrogression. Black people, minorities, people of color, and people of minority language ethnicities should have representation. We are --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
LASHONDA HOLLOWAY: -- a part of this
democracy, and we deserve to be heard.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
LASHONDA HOLLOWAY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: My apologies for interrupting you.

Ms. Staats. Next on deck is Judy Sheklin of Jacksonville.

You are recognized, ma'am.
NANCY STAATS: Good afternoon, everyone.
My name is Dr. Nancy Staats. I'm a board-certified medical doctor, but you don't need an advanced degree to see what is happening here. What we are seeing is a blatant disenfranchisement of African American communities and their representatives. The Governor has many duties and
responsibilities, but drawing maps is not one of them. That is your job, and you are here working hard doing that job. But unfortunately the Governor rejected all your hard work, then came up with us his maps, which you appropriately, rightfully rejected when he first proposed. But now suddenly, after vetoing yours, he's back with more nonsense, and you have folded like a cheap suit, the Republicans.

Now, what I would like to say -CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Ma'am, I'm going to remind you. I don't know if you were here when we --

NANCY STAATS: Yes. Thank you. I will. CHAIRMAN SIROIS: -- started the meeting -NANCY STAATS: I will.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: -- regarding decorum -NANCY STAATS: I will. Yes.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: -- in the committee room. NANCY STAATS: I will. What happened in those two months? I'm just curious. Were there discussions about budgetary requests perhaps? Was there arm twisting? I don't know. Maybe someone can clarify. It's painfully clear to me that everyone in this room and everyone outside of this
room knows this entire special session is a farce because there is not even another map being considered.

As has been mentioned by others, our
Harvard-educated Governor must be well aware that this map violates both the Florida Fair Districts Amendment and the Voting Rights Act, but perhaps he wants the attention. Perhaps a Supreme Court case? I don't know.

Everyone remembers back our American
history lesson that our government was formed in response to an authoritarian ruler, King George. Our Founding Fathers created a system of three district, autonomous branches of government, yet here we are today, seeking complete -- seeing complete complicity on your part to a new king.

In closing, as a physician, $I$ took an oath. I pledged to uphold the Hippocratic Oath. You too, each of you, took an oath. You have taken oaths to uphold the State and U.S. Constitutions and to serve your constituents, and many of you sadly seem to have forgotten. We will not.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
Ms. Sheklin, you're up next, followed by Juanita Powell-Williams of Jacksonville.

Ladies and gentlemen, if I'd just ask you, when you come to the podium, if you would identify yourself once again. And we'll observe the two minutes, but we may be pressed for time moving forward.

Ma'am, you are recognized.
JUDY SHEKLIN: My name is Judy Sheklin, and I live in Jacksonville. I'm speaking in opposition to the Governor's proposed maps for several reasons. It is the responsibility of the Legislature to create congressional maps during redistricting according to Article III of the Florida Constitution.

The House and Senate, as the previous speaker stated, created and approved maps that you were satisfied with, which, as we know, were then vetoed and redrawn by the Governor. This is unprecedented in state Legislatures throughout the United States.

The Legislature here, quickly, the House and Senate acquiesced to the Governor, and that created a dramatic imbalance of power in our state government. This is troubling to me as a citizen. The Governor's maps are a radical departure and aren't in compliance with state and federal law.

These maps, as we've heard today, reduce the likelihood of minorities to elect congressional members of their choice, eliminating two minority districts, and also violating the Voting Rights Act.

In 2010, Florida passed the Fair Districts Amendment, and the citizens stated and deserve and expect fairness in redistricting decisions. The Governor's plan that creates 20 Republican minority -- majority districts out of -- and 8 majority Democratic districts blatantly demonstrates partisan gerrymandering.

Please stand up for all Floridians and oppose these unfair maps. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am. Ms. Powell-Williams, you're up, followed by Cristian Cardona.

> You're recognized.

JUANITA POWELL-WILLIAMS: Yes. Thank you.
Good afternoon. Juanita Powell-Williams from Jacksonville, Florida. We often in the law consider knowledge and intent. Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you today that there is full knowledge of what is being done here today within Florida.

Florida has become a laughingstock,
unfortunately, and with that, you as our leaders are privy to that. There is full knowledge, and with that, intent, to do just what the Governor is doing. He is taking away a right of a people. We are retrogressing back to the past, and you are allowing that to happen.

I know this is falling on deaf ears, unfortunately. We're here from -- your constituents are here from these various counties within Florida, and we're speaking out regardless of some of you already having made up your minds as to what's going to come out of your mouth.

But we're here. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to speak up. We're going to vote, and we will remember. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
Cristian Cardona followed by Marsha Davis.
If I could remind members, if I call your name second, if you could make your -- members of the public, if you could make your way up, you're on deck. That will help us move things a little bit -move along a little bit faster.

You are recognized.
CRISTIAN CARDONA: Thank you.
Hello, everyone. My name is Cristian

1 Cardona. I am opposed to the redistricting plan. I am a worker and a leader with the Fight for $\$ 15$ and the union. Different movements are gathered here today because we stand against the elimination of protections that the Fair Districts Amendment provides. This map is a direct attack on black representation and our democracy, and that ain't right.

I want to share why -- I want to share my experience as a voter and why this issue is important to me. I moved to Orlando, Florida, with my family in 2009. I gained citizenship and just in time to vote for Amendment 2, which brought us one step closer to a living wage, which is something I have been organizing and speaking up about for years.

This amendment has a direct impact on the community around me, my family, my friends, and my neighbors. It felt powerful to organize and campaign to raise the standard of living for millions of Floridians. The day I got to vote yes for Amendment 2 was a day that I will always remember. After months of complaining and yelling it out to the world, I finally had the chance to cast my vote along with my community.

This is why it's so important that workers have a strong voice and a vote. Workers have never been given rights. We've had to fight for all of the things that we won, ever little crumb, every race, every right, and this fight is no different.

Governor DeSantis is trying to diminish our ability to have our voices heard at the state level, which we aren't going to let happen. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
Marsha Davis, followed by Rosemary McCoy of Jacksonville, followed by Tameka Hobbs of Jacksonville.

Ma'am, you are recognized.
MARSHA DAVIS: Thank you.
Good afternoon. I'm Marsha Davis from
Orlando, Florida. I'm here to speak against
Governor DeSantis' legislative map.
Floridians passed the Fair District Act amending the State Constitution to protect minority voters, to ensure their access to representation, and to limit legislators from drawing maps that are unfair. And this map is -- these maps are unfair. It's just not right. I hope your conscience is twinging just a little bit.

Minority growth in the last -- this last
census is very clear. That's why we got an additional congressional seat. That tells us that we need more representation, not less. So I would ask you to consider that. The plan is unfair, and I believe the plan is unconstitutional. So I would ask for you to please think about all of your constituents and vote no. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
Rosemary McCoy, followed by Tameka Hobbs and then Laura Cardona.

ROSEMARY MCCOY: Good afternoon and thank you so much for having us here and thank you so much for being here.

We are living in a time of desperate reaction, and we need your reaction in a positive way. Everyone here knows that we have a war, and yes, I'm going to continue to speak about this here war, Russia and Ukrainian. It's a serious war because it does affect us, whether we're in Florida as a state or whether we are federal or whether we are citizens, residents of the state of Florida.

I am a disabled veteran, and I believe in this country. I would go to war today for this country, and you know what I'm asking you all to do? I'm asking you to go to war right here in the state
of Florida. I'm asking you to put down your party. We're not here to be Republicans. We're not here to be Democrats or Independents. We're here to serve the people. I have a nonprofit organization called Harriet Tubman Freedom Fighters, freedom fighters.

I believe in freedom. I am a Ukrainian. I have that spirit, and I pray that each one of you do. I pray that you do not bow down to a dictator. We have to stop this. When are we going to stop this?

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Ma'am, I'm going to caution you regarding --

ROSEMARY MCCOY: Stop it now. Stop it now.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Our next speaker is Tameka Hobbs, followed by Laura Cardona.

I'd like to remind members of the audience as well regarding civility and decorum in the Committee room.

Ma'am, you are recognized.
TAMEKA HOBBS: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Dr. Tameka Hobbs. I am a recent resident of Jacksonville and Congressional District 5. I am a native of Florida. I grew up not very far from here in Suwannee county. I am here to report to you as a person who has lived the majority of my life
here in the state of Florida that I have never paid as much attention to the proceedings of this organization because I have never in my life been as concerned as I have been over the last several months.

I'm here to voice my opposition to the maps that are being presented by the Governor to this legislative body because, on its face, that is outside of his scope and function. This body has a responsibility for bringing these maps, developing these maps, as you have, for consideration. And it is a definite violation of the checks and balances that are built into our Constitution, as I understand them, for someone else to present those to us. So I will say that, number one.

I will also echo what's been said already in that these proposed maps, this proposed map is unconstitutional based on the Florida State Constitution, based on the Fair Districts Amendment from 2010, based on the Voter Rights Amendment that's been -- Voting Rights Act, excuse me, that's been presented here several times.

I'd also like to talk about what $I$ heard in the two times, both in the senate and before this body, that I have heard Mr. Kelly make his
representations about the way that the map that was presented today was -- had come about. He asserted us that he was very interested in it being squared and compact. He described these very round districts. Visually, certainly, we can certainly see that.

What he has used -- and I believe mistakenly -- is the application of this idea that these maps were constructed in a race neutral fashion. If it was race neutral, we would not be dealing with the disillusionment, the dismantlement of two of four seats -- congressional districts that have put African Americans in the Congress.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Ma'am, your time is expired. You want to just bring it in for a landing.

TAMEKA HOBBS: For two minutes?
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Ma'am, your time is
expired.
TAMEKA HOBBS: Okay.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: If you'd like to wrap up
your comments.
TAMEKA HOBBS: I would like to say that that is on its face false. I want to say to this body that you have a choice before you. As a
historian I have followed the racial history, very painful --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
TAMEKA HOBBS: -- history that has not been considered here.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am. Thank you.

TAMEKA HOBBS: You have a choice about your legacy today.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much.
Laura Cardona of Orlando and then
Christopher Nurse of Jacksonville waives in opposition. Our next speaker -- is Laura Cardona coming up? Christopher Nurse waives in opposition. The next speaker Sheila Singleton of Jacksonville, followed by Barney Roberts of Jacksonville.

Sheila Singleton?
Barney Roberts of Jacksonville, come on up, sir. And then our next speaker will be Trish Neely of Tallahassee.

BARNEY ROBERTS: Hi. I'm Barney Roberts from Jacksonville, Florida. I'd like to challenge you to build a future for our kids for tomorrow. If they look at Tallahassee as it has been for the last couple years and they see the behavior that's
happening here, then they're going to say, hey, what should we do about it?

Our kids deserve the best, and I hope that you do that too with your decision that you make today and tomorrow. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, sir.
Trish Neely, Tallahassee, followed by Larry Coleton (phonetic) of Orlando.

TRISH NEELY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Ma'am, you're recognized.
TRISH NEELY: Thank you for the opportunity
to speak. I'm Trish Neely, and I am with the League of Women Voters.

I won't repeat what's already been said, but I do have two points. Number one, it was the League of Women Voters against the State of Florida that was the lawsuit that Mr. Kelly mentioned, and we disagree that the court got it wrong. We believe they got it very right.

We urge you, urge you to carefully consider what this map will do. It cuts the voting power of African Americans by 50 percent. Think of that, by 50 percent, and this is very reminiscent of Florida's voter suppression tactics of over 100 years ago.

Folks, we don't want to go backwards. We need to go be going forward. We urge you to vote this map down. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
Larry Coleton -- I'm sorry. I know I'm mispronouncing that -- followed by Hedder PierreJoseph of Orlando.

If you're going to speak and I mention your name, please make your way forward in the interest of time.

Hedder will be followed by Stacy Williams of Orlando.

Sir, you're recognized.
LARRY COLETON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Larry Coleton from Orlando, Florida.

I find myself thinking that I'm back in the 1950 s or $1940 s$. This reminds me of basically, pardon the language, but white supremacy.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Sir, I'm --
LARRY COLETON: And the fact of the matter is it's ironic to me that the 14 th Amendment would be turned on its head when that was initiated to protect Africans who were recently freed from slavery, and we, me, an African descendant of slavery, having people stand -- sit here and talk
about this as though -- and using it as a weapon against the very people it was intended to protect.

This is a moment for profiles in either courage or cowardice. To be intimidated by the Governor of this state to capitulate, this is not this Committee's bill. This is the Governor's bill. You haven't done your job. You aren't doing your job, and we are not going to forget this. And history will speak to you. It will speak about you. You will be dealt with for your history and hopefully at the ballot box.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, sir.
Hedder Pierre-Joseph -- I apologize. I'm butchering the name -- followed by Stacy Williams.

HEDDER PIERRE-JOSEPH: No worries. Good evening to the Committee and the Committee members. My name is Hedder Pierre-Joseph. Redistricting is the process by which new congressional and state legislative districts are drawn. Federal law stipulates that districts must have nearly equal population and must not discriminate on the basis of race and ethnicity. The current redistricting map, which eliminates congressional House representation for black people, is based on solely fear, fear that
black people are voting. As black people who are descendants of the enslaved Africans, we know our history, and we have seen this devil before.

I implore you not to continue down the dark path of your ancestors and deny black people their constitutional right of representation. I remind all of you of the Boston Tea Party of 1773.

Finally, I ask you to look around and to see the promise and the hope of the enslaved Africans. We are on the side of justice, and with the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and our ancestors, we shall always overcome. Remember, there is something called God and time. Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you. My apologies for butchering your name.

Stacy Williams followed by Troy Squire.
Stacy Williams is not here.
Troy Squire of Jacksonville. If I call
your name, if you'd make your way forward.
Following Troy will be Jonathan Webber of Tallahassee.

TROY SQUIRE: THANK YOU for letting me speak.

I just have one question, but first, my
name is Troy Squire. I live in Congressional District 5, and as the regional breakdown for Northern Florida states, your plan will split black communities across three different congressional districts, which results in the loss of the current black opportunity district, linking Jacksonville and Tallahassee.

So my question is to Governor Ronald Deon DeSantis and this subcommittee. What are you saying (sic) is that black votes does not matter to you? That's my only question. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, sir. Jonathan Webber of Tallahassee, followed by David Rucker of Orlando. And after David will be Genesis Robinson of Daytona Beach. Sir, you are recognized. JONATHAN WEBBER: Thank you so much. Good afternoon. My name is Jonathan

Webber. I'm the deputy director of Florida Conservation Voters, and for the record, I do live in CD 5, Al Lawson's district just south of Apalachee here in Tallahassee.

Florida Conservation Voters strongly believes that the health of our environment is directly tied to the health of our republic, and
just as we monitor our water for pollution, we monitor our government for signs of sickness.

Fair representation is one of the best metrics we have to measure the health of our government. The census and ensuing redistricting process is the test. Today, we're asking ourselves questions like, was this map drawn in complete transparency? Does it respect the rules set forth in the Voting Rights Act, in the state and federal Constitutions? Were the people of Florida given ample opportunity to participate and comment on this map? And most important, considering the profound legacy of state-sponsored oppression in Florida, does it protect or diminish the right of black Floridians to elect the leaders of their choice.

You all know the answers to these questions, and while fair representation is vial, fear of doing the right thing is the ultimate terminal sickness in democracy. Our republic is only as strong as the rights of the minority groups to participate. I love this country not so much for its history but for its promise. But that promise must be guaranteed to everyone, not just the powerful or the monied or the ruling class.

FCV stands in solidarity with our friends
and allies across the state in opposition to these maps. Thank you all for coming today. Thank you. CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.

Next is David Rucker, followed by Genesis Robinson.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have about 20 speaker cards left. I'd like to move into debate at 6:00 p.m. So following you, sir, I will be reducing public testimony to one minute each.

Thank you, sir.
DAVID RUCKER: You're giving me one minute?
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: No, sir. After you.
DAVID RUCKER: Oh, after me.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: You have two minutes.
DAVID RUCKER: Good. My name is David
Rucker. I live in Orlando. I live in District 10, and I am a super voter. I started voting when I was 18. That's in the Civil Rights in 1965. I've only missed two voting out of my whole time as being a teenager and a young and old adult.

And what I like to do and have you guys, before you even think about voting, we keep asking you to vote and the things that we don't like about what's happening with the Governor and what he's talking about, I want you to go back.

Before you make this vote -- in 1975, a song came out by the o'Jays, and it would say you got to give the people what they want. Before you vote, I want you to listen to that song. I want you to listen to it all the way through and then come back and vote. All right. That's what I need you to do. All right.

The next thing, there are four positions that we have now. The Governor want to cut them down to two, all right. You need to look at that too. We're talking about oppression of voters, especially blacks at that time, in '65. We need to take heed and look at those things. We don't want to repeat history, all right. We want to move forward.

But what the Governor is trying to is to try to repeat history, which is not good for all of us in America, you know. U.S. is us. That means we are here together, but remember, what I want you to do, 1975, the O'Jays, the O'Jays, all right. You got to give the people what they want. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, sir.
Genesis Robinson, followed by Gail Gardner, one minute.

Sir, you are recognized.

GENESIS ROBINSON: Mr. Chair, I would ask that you reconsider to allow two minutes so I can speak.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Sir. I have --
GENESIS ROBINSON: I have somebody that's going to yield his time.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: I have 20 speakers left. One minute, sir. You are recognized.

GENESIS ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you. Good afternoon, members. Thank you, Mr. Chair, for the opportunity to speak for one minute to address the House Subcommittee.

My name is Genesis Robinson. I am a registered voter in the state of Florida. I also serve as the political director for Equal Ground Action Fund. We are a black-led voting rights organization working to increase civic engagement in black communities throughout the state.

We are here in opposition to this plan. Obviously, you have abdicated your responsibility to draw maps to the Governor, and as an organization working to expand equity in the state, we believe that this map is unconstitutional.

With minority growth that we saw in the 2020 census, it is critical that we have diverse
viewpoints and experiences represented at the federal level of government. The lived experiences and perspectives of these individuals are a crucial part in representing and reflecting the fullness of our state.

It is unconscionable to think that maps that govern our state for the next decade could give us less minority representation than we currently have. When the history of this moment is written, you do not want your name to be among those that violated --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Sir, your time --
GENESIS ROBINSON: -- and voted to take --
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: -- your time is expired.
GENESIS ROBINSON: -- away minority
representation --
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
GENESIS ROBINSON: -- in the state of
Florida. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
Gail Gardner of Ocoee, followed by Cheryl Jones of Winter Garden.

Ma'am, you're recognized.
GAIL GARDNER: Good evening. Gail Gardner from District 10.

