

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA

Black Voters Matter Capacity
Building Institute, Inc., *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 2022-ca-000666

v.

Cord Byrd, in his official capacity as
Florida's Secretary of State, *et. al.*,

Defendants.

EXHIBIT APPENDIX - VOLUME 3 OF 4

Exhibit Letter	Exhibit Description	Reference to Factual Stipulation	Volume Number
A	J. Alex Kelly presentation to Florida House	Joint Factual Stipulation (2)(1): "Transcripts of legislative committee and floor proceedings" are "judicially noticeable"	1
B	J. Alex Kelly presentation to Florida Senate	Joint Factual Stipulation (2)(1): "Transcripts of legislative committee and floor proceedings" are "judicially noticeable"	1-2
C	VAP summary report, enacted map	Joint Factual Stipulation (1): "demographic information" "available on floridaredistricting.gov"	2
D	VAP summary report, benchmark map	Joint Factual Stipulation (1): "demographic information" "available	2

		on floridaredistricting.gov”	
E	Senate session, March 4, 2022	Joint Factual Stipulation (2)(1): “Transcripts of legislative committee and floor proceedings” are “judicially noticeable”	2
F	Senate session, April 20, 2022	Joint Factual Stipulation (2)(1): “Transcripts of legislative committee and floor proceedings” are “judicially noticeable”	2-3
G	House congressional redistricting subcommittee, February 18, 2022	Joint Factual Stipulation (2)(1): “Transcripts of legislative committee and floor proceedings” are “judicially noticeable”	3
H	House redistricting committee, February 25, 2022	Joint Factual Stipulation (2)(1): “Transcripts of legislative committee and floor proceedings” are “judicially noticeable”	3-4
I	House session, April 20, 2022	Joint Factual Stipulation (2)(1): “Transcripts of legislative committee and floor proceedings” are “judicially noticeable”	4
J	VAP summary report, 8019	Joint Factual Stipulation (1): “demographic information” “available on floridaredistricting.gov”	4
K	Benchmark north Florida districts, heat map & population density	Joint Factual Stipulation (1): “demographic information, political information, and other districting criteria” “for all districts used for the 2016-2020 congressional	4

		elections (“Benchmark Plan”)” “as available on floridaredistricting.gov”	
L	Benchmark map packet	Joint Factual Stipulation (2)(5): redistricting committee meeting materials from the 2022 regular session	4
M	District compactness report, 8015	Joint Factual Stipulation (1): “demographic information” “available on floridaredistricting.gov”	4
N	Popper written legislative testimony	Joint Factual Stipulation (2)(5): redistricting committee meeting materials from the 2022 regular session	4
O	Benchmark districts, heat map, Duval County	Joint Factual Stipulation (1): “demographic information, political information, and other districting criteria” “for all districts used for the 2016-2020 congressional elections (“Benchmark Plan”)” “as available on floridaredistricting.gov”	4
P	Benchmark districts, heat map, Leon County	Joint Factual Stipulation (1): “demographic information, political information, and other districting criteria” “for all districts used for the 2016-2020 congressional elections (“Benchmark Plan”)” “as available on floridaredistricting.gov”	4

<p>86:3 dark 86:9 data 6:1 23:6 25:12,13 30:5 62:19 date 20:14 dated 37:21,25 daughter 36:7 37:20 Davis 43:1 day 16:19 36:7 36:10,13 53:14 55:24 56:1 84:2 86:9 95:2 days 70:8 80:11 82:22,22 DCF 43:2 deal 36:11 52:23 72:15 73:12 80:3 85:4 dealing 39:19 49:15 81:25 85:24 dealt 71:15 82:3 death 23:22 debate 5:12,15 8:18,19 10:16 12:4 15:23 19:1 22:15 23:23,24 24:2 26:14 29:15,17 31:10 31:10,13,15 34:2,4 39:13 41:24 42:2 43:16,25 44:16 47:5,8,12 48:6 49:1,2,5 56:14 59:5 61:9 69:1 69:2 71:10,11 74:2 77:15 79:7 81:17,20,20 86:13 89:13,24 91:22,24 92:25 93:1,14,14 debated 50:10 51:9 debaters 59:5</p>	<p>debates 43:7 debt 75:7 78:4,6 83:14 84:20 85:4 decade 29:23 30:14 31:7 39:20 65:3 decades 30:17 December 42:12 decided 19:10 41:6 52:23 decides 33:5 deciding 21:10 76:3 decision 70:15 decisions 3:11 61:12 70:5 decisive 78:19 deck 31:11 declare 58:24 declared 16:3 decrease 30:22 dedicated 72:24 deemed 21:13 deep 82:16 defend 21:14 defended 12:7 definition 69:16 69:18 degree 26:17 delegate 53:12 deliberate 43:20 Demings 35:22 democracy 18:4 23:22 51:6 55:25 Democrat 13:13 15:14 69:4 democratic 25:15 25:18 37:5 51:10 65:2,13 Democrats 19:13 36:24 56:21 57:3 69:5 denying 9:6 DEP 43:1 depends 33:5</p>	<p>deposed 62:17 Deputy 60:5 67:9 DeSantis 12:22 59:15 described 90:22 describes 24:17 desk 4:6,10,14,18 4:22 5:10 68:24 91:20 94:16 despot 50:6 85:12 destroyed 84:19 destroying 19:22 determine 11:12 determined 55:4 65:11 determining 65:7 76:4 development 72:15,18,20 77:20 deviate 30:20 devices 2:5 dichotomy 18:8 die 13:15 died 38:9 difference 61:4 different 35:23 37:2 40:20 46:22 64:24 65:10,15 88:5 89:3 differential 19:16 difficult 36:22 42:22 digital 1:23 96:3 dilute 5:24 diminish 9:8 diminishing 48:23 diminishment 10:5 44:4 64:23 direct 3:11 33:21 directed 61:2 direction 20:10 directions 19:9 directly 77:22</p>	<p>director 60:9 directors 70:23 directs 44:7 dirt 38:20 disadvantage 16:23 disagree 11:15 43:24 59:11 disagreement 52:19 disagrees 71:21 disappoint 51:23 disappointed 82:9 disappointing 6:4 disappointment 82:14 discriminatory 15:21 discuss 87:24 discussed 5:7 11:4 28:14 31:22 51:8 56:17 65:5 68:22 78:8 91:18 discussing 33:23 discussion 32:16 87:16 88:3 disfavored 24:14 disfavors 9:2 Disney 69:10 74:12 77:6,22 78:18,23 80:15 80:20,23 81:1 82:8,10,12,16 83:24,25 85:9 85:16 87:8 89:19 92:2 Disney's 74:17 displayed 17:9 dispute 76:16 disputes 76:18 disregard 23:20 82:18 disrespected</p>	<p>16:13 dissect 42:9 dissent 82:2,2 dissolution 73:20 78:5 86:20 dissolve 87:3,9 dissolved 70:11 84:8,16 88:23 distant 55:15 distinct 24:21 distractions 3:19 distributed 76:18 district 2:12 3:24 5:24 9:15 10:1 10:1,3 17:19,19 17:25 22:19 24:15,17,18,23 25:2,3,6,6,14 25:17 26:2 27:5 28:5 29:22 30:16 31:12 33:2 35:6 58:7 58:8 61:9 63:12 63:13,14 64:1,5 64:20,21,23 65:4,7,17,22 68:21 72:5,18 72:20 73:1 74:13,15 77:20 77:21 78:3,3,5 78:6 84:8,16,19 86:21 87:10,12 district's 29:11 districts 5:3 9:5 9:23 18:21 19:25 20:2,9 23:12,16 24:13 25:23 26:25 30:25 32:17,23 33:6 39:18 40:11 55:21 57:1 58:12 60:2 60:3,4,19,21,25 62:10,10,14 63:2,5,8,11 68:17 70:3,10 71:22 72:2,14</p>
--	--	--	--	--

72:15 73:4 74:10,10 77:19 83:17 86:22,23 87:18 88:22 90:11,13 diversity 2:23 3:17 69:9 divide 26:23,24 Doctor 53:16 doctrine 61:13 62:5 document 49:21 50:1 documents 53:1 dogs 48:13 doing 7:13 13:25 14:10,17,19 17:10 19:4,7,8 21:15 22:12 28:19,19 32:21 33:21 46:10,16 48:20 68:4 71:14 75:15 80:6,9 93:3 dollar 28:15 70:6 dollars 21:14 75:7,25 78:4 83:13 Donalds 12:20 door 29:1 double 42:8 doubt 70:1 94:5 downward 65:12 Dr 53:16,19 Draconian 69:6 drafts 32:1 drainage 83:16 draw 11:17 29:24 31:21,23,24 32:9,10,12 33:17 46:17 58:25 59:2 60:11 61:3 62:19 drawer 62:16 drawers 40:11 drawing 5:21,25	9:1 24:13 29:21 29:25 33:22 41:12 59:25 60:8 drawings 55:2 drawn 9:5 33:3 45:14,15 47:19 47:19 58:9 60:3 60:22 62:13,18 63:25 64:6,21 67:8 dreams 48:21 drew 9:16 43:19 43:21 45:17 58:11 59:25 60:2,3,4,12 66:16 drive 74:6 due 73:21 78:12 85:17,18 dust 38:21 duties 58:21 duty 47:21 59:3 68:2 69:23 86:18 Duvall 10:2,4 24:13 26:3	effective 63:12 87:3 effort 23:16 efforts 47:3 eight 25:3 either 29:10 76:4 elaborated 60:7 elect 9:9 17:16 25:19 30:19 elected 10:10 15:3 17:6 32:23 33:1,8 35:3 36:2 54:4,8 58:8 election 21:5 35:24 86:4 elections 19:10 electorate 19:18 electors 87:11 electrical 77:25 electronic 2:5 eliminate 50:22 eliminates 30:10 eliminating 20:5 20:8 emotional 44:19 emperor 85:9,10 86:3 employee 22:5 85:16 96:6 employees 69:12 76:23 77:25 78:2 82:11 employs 77:23 EMT 77:24 enabled 83:4 enchanted 55:14 endorse 7:10,12 engaged 29:8 engaging 70:18 English 51:14 enjoy 52:15 enormous 70:15 enshrined 52:25 ensue 83:25 ensure 19:21 56:1 66:11	ensures 30:18 entail 72:6 entering 28:16 entire 10:7,11 25:1 50:12 entitled 5:2 68:16 85:16 91:12 equal 9:6 17:4 30:2 40:8 51:10 61:1,1 equality 52:16 53:25 equally 93:23 94:1,4 especially 6:5 85:10 establishing 5:2 establishment 30:15 et 1:2 76:8 evaluated 65:10 72:3 event 79:17 80:19 events 53:14 Everglades 20:6 everybody 10:21 11:22 46:21 EVIDENCE 1:23 evinced 54:24 exactly 27:13 28:2 57:6 69:18 excellent 10:20 exceptional 52:7 excited 75:9,12 excuse 15:4 71:7 executive 4:13 14:23,25 45:24 exemption 93:19 93:24 exercise 69:19 90:7 exist 54:7 65:17 84:20 existing 72:21 exists 54:10 64:9 expect 31:5	expectant 51:23 expedited 83:4 experience 2:22 59:25 60:8 62:20 experiment 51:6 51:21,25 52:13 52:15 53:21 56:9 expert 67:18 explain 5:5 68:19 91:15 explained 11:7 explanation 43:12 express 51:25 expressed 82:16 expressing 69:11 extent 40:9 51:13 65:16 extortion 81:13
E				
earlier 34:7 35:1 36:11 early 92:6 earth 56:7 80:21 82:13 east 24:19 72:19 73:1 eastern 22:22 easy 46:24 echoing 24:4 ecological 83:17 economic 72:15 78:11 79:1 83:12 85:1 87:16 education 76:8 effect 59:20 85:19				
F				
face 22:19 26:5 Facebook 79:12 fact 6:3,11 15:2 20:10 25:16 45:18 48:12 54:3 62:13 72:12 87:9,12 93:22 fact-finding 73:20 factor 55:2 factors 85:1 factually 63:3 fail 28:18 74:10 74:18 failed 59:12 fair 19:25 20:2 22:10,19 23:11 23:16 24:13 25:23 39:18 43:5 55:18,22 60:25 fait 43:14 faith 28:16 47:19				

fallen 65:2	figured 85:1	47:11 54:10	29:4 56:21,22	Gaston 24:22
falling 52:22	file 49:17 74:11	55:9 59:16 60:9	Franklin 17:24	gather 83:11
familiar 24:25	filed 27:19 32:8	60:19,24 61:11	53:16,17,19	gathering 83:10
72:17	32:14 67:15	61:17 64:11	73:2	gay 34:20 77:3
families' 80:24	78:16 82:24	66:7 67:16,23	frankly 43:13	82:5,11,13
family 2:19 77:6	filing 49:13	68:1 74:7 76:20	82:9 84:14	83:23
80:5	finally 7:4 55:16	80:13,17 85:22	Frederica 12:21	gazelle 34:14
famously 53:17	60:15 74:14	Floridas 79:1	35:20	general 51:10
far 69:21	financial 78:9	Floridians 19:24	free 55:9,23	64:16 69:5,14
Farmer 39:11	financially 96:8	26:24 71:2 82:7	76:20 85:22,23	84:10
41:25 44:14	find 6:1,4 21:16	86:9 89:3	93:2,2	generation 55:17
49:2,3 81:16,18	49:9 81:21	fluid 50:2	freedom 52:7	gentleman 21:20
93:1,2	Fine 70:12	focus 89:3	53:25 55:8,12	gentlemen 54:9
farther 25:23	finish 38:14	focuses 62:7	55:13,16 93:8	geographic 63:22
father 2:15 38:6	firefighters 77:24	focusing 88:6	freest 55:9	geographical
38:8	firefighting	folks 5:23 28:11	friend 12:9 58:6	23:2
fathers 50:3	83:16	80:9	61:8,8 80:3	George 52:14
favor 21:25	first 4:25 8:8	followed 23:25	friend's 80:2	gerrymandered
56:25 57:10	12:2 38:17 41:5	following 20:2	friends 8:12	19:8
62:11,15 69:5	44:19 45:18,20	33:20 48:4	front 15:18 67:2	gerrymandering
favorable 68:5	49:11,21 51:21	food 34:16,16	90:25	12:11 57:6
favoritism 23:10	52:18 57:23,23	forbid 69:10	fulfill 59:3	gerrymanders
favors 9:2 23:8	63:16 64:7	force 23:16	fulfilled 58:17	23:9
62:12	66:22 69:4	forefathers 52:2	fulfills 58:23	getting 44:23
fear 55:24	77:23 85:6 93:3	foregoing 96:2	full 3:16 11:3	Gibson 8:18,20
fears 82:6	five 12:15,16	foreign 50:11	39:25	15:8,10 32:22
federal 40:13	25:4 56:18,20	forge 53:23	fully 31:4	44:5
61:22 62:2,3	63:4,7 71:22	forget 42:12	function 56:4	gifts 3:1
63:23	72:13 86:22	form 49:7 50:15	functional 64:25	Gingles 63:17,17
feel 16:13,14,16	five-year 75:14	50:24 51:7	functions 90:8	girls 37:22
17:4,20 21:3	fix 70:25	70:18 93:4	fund 76:11	give 18:16 32:12
41:7 54:23	flea 48:16,17,19	formal 18:4	fundamental	given 2:11 20:18
86:16 87:21	fleas 48:12,13	formed 51:3	54:2	29:2 30:3 63:3
89:7	flip 15:11	former 35:6 60:9	funding 75:25	67:5
feelings 39:1	floor 24:7 74:17	forum 44:7 79:9	fundraiser 80:19	giving 16:17
fees 21:11 28:15	83:1	forward 77:11	funds 33:11	17:10 61:20,24
fellow 82:6	Florida 8:22,24	foster 56:8	further 90:25	88:9 93:7
felt 60:23	9:12 12:14 19:9	found 79:21 92:6	96:5	glad 88:15
FEMALE 2:2	19:18 22:9,20	92:11,18 93:20	future 41:21	Gladstone 52:4
fewer 56:20	23:13 25:1,19	foundation 53:24	46:17 84:17	go 7:25 14:22
fifths 53:3	26:1,20 27:2,9	92:20	futures 28:20	17:25 19:6 20:3
fight 34:18 36:10	27:14,16,20	foundations		21:14 23:14,24
36:18 37:2,3,17	28:3 29:20 30:6	43:11 81:24	G	27:16 31:12
38:9,11 55:25	30:8 32:25	founders 52:2	gallery 2:4,10	44:14,14 45:10
69:6	35:12,17 36:3	53:7	game 7:19 43:6	45:12,22 48:22
fighter 36:25	39:17 40:20,21	founding 50:2	games 74:24	49:24 50:15
fighters 36:23	41:10,18 44:24	four 19:20 27:16	garden 55:14	57:15 61:3 62:8

67:25 70:19 77:6,11 80:5 81:1 89:21,21 93:9 goal 50:21 God 2:15 69:9 goes 11:25 25:23 89:19 going 6:9,18 7:12 7:13,14,18,20 8:13 11:20,21 11:25 12:24 13:1,3,4,5,19 14:1,21,22 16:12 18:18,18 20:20,22 21:4 21:23 22:6 33:12,16 36:4 36:10,16,17 39:19 41:15 42:24 46:1,11 46:15 52:23 53:22 57:5 59:6 62:2 63:7 64:13 64:17,20 67:13 69:21 71:18,21 73:9 74:21,22 74:24,25 75:1,2 75:5,7,8,8 77:9 77:10,11,11 81:19 85:7 86:20 87:5,13 88:8,20,25 89:16 92:19 93:10 good 2:13 4:1 12:2,8 15:25 26:16 27:24 28:9 33:6,7 47:19 52:17 61:8 66:21 67:1 80:12,15 88:25 91:2 93:17 goodness 2:16 gospel 36:13 gotten 27:17 92:1 govern 52:10	69:22 85:5 93:12 governance 70:17 governing 41:6 53:1 government 2:19 2:21 16:15 18:9 30:2 33:24 41:1 47:22 49:8 50:15,24 51:8 51:11 61:14,16 73:4 81:24 84:8 84:10 85:8,14 93:5 governments 90:19 Governor 4:13 6:8 7:23 12:22 13:3,5,22 16:2 16:3 29:24 30:3 32:6 33:21 42:25 45:12 46:3 49:12 55:1 58:2,5 59:10,14 59:15,16,18,19 59:21,24 60:18 60:23 64:15 69:17,20 70:13 70:22 71:20 78:15,20 81:4 82:23 83:25 87:20 89:2,9 Governor's 5:18 11:6 12:10 16:6 19:8 20:10,16 24:16 50:20 55:5 63:14,24 64:22 65:20 67:9 85:17 grade 6:19 grain 51:5 grandchildren 18:23 Grant 3:17 granted 93:6 great 2:21 17:22	17:22 42:13 43:22,25 50:14 51:3,20 52:13 53:24 55:13 56:8 greater 64:2 greatest 27:23 51:17 55:23 93:4 grew 6:21 GROUP 1:23 grow 56:8 growing 72:23 growth 30:6,8,9 guess 54:12 77:8 77:9 guests 2:4,10 guys 44:25 81:5 94:18 <hr/> H <hr/> habitat 83:17 half 9:24,24,25 23:4,5 27:11,13 28:1 79:21 Hamilton 43:1 72:18,20,21 Hampshire 41:13 hand 3:9 42:14 80:18 hands 84:21 happen 7:13 13:4 20:20 74:21,22 74:24,25 75:1,2 75:2,6,8 77:10 77:10,12 84:11 90:23 happened 23:14 69:13 89:6 happening 56:24 75:5 93:6 happens 56:1 83:23 91:1 happiest 80:21 happiness 52:17 80:24 happy 11:20	13:13 47:16 80:21 hard 11:7 18:13 75:13 88:21 94:2 Harris 43:2 Hastings 35:16 hate 28:12 54:11 54:13,14 hateful 54:11 haunted 79:16 head 42:20 48:18 85:13 heading 21:22 headquarters 76:5 heads 2:14 hear 11:5 42:18 42:19,22 44:10 heard 8:7 9:22 22:2 32:16 41:2 59:4,8 61:5,21 62:6 67:17 71:24 74:11 86:24 89:17 hearing 28:5 55:8 57:23 88:2 hearkens 53:6 54:6 heart 3:9 43:4 49:4 80:7 hearts 3:11 heavy 49:4 heck 81:10 help 71:4 helped 83:3 helping 71:2 helps 72:21,22 heretofore 52:25 hide 7:2 high 48:16,22 55:15 higher 17:17 18:15,19 highest 48:14 54:25 highlighted	47:25 hijack 13:6 hijacked 13:19 13:20 47:21 Hillsborough 22:25 hire 73:9 Hispanic 20:7 30:8,12 historian 51:14 historic 25:18 49:10 history 38:18 45:1,21 46:9 49:12 50:25 51:1,4,15 hit 48:18,18 59:6 79:19 hold 49:21 holder 27:5 holds 6:8 51:18 home 13:2 17:25 37:15,19 74:6 77:22 88:9 honest 71:6 honor 57:20 hope 14:14,15 51:22 85:16 89:10 hoped 51:22 hopefully 41:22 46:16 horrible 90:22 host 80:19 hostile 83:24 hour 42:6 70:21 86:18 hours 71:16 house 4:17 8:5 9:14,20 13:9,12 16:2,5 24:11,15 24:22 25:2,5 27:11,25 32:5 40:24 49:16 58:20 60:3,9,11 62:18 64:25 65:10,11,21
--	---	--	--	---

67:10 housing 79:10,11 88:13,14 huge 76:19 83:18 hull 66:12,14 human 51:18,22 humanity 3:20 51:23 humbled 2:20 45:19 humility 3:18 hurt 80:11 hurting 16:13 33:4 hurts 11:2 18:6 Hutson 41:25 44:15,17	importance 49:25 important 11:10 11:16 15:11 49:6 54:1 61:6 66:11 75:24 76:19 83:6 87:24 90:9 93:3 imposed 67:3 impression 41:5 improve 29:11 improved 67:7 improvement 67:3 72:5 improves 66:9,12 66:15 67:11 inches 48:15,17 48:19 includes 10:4 25:2 55:1 including 60:2 incorporate 40:25 incorporating 67:9 incorrect 63:3 increase 30:12,22 66:20 increased 30:5 incredible 53:5 57:5 incredibly 40:22 90:9,13 incumbent 9:3 24:15 62:11,13 incumbents 62:13 incurred 78:4 indebtedness 84:9 independent 13:16 15:2 52:12 68:16,21 70:3 71:22 73:4 74:13 77:19 86:21 87:10 88:22	independently 82:23 indicate 2:6 indicative 84:3 individual 3:2 50:8,10 56:2,7 56:7 61:25 indoctrinated 26:18 industries 80:17 industry 72:24 78:12 79:2 infirm 28:18 92:6 92:18,20 93:20 infirmity 92:11 inflation 88:16 influence 27:23 information 8:22 9:11,21 83:10 informed 29:8 infrastructure 29:12 initial 71:14 initiative 39:22 injury 44:6 71:17 injustice 17:21 input 10:23 11:5 41:1 75:17 83:8 insert 49:12 insertion 50:20 insist 48:4 instance 23:4 instant 13:17 institutions 2:18 instructions 60:23 insult 44:5 71:16 insurance 70:25 75:11 88:15 insurrection 53:8 intelligent 29:8 intend 93:22 intended 44:14 intent 9:5 16:8 55:1,5,21 57:12 62:20 82:1 84:3 93:22,25	intentionally 9:2 interest 10:13 47:21 65:23 interested 96:8 interesting 27:8 48:12 interests 16:8 30:20 48:3 interplay 40:7 interpreted 40:13 64:12 intersect 42:9 intrusive 69:6 investment 72:23 invidious 54:10 involved 90:20 90:21 ironies 85:15,21 issue 21:8 30:4 31:1,6 41:5 47:2 50:20 70:25 76:9 80:10 94:3 issued 83:14 issues 70:6 79:13 80:11 88:5,5,12 88:18 89:3,18 it.' 53:18	48:7 Josiah 35:13 journal 53:11 joy 42:7 judge 42:13 43:3 judicial 45:22,24 46:5 60:13,22 61:13,18 62:4 Julie 96:19 jump 6:25 48:15 48:17,19,21 jumping 22:23 61:10 June 7:16 20:21 87:3 jurisdiction 41:7 justice 3:14 49:23 53:25 justification 20:2 20:4 justify 64:4
I				K
idea 5:20,23,25 identical 9:16 identified 40:3 identity 85:24 ignited 82:5 ignore 87:13 ignored 23:17 ignores 62:7 ignoring 23:11 ill-thought 69:24 illegal 69:25 70:21 imagine 18:20 79:20 imbalance 57:5 immediately 84:11 immigration 74:25 impact 18:22 43:6,7 73:6 78:11 83:13 87:16 impacted 79:2 impacts 77:18 impasse 58:24 implemented 60:14 65:4				K 75:4 keep 28:5 53:10 53:18 55:8 86:1 93:3,4 keeping 22:21 Kelly 5:18 28:8 60:5,8 Kendrick 35:19 kept 53:11 66:17 66:18 key 54:20 81:2 kicked 54:13 kid 7:7 kid's 28:25 74:23 kids 29:10 49:24 72:7 kids' 75:3 killed 53:5 kind 18:7 45:1,3 45:9 46:4 72:6 79:12,14 kinds 36:13 king 50:5 king's 3:8
			J	
			Jacksonville 9:24 15:17,17,20 24:20,23 35:21 James 42:13 53:12 jar 48:9,11,16,18 Jesus 3:20 job 12:2 42:16 43:22 79:19,21 87:8 92:21 jobs 17:10 John 43:1 55:13 Johnson 51:15 joined 79:14 joint 72:25 73:16 Jones 12:3,5 32:22 35:1 44:2	