In the '60s, my ancestors who lived in the North where I was born and grew up would board a charter bus and head south where they were born and grew up. Well, now, I too boarded a charter bus today for the same reason.

My experience has been that we are fighting once again and repeating history. Our ancestors did this. They defended their time. They defended the right to vote. And so, therefore, we're asking that the congressional redistricting map not just to draw the line but hold the line and make this legislative body accountable and not allow the persuasive executive decision by the Governor to be a force to diminish the black vote, of which those of you who benefited from the Fair Districts Amendment 5 and 6 that prohibits politicians from drawing districts that favor themselves and their parties, to ensure that minorities will have the opportunity to elect representatives of their choice. Let's not allow history to repeat itself. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
Cheryl Jones, followed by Ebony Hardy-Allen of Jacksonville.

Ma'am, you are recognized.
CHERYL JONES: Hello. I am Cheryl Jones
from Orlando.
I want to emphasize that our democracy is under attack. When you look at this redistricting map, it is clearly and blatantly designed to oppress black voters.

And I also want to address the fact that you would not have the speaker under oath. That simply holds them accountable. I don't know if others in here have heard, but he's flip-flopped back and forth a few times between here and the Senate, and being under oath holds his word to his record. So we would like to make sure that as we listen to the speakers, that they are held accountable and that the redistricting map actually does represent the citizens of our state.

I live in Orlando, which is currently district 10, but the redistricting will put me in District 11. And some of the reasons that were stated as to why it's being redistricted are different from other counties. Other counties are held intact, and I believe that holding our representatives accountable will make a difference. CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Your time is expired. Thank you, ma'am.

Our next speaker is Ebony Hardy-Allen,
followed by Indesar Sabris (phonetic) of Jacksonville, and then we'll have Gail Presley of Orlando.

Ma'am, you're recognized.
EBONY HARDY-ALLEN: Hello. My name is Ebony Hardy-Allen. I'm a voter's right advocate. Since I only have one minute, I'm only going to take 30 seconds because I've sat here, and I prepared a speech. But I'm not going to use it. I sat here, and I listened. And I looked at everybody's faces.

Three things, this reminds me of a poll tax. This reminds me of a literacy test. This reminds me of a paper bag test. My skin is too dark. I will not have representation. If you all vote for this bill, we will remember. We will vote you out of office. I am asking that you do not strip us of our representation. That's all I have to say. Literacy tests, poll tax, and a paper bag test.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
Indesar Sabris of Jacksonville, and then we'll have Gail Presley of Orlando, followed by Hazel Gillis of Jacksonville.

Ms. Presley?

GAIL PRESLEY: Yes?
Come on up.
Hazel Gillis will be next, followed by Cecile Scoon.

Ma'am, you're recognized.
GAIL PRESLEY: Well, thank you and good afternoon. Thank you, Chairman. To all of our House of Representatives, my name is Gail Presley, and I am a proud member of Congressional District Number 10, which is held by none other than our House of Representative.

It is disheartening to me here today to hear some of the information that was shared, especially from the attorney today. I come from a family, who have -- back in the 1960s, listening to some of the stories that they told me about voters rights and how they had to fight so hard to become a voter. I feel like I'm back in the 1960 s today, and it is 2022.

I do oppose to the bill that is here today, and I implore you -- because you took an oath to serve the people. And we are the people. I am that person, and I do represent Congress -- Congressional District 10, and I do implore you, ladies and gentlemen, to do the right thing --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Your time is --
GAIL PRESLEY: -- and vote the right way.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Your time is expired.
GAIL PRESLEY: Thank you, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much.
Thank you, ma'am.
Hazel Gillis, followed by Cecile Scoon, and then we'll have Allison Clark of Maitland.

Ma'am, you're recognized.
HAZEL GILLIS: Good evening. My name is
Hazel Gillis. I am a member of the James Weldon Johnson Branch of the ASALH, the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, and I live in Congressional District 5 in Jacksonville, Florida.

Governor Ron DeSantis' rejection of Florida Legislature-drawn maps is a direct attack on black representation in our democracy. By proposing a congressional map that reduces Florida's black representation in Congress by 50 percent, the Governor is attempting to silence the voices of hundreds of thousands of black voters.

We oppose any map that has been drawn by Governor Ron DeSantis. In 2010, Florida passed the Fair Districts Amendments 5 and 6 that prohibits
politicians from drawing districts to favor themselves and their parties and to ensure minority voters have equal opportunity to participate in the political process and have a fair opportunity to elect representatives of their choice -CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am. HAZEL GILLIS: -- their party. CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Your time is expired. HAZEL GILLIS: We must end this manipulation. Thank you. CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Cecile Scoon of Panama City.

Thank you, ma'am.
Cecile Scoon of Panama City, followed by Allison Clark of Maitland, followed by ZsaZsa Ingram-Fitzpatrick of Tallahassee.

Ma'am, you are recognized.
CECILE SCOON: Thank you. Cecile Scoon, President of the League of Women Voters of Florida. What a difference a day makes. I was here a. few weeks ago, and I was really proud of this body when you addressed Mr. Popper, Professor Popper, and he came forth with this idea, turning things on its head and telling you that following the law was illegal.

And you literally asked him, do you have a case on point? And the man said no. I don't. And that is the true fact. You are ignoring Tier 1. Tier 1 actually does not require intent, as Mr. Kelly seemed to be implying and stating. It goes by impact. If you do not protect the voting rights and make sure that people have an opportunity to select a representative of their choice if they are a minority by race or language, you are violating Tier 1, and you are violating the Florida Supreme Court's standing on the law. And that's simply the case.

They are trying to change the law ahead of time. The Governor is supposed to enforce the law, not change the law. The people that write the law are the legislators. This is all backwards, and it's hurting every single citizen of this state. Yes. Black people are being targeted, but the destruction of our separation of powers is -CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am. CECILE SCOON: -- is affecting everyone. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am. Thank you.

CECILE SCOON: Please vote no. CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Clark of Maitland, followed by ZsaZsa Ingram-Fitzpatrick of Tallahassee, and then we'll have Myrtle Lucas of Jacksonville.

Ma'am, you are recognized.
ALLISON CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I am Dr. Allison Clark, a native Floridian born in Volusia County, and I live in District 7. I am here to voice my opposition to this bill.

I could cite historical data, statistics, court cases, et cetera that demonstrate the unconstitutionality of the vote that you are about to take, but due to time, I will keep my statement to this.

The purpose of this session is clear to the nation and Floridians. It is to establish a path for the Governor's race for the White House in 2024, and it is a path that is being built on the backs of Florida's black voters. I ask you to vote no to this bill.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
ZsaZsa Ingram-Fitzpatrick, followed by Myrtle Lucas.

Ma'am, you are recognized.
ZSAZSA INGRAM-FITZPATRICK: Thank you.
I am ZsaZsa Ingram-Fitzpatrick, and I come
to give you a brief statement. It is about facts, rights, and responsibility. The fact is it is not in the Governor's job description that he should be putting forth maps on redistricting.

It is your right to tell him to stay in his lane and do his job, and it is the responsibility of us, the voters, the people who put you in office, to come before you and let you know what we think when we do not like what you're doing.

And today I am requesting that you look closely at what is being put forth to dimmish black voters and people of color, our voices within this state, and that you also look at the census and know that we are that sleeping giant because our numbers are not diminishing. They are growing. Thank you and vote against this bill.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
Myrtle Lucas of Jacksonville, followed by Haraka Carswell of Jacksonville, and then we'll have Ingrid Montgomery.

MYRTLE LUCAS: Okay. My name is Myrtle
Lucas. I am a member of the James Weldon Johnson Branch of the ASALH, the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, and I live in the Congressional District 5 in Jacksonville,

Florida.
We oppose any map that has been drawn by the Governor -- by Governor Ron DeSantis.

Legislators and Governors are doing this to unfairly rule -- unfairly have it their way. That's what I'm really going to say. Okay. We must end this at the cost to protect our democracy and black voters. We vote for legislation --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
MYRTLE LUCAS: -- to draw -- no. I can't sit -- to draw maps for Fair Districts, and we want them to do their job.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am. Your time is expired.

MYRTLE LUCAS: Okay. Enough for Governor DeSantis.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
Haraka Carswell, followed by Ingrid
Montgomery, and we'll -- no Haraka Carswell?
Ingrid Montgomery?
Yes, ma'am.
HARAKA CARSWELL: (No audible response)
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Waive in opposition.
Thank you very much.
Ingrid Montgomery?

INGRID MONTOMERY: (No audible response)
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Oh. My apologies. Thank you, ma'am.

Jasmine Burney-Clark, an opponent of the bill.

Odwan Whitfield (phonetic) of Jacksonville, an opponent of the bill. Are you here to speak? Come on up, sir. And then we'll have Gwendolyn Colman of Jacksonville.

Sir, you are recognized.
ODWAN WHITFIELD: My name is Odwan Whitfield. I'm in Congressional District 5. I'm a taxpayer, and I am a United States Army combat veteran. I fought over in district -- in foreign territories only to come back here to fight for my rights for representation.

It bothers me. It bothers me that we rush through this Committee hearing. First, it was for the interest of the people. So you rush the Representatives, and the people come up, and we rush the Representatives.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Sir, could you please
keep your comments to the legislation.
ODWAN WHITFIELD: It's to you all. And so what's the rush? The session is from the 19th until
the 22nd. Why are we rushing so fast? This affects me and the people in my district.

The difference between you all saying that, you know, well, my uncle, auntie, cousin, brother, sister went to war, the difference is they don't have to come back to this. They don't have to. Do your jobs.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Sir, your time is --
ODWAN WHITFIELD: It isn't fair.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Sir, your time is expired.

ODWAN WHITFIELD: Do your jobs. That's all (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Your time is expired. Thank you.

Gwendolyn Coleman, Jacksonville.
Thank you for your service.
Gwendolyn Coleman, an opponent of the bill.
Walter Smith of Jacksonville, an opponent of the bill.

Kristin Fowailee of Maitland, an opponent of the bill.

Dr. Carolynn Zonia, followed by Lisa Perry. Lisa, are you here? Next will be Joey McKinnon. Ma'am, you are recognized.

DR. CAROLYNN ZONIA: Okay. Mr. Chairman, Committee members, I'm Dr. Carolynn Zonia. I'm speaking against the Governor's maps.

I just wanted to point out in September 2021, the U.S. Department of Justice issued guidelines for Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, and they clearly state that it's prohibited -- it prohibits any procedure or practices that minimize or cancel out the voting strength of members of racial or language minority groups in the voting population.

So whether you vote down the amendment, whether, you know, you're keeping the language in that says that you're limiting where this can be challenge, it's going to be challenged, and it's going to be overturned. Please vote against the Governor's maps. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, ma'am.
Lisa Perry, followed by Joey McKinnon.
Mr. McKinnon, you are recognized.
JOEY MCKINNON: Thank you, Chair.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: I'm sorry. Excuse me.
Lisa Perry is an opponent of the bill.
Sir, you're recognized.
JOEY MCKINNON: Thank you, Chair.

My name is Joey McKinnon, and I'm a resident of the impacted CD 5. And I'm opposed to this bill.

During the regular legislative session, you, the Legislature, produced a map that was challenged to my knowledge by no one. Until Governor DeSantis broke with democratic norms, and here we are. And to be fair, I love many of you, but I didn't want to see you after Easter.

Stand by your maps. You did a good job. How often do people come to this podium and say that? But stand by your map. After this past session, it's time to turn down the heat. We all know that.

Today, you have the opportunity to protect the Constitution of the great state of Florida by upholding the Fair Districts Amendments, defend democratic norms, and prioritize people over partisanship, like you did with your maps. So let's do what's right. Thank you.

Thank you. We have Charletta Sowell of Jacksonville, waiving in opposition.

And finally Joanne Brooks of Jacksonville, waiving in opposition.

Members, we are now in debate.

Members wishing to debate.
Representative Benjamin, you are recognized, followed by Representative Skidmore.

REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: Thank you,
Mr. Chair.
We're here at this special session and in this Subcommittee to consider the Governor's veto with regards to a map or maps that we sent him that we believed at the time that we sent them that those maps were constitutionally compliant and that those maps were sufficient for representation in our -for our congressional representation.

That map held that four seats from Florida would hold black representation in our Congress. And now we're here today discussing a map that will change that representation from four to two.

And when we talk about the significance of that, we're told that the contested seating was, in fact, not legal in its iteration. However, it was not challenged. It was provided to us by the courts and was never challenged. That makes it benchmark. That means it had to be analyzed. That means it was subject to Title 3, or our Fair District Amendment, and that we codify section 5 of the VRA, which says that we have to protect our representation in our
state from regression.
We believe that when we did that Title that regression was something that we wanted to protect our state from, and we have long recognized that in the law that we can give greater protections than the federal government. And it was said by counsel that adhering to state law was not a compeling state interest.

Yeah. I believe that -- and that's not case law. That's his opinion, and I believe that there is no greater state interest than upholding our Constitution, our Constitution that gives greater protections. And so we have now decided that we would compromise with the Governor after we've given him constitutionally compliant (sic), but where is the compromise? He's given us an offer, but where is our counteroffer? Where is our counter discussions as to what we believe should be right.

You've heard a lot of testimony giving here
today. I don't believe that the court got it wrong. I believe that we're getting it wrong now, that black folks matter. Black representation matters. We sought to ensure that we would not go backwards. Our State Constitution ensured that we would
continue to take Florida forward, and in doing so, we enshrined it in law.

And so there could be no greater state interest -- there could be no greater compelling interest than to ensure that our laws are upheld when -- especially when they give greater benefit.

And so we should vote this down because black votes matter. Black voters matter. Black representation matters, and we should give the people what they want.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Representative Benjamin.

Members, just checking in on time, according to my phone, we're at 6:02 now. I'd like -- my goal is for us to vote or to have a close from Chair Leek at about 6:25. So if you'd help me stay on track.

Representative skidmore, you are
recognized.
DEMOCRATIC RANKING MEMBER SKIDMORE: Thank
you, Mr. Chair.
I want to thank the folks that traveled
from around the state who came to testify today. We heard they came from all parts of Florida.

You know, I just feel that this map clearly
violates the Florida Constitution. Whether it was devised with the intent of denying of abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or to diminish the ability to elect representatives of their choice, the fact of the matter is the result is it does. And that violates the Constitution.

If the Governor believes, as he has stated, that a racially gerrymandered district is tantamount to segregation, then why did he leave Congressional District 20 alone? When all of his objection was on Congressional District 5 and they redrew 18 other districts but they left a racially gerrymandered district alone, that is -- it doesn't jive with what it is that he is saying.

And this bill, this map, is
unconstitutional because whether it was devised with the intent to favor a political party, the fact of the matter is the result is it does. Mr. Kelly testified that -- in his testimony that his cleanup of the Legislature's map randomly resulted in a partisan makeup of 20 Republican seats and 8 Democratic seats, as widely reported in the media. Members, it's an Easter miracle, and all he was worried about was race neutral. But remarkably
this map has 20 Republican performing seats and 8 Democratic seats. There are so many things wrong with this map. There are so many things that are wrong with this process and wrong with the Governor's insertion of himself in this map to benefit his Presidential election.

I am telling you this is going to come back and bite you. You should vote no on this. I don't care how many times we have to come back to get it right. I will come back. I will come back. I will come back. And you should too.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Brown, you are recognized in debate.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Frankly, I cannot tell you what the purpose of this Committee is -- here is today because it seems as though there are folks within this room that are sort of content with the Governor's decision to run a one-man show with these congressional maps.

Not only has this move been unprecedented, but it is unnecessary meddling in its finest on behalf of the Governor. I find it an honor and a privilege and it is an honor and a privilege that

Floridians have elected us to represent them and to really participate in this redistricting process. But it's also our constitutional duty as legislators to do so.

And so I refuse to sit here and neglect that. I refuse to sit here and ignore my constitutional duty, my moral duty, of the people of the state of Florida, who entrusted us to ensure that their voices are heard.

They voted some years ago on the Fair District Amendments, and they voted for every legislator in this room. Our biggest obligation to them, members, is to do what's right. The biggest obligation is to them and not the Governor.

His pride, as it was mentioned by Rep Skidmore, his pride and his ambition to become President by any means necessary only hurts us as a collective, and it hurts us as Floridians. And we have continually seen this time and time again, just with the many bills that we have been asked to vote on. We've seen it with SB-90. We've seen it with last year election's police bill, and all these bills disenfranchise voters.

I feel that we should not be allowing someone to bully both chambers and do his bidding
without a fight, and so today, on behalf of the many folks that have come here, those that have been silent, those who have not been able to make it here to Tallahassee, I'm here to fight for you as a constituent. I will be voting no, absolutely. I'm not here to work for the Governor or his ambition, and so I ask my colleagues, I implore my colleagues, not only in this room but also in the other chambers and the 120 of us to do the same and do what the folks of Florida sent us here to do.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
Representative Harding in debate.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDING: Thank you,
Chairman.
And, first, I just want to say that I will be supporting House Bill $1-C$ today, one, because I believe that, as it's been outlined throughout this process today, that $I$ believe it's constitutional, and I believe it's the right result. But, number two, because there's a process.

And today we've talked about -- we've used the term veto several times, but we haven't talked about -- I'm sorry -- we've inserted the term about the Governor proposing a map, but we haven't talked about in the process the Governor has the ability to
veto. That is part of the process.
When you get elected, oftentimes, we were told, you know, the first time you have a bill that you want to run, the idea that it's going to pass on its first time is pretty slim. It does happen, but it's the exception. It may not work through the process for a variety of reasons, or it may be vetoed. And you have to come back and reconvene on how do we work to move forward? And that's what we're doing is moving forward.

When I got elected, I tried to do three things when I was running and then also as I've served. I've tried to be straightforward, try to represent the people that have sent me here, and I've also tried to stay true to my values.

And on the straightforward piece, I went back, and there's been discussion today in Committee that the previous map was just this harmonious map that we all loved. And it was so great. The fact was that there was not a single Democrat member that voted for the previous map. So when we point to that as the example, then why did you not support that map?

And the second thing I want to point out is that, just as I mentioned previously, there's a
process. We were -- we knew going into redistricting that one of the jobs we had was we could propose our own maps. That didn't happen. I have not seen Democrat members that are opposing the bill today propose their own maps in the process.

So I want to -- last thing is just to the audience members, I want to thank you for being here. Whether we agree or disagree, it takes courage to be here, and the term courage was pointed out. And I like that word courage because it takes courage to speak. It takes courage to run for office. It takes courage.

But I would implore you to hold the folks accountable that you are celebrating today in opposing this bill by having the courage to propose their own maps, which hasn't happened.

So I'll be supporting this bill. Thank you for being here and speaking, whether we agree or disagree.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Joseph in debate.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Black representation matters. Even if that means you might have a better chance at getting a
seat in Congress. When we think about the amendment that I proposed, right now, even in the bill, there is a little subclause that says federal questions can be addressed in federal court. So why would we need to add that it needs to go to state courts?

Well, if you haven't been following the jurisprudence, the federal courts have relegated dealing with these kinds of redistricting gerrymandering cases in cases where there's partisanship. They say we're not touching that. So partisanship is the carrot.

We also have indications from the U.S. Supreme Court with questions raised in other litigation about what constitutes a compelling interest. I would posit that making sure that minority representation exists is a compelling state interest. Some may disagree. Some people want us to be race neutral.

What race neutral means is that I have the opportunity to ignore the impact on racial minorities when I make a decision that is factually neutral. That means, on its face, it doesn't take into account race, but in practice, the impact, the effect is that it eliminates, diminishes, decreases, and has the effect of discrimination.

And what we're saying when we pass these policies, whether it's in this context or in the context of education or in the context of employment is we see the pain, but we don't want to see the pain. So we're just going to pretend like your pain does not exist.

It is disgraceful that this legislative body would be willing to sacrifice black representation at the alter of this Governor's political ambitions and maybe some of your own. People, Floridians, voters, Americans should have the right to choose their representatives and not the other way around.

We should not be stacking the cards --
Republicans should not be stacking the cards in
their favor 20 to 8 and then have the nerve to come up here and try to say that it was not in
consideration of partisanship.
All that does is empowers one particular group to continue to ignore the needs of Floridians. Floridians, both Republicans and Democrats, care about things that help us to be healthy, prosperous and safe, whether that means fixing our broken Unemployment Compensation system -- and a number of things that I'm not even going to get into.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Joseph, let's try to keep it, you know, within the framework of the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Understood.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: And let's bring it in for a landing because there's others that want to participate.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: I will do my darndest right now.

These maps are not it. They're not even our maps. They're the Governor's maps. This is absurd. I was so proud of us last time that we even at least made the effort. It doesn't mean that those maps were perfect. We identified issues. We're going to have issues. Just because something isn't perfect doesn't mean it wasn't better. The other ones were better than this.

And I'm disappointed that this is the route that we have decided to go, we, to be clear, my colleagues who will be voting in favor of this map. That's who I mean by we. But we who are still fighting for the people, whether you're Democrat or Republican, whether you're black or white, we are disappointed with this process, with this legislation, and with the result of decreasing black
representation, which will be difficult to challenge in advance of the next elections.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Driskell in debate.

REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Members, no problem can be solved from the same consciousness that created it. That's Albert Einstein. And when $I$ look at what we're doing with the redistricting process, it seems to me that we're trying to roll back the clock to the same consciousness that created the problems such that we would need a Voting Rights Act and Fair District Amendments in the first place.

I know sometimes our debates get heated in here, and we have very deep issues and values that cause us to disagree. But I actually have love in my heart for each and every one of you, and when $I$ go back home, people ask me, how is that possible when you hear these bills that are just -- my constituents, many of them perceive to be so mean spirited. And I say because I'm able to connect with my colleagues on a human level.

But I think that we've missed something in the process when we can have people come before us
and bare their souls and their fears and their frustrations, and we cannot connect with them on a human level. What about their humanity? What do we say to the voters of Gadsden County, the only majority-minority district that we have in the state of Florida? I'm sorry. We're taking your representation. What about their humanity? I'm worried about our consciousness. I'm worried that we are going backwards with these maps.

Just to address a couple of things. I know the point was raised that the Democrats in large part did not vote in favor of the congressional maps when we had them before us in regular session. Well, there were some real things wrong with that, starting with we introduced two maps, and the primary map was closer to what the Governor was proposing then, which we thought was unconstitutional.

The secondary map was closer to what many of us had worked on with Chair Sirois, and there was starting to be a consensus around. And I'm not even sure that passing two maps was constitutional, right. So the only flip that I see -- Democrats, let's be clear, have been real consistent. The only flip that I see was not from our caucus.

And to the point that was made earlier in testimony, that the Governor, you know, it's no secret that he's, you know, been putting information about there about these maps and what he thinks, that's right. And guess what? The Legislature close to ignore that for the most part. Some of his feedback was taken into the primary map that was passed, but we looked at what the Governor was doing. We were saying no. This is wrong. It's unconstitutional. The Governor is the executive branch. That is to execute the law, not to legislate it and to pass it. That's our job. Another thing, second, the current law matters. I heard in testimony today, well, the court got it wrong. Well, we can opine that all that we want, but the law is the law. The rule of law matters, and I don't see anything that we've done here that suggests to me that we actually are following in a legal way redistricting principles.

I know. I got to bring it in for a landing. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The third point is just I see so much inconsistency in what's been presented before us where we focused on certain principles for certain regions of the state but not for South Florida. I
don't understand the inconsistency. It's problematic. It is rushed. We need more time, Mr. Chair. We absolutely just need more time to consider this. This process is not enough. I'm down. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Hunschofsky.

REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have to say when I asked to be on this Committee, I was very excited. I find it an incredible honor to be able to serve in this Florida House of Representatives. Wherever the outcomes end, I feel so -- it weighs tremendously on me that every vote I make, every decision I make impacts someone's life, and not just their life today but their future.

It also is about a sense of trust that we have been entrusted to be the voice and to speak up for the people we represent. So I was super excited when I got to be on this Committee, and we were told really early on not to talk to people about the maps, not to listen to people about the maps. And we were given rules to follow.

And I followed them. I listened at every

Committee meeting. Every time something came up, I always went back to the Tier 1 and Tier 2 that the leadership here and the staff here told us this is what we are supposed to follow. I didn't follow Twitter. I didn't follow newspapers. I followed exactly what I was told to follow.

This map doesn't follow what I was told we are supposed to follow. It doesn't matter what the intent is. It's the result of whether we are denying or abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or to diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice, not the intent but the result.

That's a Tier 1 standard, which must come before the Tier 2 standards. And I, as a local person, always talked about I want to keep our cities together, ad nauseum. But it's --

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative, if you could -- if you could wrap up your comments please. REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: I will -CHAIRMAN SIROIS: There are others. REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: I understand. So what I'm saying is we talk about being race neutral. I didn't see anywhere in my
directions that I'm supposed to be race neutral. I see that I'm supposed to make sure that we're not diluting representation.

There are also concerns in here that now we're picking which courts the challenges come. We didn't do that in our last maps, and we even put in a $\$ 1$ million of an appropriation in here for that, that we didn't do prior. And those are all concerns I have with this map.

I don't understand why -- where the difference is that some bodies of water take precedent over other bodes of water, that some weird-shaped districts take priority over some -why 200 miles is worse than 180, and these are all my concerns with this map.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
Representative Latvala.
REPRESENTATIVE LATVALA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think it's slightly disingenuous to say that you were proud of something that you voted against. The last Speaker, one of the last Speakers said that there was virtually -- and my -- just for the record, I was not referring to Representative Hunschofsky.

One of the last Speakers said that the last map had no opposition. Well, it was apposed by the nonpartisan organization the League of Women Voters, and it was also opposed by every one of my Democratic colleagues. But other than that, it didn't have any opposition.

And, you know, we passed a map, members. the Governor didn't like it, and I remember the day that we passed it on the floor. One of my Democratic colleagues stood up on the floor and said you all are passing this map for the Governor.

We were accused of passing the map for the Governor then, and I didn't agree with that. And I guess the Governor also didn't think that we passed the map for him because he vetoed it, which is part of his constitutional duties. He's allowed to do that.

Gadsden County was brought up. We're keeping Gadsden County whole in this map. We're not including Gadsden County with a county that's 10 counties away.

I thank all the people that were here to speak to us today. I thought it was interesting that we had people from Tallahassee and people from Jacksonville that were here, and they were all in
the same congressional district. I grew up in Jacksonville.

I voted in -- the first election that I voted in was in 2000. Back then, my Congressperson represented me, and her congressional district was in Jacksonville. And it stretched all the way from Jacksonville to orlando. Part of it had one side of the street but not the other because it was a, as somebody from the Governor's Office's mentioned, it was a small skinny salamander. That's called gerrymandering.

And so this is a good map. I will be supporting it. I will have no regrets, and I think history will judge me just fine, as it will everyone else that votes yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Representative Leek, you are recognized to close.

REPRESENTATIVE LEEK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
In the interest of time, I'll waive close.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.
DJ, please call the roll.
THE CLERK: Chair Sirois.
CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Yes.
THE CLERK: Representatives Benjamin.
REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN: No.


REPRESENTATIVE PLAKON: Yes.
THE CLERK: Silvers has been excused.
Skidmore.
DEMOCRATIC RANKING MEMBER SKIDMORE: No.
THE CLERK: Trabulsy.
REPRESENTATIVE TRABULSY: Yes.
THE CLERK: Truenow.
REPRESENTATIVE TRUENOW: Yes.
THE CLERK: Tuck.
VICE CHAIR TUCK: Yes.
THE CLERK: Williamson.
REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMSON: Yes.
THE CLERK: Ex Officio Driskell.
REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: No.
THE CLERK: Ex Officio Leek.
REPRESENTATIVE LEEK: Yes.
THE CLERK: 15 yeas, 7 nays, Mr. Chair. CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, DJ.

Please show the bill reported favorably. Members, I'd like to thank you for your work today. I'd like to thank the members of the public that joined us as well.

Without objection, the meeting is
adjourned.
(END OF VIDEO RECORDING)
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| 44:22 46:14 | 125:2,23 127:8 | Weldon 127:11 | 145:10 | 151:9,15 |
| 75:22 76:8 | 130:2 131:19 | 131:22 | words 18:5 19:13 | wrote 21:16 |
| 86:16 90:4 | 132:19 133:8 | well-recognized | 26:20 61:7 | www.FloridaR... |
| 135:4 138:3 | we're 48:9,16 | 26:18 40:1 | work 4:9 9:8,12 | 9:19 |
| wanting 75:20 | 49:9 61:19 | 54:20 | 15:20 18:9,11 |  |
| wants $95: 14$ | 76:17 80:23,23 | went $32: 24$ 68:16 | 21:3 28:24 29:1 | X |
| 102:8 war 108:16,18,18 | 81:11 85:13,21 | 68:18 77:1 | 30:2 32:15 | Y |
| war 108:16,18,18 | 87:14 90:3 | 134:5 144:16 | 41:18,21,24 | Y |
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THE CLERK: A quorum is present, Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you. I'd like to ask everyone to silence your electronic devices. Anyone wishing to speak before the Committee should complete an appearance form and hand it in to a member of the Sergeant's Office. Should you select to waive your speaking time, your position will be included in the Committee meeting records.

Members, as you know, the Congressional maps passed by the Legislature in our regular session were vetoed. We have been called back into special session to fulfill our constitutional obligation to reapportion this state.

On Tuesday, April the 12th, I was briefed by the Governor's Office on a map which has been published as POOOC0109. After a conversation with our Senate counsel, I determined that this map reflects standards that the Senate can support and filed it as Senate Bill 2-C.

I've asked our general counsel, Mr. Dan Nordby, to prepare a legal analysis of the Governor's submission, and that legal analysis is included in today's meeting materials for your review. The letter that the Governor's Office sent, along with their map and their analysis the
accompanied the veto message, are also included in today's materials.

At my request, the Governor's Office is here today to provide members of this committee with the same briefing that I received last week and to answer questions about the map. Members earlier today -- all interested Senators were invited to attend this meeting.

Members of the Committee will be the first to ask questions relating to the proposed map, after which, if time permits, non-Committee members will be allowed to ask questions. Questions should not be framed in the form of debate. Debate is reserved for members of the Committee at the appropriate time.

We are scheduled to conclude this meeting at 4:30. The Senate will reconvene at 5 o'clock, as required by the earlier recess motion. In order to keep with the special session schedule, the President has indicated that he will not be open to extending today's meeting.

If there are no questions about our process for today, then we will proceed to today's agenda.

Seeing no questions, we will now move to the agenda. Take up tab number 1, Senate Bill 2-C
on establishing the Congressional districts of the state.

Mr. Alex Kelly is here on behalf of the Executive Office of the Governor to walk us through the map.

Mr. Kelly, the floor is yours.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Chair and members.
Again, my name is Alex Kelly, and I
appreciate your time and this opportunity today to present the map proposed by the Executive Office of the Governor, the third map filed by our office, and the proposed Congressional Reapportionment Plan and to discuss our office's contribution to what is a compromise plan.

And just for a background, I serve as at the Deputy Chief of Staff for the Governor. A very brief introduction before I get into the slides. I'll frequently today refer to improvements in the plan before you today. Senate Bill 2-C is followed by the Chair Plan 0109.

Although when $I$ refer to changes in this map, as you may know, you know, my role in terms of when I talk about my role in these changes, I'm only really referring to 18 of the 28 districts in this map. Ten of the districts are unchanged from Senate

Bill 102 that you passed during session, so Primary Plan 8019. So when I refer to changes and I refer to my work on this map, I'm really just referring to the 18 districts that I changed.

For my role in this process and my reason for being here today, I am the map drawer of the 18 changed districts in this plan before you. As for my experience, just to give a little context, a decade ago I was the Redistricting Committee Staff Director in the Florida House of Representatives. Starting in January earlier this year, I initially served for our office just in a role of providing general guidance and oversight to our inhouse and contract counsel and also to a contract map drawer, who we brought on to support this work, and that contract map drawer supported our work in the Governor's first map that was submitted back in, I want to say, maybe late January, early February, Plan 0079.

For reference, that contract map drawer of Congressional Plan 0079, his name is Adam Foltz. He's also previously drawn maps on behalf of the Texas and Wisconsin Legislatures. He's currently drawing maps right now on behalf of the Texas Legislature.

Adam and myself collaborated on our office's second map, map 0094, which was submitted a few weeks later. Much like your professional staff, myself, and our contact map drawer, we've only ever worked on maps for state government -- or I should say much like your professional staff and your Committee.

In this map before you today, I alone authored the changes in this plan, 0109, with respect to how this new plan compares to the map that the Legislature passed, the Legislature's primary plan. And generally speaking, today, I'll refer to the Legislature's primary plan, except where I might note otherwise, but generally, I'm referring to Plan 8019.

I will also say at the outset some important disclaimers. One, no one directed me to favor or disfavor a political party or incumbent in my work, and I did not draw with the intent to favor or disfavor. Two, in drawing any of the districts submitted by our office, I did not consider or even look at political data, including party registration and voting data. In other words, I do not know the voting history or party registration numbers for any of the districts that we've drawn as an office for
any of the districts that we'll look at today.
The only time I did reference political data was early in the process to determine a question that you were having to address, to determine whether or not it was possible to draw a compact African-American performing district in Northeast Florida, essentially a more compact version of the benchmark District 5.

I did at that time reference political data to determine if that was possible and determine if there was a way to draw such a district that complied with the U.S. Constitution, the Florida Constitution, in particular the Florida Constitution as interpreted by the Florida Supreme Court and implemented by this Legislature. I ultimately determined earlier in this process that it was not possible to essentially check all those boxes.

Three, in drawing the plan before you today -- in drawing and in really contributing to any of our office's plans and in the totality of our engagement in this process, I have not consulted with any outside -- anyone outside the Executive Office of the Governor, our contract counsel, our contract map drawer, or the Legislature and the Legislature staff and counsel.

In other words, I can confirm I've had no discussions with any political consultant, partisan operative, or any political party official concerning any plans presented by our office, including the plan that you'll be considering today. In effect, I have engaged in this process, including authoring this proposed comprise plan, in a manner that meets the same high standards that you set for your professional staff.

And this proposed plan truly is -- senate Bill 2-C, Plan 0109, is indeed a compromise. It is the project of -- a product of consultation and collaboration between our office and the leadership in the House and Senate, and it incorporates portions of the plan passed by the Legislature. when I noted earlier that 10 of the districts are identical to what the Legislature passed.

It incorporates concepts from maps previously discussed and presented by -- or previously submitted to the Legislature by our office, 0079 and 0094 . It incorporates concepts from the map that was referred out of the House's Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee, Plan 8011, and it aligns in several other ways that I'll describe with the House and Senate's map drawing.

I'll jump into the slides. Ten districts in the compromised plan, as I noted, Districts 1, 2, 20-25, 27, and 28 are unchanged by the plan passed by the Legislature. The remaining districts, 3-19 and 26, have been modified in various ways to address the federal constitutional concerns raised by the Governor and to improve various Tier 2 metrics.

In a few minutes, I will walk you through visually the 18 districts that $I$ changed in this proposed plan. First though, I'll give you a general overview on the next slide and then after that some highlights of the improvements to the Tier 2 metrics.

First, in an effort to create a collaborative product, I worked off the Legislature's primary plan, 8019. So while I was seeking to remedy the Governor's veto message and make improvements throughout the map, I began my work by downloading the Legislature's Plan 8019 and subsequently making changes. And I should note that I drew Plan 0109 entirely with the Legislature's publicly available website and data.

Regarding the proposed plan, the plan maintains the same number of performing
minority/majority seats. It retains, as I noted before, the Legislature's exact configuration for congressional districts in the Florida Panhandle, Districts 1-2, and Congressional Districts in the southeastern region of the state, essentially st. Lucie County down to Monroe County, just as in the Legislature's primary plan.

For the reasons set forth in the detailed memorandum that the Chair referenced and is in your packets that was prepared by our office's general counsel that accompanied the Governor's veto message, the compromised proposal eliminates the racially gerrymandered versions of Congressional District 5, which were included in Senate Bill 102 in both -- in different ways, the primary plan and the secondary plan. Again, members, that legal memorandum is in your committee packets.

In summary, Congressional District 5, in both the primary and secondary maps enacted by the Legislature, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the 14 th Amendment of the United states Constitution because it assigns voters primarily on the basis of race but is not narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling state interest.

That memorandum otherwise fully explains
the Governor's legal objections to both versions of the district as passed by the Legislature in the primary and secondary maps. I should note, as a map drawer, I'm not an attorney. So I'm not going to play the role of an attorney here today. I'll keep my comments focused on the map itself and do my best to answer your questions, but $I$ just want to note that at the outset, that I'm not legal counsel to the Governor.

Plan 109 creates in Northeast Florida two new districts, Districts 4 and 5, in the area that are consistent with the other maps previously published by our office with some minor improvements. These two districts are race neutral and overall more compact than District's 4 and 5 in the maps passed by the Legislature.