knee 81:11	larger 30:13	39:25	lid 48:9,20	longer 38:10 63:9
knee-jerk 78:20	largest 5:22 30:7	legal 16:18 21:11	lies 38:19	84:20
knew 12:23 13:15	77:20	28:15 39:19,23	life 25:2 42:8	longstanding
36:25 38:4	late 42:13 55:12	40:4,14,15,16	76:6	30:21
50:17 53:19,20	82:15	41:3,4,5,19	light 18:19	look 5:25 9:21
53:21	Latvala 36:23	43:10 48:1 76:3	lightly 38:3	11:9,14 17:2
knocked 36:17	laugh 42:7	84:15,18	liked 31:16 33:14	18:10,18 36:20
36:18,19	Laughter 37:23	legislate 85:5	43:19	41:11 62:9 66:5
know 2:17 6:15	77:7 89:22 92:3	legislation 32:3,4	limited 35:2	67:25 71:23
7:4,5,19 10:19	94:25	39:6 71:3 82:2	limiting 25:25	76:2 80:14
11:8 12:12,23	Lauren 38:12	83:13 84:17	limits 39:25	82:20 83:23
13:24,25 14:1	law 14:3 16:20	86:6 89:1,11	line 9:1	87:6,22,22 93:6
14:18 15:1,14	19:14 26:17	92:15,16	lines 11:12	looked 11:18
15:25 17:11	40:1,6,20 42:16	legislative 45:11	lineup 26:10	15:25
19:7,9,14 20:18	45:10,21,24	45:22,23 46:1	29:15 41:25	looking 22:25
21:19 22:4,7	46:2,6,9,18	46:25 49:7,13	lion 34:14	43:12 67:12
23:20 28:21	54:21,24 61:21	49:16 71:25	list 26:12,13	Lord 3:9 77:18
29:2,6,10 33:12	63:23,23,23	73:10,14,16,22	listen 10:22	lost 37:2 79:19
33:16 37:18,25	69:25 82:18	84:17 86:25	36:13	lot 13:8 16:20
38:5,10 41:15	84:6,7 87:2	87:7 90:12	listened 10:21	32:3,16 37:2,21
44:19 45:20	94:3	93:25	48:5 59:5	38:1,1 39:23
46:13,23 47:10	laws 23:20 45:16	legislator 3:1	literally 71:19	47:1,10 48:5
47:12 48:13	45:16	legislators 53:9	litigation 62:17	89:17 90:4
50:25 52:20	Lawson 24:14	Legislature	66:4 67:25 92:7	lottery 43:2
53:7 55:7 69:13	35:22	14:24 21:10,12	92:12,15	love 8:3,14 17:21
71:13 72:5	lawsuit 21:9	29:20 30:2	little 17:24 20:11	37:20,21 38:1,2
74:24 76:24,25	32:14	47:20 58:13	37:1 46:21	38:3,3 43:23
77:13 78:14	lawsuits 32:8	59:9 60:15 67:7	48:13 56:18,20	45:19
80:15 81:9	lawyer 28:8	69:7 88:6 89:8	79:20 81:2,19	loved 38:4
87:21 88:20,20	32:20 42:16	90:5,6,21 94:5	83:7,8 90:17	loves 38:6
knowing 28:17	lawyers 29:5	legitimate 73:13	live 3:15 10:11	
34:17 36:10	46:14 70:21	Leon 24:22	27:18 37:7 56:9	M
37:16	lay 28:12 42:20	lesson 45:2,9	lived 17:18,19	M 1:24
knows 15:19	Leader 8:18,20	46:13	25:1,9 35:17	ma'am 53:18
72:11 74:21	15:8,10 47:7,7	lessons 51:19	lives 3:15 29:11	Madam 94:20
kowtows 18:2	49:2,3 81:16,18	let's 7:14 18:13	37:9 93:7	magical 82:12,12
	89:13,15,23	23:24 31:12	living 79:18 80:2	magically 70:24
L	92:25 93:2	44:14 57:15	86:16	magistrate 41:12
Ladies 54:9	leaders 14:8	82:20 86:1 92:2	lobbyists 73:9	maintain 77:25
lady 53:15	54:25	94:3	local 84:10 90:19	maintained
laid 50:3	leadership 7:11	level 65:9,18	located 77:21	54:20
Lake 87:17	leap 48:14	Lewis 55:13,23	location 76:5,8	maintenance
land 36:19	leave 2:3 29:7	LGBTQ 69:12	Lock 68:9 91:5	83:16
language 9:4,7	58:25	liabilities 84:9	94:10	major 17:20 18:8
large 16:11 26:25	led 2:25 3:23	liberty 3:13	long 16:7 20:15	80:12
51:13 63:20	40:21 41:10	52:14	57:22 74:5	majorities 56:6
largely 85:18	left 15:14,15	libraries 72:16	82:10	majority 19:20

<p>25:17 32:23 33:2 51:11 56:3 63:2,4,7,11,21 63:25 making 25:8 33:24 61:23 70:14 71:3 79:22 91:1 malignancy 23:21 man 6:20 50:8 man's 43:3 mandates 69:10 mankind 50:25 51:20 manner 14:17 47:16 64:9 map 5:7,21 6:6 6:12 8:15 9:13 9:17,19 10:3,6 10:23,25 11:3,6 11:17,21 12:7 12:10 19:5,8,12 19:17,18 20:4 20:14,19,22,24 21:2,6,16 22:12 22:18,25 23:3 23:10 24:12,17 25:22,23,24 26:1,5 30:10 31:21 33:25 36:5 37:7,11 39:7 40:10,25 42:19 47:14,17 47:19,24,25 48:10 49:5,13 56:9,24,25 58:2 58:2,5,10,11,23 58:25 59:2,3,13 59:18,20 60:1,2 60:12,12,14,18 60:22,24 61:3 62:1,7,12,16,18 62:19 63:3,5,6 64:21 66:5,8,12 66:13,19,21,21 66:25 67:2,3,8</p>	<p>67:12 68:3 map's 30:25 maps 5:19 9:10 12:23 15:15,21 16:2,3,5,6,21 18:21 20:25 22:10 24:11 28:4 29:19,22 29:25 30:21 31:2,7,16,17,23 31:24 32:1,7,10 32:10,12,14,15 33:3,10,14,17 33:18,22,23,23 34:9,20,25 37:13 41:12 43:19 45:8,14 45:15 46:2,8,17 49:17 55:2,4,20 59:25 60:8,11 65:19 67:6,19 68:2 march 11:22 32:14 marginalization 44:3 marginalized 14:17 44:2 margins 19:10 Marsteller 43:3 Maruschen 52:5 marveled 52:6 Maryland 41:14 53:12 math 19:15 26:16 26:17,19,20 27:9,15 32:19 32:19 88:2 mathematician 32:20 42:11 mathematics 43:9 matter 13:1 16:19 32:8 37:9 70:8 73:8 88:17 96:4 matters 4:20</p>	<p>83:17 Maya 38:14,15 McDonald 67:18 McHenry 53:12 53:14 mean 8:9,11 12:18 75:10 meaningful 71:25 73:14,22 means 10:5 28:16 36:16 55:12 59:19 74:19 measure 69:25 media 15:16 69:8 83:25 91:12,17 mediocrity 38:25 Meek 35:17 member 8:3,15 10:8,9 33:7 35:7 80:16,17 members 12:6,12 12:15,16,20 14:12 24:24 27:9,11,19,22 27:25 37:12 90:3 memories 81:2 men 2:23 50:9,9 52:15 mention 74:7 mentioned 46:12 mess 70:13 message 24:16 81:5,6 messages 4:12,16 messes 70:21 methods 16:5 metrics 66:9,20 67:12 Miami 21:21 Miami-Dade 27:3 Michael 67:18 mid-1800s 52:22 middle 87:24 miles 20:3 24:19 million 12:17,18</p>	<p>27:4 28:15 34:24 56:18,20 56:22 75:25 76:15,16 mind 94:5 minimum 76:15 minor 56:22 88:13 minorities 9:4,7 33:4 48:21 56:5 minority 19:20 19:22 20:1,5 24:20,21 25:25 28:5,7 30:15,18 30:22 31:4 32:17,23 33:2,6 33:7 48:3,23,23 50:22 54:5,6,17 55:21 56:4,6,10 63:2,4,8,11,12 63:13,19 64:1 64:21 65:8,25 66:1 83:3 minority/majo... 20:7 minute 42:6 50:14 minutes 13:8 missing 74:23 moans 42:8,18,19 42:22 44:10 mom 38:4 80:25 89:19 moms 85:25 monarchy?' 53:17 money 21:11 month 79:23,23 months 47:15 80:4 moral 17:15 18:7 morning 2:13 4:1 15:25 34:12,13 34:15,22 37:16 86:19 mother 36:9 38:8 38:9</p>	<p>motion 94:20 motions 4:8 motivation 84:24 mouse 81:12 move 94:23 moved 14:4 24:6 moves 66:17,18 multiple 31:22 31:23 municipalities 27:2 music 36:13 muster 48:2 myriad 82:3 83:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <hr/> <p>name 3:20 6:20 35:9 67:18 named 51:14 nascent 51:2 nation 17:22 52:24 54:20 national 51:18 nature 50:2 nays 68:11 91:7 94:12 nearly 10:24 77:23 78:4 79:21 necessarily 37:4 37:5 neck 81:11 need 14:11,24 43:14 54:6 62:25 70:3,25 72:1 73:13 80:20 83:6 88:6 89:20 90:17 needed 54:16,18 90:25 needs 66:25 negative 39:2 negatively 79:2 negotiation 28:17 negro 34:23 neighbor 80:12</p>
--	--	---	--	---

80:16 neighborhoods 17:12 23:3 neighbors 29:1 neither 63:10 96:5 never 7:6 36:15 36:25 41:6 42:7 42:12 43:3 55:25 56:1 64:6 75:2 82:15 new 14:22 20:24 30:7 41:11,12 72:23 news 13:23 nice 79:18 night 42:20 74:16 nine 29:4 34:7 46:13 58:15 noble 39:22 non-diminishm... 40:9 65:14 norm 14:23 normal 30:1 40:18 north 6:23 7:3 25:1,19 26:1 note 61:6 noted 51:24 63:15 nothing's 74:20 74:25 75:1,2 77:9 notice 70:8 86:19 notion 84:13 notions 54:16 notwithstanding 87:12 novel 41:4 November 8:21 8:23 21:5 NPA 56:22 nuclear 90:15 number 11:16 19:19 26:25 27:1 30:12 35:2 59:4,6,8 66:16	66:18 72:25 numbers 26:22 27:25 79:1 NW 1:24 <hr/> O <hr/> oath 42:14 Obama 54:8 object 30:24 87:23 88:1 objection 95:1 objections 59:8 61:5 62:6 objects 83:24 obligation 17:15 58:17 64:8 observers 51:24 obvious 23:10 obviously 47:12 offered 61:9 office 11:6 12:10 63:14,24 64:22 65:20 oh 7:15 23:12,13 71:21 74:1 77:15,18 86:13 92:25 okay 7:14 54:14 77:9 old 14:6,8 older 6:24 olds 75:14,14 Olleen 6:20 once 22:11 40:16 49:14 66:3 81:21,25 82:17 86:17 one-way 80:14 ones 43:24 64:14 ongoing 73:6 open 47:15 56:10 92:11 open-stated 55:20 opened 81:1 opening 2:11 openly 50:21	51:8 operate 77:25 operating 63:6 operation 51:12 operations 88:25 opinion 23:17 40:21 80:24 opponent 6:9 opportunities 18:11 30:18 52:16 opportunity 2:20 3:15 9:6 17:5 40:16 63:13 64:21 65:16 oppose 8:15 22:18 47:14 opposing 78:19 opposition 29:19 82:8 oppression 56:6 56:10 Orange 78:7,25 87:17 ordained 2:18 order 2:10 4:4 45:10 63:15 ordered 52:14 orientation 17:8 75:4 original 66:17,19 Osceola 78:7,25 87:17 Osgood 3:25 4:1 15:23,24 33:1 48:7 other's 27:19 outcome 11:21 outraged 21:17 outs 94:7 outside 51:24 overreaching 69:7 oversight 72:1 73:14 74:8 87:1 87:7 90:7,12,17 overturned 67:6	owned 81:9 <hr/> P <hr/> page 15:11 53:13 Palm 35:23 37:18 panhandle 19:5 parade 90:22 parameters 43:10 parents 72:6 part 6:22 11:10 25:3,5 44:20 47:13 55:18 76:6 82:4 87:21 88:13 92:14 participate 9:7 participated 49:22 particular 92:14 particularly 11:20 49:25 parties 96:7 partisan 23:10 25:12 47:21 party 6:9 9:2 56:23 62:16 69:14 85:18 pass 11:24 36:5 37:13 45:10,13 46:6,18 48:1 58:15,18,19,22 59:3,12 68:2 75:18 89:10 passage 39:22 84:11 passed 6:13 21:12 32:7 35:18 45:21,24 58:1 60:15 82:7 82:15 passes 68:13 91:9 94:14 passing 30:21 55:20 passion 82:6 patiently 24:9 Paul 51:14	pay 17:14 77:2 payback 86:2 93:11 peck 42:7 pen 45:12 penance 77:1 people 12:17,17 14:6,17 15:4,20 16:10,12,19,19 16:22,22 17:4,6 17:16,20,23 18:9,10,11 20:19 22:7,7,9 23:14 26:22 27:4 29:3,5 34:8,24 35:3,8 35:15,25 36:1,2 36:6 37:3,8,22 37:24,25 38:16 42:17,18 43:8 43:17 44:3,10 48:21 50:14 51:16,19 52:9 53:23 55:10 59:24 67:21 72:22 79:14 80:8 81:8 85:20 85:23 87:11 89:20 93:7 percent 9:18,20 10:3,4 12:18 19:11,16,24 25:7,16 27:10 27:12,13 28:1 56:25 57:4,10 57:11 64:2 65:3 65:6,6 percentages 9:25 perched 55:15 perfect 10:25 perform 65:24 performance 23:6 25:12 74:13 performs 65:7 period 9:12 83:11
--	---	--	---	---

<p>periodic 72:1 Perry 2:12,13 76:1 Perry's 76:1 persistent 23:19 person 11:5 18:3 18:14 50:19 53:1,2,3 59:25 personal 24:8 persons 2:3 perspectives 18:8 pertains 14:3 petulant 86:2 93:10 Philadelphia 6:22,23 Philly 6:23 7:3 phone 27:17 72:9 phonetic 6:21 52:4,5 pick 70:20 picture 51:5 pillow 42:20 Pinellas 22:21 23:2,8 pint 42:6 pit 38:24 Pizzo 24:1 26:10 26:13,15 32:19 34:6 74:1,3 91:23,25 place 6:21 14:2 19:21 20:24 21:1,6 27:21 43:25 44:1 64:7 80:21,24 82:12 82:13 90:6 plaintiffs 67:6,19 plan 58:19 59:17 85:2 plane 21:22 planet 51:4 planner 79:18 plans 67:23,24 plateau 55:15 platform 91:17 91:18</p>	<p>platforms 69:8 91:13 play 7:18 14:23 played 16:16 please 2:3,4,6,11 3:22 7:21 34:1 87:19 Pledge 3:23 4:2 poach 27:19 pocket 49:22 pocketbooks 88:11 point 7:24 54:22 72:19 73:1 points 26:4 59:6 policies 54:24 78:19 policy 43:6,8,24 political 9:2,8 28:20 43:5 56:4 62:16,19,19 67:16 73:23 78:18,21 84:24 86:2 87:8 89:9 93:11 politics 3:4 76:25 poll 32:18 Polsby- 66:14 Polsky 56:14,15 57:15 69:2,3 73:12 Popper 66:15 population 9:18 10:2 24:20,21 25:7 27:14 28:2 29:22 30:6,7 63:20,21 64:1 populous 27:3 portion 16:11 22:21,22 23:3 85:3,3 93:8 position 12:1 28:11 63:24 64:6,25 65:10 71:20 81:22 89:1 possible 5:22</p>	<p>post-fair 60:21 potential 27:24 potentially 35:10 Powell 26:12 29:15 31:11 32:22 34:2,3,5 39:11 48:6 94:22 power 6:17 23:19 27:23 47:21 50:18 69:21 85:18 powers 14:4 49:20 50:4 69:20 89:7 90:14 practical 51:12 practice 61:18 pray 2:14 3:20 prayer 2:11 precariously 52:21 precedent 33:13 41:4 87:14 precisely 56:5 precondition 63:17,19 prescient 53:19 presence 2:7 present 2:8 5:18 20:3 66:22 presentation 5:19 presentations 16:7 President 2:8,9 3:22 4:3,7,8,11 4:12,15,16,19 4:20,23,24 5:4 5:9,11,12,14,16 7:21 8:2,17,20 10:14,15,17 12:3,5 15:6,7 15:10,21,22 18:25 19:3 22:14,17 23:23 24:3 26:9,15</p>	<p>29:14,18,19 30:15 31:8,9,14 34:2,5 39:9,10 39:15 41:24 42:4 44:12,13 44:17 46:19 47:3,4,10 48:25 49:1,3 54:8 56:12,13,15 57:14,19 68:7 68:12,13,18,20 68:23,25 69:1,3 71:9,12 73:25 74:3 77:14,17 79:5,6,8 81:16 81:18 86:12,15 89:12,15,23 90:2,23 91:3,8 91:9,14,16,19 91:21,22,25 92:24 93:13,16 94:8,13,14,17 94:18,22,24 95:1 pretty 9:24 26:16 48:15 prevent 61:25 previous 20:25 45:8 64:7 73:18 previously 45:14 price 83:17 primary 6:9 7:10 9:19,19 25:15 25:18 65:2,9,13 principal 51:10 principles 53:24 printed 8:21 prior 35:11,12,14 private 69:6,15 71:18 78:2 privileges 72:10 probably 11:20 19:12 20:20 32:2 45:4 80:16 problematic 52:9 problems 7:7 48:1 89:4</p>	<p>proceed 52:20 68:9 91:5 94:10 proceeds 76:17 process 8:12,23 9:8 10:24 11:1 11:11 13:6,19 16:14 17:5 30:1 30:25 31:20 34:17 36:21 40:22,23 41:9 41:23 43:5,20 44:23 46:2,11 46:16 47:15 49:13 50:21 60:21 70:11 73:10 74:8 75:22 82:20 86:6 88:19 90:6 90:8,18 professionals 37:13 professor 67:17 profound 52:1 program 49:23 prohibit 9:1 prohibits 62:3 projects 6:10 72:25 73:6 promote 3:13 promptly 76:9 proof 54:5 proper 90:5 property 70:25 75:11 88:15 propose 29:25 proposed 28:4 30:10 71:18 87:2 proposing 37:8 78:10 proposition 52:6 props 8:9 protect 54:15 56:5,8 protected 64:23 protection 9:4 28:7 40:8 54:17</p>
--	--	--	--	---

61:1 63:10 proud 8:6 11:1,1 24:10 41:17 47:2,11,13 66:22 90:10 Proverbs 3:8 provide 69:9 83:15 provided 19:25 25:11 53:7 96:4 provision 40:17 provoke 74:20 public 11:4,4 18:5 56:3 79:9 86:25 87:6 publicly 23:6 25:12 punish 69:21 71:1 82:2 punished 69:17 70:14 78:23 79:1 punishment 73:22 78:18 punitive 69:25 76:25 78:17 86:2 93:10 puppet 89:8 purported 70:2 purpose 3:6 84:10 86:25 87:6 pursuit 52:16 push 83:21 pushed 18:22 85:11 put 14:2 18:18 19:21 20:24,25 21:6,7 22:10 23:15 33:11 39:17 44:7 46:2 48:16 60:18,18 60:19 61:19 79:12 80:18 86:5 88:1 90:6 puts 16:22 18:7 48:10	putting 5:23 22:24 48:20 72:7 81:11 <hr/> Q qualified 60:16 60:20 qualifying 7:16 20:21 qualities 54:1 quality 76:6 quest 56:1 question 9:12 34:6 41:19,22 58:1 59:22 62:23,24 64:10 66:3 83:12 84:7 questions 24:9 39:20,23 40:4,6 40:14,16 61:10 85:7 92:10 93:21 quickly 76:2 quite 89:20 quorum 2:8 quotation 53:11 quote 67:13,16 67:21 quoted 61:11 <hr/> R race 17:7 34:21 51:22 64:3 75:3 race-neutral 19:4 racial 9:4,6 55:1 racism 54:7,9 racist 33:20 39:2 42:25 43:1 rain 38:13 raise 42:14 ramification 43:10 ran 35:7,25 randomly 60:19 rap 36:14 rapid 82:24 ratio 27:22 66:15	reaction 74:20 78:20 reactor 90:15 read 4:25 67:13 68:14 91:10 94:15 reading 4:25 83:2 ready 38:10 real 18:13 85:22 86:1 reality 33:17 84:18 85:25 86:17 realize 28:11 42:20 48:10 67:22 really 8:9 9:25 11:3,7 12:1 14:7 20:9 21:3 21:8,16 23:10 23:18 27:8 70:14 74:18 76:19 77:4 81:6 81:6,23 83:20 83:22 88:21 reapportionme... 10:18 57:23 58:19 59:17 reason 29:2 49:20 64:24 71:14 75:24 79:3 81:14 reasonably 63:22 64:3 reasons 26:7 31:2 47:22 49:11 71:24 recall 75:20 received 8:23 9:17,20,22 recognize 14:16 94:19 recognized 5:5 5:15 8:19 10:16 12:4 15:9,23 19:2 22:16 24:1	26:14 29:17 31:13 34:4 39:12 42:1 44:16 47:6,8 49:2 56:14 57:16 68:19 69:2 71:11 74:2 77:16 79:7 81:17 86:14 89:14,25 91:15 91:23 93:1,15 94:21 recommend 73:18,19,19 reconciled 61:3 reconsideration 4:21 reconstituted 87:4 88:24 reconstruction 12:13 35:13 reconvene 94:23 record 15:19 28:12 46:15,20 59:7 60:6 66:12 68:9 74:7 82:21 91:6 94:10 recording 1:10 95:3 96:3 records 53:14 recreate 65:18 redistricting 8:22 49:5 58:10 59:11,15 60:10 60:13 67:4,20 67:22 70:9 87:25 redistrictors 41:21 redraw 64:8 65:23 reduced 19:19 31:3 78:12 redundant 81:19 Reedy 72:5 77:19 77:22 83:15 84:19 86:21	89:18 reference 4:9 reflect 19:17 reflective 28:2 reform 75:12 refuse 48:2 Regarding 63:13 regardless 17:6 39:4 regards 32:18 registered 56:19 56:20 57:4,11 regular 49:14 84:25 reinstated 72:3 reinstatement 73:11 reintegration 84:15 rejected 29:6 relates 92:7,12 relating 4:9 68:16 91:12 relative 96:6 relatively 74:4 relevant 55:6 relied 84:18 religious 17:7 reluctantly 37:19 37:19 rely 53:22 remain 3:22 39:23 40:14 remaining 40:3 remarkable 52:1 remedy 92:11,14 remember 6:19 22:8 27:24 35:4 35:18 75:20 76:12 90:11 remind 36:12,14 reminded 44:5 53:10 reminder 55:12 removal 55:21 removes 93:24 93:24
--	--	---	---	---

removing 42:21 93:18	41:22 60:24 64:15,15,17 76:20	14:1,20 15:5 16:12 26:19,19 27:15 28:12	42:1,3,15 44:14 48:6	score 66:15
rent 79:11,23	resolved 39:18	31:20 34:19	rule 50:6 54:21	scream 14:12
Reock 66:15	64:14 66:4 76:3	35:4 36:8,12,25	54:24 82:18	scripture 2:18
Rep 70:12	76:10,18	39:25 42:14	84:5	seat 23:8 24:14
replaced 35:19	respect 6:10,16	46:10 52:10	rules 94:19,20	30:7 35:5,25
35:19,22	6:17 8:2,14	54:2,2,15 56:3	ruling 92:6	36:1 50:22
replied 53:18	17:24 23:1 24:6	56:7,11 57:2	run 12:19 27:18	seats 19:20 20:3
report 73:15,20	43:23 54:21,23	61:18 76:14	33:5 35:8 36:1	20:6 26:23
88:10	69:14 73:21	77:2 92:23 93:7	69:15	30:11,12,23
reports 4:4 74:11	81:23 84:5	rights 19:21 26:6	running 27:20	35:23 36:4
represent 3:13	respected 18:1	47:18 50:1,8,10	34:15,15,16	42:21 54:4,5,6
16:13 17:6	47:17	50:11,15 51:10	35:10 54:13	57:1,10
30:19 36:6	respectful 44:23	52:16 56:2,4,5	rural 25:9,15	second 39:16
43:18 57:7 78:7	responders 77:23	61:1 62:1 63:16	rush 70:6 83:7	50:12 64:20
representation	responsibilities	63:18 64:13	rushed 69:24	83:1
10:12 19:22	58:14 78:9	85:21 93:8	rushing 87:19	secondary 9:13
20:1,5,7 26:21	responsibility	righty 94:18	<hr/> S <hr/>	9:17,19 24:17
27:1 31:4 32:21	22:11 29:21	rise 2:11 29:19	sad 54:9	28:7
representatives	30:4 32:11	38:21,24,24	sadly 50:9	Secretary 4:6,10
4:17 9:9 49:17	58:13,18,24	39:1,2,4,5,5,6	sales 78:12	4:14,18,22 5:1
60:10 73:3	59:9,12	49:4	sand 51:5	5:10 68:8,11,15
represented 2:23	responsible 85:8	risk 12:19	Sanderlin 42:13	68:24 91:4,7,11
35:16	rest 51:20 55:16	road 7:25 14:22	Sane 71:3	91:20 94:9,12
representing	55:25 92:17	57:22 83:16	sat 48:5	94:16
32:25	restrictions 72:7	roadways 11:12	satellite 76:4	sect 42:10
represents 26:3	result 78:6	29:12	satisfy 63:16	section 23:2
republic 49:7	resulted 20:16	rock 54:12,14	save 29:10	40:10,12 63:15
53:6,10,17,18	retains 66:14	Rodrigues 5:4,6	saved 80:25	74:9
86:7	retrogression	10:20 12:9 24:5	saw 67:13	sections 8:25
republican 13:13	44:4	43:21 46:23	saying 14:6 31:15	22:24
23:9 37:6 51:21	revenge 70:17	47:5,6 57:16,18	57:20 83:21	sector 16:11
69:14	71:7	92:8	87:5	see 7:14,16 11:2
Republicans 5:21	revenue 72:24	role 11:24 42:15	says 3:8 37:11	13:8,9,22 21:21
19:12 36:24	78:12	59:10,14 90:4,5	38:6 61:17	24:7 42:8 44:12
56:19,25 57:3,3	reversed 6:7	rolled 83:1	63:23 70:10	50:5 54:24 75:9
57:10	review 60:13,22	rolls 18:2	87:3,4 93:25	seeing 5:13 88:18
reputation 80:23	70:4,12 72:1	room 46:14	SB 57:17	92:25
required 74:11	73:22 74:8,9,13	74:21	scared 6:25	seek 92:10
requirement	87:5	rose 85:18	36:15 37:16	seeking 75:25
33:22 65:14	reviewed 21:5	roughly 27:4,13	scary 54:22	seeks 85:12
87:25	70:3	round 41:14	Scholarship	seen 18:1 21:11
requires 87:2	ridiculous 6:14	62:17	85:17	32:1 70:19
requiring 86:20	81:12	Rouson 31:11	school 7:1,1	self-governance
reside 62:15	rife 48:1	32:22 34:3	19:14	52:19
resides 62:14	right 13:2,20,25	39:11 41:25	science 67:17	self-reflection
resolve 40:16				14:19
				Senate 1:11 2:9