In addition to resolving federal -- the federal constitutional objections raised by the Governor, the compromised plan makes several overall improvements with respect to Tier 2 metrics relative to the maps passed by the Legislature by bringing together some of the best concepts from the Legislature's maps and of our office's maps.

Plan 109 adjusts the congressional districts in the Tampa Bay area and the larger Gulf

Coast region stretching from Citrus down to Lee Counties and impacting some inland counties to create sort of a hybrid, if you will, of some of the Legislature's and our office's maps. These changes improve overall visual compactness, have a net affect of reducing a county split, and significantly increase usage of other Tier 2 political and geographic boundary lines.

In the Central Florida region, the plan that you have before you today aligns more closely with the map that was referred out of the House Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee Plan 8011 with one distinction that I'll describe later that aligns with Senate Plan 8060 as you passed out of the senate.

SENATOR GIBSON: Mister --
ALEX KELLY: With --
SENATOR GIBSON: Sorry.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: (Indiscernible)
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So we're waiting until the entire packet is done to ask any questions because I didn't hear the explanation of the -- I think Mr. Kelly said of the Governor's veto language. I don't see it in the packet. So I'm just -- could he repeat? It was a rational for

|  | Page 14 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -- |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: The veto language was |
| 3 | in the packet we provided. |
| 4 | SENATOR GIBSON: And is -- can I have |
| 5 | clarity if that is the language that Mr. Kelly is |
| 6 | talking about that's in this thing? |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Do you understand the |
| 8 | question? |
| 9 | ALEX KELLY: Yes, Chair. |
| 10 | Yes, Senator. Yes. I gave a brief |
| 11 | synopsis of that veto message and the accompanying |
| 12 | message from our general counsel that went with the |
| 13 | veto message. |
| 14 | SENATOR GIBSON: I think that's the part I |
| 15 | didn't understand how you put it together. I just |
| 16 | want to make sure I hear it correctly. That's all |
| 17 | -- |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Okay. |
| 19 | SENATOR GIBSON: -- Chair. If he could |
| 20 | repeat it? |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Would you repeat that |
| 22 | please? |
| 23 | ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Chair. Happy to. |
| 24 | SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you. |
| 25 | ALEX KeLly: In summary, Congressional |



We understand during the course of the testimony between House and Senate there was a disagreement on this point. However, because districts cannot be drawn on the basis of race unless there is a compelling reason to do so, in the absence of an agreement between the House and Senate on the need to treat District 10 as a minority protected district under the state Constitution indicates that a compelling basis for using race is lacking.

Accordingly, the proposed plan defers to the House's stated testimony and my changes to the district in Central Florida in that region, including District 10, are drawn on race-neutral principles. Again, these changes in Central Florida result in Tier 2 improvements in the Central Florida region. And in combination, these changes in Central Florida and in the Gulf Coast counties result in some additional Tier 2 improvements for other impacted districts like Districts 3, 6, and 11.

Lastly, in-between the submission of our office's second map plan, 0094, and my drawing of this plan, 0109, I received feedback from House and Senate staff regarding our second maps overreliance on the use of census-designated place boundaries. I was encouraged to follow the House and Senate's preferred methodology for boundary usage to increase our usage of major roadways, waterways, and railways for Tier 2 compliance.

Our second map closely adhered to county and city lines. So that was not a concern, although less frequently so to other Tier 2 recognized boundaries. Therefore, throughout the 18 districts that are revised in this plan, I adopted the House and senate's preferred and clear articulation of Tier 2 compliance. So even when $I$ was trying to articulate a concept from one of our office's plans, I made such revisions using the Legislature's preferred approach to Tier 2 compliance.

In the next few slides, I'll walk you
through some key points regarding those Tier 2 improvements. First, the proposed -- the proposed plan before you today reduces by one the number of county splits from 18 to 17 by keeping Citrus and Sarasota Counties whole lieu of Polk, effectively a two-for-one swap. Furthermore, where there are county splits, the number -- the number of ways in which those counties are split is reduced.

Probably the most visible example of that
is -- at least in a larger county is the change in Hillsborough County, where portions of Hillsborough County are now only divided into three districts, rather than four districts.

Second, the proposed plan reduces the reliance on nongeographic and nonpolitical boundaries from 12.5 percent to 1.5 -- to -- I'm sorry -- 12.5 percent to 11.5 percent. In other words, just a minute ago when $I$ mentioned previously that I adopted the House and Senate's preferred way to articulate Tier 2 compliance by substituting major roadways, waterways, and railways, along with our map's already strong usage of county and city lines, my Tier 2 usage of compliant boundaries surpassed that of the maps passed by the Legislature.

Third, although mean compactness scores are largely equivalent when comparing my revisions to plan -- or in Plan 0109 with the Legislature's primary plan, the proposed plan improves the compactness score of the least compact district in the map. I believe this would actually be the first map considered by the Legislature in which every district has a Reock or Polsby-Popper score greater than 0.2 .

Moreover, visually, as we go through the map, we'll see in just a few moments many of the districts are just plainly more circular, squared, more visually compact shapes that are more easily understandable.

Lastly, my changes in Plan 0109 stayed equal to the Legislature's achievement of only splitting 16 cities in its primary plan. There are some differences about which cities are split when comparing my revisions in this plan to the Legislature's enacted plan. Specifically, Cape Coral, Plant City, and Port Orange would be kept whole in this plan, while splits would occur in Lakeland, St. Petersburg, and Longboat Key. What I did take care to do is ensure that where those essentially trades in city splits occurred to ensure that other Tier 2 metrics were being met in the process. For example, as you know, Longboat Key is one of four cities in Florida that crosses county lines, and I only split Longboat Key in the process of keeping Sarasota County whole. So it seemed a reasonable and rational trade to keep a county whole in lieu of a city that crossed county lines.

I should say in saying all this $I$ don't ever mean to suggest with these slides that there is a statistical line in the sand for what is Tier 2 compliant compactness or county splits or city splits. But recognizing that we could be presenting a plan to this Legislature and me author -- you know, authoring a compromised plan, I recognized I should come to you with a plan that recommends improvements and builds on the work of the Legislature and certainly in no way ask you to go backwards, only ask you to consider improvements, and that's exactly what I've done.

So with that, I'll proceed to a more detailed visual presentation. The next two slides are the same content just the second slide doesn't have the district labels. The statewide view definitely helps get a sense of some of the visual compactness -- and we'll zoom in some -- the visual compactness in this map and some of the improvements. And this was really here for your reference, as is the next slide, and you can begin to really see the changes -- if $I$ might just go to that slide -- you can begin to really see the changes when I've excluded the district labels. Again, as much as it was important to maintain statistical compactness for Tier 2
purposes, I also wanted these changes to satisfy the eyeball test and so offering up some square -- more square, circular districts, greater usage of clear and visible boundary lines helped that effect.

The next couple slides zoom in a little closer just focusing on those districts that I changed in this plan, so excluding the Panhandle and excluding Southeast Florida. Again, the slide without district labels might be a little easier to see, if only to appreciate some of the Tier 2 improvements.

One of the other key facets of my work on this proposed plan -- that I wanted to make sure there was not essentially collateral unintended consequences to my changes without making some sort of equal or better Tier 2 change. For example, as you see, I split Polk County as part of the swap for keeping Citrus and Sarasota Counties whole, and I'll explain in a little more detail later what exactly I mean by that.

In doing so, I incorporated several Tier 2 related changes in Polk County to make sure that the new lines and how those districts interact with districts from neighboring counties, how those lines are still very meaningful in a Tier 2 context.

that and in no way did I ever intend to do that. So I addressed Tier 1 in that context. Additionally, there is nowhere in the map where there's a contiguity issue. So Tier 1 has been addressed in that context as well.

In terms of the non-diminishment standard, when I went through the benchmark District 5 and the Governor's veto message, that really was at the heart of probably the one sort of outstanding Tier 1 question, the division between the Legislature's maps and the Governor's ultimate veto and objection to the map because there's this tension between that district -- that district, the way it was composed in both the primary and secondary plan violate the Federal Constitution.

So while there is the Tier 1 diminishment requirement, that Tier 1 diminishment requirement cannot be utilized to violate federal law, and so that's what I was referring to as I was walking through that.

SENATOR BRACY: How do we know that you haven't talked to --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized for a follow-up.

SENATOR BRACY: Thank you, Chair.

You said you haven't spoken to anyone. You haven't looked at any data regarding race. How do we know that? I mean, it was -- that was said before when we had the map drawing process in 2016. It proved to be wrong. We're just -- why would you even mention that if there's no way to prove that?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Bracy, I'm not going to forward that question on. I think he opened in the preamble by laying out these were the parameters that he worked from. If the question is -- you can ask the question, why did he feel he should lay those parameters out, but I don't think it's a fair question to put out, how can you prove something that you believe can't be proven. So I will yield to Mr. Kelly --

SENATOR BRACY: Okay.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- if he wants to
articulate why he led the preamble of these were the things I drew from.

ALEX KELLY: Sure. Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the question.

And really in due deference and respect to your process, we know these are standards by which you have to live too. And so we know that your work, the work of your professional staff, you hold
yourself to this high bar as well, and so I wanted to make sure that you understood that from our office's perspective, we were living up to that same standard that you are.

SENATOR BRACY: Question. How do you -CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized. SENATOR BRACY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. How do you feel that District 5, District 10 violates the 14 th Amendment?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized. ALEX KELLY: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And so I could probably -- I could probably at this point probably defer a little bit to counsel because I've probably given sort of my best summary overview of the tension between the two. I will say that the memo that has been provided to you details this significantly and explains the Governor's veto message.

And, of course, I also walked through District 10. In District 10, we accept the House's analysis that it's not actually a performing seat. The House testified to that in committee. It was a very rational and well-thought-out analysis, and so we're adopting that analysis here. And in both cases, if there's absent a compelling state
interest, if there's a potential violation of federal law, at that point, the state's not obligated to draw those districts in a manner that aligns with the state constitutional diminishment standard.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Bracy, did you get a copy of the veto letter in the packet we provided?

SENATOR BRACY: I didn't, but if the staff can go through how this violates the 14 th Amendment I guess from the House analysis -- I mean, you're here to defend this map. So if someone can explain to me how District 5, District 10 are not protected minority access seats when it was in our senate drawing -- Senate map drawing process. Now all of the sudden, it's not. I understand that was the House position. If it can be explained for this committee so it's clear, I would appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Why don't we do this? Why don't we give you some time to read over the veto letter, and then I'm going to go to Senator Rouson for a question. And then we'll come back and (indiscernible).

SENATOR ROUSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

You indicated that your rationale for not drawing Congressional District 5 the way it currently is configured and for not drawing Congressional District 10 the way it's currently configured was because it violates the Equal Protection Clause because it assigns voters based on race but not narrowly tailored to meet a compelling state interest; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And I don't know that I would -- I would relate the analysis of both districts identically. I did state regarding District 5 -- benchmark District 5 and subsequent attempts to redraw that. I did articulate that that's a violation of the United States Constitution.

The issue with District 10 is just more plainly -- and we accept the House's analysis of this -- that the district is not a performing minority seat, and that analysis was laid out in the House record. And we have adopted that analysis into our justification here.

And essentially what the House articulated is that the minority community is not on its own -it does not on its own have enough strength to elect

great state of Florida?
ALEX KELLY: Chair?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: I mean, Chair -- Senator
Rouson, redistricting standards as outlined in the Florida Constitution and outlined just traditional redistricting standards refer to things such as compactness, keeping counties together, keeping cities together, using clearly identifiable boundary ways. These are ways to draw districts that have a lack of political intent, a lack of racial intent, a lack of any sort of manipulation. And so that is -that is, generally speaking, the way to draw a district. The Florida Constitution guides districts to be drawn that way, and so that is the process that we followed.

SENATOR ROUSON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator stewart.
SENATOR STEWART: Thank you, Chair.
And you have outlined quite a few concurrences with the criteria for 2 , and, of course, since it was brought up about Tier 1 , it seems to have much more need for compelling review. One of the Tier 1 guidelines along the federal law directs the lawmakers -- and we heard
this in committee over and over and over again -that districts shall not be drawn with the intent or result of denying or abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or to diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice.

Now, I have not heard yet from this map that was drawn if that was also considered.

ALEX KELLY: Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: I think I've just answered that same question a couple different ways. I'm not sure I have any more to offer.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Bracy, have you had an opportunity to read the veto letter?

SENATOR BRACY: I perused the letter.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized for a question.

SENATOR BRACY: So and you just said that minorities cannot elect a candidate of its own. It does not have enough, I guess, voting strength to do that, and that is why you don't consider District 5 or District 10 a minority -- protected minority access seat; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.

ALEX KELLY: Just to -- just to clarify, there are some points there where the analysis regarding benchmark District 5 and benchmark District 10 would be different. So the analysis regarding benchmark District 5 is very plain sighted in that regard. There is not sufficient voting strength in the minority community to, by itself, elect a candidate of its choice. So the analysis for the two is not identical.

SENATOR BRACY: Got it. So --
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized. SENATOR BRACY: -- thank you, Mr. Chair.

So what is the benchmark where minorities could elect the candidate of their choice? What would be that percentage if you --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Mr. Chair, thank you.
That would require an analysis of the political data for any district. I don't know that there's one line in the sand, but generally, the idea is that could that minority community -- on its own voting strength without help, could that minority community elect a candidate of its choice? But that's going to be different in every single district.

SENATOR BRACY: So if you didn't -Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
SENATOR BRACY: So if you didn't look at any data to determine that this is a minority access seat, how did you determine it? By eyeballing it? How did you make that determination?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: He said earlier that he did use the political data on District 5 when he was attempting to draw the district. So on that, I believe he's already answered that question.

SENATOR BRACY: Okay. So you did use political data, and you -- when you were looking at the political data for District 5, what determination did you -- how did you determine that that was not a minority access seat since you did look at the data for that? What did the data show you that --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You -SENATOR BRACY: -- told you?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You're recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
So the look at District 5 -- benchmark
District 5 in different configurations the Legislature considered wasn't a question so much of
the political effectiveness of the community. It was a question of multiple facets at the same time. The district is clearly -- the benchmark is clearly drawn from Duval to Gadsden Counties is clearly a racial gerrymander. That's what the district is plain sighted.

So the question becomes does it meet some compelling state interest in doing so? And our analysis, particularly early on as we were weighting this question and I was personally weighing this question was, was there a manner in which that district could be drawn more compactly, more in line with traditional redistricting criteria so that, in effect, from a federal law perspective, state law perspective, and sort of the traditional redistricting criteria, could you, so to speak, check all the boxes and find a way to have a sort of compromise?

The reality through analysis of that district, including just observing the Legislature's process, there was not a way to draw a compact, politically effective, minority district and check all the boxes, so to speak, without violating some manner of law.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Do you have a follow-
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| 1 | up? |
| 2 | SENATOR BRACY: I do. I do. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You're recognized. |
| 4 | SENATOR BRACY: You mentioned that your |
| 5 | determination was basically, did it meet a state -- |
| 6 | a compelling interest? But I want to go -- but I |
| 7 | feel like you haven't answered the question about |
| 8 | minority voting strength. You said it did not meet |
| 9 | the criteria because it did not have enough of a |
| 10 | minority voting strength to be a protected seat. |
| 11 | How did you determine -- I know you said it didn't |
| 12 | have state compelling interest. |
| 13 | But specifically to why you said it did not |
| 14 | have enough of a voting -- a minority voting |
| 15 | strength to make it a minority access seat, how did |
| 16 | you determine that specifically? Was there a |
| 17 | percentage that it did not meet that made you decide |
| 18 | it did not meet the threshold? |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You're recognized. |
| 20 | ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Chair. |
| 21 | So and I apologize. I think we're having a |
| 22 | little bit of just confusion, which is certainly |
| 23 | understandable, between our district of benchmark |
| 24 | District 5 and benchmark District 10. |
| 25 | Benchmark District 10 in Orlando -- or |

Orange County, I should say, for that district, I was specific in saying it does not have a significant enough minority community to have the electoral strength to elect a candidate of their choice.

So that analysis was provided in public testimony by the House's professional Redistricting Committee's staff in their Congressional Redistricting subcommittee. It was -- the analysis was a sound analysis, and we have adopted that. We have essentially adopted their judgment in our process, and we've agreed with their analysis.

So that's where the analysis for District 10 departs some from District 5. District 5 starts with the question of the district is a racial gerrymander. Is it done in such a way that is so narrowly tailored to a compelling state interest? And it ultimately fails a different test. It fails a test of violating the U.S. Constitution. Obviously, we can't take any element of our state Constitution and use that against the U.S. Constitution and violate that.

SENATOR BRACY: Okay. So just so that I understand, you did not make your determination on District 5 based on the minority voting strength.

the House's position is again?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Could you clarify that again please?

ALEX KELLY: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
The House's position -- the House staff articulated in their committee meeting or

Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee meeting that they looked at recent elections history, and that when they looked at that recent elections history, the black community in orange county, in Congressional District 10 was not sufficient enough on its own to elect a candidate of its choice. They did that analysis on their own. We didn't do that analysis, but the logic that they articulated in committee was sound logic and a sound analysis. And so we adopted that.

SENATOR BRACY: Okay. I don't serve in the House. I did not see that election data. So I understand you took their position, but I guess I'm asking for specifics on their data and how they made that determination. And I don't know if our staff can clarify how they came to that position. I understand what their position was, but I'm trying to understand how they came to that position.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Jay, do you have
insight on that?
JAY FERRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I'm understanding the question correctly, I believe the House reviewed the data for benchmark CD 10 and determined that, over time, over the different election cycles, the level of primary control for African American voters in the Democratic Primary was slipping below 50 percent and, therefore, concluded that the voters in that benchmark district did not outright control the Primary and, therefore, made their determination based on that.

And that's my understanding of the House's analysis on that district, and that's probably about all I can speak to on that.

SENATOR BRACY: Just a follow-up. So from your understanding, the black voting age population in that $C D 10$ had a voting strength of less than 50 percent in a primary, which in turn is how they and the Governor determined that that is not a protected seat. Is that the way you understand it?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Jay, you're recognized.

JAY FERRIN: Mr. Chairman.
Yeah. Without trying to speak for the
House or the Governor, that is my understanding is
that they reviewed elections over time and noticed a trend in terms of primary control. It has nothing to do with voting age population but in terms of primary control for African American voters on the Democratic Primary and based their conclusions on that.

SENATOR BRACY: So they took an average of elections, not just like the past 2020 elections. They took an average of recent elections and put that together and determined together that it went less than 50 percent?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Jay.
JAY FERRIN: No. Senator Bracy, we did look at the average in the senate to try to control for electoral trends. The House looked at the trends. They looked at each individual -- each election -- the primary control in each election cycle individually and looked at that over time and noticed that it was decreasing every two years.

SENATOR BRACY: Okay. So they are anticipating, the way you understand it, that the trend will be that it will go below 50 percent, but maybe it's not there yet. But the trend is trending toward below 50 percent; is that a correct analysis of how you understand it?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Jay, do you recall what the percentage was?

JAY FERRIN: Unfortunately, I don't recall the percentages offhand, and I can't always speak to the House's analysis of that. But that's how I understood it to work.

SENATOR BRACY: Okay. Well, I'll just say I think it's troubling that the Governor's Office is coming before us and touting an analysis that no one really understands -- and he cannot speak to either -- and this is how he's determined that District 10 is not a protected access seat. I think that's important information.

So, you know, if you can't answer my question, we can move on, but $I$ just want to make the point that we're here for this purpose of learning more information. And no one can speak to it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Broxson, you are recognized.

VICE CHAIR BROXSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to kind of put this in perspective of the predicate that you started on. When you looked over the senate -- state Senate and state

House, you used more of a Florida standard of what we were trying to accomplish. Now, you're looking at the Congressional maps, which this probably will be contested, and you believe that based on the U.S. prototype that these conform with the intent of the current law and gives you the position that you have -- you've stated today. Is that kind of where we are?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Alex, you are recognized.

ALEX KELLY: And thank you for the question. So essentially, yes. We've brought -- if I understood correctly, we've brought forward a map that we believe complies with the U.S. Constitution and the State Constitution. So obviously, we have an obligation to try to balance and comply with both, of course, and so we believe we've brought forward a map that complies with both and gives the Legislature a work product that brings forward the best of both.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Gibson.
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
In terms of the statement of, I guess, apparently there was no way to meet the state's interest in drawing minority access seats, in the


your words, you cannot explain what the compeling state interest is?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
That obligation would be on the part of the map drawer. I did not draw the Legislature's attempts to redraw benchmark District 5, and I didn't redraw -- I didn't draw benchmark District 5. So that would be a compelling interest that the Legislature would have to put forward through your process if you were attempting to redraw that and narrowly tailor that to some state compelling interest.

SENATOR GIBSON: Follow-up?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You're recognized. SENATOR GIBSON: May I? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There's no functional analysis in the packet that I see of the districts. Is there no functional analysis because it is the -- is there some understanding that if it's not going to be a minority access seat, then there's no reason to have a functional analysis?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Gibson, I'm going to refer to Staff Director Jay Ferrin on that

understand the information in that was used to determine that the Senate 8019, which I want to make sure we're also clear that 8019 and the House's map -- primary and secondary maps were all voted on before special session. And those maps are not the maps that the Governor or that you all drew at the Governor's direction; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Mr. Chair.
Yes. Primary plan 8019 and secondary plan 8015 are the two maps that you, the Legislature, approved within the contents of senate Bill 102, and that's the bill that the Governor vetoed.

SENATOR GIBSON: Follow-up?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I wanted to make sure that that was clear because there is some confusion about which came first, the chicken or the egg, whether it was the House maps that came over that were passed out and not the Governor's maps because we are now addressing the Governor's proposed maps, correct?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: I'll answer that. we are taking up the Governor's map now.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you. Follow-up, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
SENATOR GIBSON: I want to go back to -- so CD 5, which was different before it became 5, I think in the last redistricting, the last how many years has an African American been elected in the maps previously that represented -- that included representation of what is currently shown as CD 5?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: I think we're getting beyond the contents of the lines he's drawn there, but I'll give him a shot at it.

ALEX KELLY: To my knowledge, of course, that district has only existed since the court adopted it in late 2015 and it went into place for the 2016 election cycle. Prior to that, the district, instead of going from Jacksonville to Gadsden County went from Jacksonville to Orlando, and if I recall correctly, Congresswoman Brown had that seat since somewhere in the early-to-mid '90s. I don't remember the exact year.

SENATOR GIBSON: Follow-up?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And then the recent CD 5 that elected an
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| 1 | African American, the drawing of the maps concluded |
| 2 | that that -- or the drawing of the Governor's maps |
| 3 | concluded that that map was not gerrymandered but |
| 4 | the previous adaptation of CD 5, which went east to |
| 5 | west, is gerrymandered? |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Could you restate that |
| 7 | please? |
| 8 | SENATOR GIBSON: He shook his head. I |
| 9 | think he understood it. |
| 10 | ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Chair. I think I |
| 11 | got it. |
| 12 | Yeah. So yes. And this is articulated in |
| 13 | the memorandum too, but I can say unequivocally the |
| 14 | district currently today as drawn from Jacksonville |
| 15 | over to Gadsden County stretching about three and a |
| 16 | half hours is a racial gerrymander. |
| 17 | SENATOR GIBSON: I'm sorry. Mr. Chair? |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Could you repeat that? |
| 19 | SENATOR GIBSON: The last -- you said |
| 20 | what's three and a half hours? |
| 21 | ALEX KELLY: The drive from Jacksonville to |
| 22 | Gadsden County, the length of the district. |
| 23 | SENATOR GIBSON: Thank -- Mr. Chair? |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Okay. Members, we're |
| 25 | going to go back to the map. |



1 the new configuration here still allowed us to 2 improve overall on compactness.

The original iteration of this crossing that we drew in one of our earlier maps was I would say less deliberative. In this improved configuration, I used the bridges of the Arlington Expressway and Interstate 295 to literally allow a resident of District 4 to not have to leave the district in order to traverse the entire district. So we just tried to use those boundary lines a little more logically if we were going to have to
cross the river and gain equal population.
SENATOR BRACY: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Yes?
SENATOR BRACY: I have a question on the map. I'm looking at District 2. How far does District 2 go from east to west?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Do you have that on a slide, or do you want to answer that?

ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And I don't, and I don't actually know. We didn't draw District 2. The Legislature drew District 2. And I will say in general in the maps that we drew out of our office, I don't recall if we ever made any changes to the Legislature's configurations in Districts 1 or 2, but we definitely did not change them for the purposes of this map compared to what the Legislature passed.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Okay.
SENATOR BRACY: Well, the reason why I bring it up is that you said that District 5 was a racial gerrymander that spread 200 miles, but I'm looking at District 2. It looks like it goes about 200 miles, maybe more.

So the fact that you singled out District 5
for it going east to west that far but you got other
ones that do, you got a problem. It seems that -anyway, I just wanted to explain how -- I would like for you to explain how District 2 can go 200 miles, but District 5 can't.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I think if you're looking at Northeast Florida, where you have Nassau, Duval. You have Clay. You have St. Johns Counties. Within those four counties, you can fit more than two congressional districts because a third district is even started in southern $S t$. Johns in the configuration we're looking at today.

You're comparing that to rural Florida, the Panhandle, where there's significantly less population. Naturally, a district in the Panhandle is going to comprise probably several entire rural counties. The same is true if you look in the southern central part of the state as well where you have rural communities.

And that's just generally a reality of drawing a district that perhaps is maybe based out of a municipality or a larger city or a larger county versus drawing a district that's centered around a number of rural counties. So a compact


1 decision to keep Broward, Osceola, and Polk Counties whole. This decision essentially places a little bit of a limitation on the map drawer. And obviously there's -- obviously, it's a good goal to keep counties whole, but it places a little bit of limitation on the map drawer. And that limitation essentially then forces your hand as a map drawer in the Tampa Bay region.

Keeping Broward, Osceola, and Polk whole essentially creates a wall across three-quarters of the state. So if, as we do in Plan 109, if we're able to essentially break that wall in Polk County, there are means to do that in meaningful, Tier 2, metric-driven ways that make gains for the map overall, and we can still, as we'll show later, make meaningful Tier 2 decisions in Polk County as well. And that really allows a number then of Gulf Coast counties decisions that make a number of Tier 2 gains for this map.

I'll give some specific examples. So in this example in slide 16 , this became a means to keep Collier -- sorry, not Collier -- Citrus County whole in District 12, which you can see here, and this district is a much more squared-up, linear district. District 12 actually is still in this
configuration a majority Pasco County seat yielding about 141,000 of its residents in the southern part of the county into District 15.

Just while we have it on the screen, the boundaries there -- this is all of Citrus, all of Hernando, and most of Pasco. The boundaries between District 12 and 15 -- 15 is the pinkish district in the south there -- the boundaries there, the city of Zephyrhills is entirely in District 15. The cities of St. Leo, San Antonio, and Dade City are entirely in 12. And those lines, despite their curves, they're predominantly state roads all throughout. Moving on to slide 17, south of the Tampa Bay region, we were also able to keep, through changes made in the Polk County area, we're able to also keep Sarasota County whole. As I opened it up, essentially what I've done in this map is I've articulated two whole counties in exchange for splitting another county. So gaining that net whole county in the map, keeping Citrus whole, keeping Sarasota whole, splitting Polk.

In this particular configuration, keeping Sarasota whole, aligning it with all of Charlotte County and aligning it with some unincorporated communities in Lee County to essentially equalize
the population, and the boundaries in Lee county are almost entirely either major roadways or city boundaries.

On slide 18, taking this approach north and south of Tampa Bay then allowed us to go -- or allowed me to go work in the Tampa Bay area because overall just comparing the map that we had previously worked on, comparing that to the Legislature's map, the population distribution was just simply different.

So again, as I noted earlier, really had to lift the whole region out and look at options to reconfigure it. Taking this approach north and south of Tampa Bay and gave me a better chance to draw more visually compact districts in Tampa Bay and make improved usage of Tier 2 political and geographical boundary lines.

Zooming just a little bit further on Pinellas County and the bay, it seemed from the Legislature's process that there was a goal to have a seat wholly in Pinellas County, and so this map still accomplishes this goal. I literally started in this region working from west to east. Doing so, essentially, I was able to create a very squared-up, compact district.

$\quad$ In the northern part of District 13 where $\quad$ Page 57

Tampa. Current configuration of the district is different from what you've suggested. Can you explain the difference?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Mr. Chair, thank you.
To be frank, I actually am unaware of the black voting age population of District 14. This was not even drawn with any type of racial intent at all. This was not drawn with any type of even looking at any racial data for this district. There was not to my knowledge any reason to do so. So I was just drawing a district based on nice, clean, compact lines, lines that adhered to major roadways, major recognizable roadways, and try to split as few cities as possible in this area.

I do trade a split of $S t$. Pete for $--m y$ apology --

SENATOR ROUSON: You traded --
ALEX KELLY: -- one other city, my apology, but I do -- there is a city split trade in this area. But so the overall city splits are equal to what the Legislature adopted, but I just utilized the major roadways and worked my way east and worked my way north.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Rouson, do you
have a follow-up?
SENATOR ROUSON: No.
SENATOR BRACY: Mr. Chairman, I do have a question.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: We'll go to Senator Bracy and then Senator Gibson.

SENATOR BRACY: Thank you.
Is Mr. Alex Kelly under oath for this committee?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: No. He's not.
SENATOR BRACY: I know we do it in certain circumstances, certain secretaries. Could we make that happen in this committee?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: The time to have done that would have been before we began the presentations. So at this point, I would rule that out of order.

Senator Gibson, did you have a question?
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
In terms of the -- I think I heard the primary elections showed some data that CD 5 couldn't on its own elect a candidate of their choice, some historical image and something about historical, and that's, I guess, in any other district that should be a minority access district,
you mentioned that the primary elections showed that they couldn't -- is that correct -- by themselves --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Mr. Kelly?
SENATOR GIBSON: -- elect someone?
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I think the question you're asking about pertained somewhat to my comments about Congressional District 10 , not Congressional District 5. But I'm not totally sure. There might have been some blurring of the line there between the two in the question.

SENATOR GIBSON: Follow-up, Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
SENATOR GIBSON: It may be blurring because they impact the same ethnic people perhaps, but it was said that data had shown -- that was in context of 5 and 10 , that the primary data showed that the CD 5 couldn't elect a minority member of Congress on their own, which is why we weren't following any Tier 1 because all we're talking about today is Tier 2. And that's the reason for it's not diminished; is that what you said about the primary data -CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Mr. Kelly. SENATOR GIBSON: -- primary election data? ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think your question or at least what you're referencing from my testimony refers to my comments about Congressional District 10, and I was reflecting on the House professional staff's, their analysis of Congressional District 10 . We didn't look at the political data for Congressional District 10. I didn't look at the political data for Congressional District 10.

The House, in their subcommittee, referenced their analysis of Congressional District 10 and that based on their analysis of past years primary electoral data, that their analysis showed that the black community in orange County, in Congressional District 10, could not on their own elect a candidate of their choice.

Congressional District 5, I don't think I've heard anyone question that the district has an ability to elect. Their issues are similar, but the issues are not identical. The question in Congressional District 5 is it is a gerrymandered district drawn predominantly based on one criteria, a strong -- predominantly based on race and was it drawn in a way that meets a compelling state interest, which is a question that would have to be asked of the map drawer to justify the district.
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | SENATOR GIBSON: So -- |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized. |
| 3 | SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. |
| 4 | And so the map drawer only looked at an |
| 5 | analysis that didn't include a functional analysis |
| 6 | in any configuration, correct? |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized. |
| 8 | ALEX KELLY: My apology. I'm not sure I |
| 9 | understood the question. |
| 10 | SENATOR GIBSON: So -- I'm sorry. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Restate. |
| 12 | SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. |
| 13 | In the purported gerrymandered district |
| 14 | based on race, the -- and now in the map that we're |
| 15 | dealing with today, there was -- a functional |
| 16 | analysis was not reviewed to recognize communities |
| 17 | of interest, not gerrymandered based on race, |
| 18 | because it's all race neutral; is that correct? |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Do you understand it |
| 20 | now? |
| 21 | ALEX KELLY: I think so. Yes. Thank you, |
| 22 | Mr. Chair and thank you. |
| 23 | So I'm going to break that down. So our |
| 24 | office has not done a functional analysis on any of |
| 25 | the districts. We have not -- I have not drawn |

districts based on communities of interest. What you did say at the end, we drew districts -- is correct. We drew districts in a race neutral way. SENATOR GIBSON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Follow-up?
SENATOR GIBSON: I keep trying to understand the -- is there a definition for race neutral drawing?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You're recognized. ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I mean, I'll give you a non-attorney definition. Essentially, for me, race was not a driving factor of how I drew the district. It was definitely not a predominant factor, and as I noted when we talked earlier about District 14, I couldn't even tell you -- and I still can't tell you -- what the actual black voting age population of the district is.

I drew that district, District 13, 14, all the districts around it solely based on trying to draw districts that are compact, aesthetically compact, statistically compact, that follow clearly definable political and geographical boundary lines that meet that Tier 2 test. So I didn't draw a single district in this map based on race.

SENATOR GIBSON: Follow-up?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And so the Tier 1 never came into play in
terms of keeping communities of interest together, that it doesn't have to be a majority, but certainly their ability to elect the representative of their choice, that was never a factor. It's just strictly where the lines are and let people fall where they may; is that kind of how it --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized. SENATOR GIBSON: -- it is?

ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Again, I drew districts based on drawing compact districts that followed aesthetic compactness, statistical compactness, followed clearly identifiable, recognizable, political and geographical boundary lines. I did not use communities of interest as a standard, and I did not draw race-based districts.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Kelly.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Stewart, did you have a question?

SENATOR STEWART: Thank you, Chair.
A little bit toward where Senator Gibson
was going, but what I'm gathering from the discussion thus far is that Tier 1 guidelines that was the federal law was not considered in this map and primarily you went by roadways and to make sure that the Tier 2 was done correctly?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Senator, the Tier 1 guidelines are part of state law, not federal law.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Do you have a followup, Senator Stewart?

SENATOR STEWART: That's news to me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Bracy.
SENATOR BRACY: Thank you. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
Senator Rouson talked about the black people in Pinellas, and now they're moved to a district over that will now have them most likely representing -- having a Republican representative. And you're saying you are not aware of that at all whatsoever, did not have any impact on your decision-making.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Race and political partisan data in no way related at all to my drawing of Districts 13, 14, 15, 16, or any of the districts on the map. Really leaned in heavily to Tier 2 standards of compactness and use of Tier 2 boundaries in these districts. Again, I made a split in northern -- the northern part of District 13 along the Pinellas-Hillsborough County line, in the southern part of District 13 and 14 right along U.S. 19 as a southern divider. There's a little bit of equal population work done just north of $S t$. Pete in the unincorporated Feather Sound area as --

SENATOR BRACY: I got it. Thank you. I understand. So District 5 -- excuse me -- District 10 --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized for a follow-up.

SENATOR BRACY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So in District 10, the district that I represent now, in West Orange County, all of the black people in West Orange County have now been moved to a district that will be represented mostly by Lake County.

So you have an area that has elected Val Demings, who was a potential Vice President

today.
That Congressional District 10 is a very, very Tier 2-adherent district, very compact. All of those lines are used to define either major roadways or municipal boundaries, and to put this into context, the benchmark Congressional District 10, to my knowledge, has a black voting age population somewhere just under 27 percent, somewhere in the high 26 percent range.

The district that you're looking at there today has like a 25.98 , 25.96, a very close percentage to 26 . So it's not even a 1 percent. It's maybe a $7 / 10$ or $8 / 10$ of a percent point drop in its black voting age population.

So just drawing a compact seat -- and I can walk through the different city and roadway boundaries. Just drawing a compact seat that lines up with -- you can see that's the Seminole-orange County line. You can see some major roadways. That piece of District 9 that goes up into District 10 , that's the cities of Belle Isle and Edgewood. So it's keeping some municipalities whole. Maitland, Winter Park are kept whole in 10. You've got Winter Garden, Ocoee, Apopka are kept whole in 11.

So just following all those principles, we
were able to draw a very compact District 10 that's not even a percentage point difference in its black voting age population. So we really adhered to the principles in Florida law and drew a very compact district, and that's something that was similar to what the House had drawn and articulated good reasons for drawing it. And so when I worked on this map, that is the seat that $I$ drew, and it really is a very compact and very lawfully compliant seat.

SENATOR BRACY: Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You're recognized. SENATOR BRACY: Thank you. You mentioned before that you had no idea on percentages. You did not use that for any outcomes, yet you just quoted the black voting age population, how much it changed. So help me understand.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You want to provide some clarity there?

ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I noted that comment specific to District
14. District 10, we recognized that there was a tension between the testimony in the House and Senate. And so it was important to understand the
black voting age population, as well as the Hispanic voting age population of that district, that benchmark district, again, somewhere, you know, around, give or take, close to 26-something percent. I forget the exact number, but 26 -something percent black voting age population in the benchmark. And I think the Hispanic voting age population is actually larger, around 28 percent Hispanic voting age population.