5:1 8:2,6,10 10:23 13:9,11 13:14,18 15:15 18:1 24:11 25:3 26:20,24 27:10 27:21 31:16,17 32:18,25 40:23 43:19,23 44:24 45:4 47:12 57:21 58:8,10 58:20 65:15,21 66:13,19 68:15 69:23 77:21 90:23 91:11 94:23 95:2 Senator 2:12,12 2:13 3:24,24 4:1 5:4,6,14,16 7:21,24 10:15 10:17,20 12:3,5 12:9 13:7 15:22 15:24 17:10 19:1,3,15 22:15 22:17 23:24,25 23:25 24:1,1,3 24:5 26:9,10,11 26:12,13,13,15 29:16,18 31:9 31:12,14 32:19 33:1 34:3,3,5,6 35:1,5 36:11 37:20 39:10,11 39:12,14 41:25 42:1,3 43:23 44:2,5,13,15,15 44:17 46:23 47:5,6,9 48:6,6 48:6,7,7 56:13 56:14,15 57:14 57:15 68:18,20 69:2,3 71:6,10 71:12 73:12 74:1,3,16 76:1 77:1,15,15,16 77:17 79:6,8 86:13,15 89:13 89:24 90:1 91:5	91:14,16,23,25 92:8,25 93:14 93:16 Senators 2:3,6,10 23:11 29:14 31:11 32:21 47:5 53:9 68:8 91:4 94:9 send 58:5 sense 29:10 42:16 42:23 92:22 sent 58:2 sentence 15:8 35:9 sentiments 24:5 separate 24:21 separation 14:4 49:20 50:4 69:20 89:7 September 53:15 57:24 66:23 series 19:6 serve 2:20 3:12 57:21 75:13 77:23 served 10:18 12:12 13:12 serves 73:2 service 52:17 78:4 83:14 services 78:1 83:15 serving 2:24 session 1:11 7:15 9:14 12:25 34:8 44:20 45:6 46:25 47:1 49:14 57:24 58:4 70:9,24 73:17 75:16 82:4,22 84:1,25 sessions 58:14 set 14:22 50:14 76:4 settle 31:5,6 sewage 78:1 sewer 72:16,19	73:1 sexual 17:8 75:4 share 65:1 79:13 shares 25:3 Shawn 43:1 shepherding 43:22 Shevaun 43:2 shiny 87:23 ships 69:8 shooting 85:6 short 81:12,13 83:11 short-sighted 78:21 show 14:6,25 37:9 38:16 43:14 68:13 86:25 91:9 94:14 showed 30:5 43:15 84:5 shown 47:13 shows 25:13,24 82:17 sic 41:21 49:18 side 24:7 32:9 sides 45:11 sign 59:19 signed 58:6 59:18 significant 67:2 significantly 23:8 signing 84:11 silence 2:4 similar 9:15 65:18 Simone 43:2 simple 52:9 93:21 simply 70:17 87:3 SIMPSON 2:9 3:22 4:3,8,12 4:16,20,24 5:4 5:9,12,14 7:21 8:17 10:15 12:3 15:7,22 18:25	22:14 23:23 26:9 29:14 31:9 34:2 39:10 41:24 44:13 47:4 49:1 56:13 57:14 68:7,13 68:18,23 69:1 71:9 73:25 77:14 79:6 81:16 86:12 89:12,23 91:3,9 91:14,19,22 92:24 93:13 94:8,14,18 95:1 single 39:20 80:25 90:14 sit 17:18 55:16 sits 35:5 sitting 32:24 76:17 situation 10:6 21:1 49:10,10 six 27:17 54:12 77:18 80:4 size 48:14 skin 53:2 slavery 52:24 sleep 42:5 86:10 small 72:16 73:7 smaller 71:22 72:13 smallest 56:6 smart 29:3,5 smile 42:6 Smith 38:13 social 69:8 83:24 91:12,17,17 societies 51:5 society 51:1 55:19,22 sold 79:24 somebody 15:3 46:12 81:3 sorry 45:23 64:19 66:1 72:8 77:4,15 92:4 sort 76:6,10 92:4	92:19 sound 81:19 source 53:11 72:24 south 22:21 23:8 35:17 sovereignty 2:16 speak 43:17 75:14 speaking 70:7 74:4 speaks 57:12 special 7:15 41:11 44:19 45:6 47:1 58:4 68:16,21 70:3,8 70:10,24 74:9 74:10,10,13,15 75:15 84:1,8 86:21 87:10,18 94:6 specific 63:18 specious 84:14 speech 85:23 93:2,2 spend 13:21 spending 21:14 spent 18:4 88:12 spite 3:3,17,18,18 3:19 70:15 split 9:23 28:5 splits 22:22 spoiled 93:5 spoken 73:3 sponsor 57:16 78:15,17 90:10 spoon 74:5 spoon-fed 75:16 spot 77:5 spots 3:3 sprawling 24:18 spread 54:13 sprung 52:12 squares 19:6 stabbed 74:5 staff 30:1 32:18 59:24 60:3,5,9
--	--	---	---	--

<p>60:18 61:3 67:9 74:6 83:9 staffer 60:20 staffs 83:9 stage 23:21 stakeholders 70:7 stalemate 75:21 stand 17:13 33:9 36:16 37:3 81:8 86:8 94:6 standard 40:10 40:18 standards 40:7 40:12 standing 3:23 Stargel 26:11 29:15 31:11,13 31:14 start 19:5 24:4 31:15 46:19 90:15 started 8:23 state 2:17,21 3:7 3:13,15 5:3 8:24 10:7,11,13 12:13,17,19 14:9 16:8,10,11 17:1,2,22 19:7 19:9 22:6,9 27:14 28:3 34:24 35:2 36:3 40:13 41:18 42:19 48:24 51:2 55:9,9,13 56:19,21 57:4,6 57:7 59:16 61:14,16,16,20 61:21,22 65:23 67:23 71:19 76:20 77:19 85:22 90:21,24 stated 70:12 71:24 statehood 35:11 statement 62:25 82:1</p>	<p>statements 63:1 78:18 states 20:13 41:11,16 51:17 53:9 statistically 67:1 status 65:22 statute 74:8 87:1 statutes 84:6 stay 7:22 80:4 step 16:23 steps 14:8 Stewart 10:16,17 91:5 stoically 24:9 stood 69:5 94:6 stop 69:19,20,24 83:20 90:17 stopped 21:20 83:2 storage 80:1 story 2:25 51:18 79:13,15,17,24 stream 3:9 street 1:24 80:14 streets 29:11 strength 6:17 strengthened 2:25 stretches 24:18 strong 37:21 38:2 struck 29:6 stuck 20:22 82:14 studied 52:21 84:25 studies 70:5 study 73:16 83:8 83:19 90:25 stuff 13:8,23 14:13 74:24 stunt 78:21 subconsciously 37:10 subject 56:2 65:13 submit 31:16,25</p>	<p>59:23 submitting 33:23 subsets 30:24 substantial 66:20 successes 3:3,18 successfully 72:4 succession 82:25 85:2 succumb 54:16 sufficiently 63:20 suffrage 51:11 suggested 43:13 54:3 suggesting 24:22 suggests 23:7 Suite 1:24 support 11:17 12:1 24:10,12 31:2 47:2,17 56:11 68:5 69:11 83:21 87:15 91:2 94:7 supported 19:25 78:19 supporting 41:7 supposed 18:10 86:8 93:11 Supreme 40:3 41:13 45:15,16 45:21 46:17 49:23 61:11,17 63:17 64:12 68:1 sure 11:21 15:19 21:25 22:1,8 33:24 46:14,20 79:25 86:10 90:21 91:1 surrounding 89:18 survive 45:11 survived 53:4 54:18 60:12,22 swath 5:23 10:7 10:11 sweeping 90:14 swept 86:22</p>	<p>swift 90:8 swiftly 76:9 system 20:24 55:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>T 35:13 tab 70:20 tag 83:18 taint 80:23 tainted 81:3 take 4:24 17:13 18:10,11 26:22 26:24 32:11,12 38:3 43:25 49:6 55:17 59:20 71:22 81:22 93:5 taken 18:5 43:11 63:1 71:20 takes 40:24 talent 2:23 talk 20:11 34:25 43:6,9 45:1,25 47:10 92:2 talked 17:11 38:12,14 45:2 46:3 90:4 talking 13:21 34:25 55:5 72:13 Tallahassee 21:22,24 22:2 24:24 26:3 Tampa 22:24 tango 40:25 targets 16:22 taught 26:18 tax 78:12 taxation 10:12 taxpayer 21:14 taxpayers 70:20 78:24 teach 49:24 teachers 75:3 85:23 teaching 49:23</p>	<p>75:4 team 84:1 tell 12:14 18:3 28:22,25 29:7,8 29:12,13 36:7 38:16 43:8 79:14 88:10 telling 6:13 19:19 28:24 tells 37:8 Telluron 52:4 ten 86:18 tend 51:25 tension 64:10 term 85:10 terms 35:10 46:11 terrifying 50:22 50:23 territory 52:12 testified 62:21 testimony 62:16 70:6 thank 2:22 5:16 7:23 8:16,17,20 10:14,15,17 12:2,5 15:5,7 15:10,21,22,24 18:24,25 19:3 22:13,14,17 23:22 24:3 26:9 26:15 29:18 31:7,9,14 34:5 39:9,10,14 42:3 44:12,13,17 46:22 47:3,4,9 48:24 49:3 56:12,15 57:13 57:14,18 61:7 68:6,7,20 69:3 71:8,9,12 73:25 74:3 77:13,17 79:4,6,8 81:18 83:10 86:11,15 89:12,15,23 90:1 91:2,3,16 91:25 93:12,16</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p>94:8,22 Thatcher 52:5 theater 73:23 89:9 theological 18:8 theologically 18:6 theory 75:3 thing 13:2 14:20 15:5 21:1,15 27:6 46:10 58:16 66:24 things 3:21 13:11 28:13,22 29:6,9 31:18 46:4 52:21 59:4 73:17 74:7 75:10 76:2 88:11,17 think 6:14 7:11 7:24 9:10 11:14 11:15,18,19,23 12:1 13:4,7,22 13:23 15:5,7 17:14 18:13 26:18 27:21 33:18,19 39:1 41:18 45:2 46:5 46:7,23 55:10 57:9,12 59:2,7 72:23 76:12 78:14 89:9,20 92:8,9 thinking 48:8 third 4:25 Thompson 96:19 thoroughly 40:4 thought 7:2 34:13 78:22 80:8 87:15 thoughtful 33:19 43:20 70:5 71:3 thousand 76:14 76:15 thousands 10:10 78:2,24 threat 53:6</p>	<p>threaten 6:24 7:10 threatened 6:8 70:22 88:23 three 6:5,12,13 12:6 16:15 19:10,16 20:12 29:4 40:24 47:15 75:16,25 79:13 80:7 85:13 Three- 53:2 three-fifths 53:2 threshold 76:13 throw 89:2 throwing 88:4 tickets 81:2 Tier 11:7,9,10,14 11:16 20:1 28:7 40:7,12 62:7,7 62:9,9,24 66:6 66:9,20 TikTok 48:9 time 12:2,25 13:21 14:24 18:6 20:15,18 21:4 38:17 44:19 45:18,20 47:16 49:11 50:8 52:18 54:22 62:21 67:15 69:4 80:18,19,20 82:21 83:11 88:12 90:16 93:10 94:2 timeline 83:23 times 5:20 16:20 21:12 39:2 53:19,20 55:8 timing 20:12 tired 34:18,19,19 34:20,20,21,21 74:23 Tocqueville 52:5 today 2:15,24 3:24 16:9 17:18</p>	<p>18:13,20 19:23 20:17 22:8,13 29:24 30:13 31:3 32:16 33:4 33:9,20 34:1,22 34:23 37:1 38:23 43:7 44:9 45:3,7,8,25 46:10 47:12 48:2,5 49:15 50:19 56:18 57:25 58:1 63:6 63:6 67:2,8 68:4 70:16 71:17 76:25 80:10 81:15 82:19 88:2 90:4 90:6 told 7:6 16:4 28:23 36:9 37:10 77:12 79:17 tolerate 17:13 tonight 86:11 top 48:10,18 top-down 13:10 Torres 26:11 29:15,16,18 31:10 77:16,16 77:17 tossed 35:9 58:10 67:20 tossing 68:2 total 14:3 23:19 totality 15:20 totally 6:7 23:16 touch 56:17 59:6 touched 66:10 tourism 78:11 79:2 tow 30:11 tradition 30:21 trained 18:6 training 18:5 69:9 trample 14:16 trampling 93:4</p>	<p>transcript 96:3 TRANSCRIPT... 1:10 TRANSCRIPT... 96:1 transferring 78:6 transgender 88:3 transparent 40:22 41:9 47:16 treat 77:5 treatment 88:3 tremendous 51:19 82:13 85:4 trend 65:12 Trevor 38:13 tried 38:25 trod 38:20 trouble 42:7 troubled 93:19 troubling 21:8 true 24:24 55:11 96:2 truly 3:12 19:4 40:15 70:2,25 truth 32:8 52:6 try 36:19 trying 15:12 28:10 80:23 89:2 turn 55:12 70:4 turned 22:3 80:22 turnout 65:2,9 turns 3:10 tweeted 12:24 twice 49:14 twisted 38:19 Twitter 70:23 71:1 two 9:23 12:19 12:21 15:15 27:12,17,18 29:4 30:13 35:23 40:3,5,6 40:14 41:14</p>	<p>42:21 58:14 61:12 63:2 70:8 72:17 75:6,6 82:22,22 85:2,3 85:25,25 types 39:19 typically 31:18 tyranny 69:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>U.S 58:20 60:25 63:17,23 64:12 66:8 ultimate 31:5,6 ultimately 18:15 18:16 66:4 unaffordable 79:11,11 unauthorized 2:2 unconstitutional 6:6,14 12:11 16:4 21:3,13 23:11 26:5 46:4 understand 20:16 28:20 37:11 38:13 44:3,3,4 71:13 89:6 92:9 understanding 13:3 55:11 94:2 understood 22:5 underway 72:25 unfair 21:16 unfortunately 31:19 86:22 UNIDENTIFI... 2:2 unique 2:24 49:10 59:22 United 51:17 53:9 85:19 unity 3:17 universe 67:24 University 67:16 unlawful 31:7 unlock 68:8 91:4 94:9</p>
--	---	---	---	--

unnecessary 79:4	vote 5:24 22:2,8	42:10 44:11,21	37:15 38:22	win 27:20
unprecedentedly	22:13 27:20	45:7 46:12,14	39:18 42:21	Wisconsin 41:15
49:18	33:11,20 34:1	46:19 50:5,6,18	43:20 46:10	wisdom 3:19
unprecedented	43:17 47:23	57:9 61:7 77:6	47:11 48:20	wise 3:12 71:3
49:18	48:2 54:2,15	81:10 87:6	58:4 61:23 63:5	witnesses 67:19
unresolved 39:24	56:3,3,8,11,12	wanted 15:8,13	63:7 64:14,20	woke 34:12,12
40:14	57:13 63:7 68:9	15:18 43:15,16	71:14,16,21,23	woman 79:16
unsound 87:14	68:10 70:16	45:1	72:13 75:7,15	women 2:24
upper 69:23	71:5,7 77:8,12	wants 32:9	75:15 76:12	37:22,24 52:15
urban 25:8,14	77:12,13,13	war 52:22 53:4	82:19 85:6,6	wondering 34:21
urge 26:7 56:11	79:3 82:19	53:21 54:19	86:8,19 87:5,13	word 37:21
urged 76:10	86:10 91:5,6	82:5	87:23 88:2,4,6	words 14:15
use 3:6	92:23 94:10,11	warnings 53:7	88:9,18 89:4	17:23 37:9
utility 28:11	voted 13:2 15:15	Washington 1:24	93:5,18	38:23
	25:21 31:17	52:14	we've 6:6 16:25	work 3:5 7:17
V	77:2	wasn't 11:11	17:1 19:11	17:5 24:10
v 1:4	voter 65:9	79:25 82:24	28:13,14 32:1,3	31:19 32:5,5,20
vaccine 69:10	voters 8:24 25:9	84:23	38:25 41:17	50:7 73:9 78:3
Val 35:22	25:15 26:2 48:3	watched 24:8	42:9 47:18 48:5	79:20 81:9 83:9
validity 51:7	48:24 56:22	watching 22:7,10	48:22 57:24	worked 7:1 11:7
venue 40:17	57:4,11	water 3:9 72:16	62:4 70:19	workers 78:24
version 25:13	voters' 65:1,8,12	72:19 73:1	71:15,24 72:2	working 22:5
vertical 48:14,17	66:1	77:25 83:16	74:11 89:17	33:23 46:24,24
vertically 48:15	votes 37:15 48:23	way 13:20 16:21	92:1	57:25
vested 50:18	voting 9:18 10:2	19:6 23:12,13	weakness 6:16	works 16:15,20
veto 6:9 12:22	19:21 26:6,7	31:18,18,20	week 57:24 66:22	23:1
20:16 24:16	43:21 47:18	32:4 36:17	79:9	world 37:7 50:12
45:11	63:16,18,21	39:20 40:21	weeks 6:5,12,13	77:6,22 93:6
vetoed 16:3 58:3	64:1,12 71:17	41:10 42:10	12:6 16:1 34:14	worried 20:17
vetted 40:4	81:14	57:25 64:7	67:14 75:10	23:18 76:23
vexed 52:20	W	65:24 67:14	weep 42:6	81:6
vice 8:9	wait 7:16 50:14	71:21 73:14	weigh 82:10	worry 21:4
video 1:10 48:9	wake 34:15,17,22	85:5	welcome 41:21	worse 6:18 7:9
view 39:20 65:15	36:9 37:16	ways 31:23,23	Wells 35:14	worst 6:22 85:5
65:16	55:24	we'll 38:22,24	went 13:2 16:2	89:10
Villages 5:24	walking 29:5	86:5 88:15	19:14 65:5	wouldn't 8:13
violated 24:13	wall 37:10	we're 7:12,19	79:23 83:8	28:8 33:10
25:22	Walt 77:22	11:21 14:22	weren't 10:24	84:24,25
violates 22:19	want 10:19 11:14	16:14,16,17,23	82:14	write 38:18
26:6 62:1	13:21 15:1 16:9	17:9,10,13,22	west 24:19 37:18	wrong 14:11,11
violating 84:6	17:25 18:1	18:10 19:7,7	whims 84:17	14:18 45:20
violation 14:3	20:11,19 22:4,6	21:4,14,15	white 50:9	49:11 86:23
Vista 87:17	24:4 28:21	22:12 27:16	who've 35:3,3	wrote 51:9,15,16
voice 22:2	29:13 32:10,11	29:14,24 31:10	wife 29:1 37:20	53:15 75:17
voices 48:24	32:12 33:17	32:21 33:21	willing 17:13	
volumes 43:17	36:8 37:8 41:14	34:25 36:4,16	Wilson 12:21	X
57:12		36:17 37:8,14	35:20	

Y	64:19,22 65:1 65:13	20 1:12 2:1 8:25 19:12	57:4,11 368 66:18	57:9 70s 61:13
Yeah 19:1	10,000 76:16	200 14:8 20:3 24:18	38th 23:25 26:13 39 34:8	778,000 26:23 7th 44:15 58:7
year 8:8 49:9 53:8 72:3 75:20 84:14 86:18 90:19 92:7,17	1000s 75:22 101 45:3 109 9:10	2001 38:9 20036 1:24	396 66:19 3rd 23:24	8
years 18:23 21:2 22:11 32:3 51:3 54:12 58:18 72:1 73:18 74:12 75:1 76:1 90:13	10s 75:21 10th 58:15 11 12:14 11-plus 27:2 1100 73:2 12 10:4 12.5 75:25 13 27:5	2010 8:21,24 19:24 2012 65:6 2016 9:16 202 1:25 2020 65:6 2022 1:12 2:1 8:22	4	8 19:12 24:19 80 66:14 81 66:13 812 1:24 8th 2:12
yeas 68:11 91:7 94:12	14,000 72:22 14th 61:2 15 27:10 68:11 94:12 15th 29:16 16 12:18,18 27:13 28:1 91:7 168 75:1 17 27:11 1730 1:24 1787 53:15 18 53:15 1800's 25:10 1808 74:25 1860s 51:7 189.031(3)(b) 74:14 189.065(1) 74:9 189.068 74:8 189.069(5) 74:14	20th 39:12 61:9 21 8:25 27:11,25 21(a) 40:10 21,800,000 26:22 26:24 21.5 34:24 212,000 27:4 22 12:17 22nd 31:12 23 91:7 232-0646 1:25 23rd 86:18 24 68:11 94:12 25 25:7 260 51:2 27th 57:15 28 26:23 36:4 29th 56:14	4 10:1 23:21 75:1 4-C 68:15 4:22-cv-109 1:4 40 26:24 27:22 34:8 37:12 400 77:23,24 40s 61:12 42.53 65:6 43 9:18 66:15 435 27:22 46 66:16 47 66:16 48 66:17	9
yell 14:12	168 75:1 1727 11 1730 1:24 1787 53:15 18 53:15 1800's 25:10 1808 74:25 1860s 51:7 189.031(3)(b) 74:14 189.065(1) 74:9 189.068 74:8 189.069(5) 74:14	22 12:17 22nd 31:12 23 91:7 232-0646 1:25 23rd 86:18 24 68:11 94:12 25 25:7 260 51:2 27th 57:15 28 26:23 36:4 29th 56:14	5	9 58:14 9:27 86:19
yesterday 5:8,17 9:22 12:8 14:2 14:7 16:4 21:8 21:19 40:17 41:3 45:2 61:6 61:11 65:5,20 66:10 68:22 70:23 71:18 78:16 82:24 85:6 86:19,24 91:18 92:9	189.065(1) 74:9 189.068 74:8 189.069(5) 74:14 1947 38:8 1980 42:12 1992 35:11,12,14 35:15 19th 42:1	3	5 9:15 10:1,3 17:19 24:15,17 24:23 25:2,6 63:9,12,14,25 64:19 50 64:2 65:2 66:18 72:1 90:12 50-plus 74:11 50-year 75:14 500 79:23 53.78 65:6 545,000 26:25 5th 25:13	
yield 47:7	1947 38:8 1980 42:12 1992 35:11,12,14 35:15 19th 42:1	3 8:25 36:5 40:10 40:12 75:5 30 10:2 76:15 30,000 37:14 76:13 300 76:16 30th 34:4 32nd 47:8 33 35:6 33rd 3:24 34th 49:2 35 9:20 36 48:15,17,19	6	6
York 41:11	1947 38:8 1980 42:12 1992 35:11,12,14 35:15 19th 42:1	300 76:16 30th 34:4 32nd 47:8 33 35:6 33rd 3:24 34th 49:2 35 9:20 36 48:15,17,19	50 64:2 65:2 66:18 72:1 90:12 50-plus 74:11 50-year 75:14 500 79:23 53.78 65:6 545,000 26:25 5th 25:13	
young 6:20 79:13 79:16 80:8 85:23	1947 38:8 1980 42:12 1992 35:11,12,14 35:15 19th 42:1	300 76:16 30th 34:4 32nd 47:8 33 35:6 33rd 3:24 34th 49:2 35 9:20 36 48:15,17,19	7	
youth 88:4	1947 38:8 1980 42:12 1992 35:11,12,14 35:15 19th 42:1	300 76:16 30th 34:4 32nd 47:8 33 35:6 33rd 3:24 34th 49:2 35 9:20 36 48:15,17,19	6 27:9,25 6-C 91:11 60 19:24 600-plus 70:20 67 27:2 6th 6:19	
Z	1947 38:8 1980 42:12 1992 35:11,12,14 35:15 19th 42:1	300 76:16 30th 34:4 32nd 47:8 33 35:6 33rd 3:24 34th 49:2 35 9:20 36 48:15,17,19	7 25:16 56:25	
zero 35:12,14	1947 38:8 1980 42:12 1992 35:11,12,14 35:15 19th 42:1	300 76:16 30th 34:4 32nd 47:8 33 35:6 33rd 3:24 34th 49:2 35 9:20 36 48:15,17,19		
0	1947 38:8 1980 42:12 1992 35:11,12,14 35:15 19th 42:1	300 76:16 30th 34:4 32nd 47:8 33 35:6 33rd 3:24 34th 49:2 35 9:20 36 48:15,17,19		
1	1947 38:8 1980 42:12 1992 35:11,12,14 35:15 19th 42:1	300 76:16 30th 34:4 32nd 47:8 33 35:6 33rd 3:24 34th 49:2 35 9:20 36 48:15,17,19		
1 11:9,10,14,16 20:1 28:7 40:7 62:7,9,9,24 66:6 10 17:19 18:23 22:11 28:4 36:2 42:12 58:14,15 58:17 63:9,13	2 11:8 19:20 36:5 40:12 57:1 62:7 63:16 66:9,20 2-C 5:1 57:17 2,000 78:1 2.8 27:3	300 76:16 30th 34:4 32nd 47:8 33 35:6 33rd 3:24 34th 49:2 35 9:20 36 48:15,17,19		

Exhibit G

Common Cause, et al.)
)
v.) 4:22-cv-109
)
Cord Byrd)

)

TRANSCRIPTION OF VIDEO RECORDING
HOUSE CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING SUBCOMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 18, 2022

DIGITAL EVIDENCE GROUP
1730 M Street, NW, Suite 812
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 232-0646

1 February 18, 2022

2 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Good morning, Members.
3 The Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee will
4 come to order.

5 DJ, please call the roll.

6 THE SECRETARY: Chair Sirois?

7 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Here.

8 THE SECRETARY: Vice-Chair Tuck?

9 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Here.

10 THE SECRETARY: Ranking Member Skidmore?

11 Ranking Member Skidmore?

12 Representative Benjamin has been excused.
13 Brown?

14 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Here.

15 THE SECRETARY: Fabricio?

16 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Here.

17 THE SECRETARY: Fetterhoff?

18 REPRESENTATIVE FETTERHOFF: Here.

19 THE SECRETARY: Giallombardo?

20 REPRESENTATIVE GIALLOMBARDO: Here.

21 THE SECRETARY: Harding?

22 REPRESENTATIVE HARDING: Here.

23 THE SECRETARY: Hunschofky? Hunschofky?

24 Joseph?

25 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Here.

1 THE SECRETARY: Maggard?
2 REPRESENTATIVE MAGGARD: Here.
3 THE SECRETARY: Massullo has been excused.
4 McClure?
5 REPRESENTATIVE MCCLURE: Here.
6 THE SECRETARY: Morales?
7 REPRESENTATIVE MORALES: Present.
8 THE SECRETARY: Perez?
9 REPRESENTATIVE PEREZ: Here.
10 THE SECRETARY: Plakon?
11 REPRESENTATIVE PLAKON: Here.
12 THE SECRETARY: Silvers? Silvers? Toledo?
13 REPRESENTATIVE TOLEDO: Here.
14 THE SECRETARY: Trabulsy?
15 REPRESENTATIVE TRABULSY: Here.
16 THE SECRETARY: Williamson?
17 REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMSON: Here.
18 THE SECRETARY: Ex-officio Clemons?
19 EX-OFFICIO CLEMENS: Here.
20 THE SECRETARY: Ex-officio Davis?
21 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: On the way.
22 THE SECRETARY: Members present, Mr. Chair.
23 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, DJ.
24 Members, a few reminders before we begin.
25 Please silence all electronic devices, and if you're

1 here today to give public testimony, please take
2 time now to fill out a speaker appearance form, and
3 turn it into the sergeant staff. Also, Members, if
4 you wish to speak, please make sure that you turn
5 your microphone on.

6 On a personal note, I would ask the members
7 to bear with me. My voice has been faltering all
8 week, one of the occupational hazards of being a
9 legislator.

10 Representative Fetterhoff, I would like to
11 recognise you for an introduction.

12 REPRESENTATIVE FETTERHOFF: Thank you,
13 Chair. Good morning. I just wanted to introduce
14 our doctor of the today. Doctor Steven Golden has
15 travelled up from Charlotte County to visit with us
16 today, so if we have need of him today during
17 Committee, he is here to help. Thank you so much
18 for being here today, sir.

19 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Doctor. We're
20 glad to have you with us.

21 Thank you, Representative Fetterhoff.

22 Members, welcome back to our Congressional
23 Subcommittee. I'm glad to see all of us together
24 again. For those following along at home, a quick
25 recap of the last few weeks. After we began

1 session, the Governor requested an advisory opinion
2 from the Florida Supreme Court centered around
3 Congressional District 5 in North Florida. The
4 House paused the congressional redistricting process
5 once this request was issued. Throughout this
6 process we've stated that we will follow the law.
7 And we knew if the Florida Supreme Court issued new
8 guidance, we would have to take that into account.

9 Last week the Supreme Court issued their
10 ruling, that they would decline to issue an advisory
11 opinion. And with that notice being issued and no
12 additional guidance being provided, we have now
13 resumed our process. The pause in our process was
14 the right thing to do to ensure that we continue to
15 follow all appropriate guardrails. And again, I'm
16 glad to be back here with all of you today.

17 Today we will present and consider the PCB
18 for our state's proposed congressional districts. I
19 want to refocus this Committee on the task at hand.
20 There's been noise outside of our process dealing
21 with the congressional map. I would encourage all
22 members to put that noise aside. Those external
23 influences need to stay external, and our personal
24 preferences cannot override our constitutional
25 responsibility to follow the law.

1 This Committee has undertaken several
2 months of education in order to understand the
3 redistricting process and uphold the high bar that
4 was set for this chamber last decade. The Proposed
5 Committee Bill, CRS22-01, establishes congressional
6 districts that will be used in election cycles
7 beginning in 2022. This PCB has been drafted by
8 Committee staff with the advice of legal counsel
9 based on data from the 2020 census and to be in
10 alignment with the Florida constitution, state and
11 federal law, and court precedent. This map can also
12 be found on floridaredistricting.gov under the
13 planned name H000C8011.

14 You may have noticed the lengthy bill text
15 -- the bill text for the congressional map was not
16 included in the meeting materials for today's
17 meeting. The bill text reflects the technical
18 census block, block group, and tract numbers that
19 comprise each district. These are the exact same
20 districts that are depicted in the printed map
21 before you. However, to save all of our printers,
22 and 150 pages of paper, we have printed a copy of
23 the full bill text for the community's viewing, and
24 that can be found right here in front of DJ.

25 Now, it is my pleasure to hand the gavel

1 over to Vice-Chair Tuck.

2 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3 Members, up for consideration today is PCB
4 CRS22-01, establishing the congressional districts
5 of the state. As a reminder we are holding
6 questions until the end of the PCB presentation to
7 ensure we have time to get through an explanation of
8 the entire state and no one region is rushed.

9 Chair Sirois, you're recognised to present
10 the PCB.

11 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Vice-Chair
12 Tuck.

13 The Florida Legislature is directed to
14 redistrict every ten years, following the decennial
15 census, to account for growing and shifting
16 population across Florida. A decade ago, the
17 Florida Houses process and methodology for drawing
18 maps was lauded by the Florida Supreme Court, and
19 I'd like to read a quote from the 2012 ruling.

20 "A review of the House plan, and the record
21 reveals that the House engage in a consistent and
22 reasoned approach, balancing the two tier standards
23 by endeavouring to make districts compact and as
24 nearly equal in population as possible in utilising
25 political and geographical boundaries where feasible

1 by endeavouring to keep counties and cities together
2 where possible. In addition, the House approached
3 the minority voting protection provisions by
4 properly undertaking a functional analysis of voting
5 strength in minority districts."

6 As I mentioned earlier, this Committee has
7 undertaken several months of education in order to
8 understand the redistricting process and uphold the
9 high bar that was set for this chamber last decade.
10 Last week we released Proposed Committee Bill CRS22-
11 01, which proposes congressional districts that will
12 be used in election cycles starting in 2022. As I
13 mentioned earlier this map, H000C8011, has been
14 drafted exclusively by Committee staff with the
15 advice of legal counsel based on data from the 2020
16 census, and to be in alignment with the Florida
17 constitution, state, and federal law, as well as
18 court president.

19 Members, I want to make sure that each of
20 you has a packet in front of you. This contains a
21 printout of the proposed map itself, the state-wide
22 snapshot of statistics, the functional analysis data
23 used for protected minority districts, a list of
24 county shares of population, a list of city splits,
25 and finally the boundary analysis report. These

1 items will be referenced throughout the presentation
2 today, so please feel free to refer to your packet
3 as needed. This packet is also available under our
4 Subcommittee's webpage on myfloridahouse.gov.

5 Now, let's dive in, Members. Excuse me.
6 Let's first take a look at the map as a whole. When
7 compared to the benchmark congressional map, the new
8 proposed Congressional Districts have several points
9 of improvement throughout our Tier 2 standards.

10 When looking at a state-wide average of
11 each district's compactness score, we have been able
12 to recreate compact districts similar to our
13 benchmark metrics, even after the addition of a new
14 congressional district. The proposed map state-wide
15 average compactness scores are a Reock score of
16 0.43, a Convex Hull score of 0.79, and a Polsby-
17 Popper score of 0.37. Where feasible, we also work
18 to improve visual compactness of districts, or the
19 eyeball test, such as being able to keep Polk County
20 wholly within a single congressional district.

21 When looking at the number of county
22 splits, we've kept similar to the benchmark map with
23 18 counties split last decade and only 20 counties
24 split this decade. The ideal population for this
25 decade's congressional districts after adding a

1 district to go from 27 districts to 28 is 769,211
2 people. The overall deviation range is the same as
3 it was last decade with 27 districts being the exact
4 ideal population and one district having a single
5 person less than the ideal population. We are also
6 proudly able to improve the number of city splits in
7 our proposed map. In the benchmark map, there were
8 39 cities split, and in the proposed new
9 configurations, we've been able to decrease that to
10 just 27 cities split.

11 This proposed congressional map also allows
12 a district to be placed wholly within each of
13 Florida's top five largest counties: Miami-Dade,
14 Broward, Palm Beach, Hillsborough, and Orange
15 respectively. The proposed congressional districts
16 are also drawn in compliance with Tier 1 of the
17 Florida constitution. The proposed map is inclusive
18 of three protected black districts and three
19 protected Hispanic districts. This is the same
20 number of protected districts as are found in the
21 benchmark map. In each district, the minority
22 group's voting age population are similar when
23 compared to the benchmark districts, with slight
24 increases or decreases as permitted by the Florida
25 Supreme Court president, which states, "slight

1 changes in a minority group's voting age population
2 are acceptable so long as a functional analysis is
3 conducted to ensure the voting strength of the
4 minority group in both general and primary elections
5 is at a comparable level that existed in the
6 benchmark district." These districts are also drawn
7 in a consistent manner with respect to Florida
8 Supreme Court president to maintain existing
9 majority-minority districts.

10 All six of these protected minority
11 districts have had an individual functional analysis
12 conducted on them to ensure the new district
13 figuration does not deny or abridge the equal
14 opportunity of racial or language minorities to
15 participate in the political process or to diminish
16 their ability to elect representatives of their
17 choice. And as we move throughout the map, I will
18 highlight these districts as well.

19 All of our districts consist of contiguous
20 territory. And as I'm sure you are aware, the
21 Committee has also implemented safe guards in order
22 to ensure that we do not draw districts with the
23 intent to favour or disfavour a political party or
24 in incumbent.

25 Members, as we move through the

1 presentation today, you will see an analysis tool
2 reference called boundary analysis. This is a
3 report that is available in our map drawing
4 application and helps to quantify the percentage of
5 Tier 2 compliant boundaries that are used for each
6 district. Similar to compactness scores, this tool
7 is to be viewed in context with other Tier 2 metrics
8 of districts and surrounding regions. There is no
9 golden threshold to which we look when evaluating
10 each district, but it serves as another way to
11 understand the compliance of what is in front of us.

12 Members, now that we've looked at the
13 state-wide overview, let's begin to review each
14 region of the state, starting with Congressional
15 Districts 1 through 4. Beginning in the panhandle,
16 Congressional District 1 has the entirety of
17 Escambia, Santa Rosa, and Oklaosa County. Walton
18 County is then split as Congressional District 1
19 achieves the equal population threshold here.

20 Again, Members, for congressional maps,
21 equal population for each district is plus or minus
22 one person. And for this purpose, the boundary
23 between District 1 and 2 primarily uses State Road
24 83 for the majority of its length, except where it
25 deviates to ensure that the municipalities of

1 Freeport and Defuniak Springs are kept whole, with
2 Freeport within Congressional District 1, and
3 Defuniak Springs Congressional District 2. The
4 shape of Congressional District 2 and 4 are largely
5 impacted by Congressional District 3 in this region,
6 so let's jump ahead to that district first.

7 Congressional District 3 has four whole
8 counties within it: Gadsden, Madison, Hamilton, and
9 Baker counties. It also contains parts of four
10 others in Leon, Duval, Jefferson, and Colombia
11 counties. It is also a performing black district
12 that was recreated similarly to the benchmark
13 district. As noted before, the functional analysis
14 on this district that was conducted by staff ensures
15 the minority group's ability to elect is not
16 diminished.

17 Segueing back to Congressional District 2,
18 this district is made up mostly of whole counties.
19 It contains 15 whole counties along with the
20 remaining portion of Walton County not contained
21 within Congressional District 1 and the parts of
22 Leon, Jefferson, and Colombia Counties that are not
23 in Congressional District 3. Its eastern boundary
24 is the county lines of Levy, Gilchrist, and Colombia
25 Counties. This district achieves equal population

1 in Leon County, which it shares with Congressional
2 District 3 rather than having to split an additional
3 county. Excuse me.

4 Congressional District 4 has all of Nassau
5 County, along with the remaining part of Duval
6 County that is not included in Congressional
7 District 3. This leaves the district approximately
8 213,000 people short of the population needed for a
9 congressional district. So the district must
10 continue south into St. Johns County for population
11 equality. In doing so, it is able to keep all of
12 St. Augustine within the district, and all other
13 municipalities in St. Johns County remain whole.
14 The district configuration is similar to the current
15 district, and conversely, if Congressional District
16 4 instead went into Clay County instead of St. Johns
17 County, it would have created an irregular shaped
18 district that wraps around Congressional District 3.
19 This would have created a much more visually non-
20 compact district shape.

21 Moving on to Congressional Districts 5
22 through 7. In this region we are able to keep seven
23 counties whole between three districts.
24 Congressional District 5 contains all of Union,
25 Bradford, Clay, Putnam, and Flagler counties, as

1 well as the remainder of St. Johns County that is
2 not a part of Congressional District 4, using major
3 roadways in the St. Augustine Municipal line as a
4 boundary line in St. Johns County. In order for
5 this district to have equal population, it splits
6 Alachua County along mostly State Roads 20 and 24
7 and also includes a small part of Volusia County.
8 Congressional District 6 keeps Marion County whole
9 and finds the remainder of its population from the
10 remaining population in Alachua County and includes
11 both flags of Lake and Volusia County.

12 Congressional District 7 includes all of
13 Seminole County and a large part of Volusia County.
14 Its boundary lines going through Volusia County
15 follow along State Roads 11, 40, I-95 and includes
16 an area through the Tomoka Wildlife Management Area,
17 which separates population centers of Volusia
18 County.

19 Congressional Districts 8 through 11 and
20 16. Congressional District 8 includes all of
21 Brevard and Indian River counties, which leaves the
22 district about 2,800 people short of the population
23 needed for a district. In order to achieve
24 population equality required for congressional
25 districts, the remaining population is added to

1 Congressional District 8 by going north in the
2 Volusia County along I-95 and then includes the
3 entire municipality of Oak Hill and its 1,986
4 people, keeping it whole.

5 Congressional District 9 contains the
6 entirety of Osceola County, which was the fastest
7 growing county in the state this past decade. The
8 district includes part of Orange County following I-
9 4 to go north, as well as using other primary
10 roadways such as Curried Ford Road, before using the
11 Econlockhatchee River, locally known as the Econ
12 River to go all the way to northern Orange County
13 boundary line. This compact Tier 2 compliant
14 district also happens to be a new majority-minority
15 Hispanic district reflective of the Hispanic growth
16 in this region.

17 Congressional District 10 is kept wholly
18 within Orange County, similar to the benchmark map
19 where a district is kept wholly within the county.
20 This district is able to keep the municipalities of
21 Edgewood, Eatonville, Maitland, and Winter Park
22 whole within the district and has similar
23 demographic characteristics to the benchmark
24 district wholly within Orange County.

25 Congressional District 11 adds the

1 remaining population in Orange County, which is
2 about 280,000 people and goes west to include the
3 majority of Lake County, all of Sumter County, and
4 part of Citrus County, where it achieves equal
5 population.

6 Congressional District 16 keeps Polk County
7 whole in this map. This is an improvement from the
8 benchmark map where Polk County was divided between
9 three districts. Population growth this decade made
10 this possible and is approximately 44,000 people shy
11 of the ideal population of a congressional district.
12 Pairing Polk County with a small part of eastern
13 Hillsborough achieves the necessary population
14 needed for the population of a congressional
15 district while creating a very compactly shaped
16 district.

17 Moving on to Congressional Districts 12
18 through 15. Now, looking at Congressional Districts
19 13 in the Tampa Bay area, which is kept wholly
20 within Pinellas County, its northern boundary
21 follows the municipal lines of the cities of
22 Dunnellon, Clearwater, and Safety Harbor to enable
23 every city within Pinellas County to remain whole.
24 Because Pinellas County has more people than it can
25 fit into a single congressional district, this

1 configuration of Congressional District 13 enables
2 connecting the remaining portions of the county over
3 land to another county rather than over water.

4 Congressional District 12 is the entirety
5 of Hernando County, the remainder of Citrus County,
6 part of Pasco County, which is divided primarily
7 along U.S Highway 41, State Road 54, and the
8 Suncoast parkway, as well as the portion of northern
9 Pinellas County not already included in
10 Congressional District 13.

11 Congressional District 14 is located wholly
12 within Hillsborough County. Its boundary follows
13 the primary roads of Hillsborough avenue, Bush
14 Boulevard, and I-4 for its northern border, State
15 and County Road 39 on the east side, and County Road
16 672, Palm Road and Big Bend road on the southern
17 side.

18 Finishing at the Tampa Bay area,
19 Congressional District 15 then connects the
20 remaining part of Pasco County with the appropriate
21 amount of population from Hillsborough County to
22 complete the district's population.

23 Moving on to Congressional District 17
24 through 19. Congressional district 17 is the last
25 of the four districts that have part of Hillsborough

1 County. This district actually has the exact amount
2 of people on Hillsborough County: 112,723 people.
3 So that exactly 12 districts make up all of the
4 remaining population in the counties to the south of
5 the Polk, Osceola, and Indian River County line.
6 This ensures that no other district has to cross
7 these county lines and keeps the counties to the
8 east whole. Congressional district 17 then
9 incorporates Manatee County and approximately
10 250,000 people in Sarasota County to complete its
11 population. Every city in Sarasota County is kept
12 whole with Congressional District 17 utilising the
13 Venice Municipal line for part of its southern
14 border.

15 The remaining part of Sarasota County,
16 along with seven entire counties, Hardee, Desoto,
17 Charlotte, Highlands, Okeechobee, Glades, and Hendry
18 counties make up the majority of Congressional
19 District 18. This leaves the district about 150,000
20 short of the ideal population, allowing it to cross
21 into Lee County to acquire this remaining
22 population, using primarily the Able Canal, the
23 Caloosahatchee river, and the Hancock Bridge
24 Parkway, Pine Island road and County Road 765 to do
25 so.

1 Congressional district 19 connects the rest
2 of Lee County with Collier County, using primarily
3 I-75, U.S. 41 and Collier Boulevard, except where
4 it achieves equal population. With the exception of
5 Cape Coral, all other municipalities are kept whole
6 in this region between these three districts.

7 Moving on to Congressional Districts 20
8 through 23, and 25. Congressional District 20 is a
9 performing majority-minority black district that was
10 recreated similarly to the benchmark district that
11 connects population in Palm Beach County to
12 population in Broward County. As noted before, the
13 functional analysis on this district conducted by
14 staff ensures the minority group's ability to elect
15 is not diminished. This decade we were able to
16 create this district in such a way that respects
17 more major roadways in the area, such as U.S. 441,
18 I-95, and the Florida Turnpike. And it keeps more
19 cities whole, keeping the cities of Lake Park,
20 Margate, Tamarac, and others wholly within it, which
21 were split a decade ago.

22 Congressional District 21 includes all of
23 St. Lucie and Martin counties and includes just over
24 280,000 people in Palm Beach County in order to
25 achieve equal population for this district. The

1 district boundary follows a railway in the northern
2 Palm Beach County to Okeechobee Boulevard where it
3 borders Congressional District 20 before going out
4 to the coast using Palm Beach inlet to complete its
5 southern border.

6 Congressional District 22 is kept wholly
7 within Palm Beach County. Its boundary extends
8 north to Palm Beach Inlet to meet Congressional
9 District 21 before heading west to include the
10 entire city of Wellington, creating the rounded
11 point on the western side of the districts. It then
12 uses the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge to
13 continue south until it gets its population
14 necessary for a district without splitting other
15 cities in Palm Beach County. It uses Boca Raton and
16 Highland Beach City Municipal line for much of its
17 boundary in this area. This leaves approximately
18 200,000 people in south east Palm Beach County that
19 is then included in Congressional District 23. This
20 district then connects this population with Broward
21 County, utilising many municipal lines in this area
22 for the boundary line, keeping the cities of Coral
23 Springs, Coconut Creek, and many others whole within
24 Broward County. The district then travels down to
25 the Broward County line along the coast using

1 primarily Route 1 as its western border.

2 Congressional District 25 is kept wholly in
3 Broward County, giving Broward County a
4 congressional district wholly within the county for
5 the first time since the 1980 redistricting cycle.
6 The district utilizes as many major roadways as
7 possible, such as I-75, the Sawgrass Expressway, the
8 Florida Turnpike, I-95, Davie Boulevard, Sunrise
9 Boulevard, among others. It also uses the municipal
10 lines of Weston, Southwest Ranches, Pembroke Pines,
11 Miramar to the west, and the Broward Miami-Dade
12 County line on the southern side of the district.

13 Moving on to Congressional Districts 24,
14 and then 26 through 28. Congressional District 24
15 is a performing black district. As noted earlier,
16 the functional analysis on this district conducted
17 by staff ensures the minority group's ability to
18 elect is not diminished. This is the only district
19 that crosses the Miami-Dade Broward County line,
20 which is an improvement over the benchmark map that
21 had two such districts. This district also includes
22 many whole cities within the Miami-Dade County,
23 including Aventura, North Miami, Biscayne Park,
24 Miami Shores, Opa-locka, and others, and uses as
25 many major recognizable roadways in the area as

1 possible, including I-195, 27th Avenue, 47th Avenue
2 and others.

3 We're almost there, Members.

4 Congressional districts 26, 27, and 28 are all
5 performing majority-minority Hispanic districts,
6 where the functional analysis on each district
7 individually was conducted by staff to ensure that
8 minority groups' ability to elect is not
9 diminished.

10 Congressional District 26, similar in
11 shape to the benchmark map, connects the part of
12 Collier County not included in Congressional
13 District 19, with population in Miami-Dade County,
14 using Collier, Broward, and Miami-Dade County
15 Lines, as well as I-75, US-41, the Tamiami Trail
16 and the Dolphin Expressway. It additionally
17 shares a boundary with Congressional District 24
18 line eastern side of the district. This district
19 includes the municipalities of Hialeah, Hialeah
20 Gardens, Medley, Doral, and Miami Lakes in their
21 entirety.

22 Congressional District 27 uses the
23 Dolphin Expressway and the Florida Turnpike for
24 the vast majority of its boundary lines on the
25 northern and western sides, while using the

1 Palmetto Bay Municipal boundaries along its
2 southern border, creating a very compact district
3 wholly within Miami-Dade County.

4 Congressional District 28 includes all of
5 Monroe County and then connects with the remaining
6 population in southern Miami-Dade County, using
7 US-41 and the Florida Turnpike as its primary
8 boundary lines in Miami-Dade County. The
9 municipalities of Color Bay, Florida City, and
10 Homestead are wholly within the district.

11 Madam Chair, that is the Proposed
12 Committee Bill.

13 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14 Members, we are in debate and questions
15 on the PCB.

16 Representative Brown, you're recognized.

17 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Madam
18 Chair.

19 I just have a few questions relating to
20 CD 10, and I want to sort of start with -- I know
21 it's in the meeting packet. I know we previously,
22 I believe, did not mention it, but we --

23 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: I'm sorry. Excuse me.
24 I'm having difficulty hearing if -- thank you very
25 much. If you won't mind starting and referencing.

1 I apologize, Madam Chair. I'll go
2 through you next time.

3 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you,
4 Mr. Chair. So as I was mentioning, I have a few
5 questions about CD 10. And so at a starting
6 point, I know it's in the packet and I believe it
7 was mentioned or not mentioned earlier, but wanted
8 to just confirm. CD 10 here, we're saying with
9 this map, it's not a district we consider
10 protected from aggression under Tier 1. Is that
11 correct?

12 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois?

13 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
14 According to our analysis, Congressional
15 District 10 is not a black-performing district,
16 and that's according to our functional analysis.
17 I can tell you just kind of at a high-level review
18 of the Senate's proposal, they have a different
19 take on Congressional District 10. They have
20 identified it according to their analysis as a
21 protected district. So I expect, moving forward,
22 that is something that will be reconciled with the
23 Senate. But, again, according to our analysis,
24 that has not been recognized as a protected
25 district.

1 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Brown?

2 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Madam
3 Chair.

4 Is there sort of an explanation as to why
5 with our maps, as you mentioned, with the Senate,
6 they saw it as their -- and it's on record that
7 they saw it as one that was protected. But is
8 there a reason why we didn't really come up with
9 that same sort of conclusion in our maps?

10 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly, you're
11 recognized.

12 MS. KELLY: Thank you, Madam Chair, and
13 thank you Representative for that question. So
14 again I can't speak to the Senate analysis and,
15 you know, they are running a parallel process to
16 us, so I don't want to speak on their behalf. But
17 as far as the Houses, whenever we run our
18 functional analysis, just to recap, you've
19 probably heard me say this before, but there's
20 four components that we look at.

21 So the first component that you start
22 with is your population data. So this is what's
23 provided by the Census Bureau and specifically,
24 your voting age population data. From there, we
25 continue on to analyze registered voters in the

1 respective region we're looking at. We
2 additionally look at voter turnout and the
3 statewide election results, and that's for
4 election cycles from 2012 through 2020, both
5 primary and general election cycles.