So this was a district where we did have to look at -- I had to look at the data for the black voting age population, the Hispanic voting age population, try to come to an understanding of that tension between the House and Senate testimony, and figure out an appropriate resolution.

SENATOR BRACY: Okay. So you were aware of

```
    --
```

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized. SENATOR BRACY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So you were aware of the black voting age population, Hispanic voting age population when making the changes that you were -- that you made in District 10; that is correct?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized. ALEX KELLY: Yes.

SENATOR BRACY: Okay. All right. Just looking at the Federal Voting Rights Act, and it protects against retrogression. And it defines that as the ability of racial and language minorities to elect representatives of their choice. So any effect to that would be considered retrogression.

So what I'm saying is to move the people from West Orange County, who have elected Val Demings as their Congresswoman, to now move them in a district in Lake County with the villages and others where now they won't be able to elect the representative of their choice, from this definition, it clearly goes against the Voting Rights Act. It clearly is retrogression.

How do you explain that group of black people having the choice to vote for one, but now they will not be able to elect the candidate of their choice?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Mr. Kelly, you are recognized.

ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And I won't claim to be an expert on every facet of the Voting Rights Act, but in general, I don't know of any way in which a Voting Rights Act challenge could be brought to a district that's 26
percent of the black -- or 26 percent of it's the black community, 28 percent of it's the Hispanic community. I don't know that there's any connection at all to the Voting Rights Act for a district like that.

Generally, that type of challenge is, to my knowledge -- and counsel could probably clarify -but to my knowledge is applicable to a district where a majority of the district is a particular minority community, so a district, in other words, where it has a 50 percent-plus black voting age population.

There's further analysis required, more than just that, but in general, this district and the Voting Rights Act wouldn't have anything to do with each other.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Bracy?
SENATOR BRACY: But you said before you don't even know the percentages the House used to determine if this is even a minority seat or not. So --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Well, he did say he looked at District 10.

SENATOR BRACY: He looked at the black voting age population, but to determine if it is a
minority seat -- you know what. We're going in circles. What I would ask, Chairman, is that we've got a lot of people here, and I think there's honestly only three, four districts that are really what people are paying attention to.

So I appreciate the presentation from the Governor's Office, but just so that we have time for debate and that people have a chance to speak, I would ask that we could conclude the presentation or really expedite it and then allow for people to speak.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Gibson.
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And I certainly will save time for public testimony. I appreciate those who have come today. On the -- I'm unclear as to which -- when there was data reviewed, when there wasn't data reviewed.

But just in the House primary map -- I believe that was one that you all utilized, I think, a little bit or tweaked it a little bit -- the black voting age population according to this full analysis was around 35 percent, a little over 35 percent. In the data for the race neutral maps, that goes down to 12 percent.

And so it's your testimony today that
because -- that there's no diminishment because that population couldn't elect a candidate of their choice in a primary?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I apologize. I don't have the benefit of the data that you're looking at. So I'm not sure what you're looking at.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Do you have a followup?

SENATOR GIBSON: Mr. Chair? Yes.
So I have the packet with the map that we're discussing, which district by district, includes percentages for the various districts based on the map that we received.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Gibson, our staff --

SENATOR GIBSON: So this is the staff data.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Our staff prepared -SENATOR GIBSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- that data.
SENATOR GIBSON: Well, Mr. Chair, may I?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Yes.
SENATOR GIBSON: Regardless of the preparation -- and I trust what our staff does --
those are the percentages. And that is not diminishment because CD 5 is no longer considered to have need for a minority access district? Would that be the premise?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: I have to apologize. I'm not sure. Are we talking about District 5 or District 10?

SENATOR GIBSON: I said -- I'm sorry.
ALEX KELLY: And I'm still not really sure what data -- I don't know if we're referencing data regarding racial and language minorities. I don't know if we're referencing elections data. I'm struggling to follow the question?

SENATOR GIBSON: May I?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: He's at a disadvantage not having the packet.

SENATOR GIBSON: May I explain it?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Sure.
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
So we have something called a voter age voting data, right, or the voting age population in each of the congressional districts that were drawn in Plan 109, and the projection for the CD 5 in 109 of black voting age population in CD 5 is now 12
percent, which was previously in the map I believe you referenced that the Senate passed -- you chose this one -- 8019, was 35 percent.

And so my question -- but you don't -because you don't have the -- because you don't have the data, can you not answer the question based on the percentages that I gave?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Mr. Kelly.
ALEX KELLY: Sure. Okay. And thank you. And thank you for the clarification. I think I'm starting to understand what you're asking. So you're referring to District 5 in map 8019, and District 5's black voting age population in map 8019 is 35.32 percent.

I wouldn't say that District 5 in map 0109 is the comparable district. Neither district really resembles it, but I wouldn't say that it's the comparable district. District 4 if that map, in map 0109, has a black voting age population of 31.66 percent, and that achieved that 31.66 percent without attempting in any way to draw it with race as a consideration.

SENATOR GIBSON: District 4 has the 30 percent.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: That's what he said.

getting into Southwest Jacksonville in the Legislature's District 5 that for the map that I drew is in a different district. That would explain the changes in the numbers because the populations don't match perfectly.

SENATOR GIBSON: Well --
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And it's still diminishment; is that correct? In each of the districts, it's not 35 percent any longer --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
SENATOR GIBSON: -- correct?
ALEX KeLLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
As I noted in my opening, the district as drawn in the different configurations by the Legislature violates the Equal Protection Clause of the 14 th Amendment of the United States Constitution. So in effect, the plain language way of looking at that is there was no benchmark district to be redrawn. So, therefore, there is no diminishment to be considered.

SENATOR GIBSON: Last question?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Last question.
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| 1 | SENATOR BRACY: Yeah. |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Bracy. |
| 3 | SENATOR BRACY: Thank you, Senator Gibson. |
| 4 | I get your point. |
| 5 | Last two questions. Mr. Kelly, how do you |
| 6 | justify splitting the minority population in Orlando |
| 7 | into two separate districts when it had been |
| 8 | contained in CD 10 in the benchmark? |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized. |
| 10 | ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. |
| 11 | As I noted before, there was no obligation |
| 12 | in any way to redraw District 10, the benchmark |
| 13 | district. There's no lawful obligation to redraw |
| 14 | that seat that way. What I did was I drew a |
| 15 | District 10, which, again, for reference, is nearly |
| 16 | equal, maybe a 7/10 or 8/10 of a percentage point |
| 17 | different in terms of its black voting age |
| 18 | population. |
| 19 | I drew a District 10 in an area that |
| 20 | includes Winter Prink, Maitland, is more centrally |
| 21 | located in Orange County, a very compact seat, and |
| 22 | drawing of that district actually allowed for some |
| 23 | Tier 2 compliance in several other ways around the |
| 24 | seat as well, essentially helping with District 9, |
| 25 | District 11. |

So I followed the outline of Florida law to draw those seats, draw those seats compactly, utilize political and geographical boundary lines, and I didn't consider race in any way in the drawing of the seat.

SENATOR BRACY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Last question. But aren't you -- in doing it that way, aren't you putting Tier 2 requirements above Tier 1?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And as I noted in my opening, you know, part of Tier 1 is contiguity obviously, which I followed that, and then part of Tier 1 is not intentionally favoring or disfavoring an incumbent or political party. And as I noted in my opening, I did not do that, and I did not intend to do that. And I did not in any way take any feedback from anyone to try to do something like that.

So I didn't violate that Tier 1 standard, and there was no diminishment obligation for that district. So I complied with Tier 1, moved to Tier 2, and drew very compact districts that follow political and geographical boundary lines.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Okay. Are there any
other questions from members of the committee?
Seeing none, we have a new member to the Senate who's not on the committee who has joined us. If you would like, please introduce yourself to the crowd, and you may ask your question.

SENATOR OSGOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I am Senator Rosalind Osgood, newly elected for District 33, and thank you so much.

Just trying to understand in listening at the responses to Senator Bracy, where it's keep being said that we didn't use race, but then we've determined that one district is racial gerrymandering. And you just said that, when you were asked about Tier 1 and Tier 2, that when you looked at CD 5, that there was no attempt to -- you said you didn't discuss with anyone about favoring a political party. You didn't have a conversation. But if that is the outcome of what has been done, then how do we address that, you know?

You clearly said you didn't -- it was not your intent. And sometimes we can work and do things, especially when we're just using maps and highways, and the result ends up being something other than what we intended. Because when we look at what's going on with 5, 10, and the overall
schemes of these maps, it does appear to be politically motivated. And it also appears to not take the hardworking black citizens of this state serious.

And I'm sorry if I don't know all the correct languages. I'm just asking my question so that I would be able to respond to the people that elected me to represent them.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Could you restate your question please?

SENATOR OSGOOD: So in the conversation and questions back and forth with the senators here, Mr. Kelly has expressed the process he took and his intent. That's not my question, okay. But the results means that we're eliminating two seats that gave minority access, where one political party is being diminished in numbers and another one is gaining.

So that clearly to me, when $I$ look at Tier 1, violates when it talks about favoring a political party. So I'll stop there first. So I'm just trying to understand because we, you know, we talk about race neutral, and then we talk about racial gerrymander. We're either using race or we're not.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: I'm sorry. Could you
restate the question again?
SENATOR OSGOOD: Okay. I'll start with the first question.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: It sounds like we're getting into debate, and $I$ just want to make sure we're asking --

SENATOR OSGOOD: No. I'll start --
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- a question.
SENATOR OSGOOD: Okay. I'll start with the first question.

Okay. Mr. Kelly has stated that it was not -- that he didn't have any conversations with anybody to favor a political party. When we look at the results we got, Tier 1 says clearly that we cannot favor a political party, and we haven't talked a lot about Tier 1 . It's been mentioned a couple of times. So how do we substantiate what you've given us does not violate Tier 1? Let me --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: All right.
SENATOR OSGOOD: -- ask him that.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you.
Mr. Kelly?
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And thank you, senator. And as I noted in my opening -- and the Tier 1 standard's intent and I
noted in my opening that I've never had any conversations that would compromise that intent. I've never had anyone push or encourage any type of intent such as that, that would either favor or disfavor an incumbent or political party, and that's not what I intended to do. So I've not violated the Tier 1 standard of intent. Speaking of the results of the map, I don't know what the results are. So I couldn't even begin to provide an answer to that question.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Do you have a followup?

SENATOR OSGOOD: Mr. Chair, I have one follow-up.

Okay. Let me go back to District 5. I'm trying to understand with District 5. I understood your comments about the 14 th Amendment and about the racial gerrymandering, but it appears to me to violate the Voting Rights Act. So can you tell me how what you're recommending to eliminate District 5 does not violate the Voting Rights Act?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized.
ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Chair.
So Senator, generally, as I was -- one of the questions earlier was similar when we were
talking about District 10, my general understanding of the Voting Rights Act is it's not implicated -it's not a potential Voting Rights Act question unless a majority of the district's population -- a majority of the voting age population, I should say, of the district is of the same minority community.

So if a majority of the district -- that's not the only question as to whether or not there could be a Voting Rights Act implication, but that benchmark district, Congressional District 5, a majority of that district is not represented by any particular minority community. So the Voting Rights Act should not be implicated in any way.

SENATOR OSGOOD: In District 5, not 10, 5. CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized. ALEX KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My statement there would actually apply to both 5 and 10 .

SENATOR OSGOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you for allowing me to ask the question.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Yes, ma'am.
That concludes questions, and it concludes the presentation. Thank you, Mr. Kelly.

Next, we do have an amendment from Senator

Rouson.
Let's take up amendment barcode 917356.
Senator Rouson, you are recognized to explain your amendment.

SENATOR ROUSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

And there are a lot of things to say in a short period of time, and I do want to give respect to those who traveled here and want to speak in public comment. So I'll keep my description of the amendment fairly brief.

First, this amendment restores District 5 in Northern Florida as a minority access seat as it has been. Secondly, it restores the loth District in Orlando area as a minority seat, as it has been. It also keeps the city of Tampa entirely within District 14 and keeps the city of St. Petersburg whole in District 13.

The intent of this amendment is to protect minority access districts from retrogression as the black communities in those areas have had access for decades, and it continues the legacy of minority representation. And that's the amendment.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Are there questions on the amendment?


the bill so that we have their statements on the record.

We have Reverend Dr. Joe Parramore, who is waiving against the bill.

We have Deborah Baker-Rian from Niceville, Florida, who is waiving against the bill.

We have Jean Simbaneller (phonetic) from Milton, Florida, who is waiving against the bill.

We have Matt Dailey from Tallahassee, who is waiving against the bill.

We have Lisa Perry from St. Petersburg, Florida, who is waiving against the bill.

Next, we're going to move to individuals from Jacksonville, Florida, who are also waiving against the bill.

We have Robert Buchanan (phonetic) waiving against the bill.

We have Joy Burgess from Jacksonville, Florida, waiving against the bill.

We have Jonathan Burgess from Jacksonville, Florida waiving against the bill.

Okay. Next, we're going to continue with Jacksonville individuals who are waiving against the bill.

We have Gwendolyn Colman from Jacksonville
waiving against the bill.
We have -- it looks like -- and I'm having difficulty reading the handwriting, but it looks like Haraska Lavashal (phonetic) from Jacksonville, Florida, waiving against the bill.

Samille Davis (phonetic) from Jacksonville, Florida, waiving against the bill.

Sheila Singleton from Jacksonville, Florida, waiving against the bill.

Joanne Brooks from Jacksonville, Florida, waiving against the bill.

Next, we have additional people from Orlando who are waiving against the bill.

It looks like Rylan Wagner (phonetic) from Orlando waiving against the bill.

Lore Cordova (phonetic) from Orlando waiving against the bill. John Kemper from Orlando waiving against the bill.

Anastasia Jackson from Orlando waiving against the bill.

Allison Clark from Maitland, Florida, waiving against the bill.

Mecca Godwin (phonetic) from Orlando waiving against the bill.

Jasmine Fernandez from Orlando waiving against the bill.

Anyone else?
Now, we're into our list of speakers. We're going to begin with speakers from orlando, who have filled out the appearance card and are not being compensated for their appearance. We're going to get the non-compensated forms up first, and then as time permits, move through those who have been compensated for their testimony.

We're going to begin with Reverend Dr. Martin M. Spoony (sic) from Orlando. Thank you, sir. And you are recognized for two minutes, sir.

REVEREND DR. ROBERT M. SPOONY: Thank you. Good morning -- good afternoon, and that's Reverend Dr. Robert M. Spoony from Orlando, Florida.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you.
REVEREND DR. ROBERT M. SPOONY: But I'll take Martin.

To the committee Chair and his committee members, again, my name is the Reverend Dr. Robert M. Spoony. I'm pastor of Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church in Orlando, Florida, which is in Congressional District 10. I also live in Congressional District 10. I'm not a politician,
but I consider myself a public servant. Some people also may consider me a subject matter expert on servant leadership.

And I'm here today because the church is called to be engaged. The church is called to lead. The church is called to lend voice, moral authority, resources in an effort to resist evil and -- and to bring reorder to the common life of -- of those who are most vulnerable, those who need to be protected.

We're servants to our congregations, and as servant leaders, one of the things I do understand is that servant leadership consists of ethicalness and moral -- you're either -- you're ethical and moral. Leadership can be taught, but ethics is tied to your character.

And so what I'm here to talk about in only these two short minutes is the fact that morally is this the right thing to do to eliminate two congressional districts, which will, in turn, marginalize many, many people?

I've heard all the statistics spouted this afternoon, and many of them, I -- I know for a fact that they're just not necessarily true. I wonder where -- what -- what you looked at for -- to determine that the amount of African Americans and

Latinos who live in the district because I live in the 10th District, and I know that the numbers are not the same as I just heard today.

And so my -- my point is, will you morally be able to live with yourself if you really make this decision to just push a whole group of people out of the way and -- and allow them not to participate in the American system?

This is your decision. You've already vetted your process. You came up with your answers. You came up with a map, and now it's been vetoed and turned around. Will you stand up and do the right thing? Or will you bow down and be bullied?

That's the question that $I$ just -- that's just resonating in my mind. We've elected you to do the right thing, and I just ask that you do the right thing. Remember, we are one. Our cause is one, and if we're ever to be successful in this world, we ought to help one another. Help other people get a chance to vote. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

Carla Jones, and on deck, we'll have LaShonda Holloway.

Ms. Jones --

CARLA JONES: Good afternoon.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- you are recognized for two minutes.

CARLA JONES: Thank you. My name is Carla Jones. I am from Orlando, Florida, and I'm the candidate running for Chief Financial Officer of the State of Florida. I'm not an attorney, but I wake up with one every morning.

And I'm here to, as you know, let you all know that $I$ am against the redistricting planned, and I am -- because I know the representative from the Governor's Office, he stood here, and he said that race did not play a role in the redistricting process. I'm here to tell you that I don't believe it.

I think that it is the main factor that we are looking at, and it's unfortunate. Because minorities, they vote. They pay taxes. They own property. They have rights, and a lot of that -it's been looked over. And I'm highly disappointed in the redistricting.

I'm the mother of six children, and they are all of voting age. And a couple of them have came -- have approached me about this redistricting, and so I'm here today to stand up and say it's
wrong. I think race plays a big, big factor in the decisions that's being made. And unfortunately we aren't -- we -- we're -- we're one, but we're not living as one. United, we stand. Divided, we fall.

So I would like to ask everyone, everyone standing within the -- within -- if you can hear me today, please reconsider this bill, please. It is racist in my opinion. I don't know how much that means, but it is racist. And I need to take some true answers back to my children. I don't want to -- I don't want them to be --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You need to -CARLA JONES: -- lied to. CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- bring it in for a close.

CARLA JONES: Okay. I don't want them to be lied to. So please reconsider. Please reconsider this bill. It is racist, and I thank you for listening to me.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments today.

We have LaShonda Holloway. On deck, Dr. Evie Welch (phonetic).