6 So when looking at Orange County
7 specifically -- and, Representative Brown, you
8 mentioned CD 10 -- in Orange County, over the
9 decade, the black population is essentially
10 stagnant. There's some slight variations, but
11 it's essentially stagnant, which is the first
12 point, again, going back to our population as our
13 starting analysis point. From there whenever you
14 start to look at registered voters, voter turnout,
15 you can see a consistent decrease over the decade,
16 about 10 percentage points between where it
17 started in the beginning of the decade to where it
18 is now, ultimately resulting in levels that we do
19 not believe that the black population would be
20 able to control their shares of the primary or the
21 general election, therefore not allowing them to
22 elect a candidate -- the ability to elect a
23 candidate of their choice.

24 I'd also like to put on record, you know,
25 going back through last decades of materials and

1 meetings, whenever this was recreated as part of
2 the remedial redistricting cycles, this district
3 wasn't created to be a black-performing district
4 either. It was a result of some other changes
5 that happen in the congressional map.

6 So that, Madam Chair, concludes my
7 explanation. Thank you.

8 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you, Ms. Kelly.
9 Representative Brown?

10 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Madam
11 Chair.

12 So looking at the demographics of recent
13 Democratic primaries and benchmark CD 10, the
14 primary elect, they we're just plurality, and even
15 majority black. So when we look at, in 2020,
16 we've seen 43 percent; in 2018, it was 47 percent;
17 2016, 51 percent; 53 percent in '14. And, you
18 know, if we look even in 2012, 54 percent. So it
19 seems as though the benchmark in CD 10 is a
20 district where a cohesive black electorate has an
21 ability to nominate a candidate of their choice in
22 a primary and elect that candidate of choice as
23 well in the general election, since Democratic
24 candidates prevail in general.

25 In the general, is that wrong?

1 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly, you're
2 recognized.

3 MS. KELLY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

4 Thank you, Representative. So I guess my
5 first question is: can you re-reference which
6 exact data points that you're asking about? And
7 the reason why I ask that is there's no one data
8 point within a functional analysis that
9 necessarily dictates whether a candidate can
10 prevail in the primary or in the general. So
11 picking out and spot-checking specific data points
12 wouldn't be a holistic way to look at it. But for
13 clarity, would you mind re-referencing which
14 categorical points you were referencing in your
15 questions?

16 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: The primary
17 electorate. So within the primary in 2020, it was
18 43 percent. In 2018, it was 47 percent. And so
19 we're speaking directly to the black electorate.

20 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly, you're
21 recognized.

22 MS. KELLY: Thank you.

23 Representative, can I respond now, or did
24 you have additional --

25 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: No. No, no, no.

1 MS. KELLY: Okay. Just making sure. So
2 yes. As you go through those data points -- and,
3 again, I want to emphasize there's not one
4 specific column or data point that indicates
5 whether something is performing. But speaking
6 specifically to the ones that you mentioned in the
7 primary election, actually, what you described
8 demonstrated what I said previously is as we go
9 back throughout the decade, you know, in reverse
10 chronological order, we start the decade -- I
11 believe you mentioned it was at 43 percent. And
12 as we go back throughout the decade, it actually
13 increased, which, as I explained, shows that over
14 the decade, that specific data point has continued
15 to have a consistent decrease in the black share
16 of the primary. Whenever you look at the black
17 population's ability to elect a candidate of their
18 choice, specifically in the primary, you know, at
19 43 percent, there's still additional population
20 out there that wouldn't be able to necessarily get
21 them over, you know, that 50 percent marker that
22 would identify them as being able to elect a
23 candidate of their choice.

24 So I hope that provides some additional
25 context. Thank you.

1 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you.

2 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Brown?

3 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Madam
4 Chair.

5 So comparing the benchmarks of CD 10 and
6 also looking just with the HD 20, which was in
7 Ocala, Gainesville, HD 20 had similar statistics
8 as we see with CD 10. So for example, the
9 Democratic primary in HD 20 had between 43 and
10 46.7 percent black in the past eight years. It's
11 been 43 or 44 percent in the past two elections,
12 which is actually lower than CD 10, and both are
13 solidly Democratic in the general election. The
14 (indiscernible) is similar too with 29 percent in
15 HD 20 and 27 percent in CD 10. The black share of
16 registered voters as well is similar.

17 So benchmark HD 20 looks really similar,
18 but we consider HD 20 to be Tier 1 protected
19 against diminishing black voters' ability. And we
20 went out of our way to sort of maintain HD 20 in
21 Gainesville and Ocala, even splitting both cities
22 to do so.

23 So can we explain why in HD 20, it's Tier
24 1 protected, but in CD 10, it's not?

25 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirosis?

1 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
2 You know, I would, I think, revisit
3 Ms. Kelly's remarks when we started this line of
4 questions. Functional analysis is a holistic
5 analysis of a district. So I don't know that
6 necessarily picking and choosing out which metrics
7 or criteria you want to look at and then applying
8 them provides an accurate depiction of the
9 district. The functional analysis has to be a
10 holistic review of all the data points in terms of
11 making that determination.

12 Madam Chair, I would request that
13 Ms. Kelly perhaps might have something to add.

14 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly, you're
15 recognized.

16 MS. KELLY: Thank you, Madam Chair, and
17 thank you, Chair Sirois.

18 Representative, additionally, I just
19 wanted to clarify. You're referencing House
20 District 20 and Congressional District 10,
21 correct?

22 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you. Yes,
23 that's correct.

24 MS. KELLY: Okay. I just wanted to make
25 sure that that was accurate. So again, and I

1 won't repeat what the Chair just said because that
2 was one of my things that I wanted to make sure
3 was clear. I think, additionally, something to
4 think about, holistically, the Congressional
5 District 10 and its current configuration has only
6 existed since 2016 as part of the remedial process
7 when that area was reconfigured. So again, as a
8 component of the functional analysis that you have
9 to look at -- that last component I talked about
10 was the election results -- House District 20 has
11 a very long timeline and proven record of
12 electing, you know, a black population's candidate
13 of choice. CD 10 doesn't have some of those
14 additional trends that support that elongated data
15 patterns. So that's one additional data point I'd
16 like to put out. Thank you.

17 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Brown?

18 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Madam
19 Chair.

20 So part of why I'm asking this is because
21 in the previous draft we had, which was I believe
22 the workshop map of 8001, we actually maintained
23 CD 10 basically, comparable to the benchmark and
24 what sort of the Senate did in their maps. So
25 regardless of whether it's sort of Tier 1

1 protected or not, it seems to me we can kind of
2 choose the configuration of 8001 for Central
3 Florida. Am I wrong with that?

4 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois?

5 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Vice-Chair.

6 And I'm sorry I missed the tail end of
7 that question. If you could repeat for me a
8 little louder? Thank you, Madam.

9 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: My apologies,
10 Mr. Chair. So I was saying the reason I asked --
11 and I kind of referred to our draft plan in 8001.
12 We sort of maintain CD 10 comparable to those
13 benchmarks. So I was saying regardless of whether
14 we're saying that CD 10 is protected by Tier 1 or
15 not, it seems that based off of just the ones
16 we've workshop, we could sort of choose to
17 configurate it, comparable to 8001. Is that
18 correct?

19 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois?

20 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

21 So the difference that you would see, or
22 what I would characterize as improvement, you see
23 in the map that we have, overall, more alignment
24 with our methodology. We have districts that we
25 improve where they are within the five biggest

1 counties. For example, Congressional District 20
2 in the map is more compact, and we have one less
3 split in Hillsborough County. So initially, the
4 workshop maps were presented to this Committee as
5 pieces to demonstrate the real-world application
6 of our constitutional tiers. And throughout that
7 process, subsequent discussions, follow-up,
8 feedback from Members, we were able to build and
9 improve upon the map to the product that you see
10 before you today.

11 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Members, any additional
12 questions?

13 Representative Joseph?

14 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Madam
15 Chair.

16 I wanted to follow up on a couple of
17 Representative Brown's questions with respect to
18 CD 10. I understand that based on the review that
19 was presented, an evaluation of the criteria,
20 there's an expectation that the black-performing
21 district would just decrease in its performance
22 overtime. That seems to be the underlying
23 assumption. Even assuming without agreeing that
24 that assumption will play out correct, are we
25 prevented from keeping CD 10 closer to its

1 benchmark form under -- using just the Tier 2
2 criteria, which we're at liberty to do because it
3 does respect several of the geographical
4 boundaries if we kept it that way as opposed to
5 how we are. I know we're still working through
6 our map, and this is the first iteration. But I'm
7 just wondering about that.

8 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois?

9 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
10 Thank you, Representative Joseph, for the
11 question, and I think my answer would also provide
12 some further insight into Representative Brown's
13 line of question as well. You know, I think it's,
14 really important for all of the Committee members
15 to understand that the PCB that we're looking at
16 today is at its first Committee stop. And as we
17 move through the legislative process, the next
18 stop for this bill, if it's passed out of our
19 Committee today, of course, is the Full
20 Redistricting Committee.

21 I can assure Committee members that Chair
22 Leek and I remain committed, as we have been since
23 day one, to being open to your feedback,
24 accessible regarding questions that you may have,
25 suggestions that you can offer within the context

1 of our two tiers that make it a better map. And I
2 know that both of us continue to be open to
3 receiving that feedback. The final point that I
4 would add of course is even after the House
5 process unfolds, we still have a reconciliation
6 with the Senate as well, where I think, you know,
7 additional issues will be brought up as well.

8 Thank you, Madam Chair.

9 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

10 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Madam
11 Chair.

12 And thank you, Mr. Chair, for the
13 explanation, and I look forward to that. Like,
14 we've had good working relationships in the past
15 in my entire time in the Legislature, so I fully
16 anticipate that we'll be able to address that. So
17 I think part of where I'm going to go with my
18 questions today is to do exactly that: to
19 highlight some of the issues that we have in
20 anticipation that ultimately, maybe not today, but
21 ultimately, we as the legislative body can stand
22 in unison behind some maps that we can actually be
23 proud of. So I think we're ready to roll up our
24 sleeves with you.

25 So following up on CD 10 real quick,

1 looking at the data, I understand -- I mean, there
2 are a number of factors that may have contributed
3 to that decrease of performance, but I think we
4 can still use the Tier 2 factors to give that
5 district a fighting chance. There's no reason we
6 need to take it away right away. I think that as
7 a policy decision, we can look at, maybe, seeing
8 if it might perform and preserving it this round.
9 So that was one thing.

10 Let me move on to CD 26. So looking at
11 CD 26, was that impacted by the fact that it's a
12 Tier 1-protected district for Latino voters or
13 Hispanic voters?

14 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois?

15 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
16 Yes.

17 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Okay. So looking
18 at kind of the image of it, it's kind of like an
19 extruded stair-step shape, stretching up from the
20 Gulf of Mexico all the way over to a little finger
21 that points just 700 yards short of Biscayne Bay
22 in Miami. Was that shape necessary to comply with
23 Tier 1? Or were there other factors that went
24 into just how it ends up looking there?

25 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois?

1 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

2 I'd like to ask Mr. Poreda to weigh in.

3 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Mr. Poreda, you're
4 recognized.

5 MR. POREDA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

6 Yes. The shape of District 26 was
7 largely because not only it was a Tier 1-protected
8 district, but the other three districts in Miami-
9 Dade County - District 24 are protected black
10 district. And District 27 and 28 are also
11 protected districts. So trying to balance all the
12 Tier 2 issues that are there in addition to,
13 first, protecting all three of those districts and
14 their ability to elect, that largely impacted the
15 shapes of all four of those districts.

16 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

17 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Madam
18 Chair.

19 And thank you for that response. Yeah,
20 when you get to Miami-Dade, we got a lot of
21 protective folks. So -- now, still sticking with
22 CD 26, I see that it crosses the large unpopulated
23 stretch of the Everglades between --it looks like
24 Miami-Dade County and Collier. Would we consider
25 the Everglades in this area a major geographic

1 boundary?

2 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois?

3 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair,
4 and I'm going to ask Mr. Poreda to weigh in.

5 But I would add first that, you know,
6 there are still census block data available within
7 that territory. And I think if you recall from
8 earlier presentations when we showed slides that
9 contained the population of our census blocks,
10 there were several areas within the state where
11 maybe just a few people lived. You could count on
12 one hand the number of people identified in that
13 census block, but that doesn't change the fact
14 that they still have accounted for within our
15 congressional districts.

16 So you will see areas on the map -- the
17 Everglades is an example. I think closer to
18 Miami, you have the Miami International Airport,
19 again, huge tract of land that you're talking
20 about there. Along the East Coast, we have
21 wildlife refuges, military insulations, Kennedy
22 Space Center. You see other large tracts of land
23 that are included in the census block data as
24 well. So that's why you may see some variation
25 there.

1 But, Mr. Poreda, do you have anything
2 that you'd like to add?

3 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Mr. Poreda, you're
4 recognized.

5 MR. POREDA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

6 Yeah. I will echo what the Chair said
7 about all of the unpopulated census blocks but
8 also add that District 26, primarily along its
9 entire length, uses the Collier County and the
10 Miami-Dade Broward County line, in addition to US-
11 41, which is the Tamiami Trail to create that
12 extension. And if you look at actually the
13 boundary analysis for District 26, it's only 5
14 percent of its boundaries that do not follow one
15 of the designated political or geographical
16 boundaries. So it uses a lot of municipal lines,
17 actually, in that area that may look a little bit
18 more jagged against District 24. I believe it
19 uses the Hialeah Municipal line along with some of
20 the others there, in addition to using county
21 lines and the Tamiami Trail for almost its entire
22 extension until it gets over into Collier County
23 where it achieves all equal population.

24 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

25 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Madam

1 Chair.

2 Thank you for that explanation. I try to
3 play around in the system. I try to be a geek,
4 but sometimes I can't hang. So this is one of
5 these instances, so forgive me if my question is a
6 little weird. So the Esri Mapping program, so it
7 includes the rivers as one of the options of the
8 boundaries, right? But the Everglades is
9 literally a river of grass. So it covers more
10 than like 4300 square miles? And it's 100 miles
11 long, and it's up like 60 miles wide? And did you
12 consider that a major geographic boundary?

13 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois?

14 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: I would defer to Mr.
15 Poreda.

16 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Mr. Poreda, you're
17 recognized.

18 MR. POREDA: The Everglades by itself,
19 no. But that's why, through that area, we're
20 actually using US-41 and the county lines of
21 Collier and Miami-Dade County. So those are the
22 geographical or really political boundaries that
23 we're using to get through that area.

24 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: All right.

25 MR. POREDA: Because we have to include

1 all the census blocks. Even those census blocks
2 in the Everglades, as the chair mentioned earlier,
3 that had very little population, they all have to
4 be accounted for.

5 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

6 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Madam
7 Chair.

8 And thank you for the response. So I
9 agree about the county boundaries as an
10 alternative way to look at it. I guess it's
11 because it also coincides -- if I'm not mistaken,
12 the Everglades boundary coincides with the
13 political boundary where the Dade-Collier County
14 boundary is. So with that in mind, looking at the
15 Tier 2 factors with CD 6, like this stairway to a
16 mockley shape, it crosses those county lines. It
17 splits Collier, which is smaller than the ideal
18 district size. It splits the city of Miami in
19 three ways, and Miami is smaller than ideal
20 district size too. All of those Tier 2 -- I don't
21 want to say deficiencies, but infirmities, if we
22 can call it that, were those necessary to maintain
23 Tier 1 compliance?

24 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Mr. Poreda.

25 Chair Sirosis.

1 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,
2 Madam Chair.

3 Representative Joseph, I think that's an
4 excellent example of a different approach, a concept
5 that can be brought to Chair Leek, for further
6 examination at the next Committee stop.

7 Madam Chair, I'd ask if Mr. Poreda has
8 anything more technical to add.

9 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Mr. Poreda.

10 MR. POREDA: As I mentioned earlier, that
11 is primarily due to Tier 1 considerations In
12 addition to the equal population standard because
13 the boundaries within Collier County, for example --
14 even though, Collier County, there's lots of
15 counties throughout the map. Walton County is
16 another example; Citrus County, where counties have
17 to be split in a congressional map because of the
18 equal population standard.

19 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: And, Representative, if
20 you don't mind, I'm going to move on to a couple
21 other members and come back to you unless you have a
22 follow-up.

23 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Sure, that's fine.
24 Thank you.

25 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Fabricio.

1 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Thank you, Madam
2 Chair and --

3 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative, one
4 second. I'm sorry.
5 Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
7 Representative Brown's request -- her good
8 request, we're going to put the maps back up on the
9 screen when we're discussing specific areas just to
10 make it a little bit easier for everybody to follow
11 along. Thank you, Madam Chair.

12 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you.
13 Representative.

14 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Thank you, Madam
15 Chair.

16 And I'm going to preface my question with
17 an apology for its rudimentary nature. But in
18 looking at the CD 26 District and discussing Tier 1
19 requirements and Tier 2 requirements, how does the
20 factor of compactness scores factor into determining
21 the viability of a CD in light of the Tier 1
22 requirements?

23 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

24 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,
25 Representative, for the good question.

1 As you know and as we've discussed since
2 we've started, the Tier 1 standards take precedent,
3 in terms of looking at the districts. And when
4 compactness becomes a factor -- you know, I don't
5 know that it's fair to say that compactness can be
6 viewed in the context of a single district in this
7 sense, that the other districts that surround the
8 district that you're referring to also have
9 different issues at play. Whether it's following a
10 political boundary, keeping a city whole, for
11 example, that may affect the ability to keep
12 surrounding districts as compact as we would like
13 them to be.

14 The map is very much -- the districts are
15 very much tied into one another. When you change or
16 try to pursue, perhaps, one outcome with one
17 district boundary, it has impact on the surrounding
18 districts.

19 And, Madam Chair, Mr. Poreda has something
20 that he'd like to add.

21 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Mr. Poreda.

22 MR. POREDA: I'll just echo what the chair
23 said.

24 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

25 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Thank you, Madam

1 Chair.

2 And thank you, Chair Sirois, for that
3 explanation. I appreciate it. It clarifies quite a
4 bit. Because I'd like to consider the compactness
5 scores of District 26 vis-à-vis the compactness
6 scores of, say, District 3, where the Reock scores
7 in District 23 -- I'm sorry, District 26 are .3.
8 Whereas we look at CD 3 and we see a Reock score of
9 .11 and a Polsby-Popper score of .1 vis-à-vis CD 26.
10 And we see a Polsby-Popper score of .3, both low,
11 but CD 3 seems to be very low.

12 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

13 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
14 Ms. Kelly, if you'd like to jump in.

15 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly, you're
16 recognized.

17 MS. KELLY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

18 Thank you, Chair Sirois.

19 Thank you, Representative, for that
20 question. So I'm going to go back to something I
21 referenced earlier, but this is a really important
22 concept to hone in because it applies to several
23 factors in the map. So first of all, compactness is
24 secondary to our Tier 1 requirement to ensure that a
25 minority population has an ability to elect a

1 candidate of their choice. So both of the districts
2 that you reference, Congressional District 3 in
3 North Florida and then Congressional District 26 in
4 South Florida are both Tier 1 protected districts.

5 The first item I'd like to point out is
6 that Tier 3 is a protected black district. District
7 26 is a protected Hispanic district. So again,
8 whenever we're going through that process of
9 functional analysis, those minority populations
10 interact differently with one another. So comparing
11 their functional analysis postures would not
12 necessarily be a one-to-one comparison. Not only
13 are they in different regions of the state, those
14 voters may perform differently or interact
15 differently, but they're also in different
16 geographical locations of the state.

17 So in North Florida, you have a lot of
18 rural counties, where you have less population. So
19 you have to account for that, as you're not only
20 drawing down to plus or minus one person, but also
21 still ensuring that Tier 1 requirement, that they
22 have the ability to elect. Similarly, in South
23 Florida, as other representatives have pointed out
24 as well, you have a lot of Everglades population.
25 And I guess I say that ironically because there's

1 not a lot of people that live in the Everglades, but
2 there is a lot of census blocks that we still have
3 to account for. So even though they have a
4 different compactness scores, it also has to be done
5 in context of the geographical constraints of the
6 region, the Tier 1 constraints of the region, as
7 well as population of the region. And I believe
8 that was all the points I wanted to make. Thank
9 you.

10 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

11 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Last follow-up,
12 and I appreciate your explanation. Could you tell
13 me which congressional district has the lowest
14 overall compactness score?

15 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly.

16 MS. KELLY: I'm going to ask for a
17 clarification. Do you mean a state-wide average or
18 an individual compactness score?

19 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Thank you.

20 Which congressional district has the lowest
21 compactness score if you rank compactness scores
22 from top to bottom?

23 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly.

24 MS. KELLY: So it'll take me a second to go
25 through my list. I will answer your question. I

1 would like to say though, there's not one
2 compactness score that is superior to another, and
3 they're to be viewed in context of one another. And
4 I'll further elaborate on that. Each compactness
5 score, you can think of it as measuring a slightly
6 different component of the district. So for
7 instance, if you remember back to some of the
8 presentations we did during the Interim Committee
9 weeks, the Reock score measures, you know, the more
10 circular a district is, the higher your Reock score
11 will be. For Convex Hull score, you can think of it
12 as, perhaps, putting a rubber band around that
13 district. And the more it's filled out, the higher
14 that score will be.

15 And the Polsby-Popper score oftentimes
16 measures a lot of the indentations in the overall
17 perimeter of the district. So I do need a minute to
18 get that answer for you, and I will get that answer
19 for you, but I want to elaborate that whenever we're
20 ranking compactness scores, it's more just, I think,
21 as a data point and a much bigger plane of analysis.
22 But we'll get that answer for you right now.

23 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Thank you.

24 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Members, additional
25 questions?

1 Thank you, Member Skidmore.

2 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you, Madam
3 Chair.

4 I think we're very interested in CD 26
5 today. A few weeks ago, when we took up the House
6 maps on the floor, Rep Joseph had a series of
7 questions, and I kind of want to revert back to some
8 of them. I remember Chair Leek called the -- he
9 didn't want to go into a deep rabbit hole, but these
10 questions are not typical.

11 So Rep Joseph asked if the House analysis
12 involved ecological regression or inference analysis
13 to determine the level of minority cohesion and
14 white block voting, racially polarized voting.
15 Chair Leek said yes. But he didn't say what the
16 outcome of those analyses were. So as applied to
17 the congressional map, specifically, in South
18 Florida, does the House have an analysis of minority
19 cohesion, white block voting, and racially polarized
20 voting in the benchmark Latino majority districts of
21 South Florida or in the Miami-Dade area, just
22 generally speaking?

23 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

24 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
25 If I could just have a moment.

1 Represent Skidmore, could you -- I'm sorry,
2 Madam Chair.

3 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Skidmore,
4 can you repeat your question?

5 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you.

6 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Sure. I won't go
7 through the whole setup, but the specific question
8 is, as applied to the congressional map in South
9 Florida, does the House have an analysis of minority
10 cohesion, white block voting, and racially polarized
11 voting in the benchmark Latino minority-majority
12 districts in South Florida or in Miami-Dade?
13 Generally speaking.

14 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

15 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,
16 Madam Chair.

17 You know, I want to begin by answering that
18 the Florida Supreme Court has recognized that the
19 only performance measure is the functional analysis
20 test. The data that you're referring to, that Chair
21 Leek spoke to on the floor, is some of the advanced
22 statistical analysis that legal counsel has assisted
23 the House with conducting.

24 I would ask Madam Chair that Ms. Kelly may
25 have something to add on that subject. Okay. We're

1 good. Thank you, Madam Chair.

2 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

3 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you, Madam
4 Chair.

5 So the data exists, but we're just not
6 privy to it?

7 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

8 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

9 That data is an advanced statistical
10 analysis that was performed -- expert analysis that
11 was performed at the request of the legal counsel
12 that is advising the House on the redistricting
13 process. So the information that is a part of that
14 relationship as a part of that contract is retained
15 by outside counsel.

16 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

17 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: I would just add -- I'm
18 sorry -- that information is not retained with the
19 House of Representatives.

20 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

21 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you, Madam
22 Chair.

23 So is there any cohesion of voting data
24 that is available to us?

25 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

1 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: The functional analysis
2 performs exactly the kind of feedback that you're
3 referring to. That's the analysis that the Court
4 requires to be performed is the functional analysis.
5 So beyond that, you know, I'm not able to answer
6 your question.

7 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

8 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you, Madam
9 Chair.

10 Are there any reports, conclusions, or
11 analysis regarding cohesion that have been conducted
12 that would be able to be shared with us? I know
13 Chair Leek said that it's not -- you know, the
14 average person isn't going to want to go through
15 this, but is there anything that has been reported
16 that -- or, you know, memos or anything that would
17 help us understand cohesion?

18 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

19 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: There are no formal
20 reports that exist at this stage of the game in
21 anticipation of litigation. What I would add is
22 that the Florida Supreme Court requires the
23 completion of a functional analysis. We have done
24 that, and that information is contained in your
25 packet.

1 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you.

2 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Additional questions,
3 Members?

4 Representative Fabricio.

5 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Just following up
6 to see if the data that I requested was available.

7 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly, if it's okay,
8 we'll go and take Representative Joseph's questions.
9 We can come back?

10 MS. KELLY: Yes, absolutely.

11 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Joseph.

12 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Madam
13 Chair.

14 I guess it's more of like a request. We
15 can work on it later as we work through the map's
16 thing. But I'd like to see how we can -- actually,
17 let me back up. It seems that the House took away a
18 benchmark Hispanic district that or the new map
19 proposed, that crossed the Everglades from Dade to
20 Collier. And I'd really like to see how we could
21 avoid crossing the Everglades because it's been a
22 practice of doing that since the 2016 court-ordered
23 Senate map. And as we continue working on the maps,
24 I'd like to see how we can preserve that because I
25 actually think it would make it more Tier 2

1 compliant. So that's more of a request than a
2 question. So there you go.

3 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

4 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

5 Congressional District 26 remains a
6 protected Hispanic district, so I'm not sure what it
7 is that you're referring to.

8 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: My apologies.

9 Thank you. I described it wrong. So when I say
10 that, I'm talking about the benchmark district that
11 crossed from the Everglades to Dade to Collier. So
12 not that it eliminated, I totally misspoke on that.
13 I don't believe it eliminates the Hispanic district,
14 but I thought that something was moved, like there
15 was a Hispanic district that, maybe I'm mixing them
16 up. There was a Hispanic district down south that
17 was moved somewhere else in Florida.