You are recognized for two minutes.
LASHONDA HOLLOWAY: Good afternoon. My
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| 1 | name is LaShonda L.J. Holloway, and I am the |
| 2 | candidate to represent the people of the 5th |
| 3 | Congressional District. But, moreover, I am a |
| 4 | fourth generation Jacksonvillian and Floridian. |
| 5 | It is -- it is an abomination that we are |
| 6 | wasting taxpayer dollars regarding this |
| 7 | reapportionment and regarding redistricting when we |
| 8 | elect citizens -- I'm sorry -- we elect you, the |
| 9 | legislators, to come here and make laws and to draw |
| 10 | the lines. |
| 11 | However, notwithstanding your willingness |
| 12 | to stand up and -- stand up to the Governor, I am |
| 13 | here to say that this map denies equal access to the |
| 14 | political process, and it discriminates on the basis |
| 15 | of not only the African American race but black and |
| 16 | brown people and also language minorities in the |
| 17 | vein of Hispanics. |
| 18 | Furthermore, Mr. Kelly stated that he used |
| 19 | the Tier 2 standard. I believe -- not I believe -- |
| 20 | the law states, one, that all persons -- all persons |
| 21 | in the State of Florida, the fair district laws, the |
| 22 | law that the citizens stated that they wanted fair |
| 23 | districts. |
| 24 | Look, 20 seats is not fair. Twenty |
| 25 | Republican seats versus eight Democratic seats is |

not fair. So not only does it violate the will of the people, under the equal protection of the law, the equal protection argument, in particular, Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, it specifically prohibits voting practices or procedures that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or membership in one language minority group. We must protect minority access districts from retrogression. I'll repeat that. We must protect minority access districts from retrogression. The -CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it in for a landing.

LASHONDA HOLLOWAY: I'll bring it in for the landing. Last, I will say that representation of all citizens is indeed a compelling state interest. Minority representation matters. We deserve representation, and this outright attempt by Governor Desantis to dilute the voice of minorities, it is an abomination. And all voices deserve to be heard. Protect our democracy and -- and -CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

LASHONDA HOLLOWAY: -- maintain the maps. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Dr. Evie Welch. On deck is Gail Frances Gardner.

Dr. Welch, you are recognized for two minutes.

DR. EVIE WELCH: My name is Evie.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: I'm sorry. Dr. Evie Welch.

DR. EVIE WELCH: Adams Welch.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: I apologize.
DR. EVIE WELCH: I vote in District 5. I am the committeewoman for Voting District 713 in Jacksonville, Florida. You're looking at one of the warriors of the boots on the ground.

Before I give my disappointment, I must commend Senator Rouson for giving me a ray of hope. Before I came here, it appeared to me that you weren't in keeping with any of the laws that really looks at the minority people who are marginalized. I couldn't believe my ears, and so I'm here today. At least there is a glimmer of hope.

We must contain the ideas of the Constitution, Amendment 14, Section 2. We must go back and read what the people voted for in the revision of the Constitution. They -- the people of Florida, not the Governor himself, said that we must
look at the federal statutes, and we must consider what the Voting Rights Act of 1965 really made us to look at making this a more perfect union.

And as a person who spent most of her life professionally and academically working very hard to make sure that Amendment 19 was always remembered, do consider what you are doing to the state of Florida. You are dividing us. We don't want to go back, and we will not go back. Thank you for listening to me.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

We have Gail Frances Gardner. David Rucker, you're on deck.

GAIL FRANCES GARDNER: Good afternoon.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You have two minutes, ma'am.

GAIL FRANCES GARDNER: In the '60s, my ancestors, who live in the north where I was born and grew up, would board a charter bus and head south, where they are born and grew up. Well, now, I too boarded a charter bus today for the same reason my ancestors did. I too want to defend theirs, mine, and generations to come voting rights.

The Congressional District redistricting
map not just to draw the lines but hold the line and make this legislative body accountable and not allow the persuasive executive decision by the Governor to be a force to diminish the black vote, of which those of you who benefited from the Fair Districts Amendments of 5 and 6, that profit politicians from drawing districts to favor themselves and their parties and to ensure that minorities will have the opportunity to elect representatives of their choice. Let's not allow history to repeat itself. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

David Rucker. And on deck is Odwan Whitfield (phonetic).

Mr. Rucker, you have two minutes. Thank you.

DAVID RUCKER: Good afternoon, Chair and members, representatives.

My name is David Rucker. I'm from Orlando, Florida. I also lived in District 10. I am highly disappointed on the way things are being done right now. For 57, almost 58 years, we're still fighting about minorities voting.

Currently, the Governor wanted to cut two
seats when we already have four. I don't understand that. All right. You're demising the vote for minorities, and I want to say black folks first. Then we can trickle down to the rest, the Latinos and other people, but it's unfair the way that you had a map going.

You decided not to use your map and use what the Governor wants to do, all right. I think it's a bigger disappointment for the people that you represent and the people that you don't represent but are voters. I am a super voter. I have been voting here since 1965. I haven't missed but one vote in my whole life doing this, all right.

So some things has to change, and some things don't. But what you need to do is make a conscious decision on what you're going to do about drawing these maps. Let us have our own voice and do what we need to do for us and not include us with everyone else. But that would be fair to do, and I don't know if you all know how to be fair sometimes.

So I think you need to look at this and really make a concentration on getting -- keeping the four that we have now instead of cutting it down like the Governor want to do with two. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your
comments.
We have Mr. Whitfield followed by Dr.
Carolynn Zonia.
Mr. Whitfield, you are recognized for two minutes.

ODWAN WHITFIELD: Thank you. My name is Odwan Whitfield. I am a taxpayer in District 5, in Congressional District 5, and I'm here today because this is a serious matter. I have this senator here, who has been looking at her laptop the whole time. I have two Senators back there that have been looking at their laptops. I've been watching them.

This is a serious matter. There's lives at stake here. There are lives at stake here. The -the representative from the Governor's Office said that Tier 1 is only intent and that he didn't converse or he didn't talk to anybody that -- that helped him to decide these maps. Yet, he looked at public testimony on video or he read the record. So technically, he looked at everybody's opinion on these maps before he drew them. How is that not -disregard that. Disregard that.

Even if the -- the Governor's Office said you know what. I think it's -- it's better for this environment, for this government, for this -- for
this state that 1 percent of everybody needs to be killed. He came up here, gave those statistics to you all in a nice manner. It is still left up to you all to make that decision.

This is people's livelihoods. I am a United States Army veteran, served in Iraq and Kuwait. Some of you would say so did my son. So did my daughter. So did my father. So did my sister. None of them have to come back to this United States and do what I am doing here today. They don't have that. They have a luxury. They have a benefit.

I'm standing here today fighting for my livelihood after I fought in Desert Storm, after I fought in Iraq, in -- in other countries, only to come back here to fight for my right to vote, for my right to representation.

Senators, do your jobs. This is not right, and this is not fair. I don't care what statistics say. You know it in your hearts. You know it. Do the right things.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments and thank you for your service.

Dr. Zonia.
ODWAN WHITFIELD: Don't thank me for my
service. Give me my representation.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: And ZsaZsa IngramFitzpatrick, you're on deck.

DR. CAROLYNN ZONIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Senators, thank you for the opportunity to speak.

I really can't say it any better than the previous speaker, but I'm asking you to follow Florida's Constitution and remind you of your promise to support, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States and Florida. I'm also here as a physician working on the front lines to speak for families who are struggling to keep up. Essential workers cannot find or afford a place for their families to live. Homeowners can no longer find or afford property insurance. Folks are working hard but cannot afford the basic necessities like utilities, and the looming prospect of many losing healthcare in the next few months adds to the pain that many are feeling.

By the Governor's own proclamation,
legislative business this week may be transacted if introduced by consent of two-thirds of the membership of both houses of Legislature.

So on behalf of Florida families, I'm
asking you to please follow the Constitution on redistricting and vote no on the Governor's map and to use this special session to also address the real emergencies that are crushing your constituents. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

We have ZsaZsa Ingram-Fitzpatrick with Dr. Nancy Staats on deck.

Is Ms. Ingram-Fitzpatrick here?
Dr. Staats. And then we'll have Judy Sheckland on deck.

DR. NANCY STAATS: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Dr. Nancy Staats.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Staats, thank you.
DR. NANCY STAATS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: I apologize for --
DR. NANCY STAATS: No worries.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- butchering that. You are recognized for two minutes.

DR. NANCY STAATS: Okay. Thank you. I'm a board certified medical doctor, but you don't need an advanced degree to see what's happening here. We know this is the blatant disenfranchisement of African American communities and their
representatives. It's unfortunate that some of you can't even look at me.

Just two months ago, you all worked very hard making maps that adhered to Florida statutes, and then the Governor proposed his own maps, which you rightfully said, no, Gov, this is too far. But then he vetoed yours, came back with his, and now suddenly, you folded like a cheap suit.

I'm wondering what happened in those two months. Were there backroom talks maybe working out the budget details? I don't know. Arm twisting? I'm not sure. Your arms all look fine, but maybe we need to think about what you are here for, which is to, as people have said, represent your constituents.

It's painfully clear to me, to everyone in this room, and everyone outside this room that this special session is a farce. There is not even another map being considered, and you won't consider amendments. And it also has been mentioned this Harvard-educated Governor of ours must be well aware that his maps violate both the Fair Districts Amendment and the Voting Rights Act, but perhaps, he wants the attention. Perhaps he wants to go to a Supreme Court case. That may be exactly what he
wants.
At any rate, you're making it easy for him, but he must know that he's necessitating more lawsuits, which more appeals after that, all of this at the expense of all of Florida's citizens, like these special sessions.

As we all learned in early grade history -American history, our government was formed in response to an authoritarian ruler, King George. Remember that? Our Founding Fathers created a system of three distinct, autonomous branches of government, yet here we are today seeing complete complicity to a new king.

As a physician, I pledged to uphold the Hippocratic Oath. You too, all of you, took an oath too to uphold --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please --
DR. NANCY STAATS: -- your state's constitution, which demands, mandates that you form these maps, and you have not done so.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it in for a landing.

DR. NANCY STAATS: Please, please remember the oath you took, which you seem to have forgotten. We will not forget. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for our comments. Judy Sheklin. And Trish Brown will be on deck.

JUDY SHEKLIN: My name is Judy Sheklin. I'm from Jacksonville, Florida. I too am opposed to the Governor's proposed maps. It is the responsibility of the legislators, the Legislature, to create congressional maps during redistricting according to Article III of the Florida Constitution.

The House and Senate did that, created approved maps and that they were satisfied with, and as we now know -- we've heard this all day -- were then vetoed and redrawn by the Governor. This is unprecedented in Legislatures all over the country. This hasn't been done.

You, as legislators, quickly acquiesced to the Governor, creating a dramatic imbalance of power in our state government. This is very troubling. The Governor's maps are a radical departure, and they aren't in compliance with state and federal law. These maps, as we've heard again here today, reduce the likelihood of minorities to elect congressional members of their choice, eliminating two minority districts and violating the Voting

Rights Act.
In 2010, Florida passed the Fair Districts Amendment, and the citizens of this state overwhelmingly spoke. They deserve and expect fairness in redistricting decisions. The Governor's plan creates 20 Republican-majority districts and 8 Democratic-majority districts. This blatantly demonstrates partisan gerrymandering. Please stand up for all Floridians and oppose these unfair maps. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

Trish Brown. And we have Rodney Long on deck.

Trish Brown?
Rodney Long.
For the record, Trish Brown is against the bill.

Mr. Long, you are recognized for two minutes.

RODNEY LONG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I'm Rodney Long. I don't live in
Congressional District 5 or 10. I'm from Alachua County, Gainesville, Florida.

Because I am a concerned resident of this
state, I drove here today to speak to you in opposition to the proposed plan, SB 2-C Plan 019 (sic) for three reasons. First, because if you approve this map, it will reduce the minority representation in the state of Florida by 50 percent. Second is there's no doubt in my mind that these maps, if you approve them, will lead to retrogression, which violates the Voting Rights Act.

Thirdly, I'm a person who believes in process. I've served in local government for 17 years. I was president of the Florida Association of Counties, served two terms. I understand how government works very well, but what I do not understand is this. We have a process that we follow, and we all are sworn to oaths. And we follow those oaths.

What I do not understand as a person who understands process is how do you acquiesce the authority given to you as a legislative body to draw district lines under reapportionment? I'm a person who believes in process. I can accept the fact -if you approved the maps and I don't like the maps but you approved the maps, I could live with that. What I cannot live with is that you're just not going to approve any maps. That is a
dereliction of your oath and your duties. Do the right thing. I could live with whatever maps you all approve, but what I cannot live with is you abdicating your responsibility to do your job.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for -RODNEY LONG: DO the right thing. CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- your comments. Next, we have Matt Van Wormer with Whitney Wogen (phonetic) on deck.

You are recognized for two minutes.
MATT VAN WORMER: Okay. Thank you.
I was just going to waive, but I'm going to say a couple words because I'm on the other side of this bet and will be the first to speak to that. The map looks very square to me. It looks very logical. Now, I don't -- I don't live in Orlando. I moved in here recently, and so I don't understand what some -- much of the politics are here that have gone before. But I don't see weird little lines going in here and there to try to protect or do weird things. It seems very logical. So I'm favor of what plan to -- Senate Plan 2-C 109. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

We have Whitney Wogen with Bridget Smith (phonetic) on deck.

Ms. Wogen, you have two minutes.
WHITNEY WOGEN: Thank you. My name is Whitney Wogen. I just wanted to voice my support for SB 2-C Plan 109. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

Bridget Smith. And we have Carmen Soto on deck.

BRIDGET SMITH: Bridget Smith, I'm from Marion County, Florida. A lot of PhDs here, a lot of physicians here. I'm a nurse. So I don't have a redistricting degree. It is a science in all of itself. I was here for the House and Senate debates during session, and it is a lot. I commend you all for even understanding all this. It's a lot.

But me, as a lay person to this,
redistricting to me is to equalize populations among electoral districts after publication of the census, but it seems today it's been all about race issues and color.

From what I understand, the Fair District Act, it's -- it was to state that a minority group would not be prohibited from voting in their
candidate. But looking at the maps currently with the contiguousness of them, which is what we're supposed to do, and not make it about race, according to everything we've talked about today, it has become about race. And it's very confusing to all of us.

I support this bill. The 2017 Supreme Court decision, this is different. The Supreme Court decision, a North Carolina case brought up the fact that the gerrymandering had too many blacks in that district. So they threw that map out because it was gerrymandered. Now, based on that decision, District 5 is considered gerrymandered, the previous District 5. So that's my interpretation of it. I do support the bill. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you or your comments.

We have Carmen Soto, and Robert Schmidt (phonetic) is on deck.

CARMEN SOTO: Hi. My name is Carmen Soto, and I'm waiving in favor of the bill.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comment.

CARMEN SOTO: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Robert Schmidt. And
then we've got John Berry (phonetic) on deck.
ROBERT SCHMIDT: Good afternoon. I'm
speaking in support of SB 2-C Plan 109, 0109. While this plan was drawn for common sense districting, today's discussions have devolved into political accusations.

Not one voice has been silenced today by this map. Everyone still has a voice. I am happy this Governor has shown backbone. We hear people discuss the unprecedented nature of this map. I might remind those that look to other states such as New York to see what real gerrymandering looks like for political gains.

This map represents common sense and allows for the seismic shifts that are happening in Florida today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

John Berry.
I don't see John. Lauren -- John is in support of the map.

Lauren Dickenson (phonetic).
LAUREN DICKENSON: I waive in support of the map.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Waives in support,
thank you.
Okay. That concludes testimony from the non-compensated.

We're going to move to the compensated. We've got about 40 minutes, and I believe the members are going to want to debate. So we're going to do one minute testimony.

We'll start with Marsha Davis, and on deck will be Cristian Cardona.

Marsha Davis? Thank you, ma'am.
MARSHA DAVIS: I waive against Governor DeSantis' legislative map. Floridians, and I was one of them, voted the Fair District Act Amendment into the state Constitution to protect minority voters and to prevent legislators from doing what it appears has been done, making sure that you protect your party. It's not right.

Minority growth alone, by the last census, indicates that there should probably be more minority representation in the Legislature, but the Governor plans to cut our representation in half. That's not right. The plan is unfair, and I believe that it is unconstitutional. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

Cristian Cardona. And we have Stacy Williams (phonetic) on deck.

CRISTIAN CARDONA: Thank you. My name is Cristian Cardona. I am worker and leader with the Fight for $\$ 15$ and the union from Orlando, Florida. Different movements are gathered here today because Florida's Republican leadership is trying to silence black and brown communities by passing voter suppression laws.

By eliminating protections that Fair
Districts Amendment provides, this map is a direct attack on black representation and our democracy, and that ain't right. By proposing a congressional map that reduces Florida's black and brown representation by 50 percent, the Governor is trying to advance his political career at the expense of black and brown voters.

Let me tell you about my experience as a voter and why this issue is important to me. I moved to Orlando, Florida, with my family in 2009. I gained citizenship just in time to vote for Amendment 2. Amendment 2 brought us one step closer to a living wage, which is something I have been organizing and speaking up about for years.

This amendment has a direct impact on the
community around me, my family, my friends, and my neighbors. It felt powerful to organize and campaign to raise the standard of living for millions of Floridians. The day I got to vote yes on Amendment 2 --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it in for a close.

CRISTIAN CARDONA: All right. This -after months of campaigning and yelling it out to the world, I finally had the chance to cast my vote with my community. This is why it's important that workers have a strong voice and a vote.

I want to thank everyone for showing up and taking time out of their day because I know workers have never been --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

CRISTIAN CARDONA: -- given rights.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: I appreciate it.
Stacy Williams. And Larry Coleton (phonetic) on deck.

LARRY COLETON: Good afternoon --
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you.
LARRY COLETON: -- Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized for
a minute.
LARRY COLETON: Ms. Williams is not here. I'm Larry Coleton.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Okay.
LARRY COLETON: The writer James Baldwin said, not everything that is faced can be changed, but nothing can be changed until it is faced. The columnist Leonard Pitts wrote that one party in America is steering the ship of this state towards jagged rocks, and that's where we find ourselves.

I like what the former and late President John Kennedy asked. He wrote a book called Profiles in courage. In these next few days, we're going to see one of two things, either profiles in courage or profiles in cowardice.

We have a bully as a Governor, and unfortunately, we have members of this body, Mr. Chairman, that have essentially capitulated your constitutionally required responsibilities.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it in for a close.

LARRY COLETON: It's up to you. It's either going to be courage or cowardice, and unfortunately, the fear is it will be cowardice.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your
comments.
We have Hedder Pierre-Joseph with Gail Presley on deck.

HEDDER PIERRE-JOSEPH: Good afternoon to the committee and committee members. My name is Hedder Pierre-Joseph. I am a member of Congressional District 10 for the last 19 years.

Redistricting is the process by which new congressional and state legislative districts are drawn. Federal law stipulates that districts must have nearly equal protection, equal population, and must not discriminate on the basis of race or ethnicity.

The current redistricting map, which eliminates Congressional House representation for black people is based on fear, fear that black people are voting. As black people who are descendants of the enslaved Africans, we know our history, and we know -- and we have seen this devil before.

I implore you not to continue down the path of your ancestors and deny black people their constitutional right of representation. I remind all of you to remember the Boston Tea Party of 1773. Finally, I ask you to look around or to remember the
presence of the people that were in this room, and for me, I see the promise of the enslaved African. We are on the side of justice, and with the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and our ancestors --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Bring it in for a landing please.

HEDDER PIERRE-JOSEPH: -- we shall always overcome. Remember this, we win with God and time. Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

Gail Presley with Cheryl Jones on deck. Ms. Presley, you are recognized for a minute.

GAIL PRESLEY: Thank you. Good afternoon to each and every one of you, Chairman, and also to Mr. Randolph Bracy. Thank you so very much. It is indeed my pleasure to be here today but in an awe of disbelief.

I am very heartbroken as a resident of Congressional District 10, long life resident. I come from a family that marched those march in 1960. I come from a family who knows about how it feels when it comes to voter's right and standing up for the injustice that are done to the people who are
black and brown. I come from a family who was very proud to know that it is your -- your vote and your voice that matters.

And today I come to you very disappointed.
I oppose C-0109 (sic) because $I$ feel that it is a disparity on the black and brown people, and I come from a congressional district where I want to see --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it --
GAIL PRESLEY: -- someone --
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- in for a close. GAIL PRESLEY: -- who looks like me and represent and know how we feel. So with that being said, it is your right. You took the oath. You said that you would serve us, and we're looking here now and listening to statistics. And I don't understand where those statistics are coming from because I am a proud resident of Orange county, Florida.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

GAIL PRESLEY: And I thank you for this time, Chairman, and you all have a wonderful day. CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you. Cheryl Jones with Pastor Marcus McCoy on deck.

I do not see Cheryl. She is against the bill.

We have Pastor McCoy on the way. After Pastor McCoy, we'll have Barney Roberts on deck.

You are recognized for a minute.
PASTOR MARCUS MCCOY: Thank you. Blessings
to all with special recognition to my own Senator, Senator Bracy. My name is Marcus McCoy, Junior. I serve as the senior pastor of the Historic Greater Refuge Memorial Church, which sits in Congressional District 10, exiting now over 150 years.

I stand on behalf of my community to strongly urge this committee to vote no on the proposed map C-0109 by Governor -- by our Governor that removes black representation in Congress.

Currently, Florida has four black access seats of twenty-seven. If the map were to be approved, that number would reduce to 50 and would leave Florida with less than 10 percent of the congressional districts represented by members in black access seats. It is disheartening to see that with already such low representation, this Governor wants to dilute representation even more.

And while I and those that I represent do not fully agree with the decision made to offer a
two-map solution during this year's legislative session, at least it was the decision of this Legislature. The map being --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it in for a close.

PASTOR MARCUS MCCOY: -- considered today is not your own. I stand here urging you to reject political games and partisanship in drawing Florida's new congressional districts. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

Barney Roberts. And on deck will be Rosemary McCoy.

Mr. Roberts, you are recognized for a minute.

BARNEY ROBERTS: Hi. I'm Barney Roberts. I -- I stand opposing the Governor's bill. I think that it is another disheartening thing to consider in Florida.

In -- in 2010, the Florida voters added amendments to the state Constitution in the Article III, Sections 20 and 21. These amendments prohibited line drawing that intentionally favors or disfavors a political party or an incumbent. The amendment also afforded protection to racial and
language minorities.
Districts may not draw -- districts may not be drawn with the intent or resulting in denying or abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or to diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice.

Finally, unless it would conflict with the standards described above, amendments require that district populations be as neatly equal as practicable and that districts be compact, where feasible, follow existing political, geographical boundaries.

Ladies and gentlemen --
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it in for a close.

BARNEY ROBERTS: -- I would beg and ask if you'll consider that the things we do today, our children are going to have to live with it. And for me, as a veteran and a man in the U.S., I love it when kids see us, and they're proud about what we do. We should make our kids proud, and we should bring them together, not divide them on all facets. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your
comments and thank you for your service.
Rosemary McCoy. And on deck is Troy
Squire.
ROSEMARY MCCOY: Thank you so much --
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are recognized for a minute.

ROSEMARY MCCOY: -- Chair and thank you so much for, Senator Audrey Gibson, for allowing us to be here, and I respect all of you. But I want to prick your hearts. This is not about just signing off because of your party. This is about real-life situations.

There's a war going on, Ukrainians and Russians. We do not want that here in the United States, nor do we want it in the state of Florida. But if we keep on -- and it starts from you, all right. Everything trickles down. From your leadership, it comes down. And if we have a war here among you all against your people, we have Ukranian (sic) and Russia. I don't want that.

So I'm asking you to check your own hearts out. I'm asking you to just look at it. If it's fair, then go with it. But if you check your hearts out and you find out that it isn't fair, then I'm asking you to vote no.

See this? It's blue. But you know what they have? Pink. Act like this is pink. And if you fail to vote correctly, you need a pink slip. Do your job. That's all we asking you to do. You want me to do my job. So I can pay taxes.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it in for a close.

ROSEMARY MCCOY: Guess what? The people want you to do your job. That's all we ask. I think that's fair. Do you think it's fair? I do. Do your job.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: thank you for your comments.

Troy Squire. And we'll have Tameka Hobbs on deck.

I don't see Mr. Squire. He is against the map.

Tameka Hobbs.
I don't see Tameka. She is against the map.

Ebony Hardy-Allen, also against the map.
Hazel Gillis. And on deck will be Myrtle Lucas (phonetic).

Thank you, Ms. Gillis. You have a minute. HAZEL GILLIS: Thank you. Good afternoon.

My name is Hazel Gillis. I am a member of the James Weldon Johnson Branch of the ASALH, Association for the Study of African American Life and History, and I live in Congressional District 5 in Jacksonville, Florida.

Governor Ron DeSantis' rejection of the Florida Legislature's drawn political map is a direct attack on black representation and our democracy. By proposing a congressional map that reduces Florida's black representation in Congress by 50 percent, the Governor is attempting to silence the voices of hundreds of thousands of black voters. We oppose any map that has been drawn by Governor Ron DeSantis.

In 2010, Florida passed the Fair Districts Amendments 5 and 6 that prohibits politicians from drawing districts to favor themselves and their parties and to ensure minority voters have equal opportunity to participate in the political process and have a fair opportunity to elect representatives of their choice, their party. We must end this manipulation at all costs to protect our democracy and black vote. Thank you so much. Thank you, Your Honor.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your
comments.
Hazel Gillis. Oh, that was you. Thank you.

Myrtle Lucas. And then on deck is Ingrid Montgomery.

MYRTLE LUCAS: Good evening. My name is Myrtle Lucas. I'm -- I am a member of the James Weldon Johnson Branch of the ASALH, the Association for the Study of African American Life and History.

I oppose any map that has been drawn by Governor Ron DeSantis, and let's see. We vote to -let me see. I'm sorry. We vote for -- to draw maps from fair districts, and we want them to do their job and not for Governor Ron DeSantis to be a dictator and a bully. That's it.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

Ingrid Montgomery with Walter Smith, Junior on board.

Ms. Montgomery, you are recognized for a minute.

INGRID MONTGOMERY: Good afternoon. My name is Ingrid Montgomery, and I live in Duval County. I'm here today to voice my condemnation of this redistricting plan for Northern Florida. This
plan splits black communities across three different congressional districts, which personally impacts me because it results in the loss of my congressional district, CD 5, which has been the "black opportunity district" linking Jacksonville and Tallahassee.

SB 2-C, also C-0109, is intentionally and unconstitutionally designed to make it ever more challenging for us black voters to elect black Democratic members of Congress. You elected took the oath to stand up for equal ground. "If we merge mercy with might and might with right, then love becomes our legacy and change our children's birthright." Amanda Gorman, The Hill We Climb. Do the right thing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

Walter Smith, Junior. And on deck is Lee Harris.

Are you Mr. Smith?
WALTER SMITH, JR.: Yes. Good --
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: You are --
WALTER SMITH, JR.: -- afternoon.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- you are recognized. for a minute. Thank you.

Next up, Jonathan Webber with Florida Conservation Voters.

Mr. Webber, you are recognized for a minute.

JONATHAN WEBBER: Thank you so much. My name is Jonathan Webber. I'm the deputy director of Florida Conservation Voters, and just for the record, I am a resident of CD 5, Al Lawson's district, here in Tallahassee, just south of Apalachee.

We at Florida Conservation Voters, we strongly believe that the health of our environment is directly tied to the health of our republic. And just as we monitor our water for pollution, we
monitor our government for signs of sickness. Fair representation is one of the best metrics we have to measure the health of our government. The census and ensuing redistricting process is the test.

Today, we are asking ourselves questions like was this map drawn with complete transparency? Does it respect the rules set forth in the Voting Rights Act and in the State and Federal

Constitutions? Were the people of Florida given ample opportunity to participate and comment on this map? And most importantly, considering the profound legacy of state-sponsored oppression in Florida, does it protect or diminish the right of black Floridians to elect leaders of their choice?

You all know the answers to these questions, and while fair representation is vital, fear of doing the right thing is the ultimate terminal sickness in democracy. Our republic is only as strong as the right of minority groups to participate. I love this country not so much for its history but for its promise.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it in for a close.

JONATHAN WEBBER: That promise must be guaranteed to everyone, not just the powerful, the
monied, or the ruling class. We stand in solidarity with our friends and allies across the state in opposition to these maps. Thank you and thank you to everyone who showed up today.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

Cecile Scoon with the League of Women Voters of Florida.

CECILE SCOON: Good afternoon. My name is Cecile Scoon with the League of Women Voters, and I've been here a few times. I am very disappointed, as many people are, that we are in this position. When this whole thing started, there was many promises made to adhere to all of the laws, and it was interesting that Mr. Kelly did not mention that the Tier 1, which is the citizens initiative of the Fair Districts, not only has an intent provision, it has an impact provision.

So it doesn't matter if he came here and drew the maps, and he did not intend anything. That's irrelevant to the other half, which says, if you have this impact that harms the ability to select the representative of your choosing if you are a racial or language minority, that's a problem under our law. And so what they have done is
completely violated Tier 1 of our Constitution, which was found lawful and correct by our Florida Supreme Court.

So that is the status of the law as we stand, and anything that comes now that rebukes that or does anything like that is looking for a new court to make a different decision. But the law right now says --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it in --
CECILE SCOON: -- that is illegal.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- for a close.
CECILE SCOON: And we would ask you to adhere to the law as we all know it, Fair Districts and the Voting Rights Act. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your -SENATOR GIBSON: Chair --

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- comments.
SENATOR GIBSON: May I ask a question?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: We still have another

SENATOR GIBSON: Quickly.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- speaker. And we --
SENATOR GIBSON: It's just --
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: -- are doing a hard stop at 4:30.

SENATOR GIBSON: It's a 30-second answer. CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: I'm not going to recognize it at this time.

Matthew Isabel (phonetic).
SENATOR GIBSON: Well, may I ask you a question, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: What's that?
SENATOR GIBSON: May I ask the question of
you? Maybe our staff may know the answer.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Yes.
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you. I'm just
wondering if we know how many hundreds of thousands of votes across this state did the Fair Districts Amendment pass by.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: I don't know. We'll have staff look into that and get back to you. SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Mr. Isabel, you are recognized for a minute. MATTHEW ISABEL: Members of this committee, for months, a vast majority of you pledged your support to preserving districts that gave African Americans the ability to elect a candidate of their choice. You defended seats that were in some form or fashion drawn three decades ago
to correct centuries of injustice. The laws and cases from the late 20 th century saw an explosion of minority representation. Since the passage of the 1982 Voting Rights Act, the number of African American Congresspeople has gone from 18 to 60. Florida is part of this very tradition.

Redistricting in Florida began with such promise. Draft maps from both chambers had anywhere from three to four seats designed to give African Americans a chance to elect a candidate of their choice. Efforts for alt-right Twitter activists to dismantle districts like CD 5 and 10 were ignored by you lawmakers for the longest time, but now with the Governor's intervention, you have backtracked on all of these principles in the name of party unity. And for what reason? To appease a Governor who sees his path to the Presidency by acting like a modern-day George Wallace. We see the private grumblings that many of you have fed to the press, expressing your off-the-record concern. Most of you openly admitted in private to being afraid of the Governor. He's threatened primaries to you, to your colleagues, and he's threatened to black -- to veto -CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Please bring it in for
a close.
MATTHEW ISABEL: -- budget items. He's -I'm closing. Why don't you just come out and say he's blackmailing you? Instead of coming up with fake legal justifications, why don't you at least admit that you're afraid of him, and you want him to like you? Why don't you just admit that you're cowards.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Thank you for your comments.

SENATOR STARGEL: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: That concludes public testimony.

Is there debate?
SENATOR STARGEL: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Stargel, you are recognized.

SENATOR STARGEL: Mr. Chair, I move that we
-- this committee vote in $\mathrm{SB} 2-\mathrm{C}$ on or before 4:27.
CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: That motion is made. Show it adopted without objection.

We're now in debate.
Senator Gibson.
SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
First, I want to start with the whole idea that the state of Florida's Constitution doesn't cover Tier 1, and it absolutely does, which is why I was trying to determine approximately the hundreds of thousands of votes that -- from our constituents that supported the Fair Districts Amendment to the -- to our state Constitution, which is also a part of our first packet that we got on the Florida Redistricting packet, which I, of course, thank the staff again for. I have papers all over the place. And so -- in that, in the Fair Districts Amendment to the Constitution -- and I wrote a note that I don't believe that the Constitutional Revision Commission in 2018 made any changes or changed at all the Fair Districts Amendment, which speaks to the fact that districts may not be drawn with the intent or result of denying or abridging the equal opportunity of racial or language minorities to participate in the political process or diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice.

And there are other parts of this, but I want to hasten so that others get to debate. And I don't lose some other important points that I wanted to make. One of those is if you've never been denied anything, then you have no context as to why
representation is important. And so -- and why it is important that the representative understands the community that they're representing in totality.

And so what's on the line? First of all, CD 5 came about as a large representing minority population because of a lawsuit years ago, and that is why that congressional district existed as a minority access district in Jacksonville. The suit was filed by our previous member of Congress -- I don't know. It was 19-whatever it was -- '70, '60s, in order for there to be representation to include representation of people of color.

And so in a conversation $I$ had the other day, when, you know, when people try to figure out, oh, it's about race. Well, it's more than about race. It's also about need. And so in order for those folks with health -- more health disparities than -- or health disparities -- I don't know how you can have any more -- neighborhoods that have been crumbling historically, infrastructure needs, cleaning of Brownsville and communities of color that weren't anywhere else, who represents those communities matter?

Yes. There's growth in -- in upward mobility as well, but there are still healthcare
disparities. There's still holes in things that need to happen. And so when a member doesn't understand in totality that population, the funding requests that have been put forward over the years disappear. The blend of everyone takes the focus off of some of those who are the neediest of particularly healthcare and improvement in their neighborhoods, education, those kinds of things.

While it's getting better, it's been behind for so many years that catching up becomes difficult without a representative that doesn't understand exactly all of the people they are representing. And I think every individual in any district is just as important as the -- as the neighbor next door or across the street. Everyone is, and that's the way I've always done my job. But unfortunately the maps in front of us, CD 5 is one of them, where there's such a split unnecessarily, cut the community right down the middle, the community of color.

And so without having to do that and making sure that all resources are delivered to all parts of the community, it would be great if we all lived in health disparity districts, and then we'd all get the same attention. But we don't. It would be great if we all lived in low income communities, but
we don't. And so those who do need representation to speak to that issue.

And so I just think that the purpose of the maps was to make two Republican forming -- it has nothing to do with race -- there are black Republicans, Hispanic Republicans -- but has everything to do with party as well. So there's a double whammy in Duval. We have a separation of culture, and then we also have two seats that no -that will perform for Republican members of Congress.

And I don't -- I don't know if -- I don't know if we can even sit here and -- and call that the right thing to do. And also in CD 10 as well. So what seems to be -- what -- what wants to be put forward to us as innocence is -- is not there, and I hope that people will remember that this is not for tomorrow or next week. It's not -- it doesn't change for 10 more years.

And I refuse to believe that the people of color population in Duval shrunk in the past census, or if it didn't shrink, people are now living all on top of each other. That is definitely not the case. And so I -- I'm done, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator Bracy.

SENATOR BRACY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, this clearly violates Fair Districts. It clearly violates the federal law, the federal Voting Rights Act, and I don't even think it's worth debating. I mean, I think that's clear, and the fact that Alex Kelly would get in front of us and say he had no idea that he was taking a swath of black folks and putting -- putting them in the same district with -- with the villages and not -and saying he didn't know that it would affect their ability to elect the candidate of their choice is a joke. It's a joke, and it's insulting. So I'm not going to even go there.

What I will say to you, members, is that what the Governor is doing in bullying you all, in dictating what you're going to do, you are essentially losing the power and the independence of the Senate. And you are making the Governor the de facto President from now on, because with a bully, once you give in, it doesn't stop. He's going to continue this, and you will not be able to defy him again.

He's threatened to -- he's threatened to primary you all. He's threatened to primary endorsed candidates from the President, and he's not
going to stop. And you laying down, you are setting the stage for this to happen over and over again. And if that's what you want, you want him to be the House Speaker, the Senate President, and the Governor, so be it.

But I just want to lay out what we're actually doing today, and I love you all. I've served with you. You all are friends, and so I'm speaking to you genuinely. And this is how I feel, and if this is what we're going to do, so be it. But I at least want to be on record to say I don't think it's right.

And I don't think this is in tradition of what the Senate stands for. We have been an independent body, and we made a decision before. And now we are caving. We are folding, and I think we're better than that.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: Senator stewart for two minutes.

SENATOR STEWART: Thank you, Chair.
Frankly, I never thought we'd be here today. I know that when we had months and months of meetings and we came up with a map that was extremely fair and we gave that map to the Governor, we didn't expect to have any consequences. But
today we see that $I$ was really, really wrong, and that we sit here today.

This map that was produced -- and we were able to see it a few days ago, and, you know, I didn't like it. I don't like being here because I think we did a really good job when we had the opportunity to do it. But this map has no connection to Tier 1, and everything stated by the Governor's map drawer and perhaps some of the attorneys that helped him, all the paperwork is on Tier 2. Well, Tier 2 is not nearly as important as Tier 1.

And so when you've got them totally ignoring Tier 1, for whatever their reasons were stated, I think we might as well just leave here and go straight out that door and get our attorneys because we're going to be going to court anyway.

So I just think this is the wrong approach to what we have signed on to do, and we did a really good job. And I want to thank everybody here, how hard they worked, and I -- I don't -- I'm just not in favor of overturning the nearly perfect map that we put together. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RODRIGUES: It's now 4:27, time certain.
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