18 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

19 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,
20 Madam Chair.

21 And, I think that the district that you
22 were referring to was in the House map for State
23 Legislative Districts.

24 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Just kidding. All
25 right.

1 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: No, don't apologize.
2 Believe me when I tell you that I understand, you
3 know, all this stuff starts to run together after a
4 while. So I appreciate where you come from.

5 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: So thank you.

6 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

7 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: What I'm really
8 trying to say, forget the House map and that
9 district moving, is preserving the lines and trying
10 to uphold or maximize the Tier 2 criteria. I think
11 in doing so for there -- and I see staff shaking
12 their head -- I think we might be able to achieve a
13 map that does that in a way that protects that area
14 and does not have a negative impact on Tier 1 and
15 all of that good stuff. So there you go. Thank
16 you.

17 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

18 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,
19 Madam Chair.

20 I would welcome that conversation with
21 myself, staff, Chair Leek, and I think that's
22 something that, you know, we can look at as we move
23 forward through the Committee process.

24 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: And, Ms. Kelly, you're
25 recognized to answer Representative Fabricio's

1 question.

2 MS. KELLY: Thank you, Madam Chair, and
3 thank you for giving us time to pull that data.

4 So I'd like to go through each compactness
5 score. We were able to identify the district that
6 has the lowest compactness scores and give it in
7 context of that region as a whole. So whenever
8 we're looking at the lowest Reock score, we're
9 looking at CD 3, and it has a .11. Its Polsby-
10 Popper score is .10, but I'd also like to point out
11 that its Convex Hull score is .63, which is right
12 around the average for the state.

13 Moving into the Convex Hull score, that
14 one's lowest rate is on CD 28 with a .56. Again,
15 making sure I provide it in context, the Reock score
16 on that is .21 and then .24 for Polsby-Popper.
17 Going back to the Polsby-Popper score, again, CD 3
18 is there at .10. And again, just to remind everyone
19 in context, its Convex Hull score is up near the
20 average of the rest of the state as well. Thank
21 you. Hopefully that answers your question.

22 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Members, additional
23 questions?

24 Ex officio, Davis.

25 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you, Chair.

1 And thank you, Committee, for allowing me to be here
2 this morning.

3 Just a question, you may have answered it
4 along the way, but we are talking to the general
5 public. So could you be clear in the sense of the
6 difference between the functional analysis and the
7 performance analysis for me, please?

8 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

9 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,
10 Madam Chair.

11 Representative, thank you for the question.
12 And I think it's important, you know, words do
13 matter because what we're talking about here is the
14 functional analysis. And the functional analysis
15 provides information related to performance, and
16 that helps us understand as to whether or not our
17 obligation to identify and to protect -- protected
18 district's remains in effect. So, you know, I'm
19 happy -- if you want some more detail on the
20 functional analysis process, I'm happy to provide
21 that. But I think that answers your question.

22 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

23 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Somewhat. I asked
24 for the difference between the functional analysis
25 and the performance analysis of a district. So you

1 did answer the functional analysis, but the
2 performance analysis is what I'm waiting for now.

3 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Chair Sirois.

4 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

5 Thank you, Representative Davis. It's the
6 same thing.

7 If I could, Madam Chair, ask Ms. Kelly to
8 elaborate.

9 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly, you're
10 recognized.

11 MS. KELLY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

12 Thank you, Chair Sirois.

13 Thank you, Representative. Sometimes I
14 feel like those terms may be used interchangeably,
15 because the functional analysis alludes to the
16 performance ability of a minority group to elect a
17 candidate of its choice. So Chair Sirois, just
18 piggybacking off of what you said, I believe what
19 you're asking about is, in fact, the same analysis,
20 the same data set. It just may be commonly referred
21 to, differently.

22 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you. That
23 cleared it up. Interchangeable terms, I appreciate
24 that. So with that and we were talking about the
25 cohesiveness of the districts. How did you apply

1 the non-vote dilution standard when drafting these
2 maps?

3 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

4 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: I would ask Ms. Kelly.

5 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly, you're
6 recognized.

7 MS. KELLY

8 : So the provision that you're
9 alluding to is a provision that's in our Tier 1 of
10 requirements. It says you cannot deny or diminish
11 the ability of a racial or language minority group
12 to elect a candidate of their choice. So when doing
13 the functional analysis, you know, one of the
14 components of that is ensuring that that protected
15 district doesn't have a diluted ability to elect a
16 candidate of their choice. Which is why, as we've
17 recreated these districts, we've recreated them at
18 several similar levels to where the benchmark
19 districts are. The courts have said a lot over the
20 years as far as being able to drop different data
21 points too low or perhaps too high, and so we've
22 made an effort to make sure that those minority
23 populations don't have a diluted ability or
24 diminished ability to elect a candidate of their
25 choice, in complying with our Tier 1 standards.

Ms. Chair: Follow-up?

1 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Just kind of a
2 variety of questions.

3 So with another process, what did you --
4 how did you identify the process by way of your
5 Voting Rights Act and Tier 1 protected districts in
6 the benchmark map? And did you run that process on
7 all 28 Districts?

8 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

9 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
10 You know, Representative, I may ask you to
11 be more specific, but I will tell you that the PCB
12 that is presented before you today is in full
13 compliance with our state constitution, state and
14 federal law, judicial president ruling by the Court,
15 and that would include the Voting Rights Act.

16 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

17 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you for that
18 answer, Chair. And the question I was asking was
19 the process as to how we identified by way of the
20 using the Voting Rights Act and the Tier 1
21 protections to get to that. I think you've answered
22 it, and I appreciate that, saying that you feel like
23 these maps are completely legal and compliant with
24 constitutional standards. So thank you for that
25 answer.

1 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Seeing no additional
2 question -- Representative Joseph?

3 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Madam
4 Chair.

5 For CD 24, I see that it's shifted all the
6 way east where it wasn't that way before. Can you
7 walk us through, kind of, what went into that? I
8 know it had to do with making sure that CD 27 was
9 okay in terms of meeting the Tier 1 criteria, but
10 talk to us a little bit more about what happened
11 there.

12 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

13 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
14 Thank you, Representative for the question.
15 I would ask Mr. Poreda to provide an explanation.

16 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Mr. Poreda, you're
17 recognized.

18 MR. POREDA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

19 That district is a protected black
20 district. Its black voting Age population in the
21 benchmark was about 43 percent. And the district
22 you see before you, it's about 42 and a half percent
23 -- 42, I think, .2 percent. It was brought over to
24 that population, so it wouldn't impact Districts 26,
25 27, or 28, which are all protected districts, in

1 addition to adding population to all three districts
2 to achieve our new ideal population for a
3 Congressional District.

4 So that was simply where the population
5 was. In an effort to also, where we could, take
6 those Tier 1 districts and make them a little bit
7 more Tier 2 compliant and create a more compact
8 shape.

9 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Seeing no more questions?
10 We are in amendments.

11 Are there any amendments?

12 Representative.

13 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Thank you. And I
14 apologize for jumping in late there. In determining
15 the importance of the compactness scores, we have
16 Reock, Convex Hull, and the Polsby-Popper. Does any
17 one of those three different compactness components
18 have any different kind of weight over another, or
19 are they looked at in the aggregate?

20 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

21 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you,
22 Representative. The answer to your question is no.
23 And that's why they have to be used in context and
24 looked at across the board.

25 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

1 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: So if you have a
2 particular congressional district that has two
3 compact scores that are exceedingly low and one that
4 happens to be about average, how would that analysis
5 weigh out?

6 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

7 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

8 You know, you have to look at in the
9 context of the entire map. Yes.

10 And, Ms. Kelly, would you like to add
11 something?

12 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ms. Kelly, you're
13 recognized?

14 MS. KELLY: Thank you. And I agree with
15 what Chair Sirois said. I'd also like to add,
16 compactness is one of our Tier 2 standards, but it's
17 not the only Tier 2 standard. So within that as
18 well, you have to balance political and geographical
19 boundaries. So we're looking at riverways,
20 waterways, county lines, and corporate and
21 municipality lines. So it's not just, again,
22 compactness scores as a sole analysis. It's within
23 the context of our Tier 2 standards as well as the
24 consideration that that is secondary in nature
25 always to our Tier 1 standards.

1 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

2 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: And in that group
3 of additional Tier 2 standards, would one of the
4 other considerations be unnecessary appendages?

5 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

6 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
7 I think it's -- you know, I would ask you to explain
8 what you view as being an unnecessary appendage
9 because, oftentimes, when you see those in the
10 context of a congressional district, it may be a
11 municipal boundary or some kind of other feature
12 which requires us to incorporate into the district
13 boundary.

14 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

15 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: For example,
16 Gadsden County in the western edge of CD 3.

17 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: I'm sorry, Representative
18 -- Madam Chair?

19 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: You're recognized.

20 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Could you repeat that?

21 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: For example,
22 Gadsden County on the western edge of CD 3.

23 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois, you're
24 recognized.

25 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,

1 Representative. Gadsden County is a part of a
2 majority-minority protected district. So I don't
3 understand -- in an effort to protect that district,
4 I don't understand how you view that as an
5 appendage. Maybe you could elaborate.

6 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: I understand. It
7 just seems that it's linked up through a very slim
8 sliver of land there.

9 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: I'm sorry,
10 Representative. Could you repeat that into the
11 microphone?

12 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: I'm sorry. Can
13 you hear me now?

14 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Yes.

15 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: It seems to be
16 linked to the rest of CD 3 through a very slim
17 sliver of land.

18 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative, was there
19 a question in there?

20 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: I believe the
21 Chair asked me to elaborate why I considered the
22 Gadsden County portion of CD 3 to be a appendage.

23 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chairs Sirois.

24 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Ms. Leda, would you like
25 to weigh in?

1 MS. KELLY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

2 Thank you, Chair.

3 So as far as an appendage goes, whenever
4 you look at the Gadsden County connected to
5 Congressional District 3, Gadsden County in its
6 entirety is connected to Congressional District 3.

7 So usually, whenever you, in the context of
8 redistricting, talk about appendages, or, I believe,
9 the courts have used the frayed tortured shapes,
10 things that would be abnormal to the visual eyeball
11 test of compactness, a whole county being included
12 in a district is very in-line with the rest of the
13 methodology that we've applied across the map.
14 There's several districts that include the whole
15 counties.

16 And again, I'll reiterate. District 3 has
17 Tier 1 protections. Gadsden County is Florida's
18 only majority-minority black county in the entire
19 state, which goes into part of that Tier 1
20 consideration, which, again, outranks compactness as
21 a Tier 2 requirement. Thank you.

22 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: All right. Seeing no
23 more questions, we are in amendments.

24 Are there any amendments on the PCB?

25 Representative Hunschofsky, any questions.

1 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Thank you very
2 much. Going back to the section that my colleague
3 is so concerned about, Congressional District 3,
4 could you go again through how many counties were
5 kept whole and cities were kept whole in that
6 district, because those are also Tier 2, and I
7 wasn't sure how many were kept whole in that area?

8 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Mr. Poreda, you're
9 recognized.

10 MR. POREDA: Thank you, Madam Chair. That
11 district contains four whole counties. Those are
12 the counties of Gadsden, Madison, Hamilton, and
13 Baker Counties. In addition to that, it has
14 portions of Leon County, Jefferson County, Columbia
15 County, and then Duval County. That district has
16 all of these municipalities that would be in those
17 whole counties. It then also splits the city of
18 Tallahassee, the city of Lake City, and the city of
19 Jacksonville.

20 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

21 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: And when we
22 were going through the Tier 1 and Tier 2, in the
23 Tier 1, I just want to confirm, is it true that Tier
24 1, they're all held equally, or we have to
25 prioritize one of the Tier 1 over another?

1 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

2 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Representative
3 Hunschofsky. They are equal within the tier.

4 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow-up?

5 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: And the Tier 1
6 always comes before the Tier 2 when we are weighing
7 this, correct?

8 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

9 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,
10 Representative Hunschofsky. Yes.

11 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Yeah, I was
12 paying attention to it. And then lastly, I have
13 brought up several times ad nauseam on this
14 Committee, how important I think it is to keep
15 cities and counties as whole as possible having come
16 from municipal office. So but is it true that when
17 we're looking at those Tier 2 standards, we can also
18 choose -- when looking at the totality of it and
19 what we're trying to accomplish, and that there's a
20 good representation in each of these districts, that
21 we can choose, for example, to prioritize keeping
22 counties and cities Whole over prioritizing
23 compactness? Is that within our option on those
24 Tier 2 or do we have to go in the order that it
25 would -- that they were presented to us?

1 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

2 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,
3 Madam Chair. On the issue of city splits, and I
4 know that that is important to you. You've raised
5 that consistently throughout this process, and I
6 think you should proud of the progress that this map
7 makes in that regard Because we improve -- in the
8 benchmark map, there were 39 city splits. In the
9 PCB before you today, there are 27. So we have made
10 some improvement in that regard.

11 If there are additional areas of the state
12 that you would like to make some recommendation in
13 terms of -- perhaps a way we could further reduce
14 the number of city splits, I'm happy, and I can
15 speak for Chair Leek in saying we're happy to
16 continue to have that conversation with you.

17 I would ask also, if you could repeat and
18 clarify the second part of your question?

19 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFISKY: Yeah. I just
20 wanted to make sure -- I'm asking that we are
21 allowed to prioritize in -- within the Tier 2, we
22 can make the choice to prioritize keeping more
23 counties and cities whole than compactness. Are we
24 allowed to do that?

25 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

1 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Within Tier 2, each of
2 those receive equal consideration.

3 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Okay. Thank
4 you.

5 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: All right. Last chance.
6 Seeing no more questions.

7 All right. Members, we are in amendments.
8 Are there any amendments on the PCB?

9 Seeing none, we are now in public
10 testimony. I'll remind all the speakers to keep
11 their comments on topic and to the constitutional
12 standards as the maps we are voting on today must be
13 in alignment with these standards.

14 First up, Robert Popper, Judicial Watch.
15 Thank you for being here. You're recognized.

16 MR. POPPER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good
17 morning. My name is Robert Popper. I am a voting
18 specialist at Judicial Watch. Judicial Watch is a
19 Washington DC nonprofit devoted to transparency,
20 accountability, and fidelity to the rule of law.
21 I'm here to testify in particular about the
22 constitutional status and what I view as potential
23 infirmities of District 3.

24 I've been a litigator for 32 years, and
25 I've worked on voting issues for much of that time.

1 I've submitted written testimony, which I believe
2 was emailed to the Committee. I also understand
3 that revised statistics were sent to the Committee,
4 not by me, but I do understand that that needs to be
5 emphasized as well.

6 To summarize my testimony in my written
7 statement, District 3 was drawn on the basis of
8 racial considerations, as I believe the Florida
9 Supreme Court acknowledged and as I believe this
10 Committee would frankly acknowledge. That puts it
11 in a difficult position in terms of federal law.
12 Its boundaries correlate with African American
13 populations in Duval County and Leon. And one of
14 the points I'd like to emphasize is that I believe
15 that it violates traditional districting criteria.
16 That is a specialty of mine.

17 I am the Popper of the Polsby-Popper
18 criterion. Professor Polsby and I developed that
19 criterion 30 years ago to develop and understand the
20 non-compactness of gerrymandered districts. Under
21 the Polsby-Popper criterion, that scores a 0.1 or a
22 10 percent. That is extremely low. That is low
23 nationally. That is the lowest in Florida. Below
24 20 percent for a landlocked district, which District
25 3 is, is extremely non-compact. It is not the worst

1 district I've ever seen, but 10 is low. And those
2 boundary lines do not contort as they would. For
3 example, and if this was the district in the
4 Chesapeake Bay in my home state of Maryland, those
5 districts are manmade. The contortions are manmade.
6 The district is 200 miles long. It narrows to three
7 miles wide. It runs through eight counties and
8 splits four of them.

9 In addition to the Polsby-Popper method of
10 measuring compactness, there is the Reock
11 measurement, which gives it an 11 percent or 0.11.
12 It is unusual for the Polsby-Popper and the Reock
13 method to agree. Usually, the Reock method is more
14 forgiving. The fact that they agree means that this
15 is non-compact on at least two kinds of scales. The
16 indentations measured by Polsby-Popper, the length
17 to width typically flagged by Reock. It is also the
18 third worst was my measurement.

19 Madam Chair, forgive me if I've not
20 calculated that accurately, but by my count, it was
21 the third worst scoring district in the state on
22 Convex Hull.

23 As a practitioner in the area of
24 traditional districting criteria, I do not believe
25 that Convex Hull is that useful of a measurement.

1 It doesn't see too much. If you imagine a rubber
2 band stretched over the outward points of a
3 district, anything that happens internally that
4 doesn't affect the area just is not seen at all.
5 But that being said, it does not score well on
6 Convex Hull. As I pointed out, it's a landlocked
7 district, which makes the non-compactness harder to
8 explain, and I think we know why the non-compactness
9 exists. It was to connect particular communities to
10 create a particular result.

11 Now, as a race-based district under the
12 jurisprudence of Shaw vs. Reno and Miller vs.
13 Johnson, the Supreme Court has determined that the
14 equal protection clause is potentially violated
15 unless the district meets strict scrutiny, unless
16 there is a compelling justification met by a
17 narrowly tailored remedy.

18 It has been held that Section 2 will not
19 serve as a justification where you cannot create a
20 greater than 50 percent minority voting age
21 population. That is the case here. It has been
22 held that Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, prior
23 to its becoming unconstitutional, and Section 4
24 becoming unconstitutional, and Section 5 becoming
25 inoperative, prior to that, you needed a

1 specialized finding of a particular harm in order to
2 justify that remedy. And I would add that we in the
3 modern age have forgotten what those findings were,
4 including states of the union where minority voting
5 turnout was less than 10 percent. We don't have
6 that now. But I submit there have not been those
7 findings.

8 And this is the point I would particularly
9 like to emphasize to this Committee. If this
10 district is not narrowly tailored, it will not
11 satisfy strict scrutiny. If it is not compact, it
12 will not satisfy strict scrutiny. The Supreme Court
13 has viewed extremely non-compact districts as not
14 required by federal law. I understand that we are
15 discussing here today Tier 1 and Tier 2, and
16 compactness and traditional districting criteria are
17 Tier 2 under federal law. They are not Tier 2 --
18 I'm sorry, Tier 2 under Florida law. They're not
19 Tier 2 under federal law. It will torpedo the
20 ability of Florida to submit a set of districts that
21 it can call narrowly tailored if the district is
22 submitted, I believe, in its present form.

23 We all know that in a state of this
24 importance, this district is going to end up. The
25 entire map is going to end up in litigation. We

1 know that. I respectfully submit that this
2 Committee and this House would want to be holding
3 the strongest hand that it could. District 3 as
4 drawn will not permit that.

5 Madam Chair, I look forward to your
6 questions.

7 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you, Mr. Popper,
8 and we do have a couple of questions. We've had a
9 very transparent process throughout the entire last
10 four months or so, and I just wanted to give
11 Committee members a holistic view of the testimony
12 given here today. So I just have a couple of
13 questions. If you don't mind, other Committee
14 members do as well. Were you asked to be here by
15 Governor DeSantis today?

16 MR. POPPER: I was.

17 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: And were you compensated
18 for being here today?

19 MR. POPPER: I was not.

20 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Then can you share with
21 us who you collaborated with in order to prepare for
22 your testimony today?

23 MR. POPPER: It was just -- I wrote my
24 testimony myself. It's based on my experience. I
25 did talk with lawyers from Holtzman Vogel and Josh

1 Pratt, but I wrote my testimony.

2 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois.

3 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

4 And good morning, sir.

5 MR. POPPER: Morning.

6 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: You know, in all my
7 reading, I've seen Polsby-Popper. I expected
8 Professor Polsby to be here with you today, joined
9 at the hip. I will see your names appearing
10 together, but thank you for being here this morning.

11 My question is: you say that the district
12 is not narrowly tailored, but in your testimony, you
13 didn't propose an alternative. Can you point us to
14 a district that does not diminish minority voting
15 ability but is more narrowly tailored?

16 MR. POPPER: Thank you for the question. I
17 would respond in a couple of ways. The first is
18 that the requirement of showing a district that
19 accomplishes the same thing in a more efficient or
20 less compact -- or more compact way was a one-time
21 requirement in federal court. It no longer is. And
22 I suppose this is a prelude to saying, no, I cannot
23 propose such a district to you, but I would
24 respectfully submit that the Tier 2 requirements of
25 Florida law will be superseded by the narrow

1 tailoring requirement of meeting the strict scrutiny
2 required for this not to be an equal protection
3 violation. I hope that answered your question.

4 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Yes, thank you.

5 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Perez,
6 you're recognized in questions.

7 REPRESENTATIVE PEREZ: Thank you, Madam
8 Chair.

9 As I was looking up your biography before
10 you spoke -- which, by the way, welcome. Welcome to
11 the Committee. Welcome to Florida. I noticed that
12 you used to work for DOJ, and I think it's the early
13 2000s, mid 2000s. Did you ever work with Eric
14 Holder?

15 MR. POPPER: I've met Eric Holder. I guess
16 you could call it working with him when one is
17 subordinate to a subordinate to a subordinate, but
18 yes.

19 REPRESENTATIVE PEREZ: The reason that I
20 ask that is I'm sure you're aware, as many people
21 are aware, he's part of an organization now that
22 focuses on redistricting in a very partisan way,
23 specifically to make sure that that Democrats can
24 get elected or favorable redistricting measures in
25 different states. Did you consult or have you

1 consulted with anyone from Eric Holder's group that
2 he currently works with prior to today?

3 MR. POPPER: No, I have not.

4 REPRESENTATIVE PEREZ: Thank you.

5 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Clemons,
6 you may be recognized in questions.

7 REPRESENTATIVE CLEMONS: Thank you. And
8 I've read your report, your resume that you sent in
9 earlier, and you have a very impressive level of
10 expertise.

11 MR. POPPER: Thank you, sir.

12 REPRESENTATIVE CLEMONS: I'm just curious
13 though, what state do you reside in?

14 MR. POPPER: Maryland.

15 REPRESENTATIVE CLEMONS: Okay. So you
16 reside in Maryland. And then I think, previously,
17 you were asked if you were compensated, and you
18 responded that you were not. Can you just share
19 with us today the expenses, your hotel, your travel?
20 Are you borne -- are you absorbing those expenses
21 yourself, or will you submit a reimbursement to
22 anyone for those travel expenses?

23 MR. POPPER: Thank you. I must clarify,
24 based on what you're saying, that's true. It's my
25 understanding that we will be compensated. I would

1 say that we offered to forego that, but yes. We
2 would receive -- my understanding is that my flight
3 and my hotel will be compensated by the Governor's
4 office. That's my understanding.

5 REPRESENTATIVE CLEMONS: Follow-up, Madam
6 Chair.

7 There's no doubt that you are an expert in
8 these matters, and I do applaud you for being here
9 today. My follow-up question would resolve in: have
10 you offered this level of testimony in any other
11 state, at any other redistricting committee to date?

12 MR. POPPER: Missouri, long ago. Not on
13 gerrymandering; on different topics, sir.

14 REPRESENTATIVE CLEMONS: Follow-up.

15 So in the 2022 census and redistricting
16 throughout the nation, this is the only Committee
17 that you have testified in front of to share your
18 level of expertise?

19 MR. POPPER: That is correct as far as
20 committees go, but we are suing the state of
21 Maryland over their gerrymandering. And, in fact,
22 I'll be going to trial on March 15th. So that will
23 be process I'll be engaged in.

24 REPRESENTATIVE CLEMONS: And I think maybe
25 this is the last one. So when you say "we," are you

1 talking about your law firm?

2 MR. POPPER: I'm talking about Judicial
3 Watch.

4 REPRESENTATIVE CLEMONS: Okay. Judicial
5 Watch. Okay. Thank you. That concludes my
6 questions. Thank you, and thank you for being here.

7 MR. POPPER: Thank you.

8 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you,
9 Representative.

10 Mr. Popper, as you know, in the last
11 decade, we've had some landmark redistricting cases
12 in Florida law. So as it relates to Florida case
13 law, do you agree with Chief Justice Kennedy's
14 dissenting opinion, what he describes as
15 diminishment?

16 MR. POPPER: And you're talking about the
17 fair districting amendments and the Florida Supreme
18 Court's determination on those amendments? I'm not
19 an expert in Florida law. I understand the
20 decision. I understand that it's meant to be in
21 many ways an analog or even governed by the Federal
22 Authority that pertains to Section 2 and Section 5
23 of the Voting Rights Act. In that respect, if the
24 Florida courts follow the federal law, one would
25 expect that a non-compact district would not satisfy

1 the requirements of these state analogs of the
2 federal statute. Now, I don't say that as a Florida
3 practitioner. I'm not licensed in Florida. I'm not
4 as familiar with Florida law. My familiarity is
5 with federal law.

6 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you for that
7 answer. And so are you aware of any court's
8 interpretation of Section 5 that requires a district
9 to be compact?

10 MR. POPPER: Thank you for the question.
11 No. I'm not aware of any federal court decisions
12 that state that it must be compact, but I am aware
13 of Miller vs. Johnson Supreme Court decision
14 indicating that a district that was not compact was
15 not required by federal law. There's a lot of
16 interpretation from the fact that non-compact
17 districts were not permitted to fulfill certain
18 roles. And I know of no exceedingly non-compact
19 district that has been used to justify a compelling
20 explanation or justification that's narrowly
21 tailored to allow a race-based district to be drawn
22 in a congressional race.

23 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Sure. So just keeping
24 our focus on diminishment for a minute, do you agree
25 that going from the current CD 5 to the proposed

1 Governor's district diminishes the ability to elect?

2 MR. POPPER: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

3 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Oh, sorry. So just
4 focusing still on diminishment, do you agree that
5 going from the current CD 5 to the proposed
6 Governor's district will diminish the ability to
7 elect?

8 MR. POPPER: I can't speak to that, Madam
9 Chair, as an attorney. I can speak to it as an
10 individual. When you're talking about less than 50
11 percent, it's not clear. It's not clear to me as an
12 individual, not as an attorney. But there is
13 federal case law suggesting that -- well, there's
14 federal case law stating that a crossover district,
15 in which there is a minority participation that's
16 less than 50 percent, does not satisfy Section 2 of
17 the Voting Rights Act. That's Bartlett vs.
18 Strickland. There's also an indication in Perry vs.
19 Perez that the same restrictions would apply to a
20 district drawn under Section 5. But again, it's one
21 of those backwards implications where the court
22 simply says, these districts were not required. And
23 there they're talking about a coalition district,
24 which is a couple of minority groups together
25 combining to exceed 50 percent.

1 The crossover district is a minority group
2 combining with white voters to exceed 50 percent.
3 If you just have a minority-minority district, I'm
4 not sure what that accomplishes. As a practical
5 matter, it does create something of an influence
6 district, but does it diminish minority influence
7 and surrounding districts? It's ambiguous, but
8 that's not my call.

9 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you. Chair Sirois.

10 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
11 Can you tell us, did you explore alternative
12 district configurations and performed the required
13 functional analysis to determine whether a more
14 compact district could have been drawn without
15 diminishing the minority's voting ability?

16 MR. POPPER: Representative Sirois, I did
17 not.

18 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

19 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Fabricio,
20 you're recognized.

21 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Thank you, Madam
22 Chair. Earlier in the question and answer that I
23 was involved in, I asked about the relevance of
24 compactness, and one of the responses that I heard
25 was that compactness is also a factor of the

1 surrounding districts. And in light of CD 3 having
2 a Polsby-Popper score of .10, what would be your
3 analysis of that low score in the light of the
4 surrounding districts?

5 MR. POPPER: Thank you for the question.
6 The surrounding districts are always affected by a
7 non-compact district, but they're not as directly
8 affected. One can have non-compact districts
9 surrounded by compact districts. There tends to be
10 some spillover, particularly as districts become
11 serrated and indented on a small scale. But at the
12 same time, often, that's a smaller district
13 affecting a larger one, and the effect on
14 compactness is muted.

15 It's not always clear that changing a non-
16 compact district will affect the districts around
17 it. That being said, it can, but where you have a
18 district that is so low, when you have an average of
19 -- I believe it was 30, 37 percent Polsby-Popper,
20 and you have a district scoring 10, you could
21 increase that district. It doesn't have to just to
22 speak like someone who has sat at a computer and
23 tried to draw districts. It doesn't have to be
24 jammed up against the border like that. Those are
25 man-made district lines. Look at District 1, also

1 jammed up against the border and against natural
2 boundary. That's a compact district. Did that
3 answer your question?

4 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: And, Mr. Popper, does the
5 state of Florida's shape affect the compactness?

6 MR. POPPER: It doesn't affect the
7 compactness, Madam Chair, of District 1. I mean,
8 that's a flat border that it's pressed up -- I'm
9 sorry District 3. That's a flat border. I reside
10 in Maryland, and districts around the Chesapeake Bay
11 are naturally non-compact because the Chesapeake Bay
12 is non-compact. At the same time, you can see
13 what's man-made. There's a current district in
14 Maryland that goes across the Bay Bridge to connect
15 Anne Arundel County to the eastern portions of the
16 state. That didn't have to happen. And the
17 district we're looking at in District 3,
18 particularly the indentation in the western part of
19 the state heading north where it narrows, that
20 didn't have to be that way.

21 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you. And just
22 to provide full clarity for the Committee members
23 here. We seem to be focusing on about two of the
24 three compactness score methodologies, even though
25 there's only over 30 measures of compactness. So

1 can you provide any stats on all of these 30
2 measures of compactness?

3 MR. POPPER: No. But I -- no, Madam
4 Chair. I can tell you that the social scientists
5 tended to focus on Polsby-Popper, Reock, sometimes,
6 total perimeter, and sometimes Convex Hull. For the
7 reasons I've given, I don't believe Convex Hull is a
8 very good measure. I do think that there are things
9 captured by Reock that are not captured by Polsby-
10 Popper. I do believe there are things captured by
11 Polsby-Popper that are not captured by Reock. I
12 believe, as a professional in this field, that one
13 should focus on those two measures. But there are
14 many measures, and one can see -- if the chair has
15 any particular one in mind, one can see how they do
16 and don't work. I mean, there's a measure that you
17 look at north south divided by east west. Well,
18 that doesn't see a lot of convolutions that can
19 occur in the middle.

20 The Reock score doesn't necessarily see
21 serrations on a smaller level, while Polsby-Popper
22 does. But the Reock score is particularly good at
23 picking up a district that stretches. And as I
24 pointed out, it is unusual for those two scores to
25 agree to this extent. Usually, the Reock score is

1 more forgiving.

2 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Now, are you aware of
3 which methodology was endorsed by the Supreme Court
4 in the last redistricting cycle?

5 MR. POPPER: We're speaking about the
6 Florida Supreme Court?

7 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Correct.

8 MR. POPPER: I was, Madam Chair. I forget.

9 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: That's fine. Thank you.
10 Keep on going, if that's okay.

11 MR. POPPER: Please.

12 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative
13 Giallombardo, you're recognized in questions? Good?
14 okay.

15 Representative Harding, any questions?

16 REPRESENTATIVE HARDING: Thank you, Madam
17 Chair.

18 And thank you for being here, and I
19 appreciate your experience and expertise you bring.
20 And I would also preface this question by saying I
21 come from a rural part of Florida, where we are the
22 large and long districts or something that we are
23 used to. And it's definitely a different
24 perspective on this.

25 If you view current Congressional

1 District 5 as racially gerrymandered, are you aware
2 of any court decision holding a state constitutional
3 provision that protects minority voting rights that
4 is insufficient to justify the use of race to draw a
5 district?

6 MR. POPPER: Well, no. But I am aware of
7 Miller versus Johnson talking about section two and
8 section five, DS versus Silver talking about section
9 two and section five, Cooper versus Harris talking
10 about section two. And these are federal statutes
11 that didn't do the job under the supremacy clause.
12 I would imagine that the Tier 1, Tier 2 requirements
13 of federal law would be in an even weaker position,
14 but no.

15 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative
16 Hunschofsky, any questions?

17 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Thank you,
18 Madam Chair. I'm not an attorney, so please forgive
19 me in my elementary way of asking this question.
20 You talk about compactness and how important it is
21 from a federal law standpoint. When looking at
22 federal law, in your opinion, is compactness more
23 important than having an equal opportunity
24 representation in our districts?

25 MR. POPPER: I suppose my answer would be

1 that I don't think that they're pitted against each
2 other in the same way that they are under Florida
3 law. Compactness arises in the legal framework --
4 I'm talking about at the tail end of an analysis of
5 a race-based district violates the equal protection
6 clause unless it satisfies strict scrutiny. It
7 satisfies strict scrutiny if there's a compelling
8 justification that is narrowly tailored to achieve
9 its object.

10 And there in the narrow tailoring is where
11 the Supreme Court has said this doesn't work. So
12 they're not aligned in the same sentence or in the
13 same provision as they are in Article III, Section
14 20 of the Florida constitution. So I can't really -
15 - as important is a difficult question.

16 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow up?

17 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Thank you,
18 Madam Chair. So, again, I'm not an attorney, and
19 your focus on compactness is just kind of as a
20 layperson, made me incredibly curious that that
21 seems to be -- and I understand, you know, with your
22 last name and everything -- why it is your focus.
23 But in the reality, we're here, big picture, trying
24 to weigh what is best for the residents of the state
25 of Florida and Florida's representation.

1 You mentioned the term "compelling
2 justification." Do you believe there is a
3 compelling justification to have less access for
4 racial or language minorities to less access and
5 less ability to elect their representatives of
6 choice? You believe there's a compelling
7 justification to have less of that in favor of more
8 compactness?

9 MR. POPPER: Thank you for the question. I
10 think I can address it both as a lawyer and as a
11 non-lawyer. As a lawyer, under Section 2 of the
12 Voting Rights Act, even under Section 5, it is
13 possible to show the strong basis and evidence that
14 permits a compelling justification that, for
15 example, a district drawn to enhance and equalize
16 the opportunity of minority populations to elect
17 their candidates of choice. This is all very much
18 as a lawyer. That can justify a race-based
19 district. It has been held to be that that can
20 happen. I'm saying that it's unlikely to happen
21 with a district that looks like this.

22 As a layperson, I think that's an entirely
23 ambiguous question, just in the sense of 42 percent
24 black voting age population in District 3, or 44
25 percent, as I believe the state's figures. Is that

1 going to lead to more representation of the kind
2 that you're talking about than 10 percent in 4
3 districts? It's not clear, particularly when the 44
4 percent comes from other districts which now have
5 less black population. That's not -- speaking as a
6 non-lawyer, it's not clear -- as a politician, I
7 guess -- it's not clear what that does. So I don't
8 know that -- I wouldn't say that that's a compelling
9 explanation unless it's explained further.

10 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow up?

11 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: I'm not an
12 attorney, but I too am just a regular person. And
13 I'm asking this question because this is the
14 question that we're faced with when we are making
15 these decisions. This is a balancing act, as I
16 think we've heard from everybody. So I ask again,
17 if the two do come into conflict, that what we see
18 is the Tier 1, the opportunity of racial or language
19 minorities to participate in the political process
20 or to diminish their -- we're not allowed to deny
21 their -- or bridge the equal opportunity for racial
22 or language minorities to participate in the
23 political process or to diminish their ability to
24 elect a representative of choice, or districts shall
25 be compact. If the two come in conflict, which wins

1 out in law, in your opinion?

2 MR. POPPER: In law? That's a matter of
3 Florida law. I can't tell you. I don't know, and I
4 think there's some speculation about what the
5 Florida Supreme Court would do with that question.
6 In federal law, the district is in trouble. In
7 federal law, it's not going to come down to that
8 way. And I shouldn't presume to be in your
9 difficult position making these difficult choices,
10 and I don't mean to do that and second guess you on
11 that.

12 When I talk as a politician, I think I'm
13 talking out of turn. I should talk only as a
14 lawyer. And talking as a lawyer, this district is
15 going to have problems in federal court. If I had a
16 client, I would counsel them that way. And it's
17 going to have problems as a question of narrow
18 tailoring. And they, the federal court, are not
19 going to care to the same extent that the Florida
20 Supreme Court cares about Tier 1 and Tier 2.
21 They're going to view it as not narrowly tailored.
22 That's my prediction. Did that answer your
23 question?

24 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Not really,
25 but thank you.

1 MR. POPPER: I would like to answer your
2 question.

3 Madam Chair.

4 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative, you're
5 good? Hunschofsky?

6 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Madam Chair,
7 I've asked my question in several ways, and it's the
8 same answer. So yes, I'm good. Thank you. And I
9 appreciate your indulgence on that.

10 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: That's good. Thank you.
11 Mr. Popper, do you agree that protecting minority
12 voting ability from diminishment is a compelling
13 state interest?

14 MR. POPPER: It can be. Yes. If it's
15 accomplished, Madam Chair, with a narrowly tailored
16 remedy. Yes.

17 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: So in that case, do you
18 believe there should be any minority districts in
19 North Florida, whether protected by state law or
20 federal law?

21 MR. POPPER: Madam Chair, you're asking me
22 to act as a politician. I mean, I think my
23 testimony -- the thing that I am an expert in -- I
24 guess everyone's an expert in their own opinions.
25 But the thing that I am an expert in is traditional

1 districting criteria and narrow tailoring of
2 districts. And there's a problem. It's a difficult
3 weighing the kind of thing you all do.

4 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you.

5 Representative Joseph, any questions?

6 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Madam
7 Chair.

8 So how many compact metrics are there that
9 you're aware of?

10 MR. POPPER: There are a lot,
11 Representative Joseph.

12 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Estimation?

13 MR. POPPER: I believe 20, perhaps, or 30.

14 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: 20 to 30?

15 MR. POPPER: Yeah.

16 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: And some are better
17 than others, correct.

18 MR. POPPER: One is best, but yes.

19 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: The one that you
20 believe is best, I would assume that's yours, yeah?

21 MR. POPPER: It does happen to be that.
22 Yes.

23 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Okay. So since it
24 happens to be that and you believe that it's best,
25 why don't you tell me about some of the -- talk to

1 the Committee about some of the infirmities of that
2 particular method.

3 MR. POPPER: Well, okay. That's an
4 interesting question.

5 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Yes, it is.

6 MR. POPPER: I think what it does is a
7 number of things, and perhaps as I'm discussing what
8 it does, I can pick out the infirmities. What it
9 definitely does is it arrays along a scale, so more
10 is more and less is less. There are some measures
11 of compactness that just don't see certain kinds of
12 contortions. For example, the Reock score, if a
13 district was generally compact but there was a spike
14 oriented down, it would score that as better because
15 the circumscribing circle would be smaller than if
16 that same spike were heading due east. There's no
17 logical reason for that. The person drawing a map
18 who's trying to gerrymander might want the spike to
19 point in any particular direction. That's a problem
20 with the Reock score, but Polsby-Popper doesn't have
21 that problem. That spike score is exactly the same
22 in both scenarios.

23 I suppose focusing on the Reock score, it
24 very much captures when a district is long, when a
25 district is wandering, just the whole district is

1 shooting through the state. Polsby-Popper may not
2 capture that as well. Polsby-Popper captures
3 indentations, and Convex Hull doesn't capture them
4 at all. In my opinion, barely captures them.

5 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you.

6 Follow up?

7 So you compared and contrasted the Reock
8 score with the Polsby-Popper score, what about its
9 infirmities compared to any of the other metrics for
10 compactness that can be used? Are there any other
11 ones that are superior to yours, in your opinion, or
12 that you've heard or heard criticized about that
13 exceed your metric in any way, shape, or form?

14 MR. POPPER: I do not believe so. There's
15 one qualification I would make: no one has perfectly
16 compact districts. It would do -- wreak havoc on
17 political subdivisions, on communities of interest.
18 You can't have a honeycomb of hexagons. We can't be
19 silly about it, but if the minimum district length
20 were perfect, that would be a perfectly compact set
21 of districts. That's the aggregate of all district
22 lines added up the total.

23 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Madam
24 Chair.

25 And thank you for the response. My next

1 question is following up on that. In your opinion,
2 none of the other ones come close to yours, it
3 sounds like, other than, maybe, Reock on that one
4 point of length. To your knowledge, have there been
5 any individuals, entities, organizations, court
6 opinions, policy, folks who have criticized or
7 identified other infirmities in your metric versus
8 the other alternatives.

9 MR. POPPER: No courts. I would say that
10 courts typically rely on Polsby-Popper, Reock, and
11 Convex Hull. And bear in mind, that's what the
12 Florida Legislature has done. So I guess my
13 response as a professional would be that you're very
14 much in the right ballpark. These are the ones that
15 you should be looking at. I know of no court that's
16 criticized Reock or Polsby-Popper, or Convex Hull, I
17 think.

18 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Aside from courts?

19 MR. POPPER: Yeah, they're commentators. I
20 mean, the commentators are all over the map. There
21 are commentators who don't believe that there is
22 such a thing as gerrymandering. Many of them have
23 advised the United States Supreme Court, but there
24 are state courts that think differently. There are
25 commentators that have incredibly complicated

1 mathematical expressions of compactness involving
2 minimum distance from the center of gravity, and
3 then minimum distance from the center of gravity of
4 population. And it can get absurd and certainly
5 well beyond my mathematical abilities. Thank you
6 for allowing me to get this much in the weeds. No
7 one else on earth would want to hear me talk about
8 these things, but I appreciate your interest.

9 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Joseph, if
10 it's okay, we have two more members that want to ask
11 questions. We need to move on.

12 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Sure. Yep.

13 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Perez in
14 questions.

15 REPRESENTATIVE PEREZ: Thank you, Madam
16 Chair. I want to follow up on a question that was
17 asked by Representative Harding that had to do with
18 if there were any State Court decisions that said
19 race could not be used in drawing a district. I
20 think he had asked you that question, I think you
21 had said that you were not aware of any. Assuming
22 that that premise is correct, would it be fair to
23 say that the 14th Amendment would invalidate fair
24 district amendments, specifically the prohibition on
25 not diminishing the ability of minority communities

1 to elect a candidate of their choice. And if it
2 doesn't -- assuming that that isn't true, if it does
3 not, then why is complying with the Florida
4 constitution not a compelling state interest?

5 MR. POPPER: It absolutely can be a
6 compelling state interest, just as it could have
7 been when it was operative, the compelling state
8 interest to comply with and enforce Section 5 of the
9 Voting Rights Act. It could be. It depends on the
10 remedy.

11 The remedy has to be narrowly tailored. I
12 do not suggest, and my testimony is not to suggest
13 that the Fair Districts amendment would be
14 unconstitutional in all its applications. It
15 absolutely wouldn't. It could justify a race-based
16 district. It could. My testimony is just that it
17 doesn't, not with this district.

18 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Representative Davis in
19 questions?

20 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you. Kind of
21 a sidebar. Thank you, Madam Chair.

22 You mentioned earlier, as I was noting,
23 that you reside in Maryland.

24 MR. POPPER: I do.

25 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: And so you were

1 offered or told you would be compensated your flight
2 and hotel by the Governor's office, correct?

3 MR. POPPER: That's right.

4 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Could you just tell
5 me, and I'm just curious, how often are you invited
6 to states to testify on the redistricting process
7 itself by a Governor?

8 MR. POPPER: This would be the first.

9 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Follow up?

10 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you, Madam
11 Chair.

12 Is that unusual, in your opinion, to be
13 asked to come and testify about a redistricting
14 process that you've heard my colleagues say that
15 we're trying to keep this as transparent as
16 possible. Is this unusual, in your opinion, for a
17 Governor's office to reach out to you to testify on
18 the redistricting process itself?

19 MR. POPPER: Representative, I don't
20 believe so. I've testified on other bills, not
21 redistricting, other voting bills and other
22 legislatures, including every Judicial Watch,
23 including Pennsylvania. But I am a person who can
24 offer expert testimony on this district, and so I
25 believe it would have been logical to think of me.

1 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Final question. Chair
2 Sirois.

3 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,
4 Madam Chair.

5 Sir, in your written testimony that you
6 provided, that I had an opportunity to read earlier
7 this morning, I think you said that Florida's non-
8 diminishment standard protects only majority-
9 minority districts. What is your strongest legal
10 authority for that proposition? And didn't the
11 Florida Supreme Court say the exact opposite in its
12 first apportionment decision in 2012?

13 MR. POPPER: Thank you. And forgive me,
14 could you read back to me what I said again? I
15 don't recall that.

16 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: I don't have it in front
17 of me, sir, but it's your written testimony that you
18 provided this morning.

19 MR. POPPER: And if I made a representation
20 about what the Florida Supreme Court would do; is
21 that correct? I'm not --

22 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Yes, that's correct. In
23 your written testimony.

24 MR. POPPER: I don't recall that. I should
25 not have been opining about what the Florida Supreme

1 Court would do. May I have a look at my testimony?
2 Or is that not fruitful?

3 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you. We're going
4 to try to move on a little bit so we can get through
5 all public testimony and debate. So we appreciate
6 you being here. Thank you so much.

7 MR. POPPER: Thank you for having me.
8 Thank you, Madam Chair.

9 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: All right. Next up,
10 Michael Johnson. Is he here? He's a proponent of
11 the bill. Miranda Galindo? And, Members, as a
12 reminder, we have about seven public appearance
13 cards left, and we need time for a debate. So just
14 keep that in mind.

15 You're recognized.

16 MS. GALINDO: Good morning. Miranda
17 Galindo for Latino Justice, PRLDEF. Thank you for
18 your hard work this redistricting season and for the
19 opportunity to present our opposition to the
20 proposed map, which unfairly represents your
21 constituents.

22 Florida's booming Latino population is
23 underrepresented. The 2020 census counted nearly
24 one and a half million more Latinos in Florida than
25 it did a decade ago, and common sense dictates that

1 a protected class comprising over a quarter of
2 Florida's total population should enjoy a fair
3 number of Latino majority districts. In 2010,
4 Latinos comprised about 22 percent of Florida's
5 total population and have grown substantially over
6 the last decade to now comprise over 26 percent of
7 Florida's total population. While Latinos now
8 represent over a quarter of Florida's total
9 population, only 14.2 percent of the congressional
10 seats proposed in Map H-8011 are majority Hispanic
11 voting age population districts. In contrast, non-
12 Hispanic white Floridians are approximately 53
13 percent of Florida's total population but are a
14 majority voting age population and 64 percent of the
15 congressional districts in H-8011.

16 The redistricting process should mitigate,
17 not exacerbate, the injustice of desperately low
18 Latino political power. Congress passed the Voting
19 Rights Act of 1965 to protect our democratic process
20 from racial discrimination, and I'd like to note
21 that the Voting Rights Act exists in harmony with
22 the equal protection clause of the United States
23 Constitution.

24 Florida Legislature is entrusted with
25 enforcing this landmark Civil Rights Law to combat

1 discriminatory practices that have historically
2 disenfranchised black, brown, and indigenous
3 Floridians, including English-only electoral
4 practices, all-white primaries in malapportionment,
5 all of which undermined the ability of racial and
6 language minorities to elect their candidates of
7 choice. The Voting Rights Act requires that where
8 Latino majority districts may be drawn feasibly and
9 consistent with Section 2, they must be drawn.

10 First, we urge the House to create an
11 additional Latino opportunity district in Central
12 Florida, which is supported by the census data.
13 Such a district would accurately reflect demographic
14 changes and provide districts that are more aligned
15 with the true voting strength of Latino Floridians.

16 Second, while proposed Congressional
17 District 9 create one new Latino majority district,
18 the House has drawn it with a barest Latino
19 majorities. The Hispanic voting age population is
20 only 50.06 percent. We urge the House to strengthen
21 the slim Latino majority in CD 9, a region that
22 accounts for some of the greatest Latino population
23 growth over the last 10 years.

24 Without an additional opportunity district
25 in Central Florida and a more robust Latino majority

1 in CD 9, H-8011 fails to meaningfully account for
2 the substantial Latino population growth that
3 largely fueled Florida's receipt of an additional
4 congressional seat after the 2020 Census. Census
5 data does not support the creation of additional
6 white majority districts. That benchmark map had 17
7 white majority voting age population districts, and
8 H-8011 increases that number to 18. This is
9 fundamentally unfair.

10 District maps generally violate Section 2,
11 where they crack or fragment minority voters among
12 several districts, where black voting majority can
13 routinely outvote them. The House has a duty to
14 evaluate how to avoid cracking geographically
15 compact Latino populations, yet H-8011 cracks many
16 more Latino communities than the Senate's adopted
17 map, Senate Plan H-8060. The first egregious
18 example of H-8011 cracking is proposed Congressional
19 Districts 14 and 15, which split them Latino
20 populations in Hillsborough and Pasco County, near
21 the (Indiscernible) City Riverbend area.

22 In contrast, the Senate's adopted plan and
23 the benchmark map kept these communities whole. H-
24 8011 also unnecessarily cracks Latino communities in
25 Hendry and Collier counties. In contrast, the

1 Senate's adopted plan and the benchmark map largely
2 kept these communities whole.

3 Similarly, H-8011 unnecessarily cracks
4 black communities compared to the Senate's adopted
5 plan. The most egregious example is the dismantling
6 of Congressional District 10, a benchmark district
7 in Orlando, which a geographically compact
8 population of black voters have had an opportunity
9 to elect candidates of choice. We urge the House to
10 avoid cracking Orlando's black community across
11 three separate congressional districts, as was
12 achieved in the Senate's adopted plan.

13 We call upon the House to exercise its duty
14 to keep black and Latino communities whole where
15 possible, and we know this is possible because the
16 Senate's adopted plan did a better job of it.
17 Latino Justice reiterates its request for meaningful
18 opportunities for public participation in the form
19 of improved language access services, virtual
20 participation options for public hearings, and
21 regional public hearings outside of Tallahassee.
22 Floridians who are limited English proficient
23 impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and reside far
24 away from Tallahassee are no less deserving of
25 having their voices heard in this forum.

1 We have repeatedly asked for translation of
2 the forms to submit public input in the "get
3 involved portion" of the floridaredistricting.gov
4 website. The willful failure to provide these
5 minimal, yet fundamental, translations is an
6 inexcusable obstacle for your limited English-
7 proficient constituents and deprives the Legislature
8 and the redistricting process of complete
9 information on protected communities.

10 Finally, the earlier mention of performance
11 analysis data held by outside counsel but
12 unavailable to the members of this Committee and
13 unavailable to the public undermines the ability for
14 a meaningful public and your representatives'
15 evaluation of this map's compliance with anti-
16 discrimination laws. We urge this Subcommittee to
17 release it immediately. Where more information
18 exists, why hide it? Thank you.

19 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you for being here.
20 David Trotti. You're recognized.

21 MR. TROTTI: Good morning. My name is
22 David Trotti, and thank you for allowing me to speak
23 in front of you this morning. I'm a resident of
24 Jacksonville, Florida, but my physical office and my
25 residence is in District 3. I am here today to

1 speak on behalf of what I do in my spare time, which
2 is represent veterans. I'm the chairman of the
3 Veterans Council of Duval County. That is a
4 Committee that was born of a mayor's executive order
5 since 1986. Since 2016, I was the vice chairman,
6 and since 2020, I was Chairman.

7 There are over 80,000 veterans in Duval
8 County alone. In St. Johns, Nassau, they count as a
9 120,000. So the mass of veterans are in the east
10 side of the state, surrounding Jacksonville. I
11 believe it's only about 15,000 veterans in Leon
12 County and 3400 in Gadsden County. What we need is
13 we need representation in Jacksonville, Duval County
14 area that's going to be there, boots on the ground,
15 to hear what veterans need in Duval County.

16 In District 4, Councilman Rutherford, he's
17 there. He's present. He's at our meetings. I'm
18 not speaking that Al Lawson doesn't do things for
19 veterans. That's not what I'm here about. It's
20 like having a football team in the Super Bowl for
21 your defensive coordinator or for the front team,
22 and it's not at your practices. So I implore you to
23 reconsider the consolidation of District 3. Let
24 Duval County, Jacksonville, stay consolidated as
25 one, or -- I believe the Governor has created a new

1 district. I only saw that on Facebook a couple of
2 days ago. And I was asking some of my veteran
3 friends, what do you think about having Jacksonville
4 and Duval County as one district? I think it will
5 benefit veterans. We're talking about
6 consolidation, best interest of our residents, and
7 things we have to consider. I think we have to
8 consider the best interests of Jacksonville, Duval
9 County in that redistricting. Thank you.

10 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you for being here.
11 Jasmine Burney with Equal Ground Action
12 Fund. You're recognized.

13 MS. BURNEY: Thank you. Good morning,
14 everyone. I'd like to first say thank you all so
15 much for following the lead of the Supreme Court and
16 moving forward with a map drawing process that you
17 have all been constitutionally tasked to do so with.

18 Second, again, my name is Jasmine Burney-
19 Clark. I am the founder and director of Equal
20 Ground Education and Action Fund. We are created to
21 advocate for the voting rights of black voters,
22 specifically, along the I-4 corridor. We work to
23 register, educate, and mobilize black voters. We
24 were founded in 2019, and that's important because
25 it's two cycles after CD 10 was created and because

1 we were established to help break the barriers
2 facing black voters as we witnessed the acts of
3 voter suppression across the state of Florida.

4 Suppression tactics in the form of
5 legislation signed into law by this Governor and
6 other Governors in past years that have been proven
7 to diminish the black voter turnout. I'm also here
8 as a resident of CD 10. I ask that you learn from
9 the lessons of 2016 and don't make the same mistakes
10 that led to the redrawing of maps due to misconduct
11 and gerrymandering. I also ask that you follow the
12 lead of the Senate when it comes to preserving CD 10
13 under the Tier 1 status or, as Rep Joseph pointed
14 out earlier, of the possibility of placing it under
15 Tier 2 standards in future iterations.

16 This district only provides election
17 performance for less than a decade compared to the
18 other districts designed with similar makeup. And
19 so the general election book closing data, that I
20 had a chance to look up on black voters in Orange
21 County where they are largely situated in CD 10, saw
22 an increase in voter registration actually from
23 2016, 2018, and 2020 despite the turnout that
24 decreased as those years proceeded. So the will of
25 the resident is to elect someone who represents them

1 in their district. However, it's not something that
2 they are opposed to. It does, however, appear that
3 the laws in this state have made it difficult for
4 them to actually access the ballot box.

5 So I ask that you give CD 10 and the voters
6 of CD 10 the same fighting chance over the course of
7 the next decade without diluting the voting power
8 before you've been given a decade of data to
9 accurately prove otherwise. I am in opposition of
10 the current iteration of this map, and I thank you
11 for your time.

12 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you for being here.
13 Kristen -- I apologize, Folulee (phonetic)?

14 MS. FORLULEE: (Indiscernible)

15 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you for being here.
16 Genesis Robinson?

17 GENESIS ROBINSON: (Indiscernible).

18 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you for being here.
19 Pastor Marcus McCoy with Equal Ground as
20 well.

21 PASTOR MCCOY: (Indiscernible).

22 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you for being here.
23 Cecile Scoon with the League of Women
24 Voters of Florida.

25 MS. SCOON: Good morning. My name is

1 Cecile Scoon. I'm president of the League of Women
2 Voters of Florida, and I've been listening intently
3 to the testimony and the questioning that the
4 members have had. It's been a very robust debate
5 and conversation.

6 I have my own comments, but I also wanted
7 to speak to some of the comments that Mr. Popper
8 made. And if you listen very carefully to what
9 Mr. Popper said, he admitted to you under your
10 questioning which was very thorough, he had no case
11 to point to to support his comments. He could not
12 point to one case on point. He literally stated to
13 you that the analysis of narrowly construing and
14 protecting minority access districts did not appear
15 in the same sentence. He literally is taking
16 ingredients for salad and mixing them up in a bowl
17 and says, oop, I like this new salad. There is no
18 case law. The United States Supreme Court and,
19 certainly, the Florida Supreme Court has not
20 supported, in any way, the statements that were made
21 before you today. When you questioned him, he
22 backed up and said, no, I don't have a case. Oh,
23 but there is some other things that we're
24 discussing, some other parameters. Well, we
25 lawyers, we call that dicta, and those of us who

1 practice in court, which I do, I know that to build
2 my case on dicta, that does not directly support the
3 contention that I'm trying to make before the Court,
4 I'm just burning my client's money and time. Dicta
5 that you mix up in a bowl, that does not even occur
6 in the same sentence, does not support going against
7 the well understood analysis of the Voting Rights
8 Act Section 2 and our Fair Districts.

9 Remember the point of our Fair Districts,
10 we basically poured Section 2 into our Tier 1. So
11 there is a lot of closeness to our Tier 1 and
12 Section 2. And it literally says -- and the case
13 law when you deal with race, whether it be in
14 employment matters, where I would consider myself
15 somewhat of an expert on employment discrimination,
16 the analysis is the same when you're dealing with
17 race, when you're dealing with women. Because when
18 our nation started, there were only two groups that
19 were held down in writing. Women were considered
20 Chattel. They could not vote when our nation
21 started, and people of African descent were three-
22 fifths of a person. Because in our founding
23 documents we started that way, as our nation grew,
24 and we tried to make real this concept of equal
25 rights, their concept of strict scrutiny came about.

1 And it said, because prior to that time, the laws
2 were against women, the laws held women down and
3 blacks down, so the law came out strict scrutiny.
4 When you have a law that touches those groups
5 because they started out under the heel of our
6 government, you have to have strict scrutiny. If so
7 the idea of --

8 VICE TUCK CHAIR: Ms. Scoon.

9 MS. SCOON: Yes, ma'am.

10 THE COURT: We appreciate the passion but
11 if we could bring it back to the comments of the
12 bill --

13 MS. SCOON: I just wanted to clarify -- and
14 I thank you for getting me back on point. The point
15 is the strict scrutiny thing is not the way Mr.
16 Popper said it. It's because of the history of
17 using it against these groups. So it says when you
18 use strict scrutiny -- when you deal with race and
19 you deal with gender also, you have the government
20 needs to do it properly and narrowly. So we have
21 our guidelines in our Fair Districts. We have our
22 guidelines in our Voting Rights Act, and they were
23 written in a way that you could use strict scrutiny
24 to create the proper districts. And by taking into
25 consideration the Gingles elements which are laid

1 out in the Supreme Court, as laid out. That is
2 their methodology to doing the strict scrutiny. So
3 it's not like, we're taking race into consideration.
4 Are we being discriminatory? It's because you're
5 trying to remedy a historical problem, and you need
6 to do it following the guidelines. And so taking
7 into consideration the ability of a minority,
8 racial, or language group to be able to select a
9 representative of their choice is not being
10 discriminatory. And I have a few more comments that
11 I wanted to -- I just wanted to address some of the
12 things that he had said, and thank you for that.

13 The League would support the maintenance of
14 Congressional District 10, for reasons testified to
15 by Latino justice and Equal Ground and some of the
16 issues raised by some of your own representatives.
17 We believe that the voting record and the voting age
18 population and how they have actually functionally
19 performed demonstrates that the capacity for that
20 district to select a represent a representative of
21 their choice, who is African-American, they have
22 demonstrated that, and there's nothing like history,
23 you know, to show you that they can do that. So
24 that district, we contend should be maintained.

25 I also wanted to point out that the United

1 States Supreme Court in the Rucho v. Common Cause
2 case, literally phrased Florida and literally quoted
3 our Fair Districts in a footnote. And because at
4 the case, the people were going to the federal
5 government to the United States Supreme Court, and
6 they were saying, help me. This particular state or
7 the Governor is doing political gerrymandering. Can
8 the federal government step in? And Rucho said,
9 hey, the federal government is not laying out these
10 guidelines. The State has the capacity to, and they
11 cited Florida. And they told the rest of the
12 states, if you want guidelines in your state
13 constitution, to protect against political
14 gerrymandering, literally do what Fair Districts
15 says. And this was established in the Supreme
16 Court, I mean, our Florida Supreme Court case that
17 everyone's been talking about in 2015. And they
18 literally said Florida's Fair Districts' amendments
19 are clear. They are enforceable. And if other
20 states want to protect against political
21 gerrymandering, look and do what Florida has done.
22 They held us out to the rest of the nation. So our
23 Fair Districts were looked at by our United States
24 Supreme Court. Our Fair Districts were approved by
25 our United States Supreme Court. So whatever

1 Mr. Popper was trying to tell you that our Fair
2 Districts don't stand up to muster, the Supreme
3 Court has looked at us. They've held us out as an
4 example to the rest of the world.

5 And finally, I said that we have done a
6 good job, and I'm proud of us for that. And the
7 last thing I wanted to like to say is we would also
8 like to be able to see the analysis that the outside
9 legal counsel has been doing with regards to data
10 analysis, that was utilized in providing legal
11 advice and assistance to you. Thank you very much.

12 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you for being here.

13 Members, we are going to be going into the
14 debate. We have about 35 minutes left. We need to
15 give Chair Sirois an opportunity to close and vote,
16 so please keep that in mind.

17 With that said, any members wishing to
18 debate?

19 Representative Harding, you're recognized.

20 REPRESENTATIVE HARDING: Thank you, ma'am
21 Chair. And first, I want to commend you today.
22 You've done a great job and also Chair Sirois. And
23 the way that you've conducted this whole process,
24 it's been very educational. And I think that it's
25 probably the most awesome responsibility that we

1 have as a legislator and pretty unique that we get
2 to be a part of it here in our first term. You
3 know, I've stated it earlier in one of my questions,
4 but I come from a rural part of Florida where we
5 have really large districts, and it's interesting --
6 and part of the educational part of this Committee
7 is listening on questions of districts that are
8 obviously much smaller than the areas that I come
9 from and that I see. But it's an interesting banter
10 that I've learnt.

11 I'm going to support what is coming out of
12 this Committee today with this map, and I'm going to
13 do it for two reasons. Number one, I trust and
14 believe this Committee, and I think that the product
15 that we have proposed. And, number two, I trust the
16 process that this is the first Committee stop, and
17 there will be a process. And I think that, you
18 know, as we've heard today, I would say on both
19 sides of this issue, there's always room for
20 improvement and discussion.

21 And I have full confidence in you, Chair,
22 and then also Chair Leek, that as this moves
23 forward, any things that are necessary or changes
24 that are needed will be addressed. I look forward
25 to supporting the map, and again, I want to thank

1 all of you that have been a part of creating this.

2 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you, Representative
3 Harding.

4 Ranking member Skidmore on debate?

5 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you, Madam
6 Chair.

7 I too want to thank all the Committee
8 members for being so engaged in this process. It's
9 been a little bit challenging and the work product
10 that we have today is one that we do hope will
11 change and be amended throughout the process so that
12 at some point along the way, we will be able to
13 support it.

14 I will say also that Mr. Popper almost
15 convinced me to vote for it in his testimony, but I
16 will be voting no today because there are still some
17 major concerns that we have in Central Florida and
18 in South Florida as well. And we know that this is
19 just the beginning point of this process. It is
20 nice.

21 We are happy to finally have a map that we
22 can discuss and appreciate the pause that was taken
23 to make sure we were all on the right track moving
24 forward. So I will be a no vote today, but I do
25 also love and respect and admire the legislative

1 process that allows us to start at a point where we
2 might be in disagreement and at a point where we are
3 all on the same page. So I'm looking forward to
4 that process.

5 Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Ma'am
6 Chair.

7 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Thank you, Ranking
8 Member.

9 Any other members?

10 Representative Brown?

11 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Madam
12 Chair, and thank you, Chair Sirois, for your
13 continuous conversations relating to the maps that
14 we see today but also those that we've workshopped
15 in the past. I thank you for the open process and
16 for your continuous openness to sit down to hear
17 many of my concerns.

18 And I think I have been -- you know, I've
19 said several times just the concerns I have with CD
20 10 among other areas and just again questioning what
21 we were able to see, well, based off of my own
22 knowledge and understanding of that particular
23 community and those boundary make ups but also how
24 we weren't able to get to it, but it seems as though
25 the next chamber was able to see or have a different

1 opinion. And so it would be -- my ask, I will be a
2 no today, but just with the confidence that myself
3 along with staff and you to sort of sit down to sort
4 of figure out a different configuration of this
5 particular benchmark district.

6 Thank you again, and I appreciate staff and
7 Kelly. But I look forward to, you know, being able
8 to see it in a different way once it goes to the
9 full Committee. So thank you again, just for the
10 process and your understanding of my concerns, and I
11 look forward to working with you to see how we
12 rectify some of those issues. Thank you.

13 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Ex-officio Davis in
14 debate.

15 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: Thank you, Chair, and
16 I won't be long because I definitely want to give
17 the time to Chair to make this close. But I do want
18 to thank my colleagues for allowing me to be a part
19 of the Committee today. But I definitely didn't
20 know that CD 3 on this map would be a focus of
21 conversation. I appreciate the questions that was
22 asked of the person testifying, but one of the
23 speakers made the statement, and I actually wrote
24 the note myself. There was through all of those
25 suggestions that the gentleman was making, he

1 provided us with actually no functional analysis to
2 illustrate any of the testimony that he was sharing
3 with us. And, Chair Sirois, that's why I was going
4 back and forth with you with that functional
5 analysis versus the performance analysis, to just
6 make sure I was clear with that.

7 So with that, as you've heard from my
8 colleagues, there are concerns with CD 10 because
9 the House is not in the same position as the Senate
10 with that District. I know we can get to the middle
11 and find a common ground with that. But I am glad
12 that in both of these maps, we do have an existence
13 of CD 3 in our map and CD 5 over in, I think, the
14 Senate map, and I would like to make sure I'm on
15 record to state that I appreciate wholeheartedly
16 that district being protected and being seen in both
17 maps and that we are not following the lead of an
18 administration who obviously has a different
19 mindset. So just wanted to put that on record.

20 Today, I will be down on this map just
21 because simply I know we still have work to do. And
22 I know the two Houses we'll get together and produce
23 maps that we eventually, hopefully, all can agree
24 on. So with that, I'll turn it back over to Chair
25 to close, and we get on our way. But today I will

1 be a no vote just because I know there's still work
2 to be done. Thank you.

3 Representative Joseph in debate.

4 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: Thank you, Madam
5 Chair.

6 Let me say that I'm grateful to be in a
7 country that has certain constitutional protections
8 and provisions, where we have a form of government
9 where there are checks and balances, and there is a
10 separation of powers. And the Legislature has its
11 function, and the Executive branch has its function.
12 And they're not the same. Our job is to handle
13 these maps. It is highly unusual for a Governor to
14 do what our Governor has been doing.

15 I look forward to ultimately getting to a
16 point where we have some maps that we all can be
17 proud of, and I'm hopeful that we can work towards
18 that. And we've had some good conversations to get
19 that started, and we'd heard some testimony to help
20 guide us along that path. I still have my
21 reservations about CD 10 and the things we talked
22 about. We're going to work that through the
23 process, but that's literally our job. Like, that's
24 what we're here to do is to work through that
25 process. So I'm grateful for the opportunity to do

1 what the people elected us to do.

2 My question for the Chair, if he would be
3 so kind as to address in debate if possible, is:
4 we've heard a lot of testimony, and we've gotten
5 some public feedback. But as we're continuing to
6 cook the cake or bake the cake out, I would say,
7 what is the best way to get the input from the
8 public to staff without exposing members to any
9 issues? I'm still a little unclear about how that
10 is ideally supposed to work in a way that does not
11 expose anybody to anything.

12 So there were some comments made, like I
13 want to know more about what's going on in 14 and 15
14 with respect to Latino districts. I can kind of
15 just put it out there in the ether for them to send
16 those stuff. But I want to figure out what's the
17 best way to do that so that we can communicate that
18 with staffs as we continue working on these maps.
19 So that's my question, and I thank you all for your
20 service.

21 Representative Hunschofsky in debate.

22 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: Thank you,
23 Madam Chair. And I'd first like to compliment you
24 on navigating this meeting so well. Never been in a
25 meeting like this one today, and I think you did a

1 great job. And I appreciate that.

2 I've appreciated learning in this process.

3 I didn't realize there was as much to learn when I
4 originally got assigned to this Subcommittee. I
5 also appreciate the focus on cities being kept
6 whole. That has been important to me, and there has
7 been improvement in that area. I do still think
8 there is more room for improvement in this map, as
9 we've heard from my colleagues, and I do look
10 forward to the process continuing with the inclusion
11 of all these concerns that we've heard today from
12 members of the Subcommittee to make the map the best
13 map that can be. So thank you.

14 Additional members in debate?

15 Seeing none, Chair Sirois, you're
16 recognized to close on the PCB.

17 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Thank you very much,
18 Madam Chair.

19 Members, I want to thank you for your
20 questions and your time and attention this morning
21 and over the previous weeks. Some of you have said
22 redistricting might be the most complicated of all
23 of our constitutional duties both as a body and,
24 certainly, as individual members, and I want to say
25 I share that as well. It's a historic task. It's

1 one that happens every 10 years, and I'm personally
2 honored to have had the opportunity to work with all
3 of you through it.

4 The process, as you know, requires us to
5 set personal interests aside. We had a lot to
6 learn. The external pressures are significant.
7 When it comes to our communities and neighborhoods,
8 emotions run high. But this process requires us to
9 follow the law, follow the law, specifically our
10 Tier 1 and Tier 2 constitutional standards. And I
11 want to mention, you know, I enjoy so much working
12 with Representative Hunschofsky because I've learned
13 that she has a way about her where she can just cut
14 to the heart of the matter, and I think she did that
15 today with her question.

16 And I just wanted to -- I felt compelled
17 after hearing your question, Representative, to go
18 back to where we started our Committee meetings,
19 with a review of our constitutional standards, Tier
20 1 and Tier 2. "No apportionment plan or individual
21 districts shall be drawn with the interest of favor
22 or disfavor a political party or incumbent.
23 Districts shall not be drawn with the intent or
24 result of denying or abridging the equal opportunity
25 of racial or language minorities to participate in

1 the political process or diminish their ability to
2 elect a representative of their choice. Districts
3 shall consist of contiguous territory." And then we
4 move on to Tier 2. "Districts shall be as nearly
5 equal in population as practical. Districts shall
6 be compact. District shall where feasible utilizing
7 existing political and geographical boundaries

8 We have to follow the law. Representative
9 Joseph, I appreciate your questions about receiving
10 that input, and I would remind Committee members
11 that we continue to be the vehicle for that input.
12 Those information, if there's something that you
13 hear, if there's something that you think adds to
14 the process, I encourage you to bring it forward.
15 But you have to be prepared, as we have said
16 consistently from the beginning of this process, to
17 disclose who brought it to you and be prepared to
18 back it up.

19 Individuals out there who wish to provide
20 input and feedback on this process have the ability
21 to do so, floridaredistricting.gov, where nearly 100
22 individuals have utilized the website to create and
23 to submit maps of their own. In January, we noticed
24 a two-hour meeting to accept public input in
25 addition to public input at each of our meetings,

1 where we have received testimony. As elected
2 members of this House of Representatives, it is our
3 constitutional duty and responsibility to present
4 the views of our constituents in the conduct of
5 their business.

6 Members, you're going to have an
7 opportunity as you have had today throughout our
8 Committee meetings, at Chair Leeks Committee, on the
9 floor, when we reconciled with the Senate throughout
10 this process. You will have an opportunity to
11 provide that input, and I encourage you to get with
12 me and Chair Leek if there is something on your
13 mind. But we have to follow law. And once again, I
14 want to read to you the first line from the 2012
15 Supreme Court ruling that I started today's
16 presentation with. And this is what the Court said
17 then, "A review of the House plan and the record
18 reveals that the House engage in a consistent and
19 reasoned approach." Members, we hit that mark
20 again. We hit that mark again, and I'm proud of
21 this Committee's work product.

22 Now, as I said, our PCB is going to work
23 through the normal process, just like any other
24 bill, and this PCB is going to move on to the Full
25 Redistricting Committee, where the conversation that

1 we started weeks ago will continue with our
2 colleagues. If you have further policy points for
3 discussion, please, please, Members, don't wait.
4 Get with me and Chair Leek, and we are happy to hear
5 you and to continue this conversation. But,
6 Members, I want to assuage any doubt that may be in
7 front of you today. This is a legally sound map.
8 It's a constitutionally compliant map. Please join
9 me in voting yes.

10 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Chair Sirois having
11 closed, Members, please remember to turn on your
12 mics when you vote.

13 DJ, please call the roll on PCB CRS 22-01
14 and announced the vote.

15 THE SECRETARY: Chair Sirois?

16 CHAIRMAN SIROIS: Yes

17 THE SECRETARY: Representative Benjamin has
18 been excused.

19 Brown?

20 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: No.

21 THE SECRETARY: Fabricio?

22 REPRESENTATIVE FABRICIO: Yes.

23 THE SECRETARY: Fetterhoff?

24 REPRESENTATIVE FETTERHOFF: Yes.

25 THE SECRETARY: Giallombardo?

1 REPRESENTATIVE GIALLOMBARDO: Yes.

2 THE SECRETARY: Harding?

3 REPRESENTATIVE HARDING: Yes.

4 THE SECRETARY: Hunschofky?

5 REPRESENTATIVE HUNSCHOFSKY: No.

6 THE SECRETARY: Joseph?

7 REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH: No.

8 THE SECRETARY: Maggard?

9 REPRESENTATIVE MAGGARD: Yes.

10 THE SECRETARY: Massullo has been excused.

11 McClure?

12 REPRESENTATIVE MCCLURE: Yes.

13 THE SECRETARY: Morales?

14 REPRESENTATIVE MORALES: No.

15 THE SECRETARY: Perez?

16 REPRESENTATIVE PEREZ: Yes.

17 THE SECRETARY: Plakon?

18 REPRESENTATIVE PLAKON: Yes.

19 THE SECRETARY: Silvers?

20 REPRESENTATIVE SILVERS? No.

21 THE SECRETARY: Skidmore?

22 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: No.

23 THE SECRETARY: Toledo?

24 REPRESENTATIVE TOLEDO: Yes.

25 THE SECRETARY: Trabulsy?

1 REPRESENTATIVE TRABULSY: Yes.

2 THE SECRETARY: Tuck?

3 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Yes.

4 THE SECRETARY: Williamson?

5 REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMSON: Yes.

6 THE SECRETARY: Ex-officio Clemons?

7 REPRESENTATIVE CLEMONS: Yes.

8 THE SECRETARY: Ex-officio Davis?

9 REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: No.

10 THE SECRETARY: 14 yeas, 7 nays, Madam
11 Chair.

12 VICE-CHAIR TUCK: Show the PCB reported
13 favorably. Now, I'll pass the gavel back to Chair
14 Sirois.

15 CHAIR SIROIS: Thank you very much,
16 Members. I'd like to thank all the members of the
17 public that provided input today and the members of
18 the Committee for your questions as well.

19 I particularly want to thank Vice-Chair
20 Tuck. You did an outstanding job, and I've been
21 proud to have you as my vice chair throughout this
22 process.

23 As a reminder, the proposed congressional
24 map has another Committee stop in the Full
25 Redistricting Committee. If you have any questions

1 for myself, or Chair Leek, or staff, I encourage you
2 to reach out to us. As this is most likely our last
3 Subcommittee meeting, I'd like to thank
4 Speaker Sprowls and Chair Leek and the Committee
5 members for this tremendous honor to lead you
6 through this process.

7 I'd also like to thank our redistricting
8 staff, Leda, Jason, Sam, Karen, DJ, for your help in
9 and your accommodation for this rookie chairman.
10 It's been a pleasure to work with you, our ranking
11 member as well. Thank you very much.

12 That concludes our Committee meeting agenda
13 for today. Representative Perez moves that we rise
14 without objection.

15 (END OF VIDEO RECORDING)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST

I certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the digital recording provided to me in this matter.

I do further certify that I am neither a relative, nor employee, nor attorney of any of the parties to this action, and that I am not financially interested in the action.



Julie Thompson, CET-1036

A	78:19 85:4	44:12 64:1	107:7 117:17	82:17,18
abilities 100:5	account 5:8 7:15	69:13 74:9	agenda 134:12	100:24 118:18
ability 11:16	48:19 49:3	129:25	aggregate 64:19	American 73:12
13:15 20:14	107:1	additional 5:12	98:21	amount 18:21
22:17 23:8	accountability	14:2 29:24	aggression 25:10	19:1
27:22 28:21	72:20	30:19,24 33:14	ago 7:16 20:21	analog 82:21
30:17 31:19	accounted 40:14	33:15 35:11	51:5 73:19	analog s 83:1
39:14 46:11	43:4	37:7 50:24 55:2	81:12 104:25	analyses 51:16
47:25 48:22	accounts 106:22	58:22 63:1 66:3	111:2 131:1	analysis 8:4,22
60:16 61:10,14	accurate 32:8,25	71:11 106:11	agree 43:9 65:14	8:25 11:2,11
61:22,23 76:20	135:3	106:24 107:3,5	74:13,14 82:13	12:1,2 13:13
78:15 84:1,6	accurately 74:20	127:14	83:24 84:4	20:13 22:16
85:15 92:5	106:13 113:9	additionally	88:25 95:11	23:6 25:14,16
93:23 95:12	achieve 15:23	23:16 27:2	124:23	25:20,23 26:14
100:25 106:5	20:25 57:12	32:18 33:3	agreeing 35:23	26:18 27:13
109:13 117:7	64:2 91:8	address 37:16	ahead 13:6	29:8 32:4,5,9
129:1,20	achieved 108:12	92:10 117:11	Airport 40:18	33:8 41:13 48:9
able 9:11,19 10:6	achieves 12:19	126:3	al 1:2 110:18	48:11 50:21
10:9 14:11,22	13:25 17:4,13	addressed 120:24	Alachua 15:6,10	51:11,12,18
16:20 19:22	20:4 41:23	adds 16:25	aligned 91:12	52:9,19,22
20:15 27:20	acknowledge	129:13	106:14	53:10,10 54:1,3
30:20,22 35:8	73:10	administration	alignment 6:10	54:4,11,23 59:6
37:16 54:5,12	acknowledged	124:18	8:16 34:23	59:7,14,14,20
57:12 58:5	73:9	admire 121:25	72:13	59:24,25 60:1,2
61:19 117:8	acquire 19:21	admitted 114:9	all-white 106:4	60:15,19 61:12
119:8 121:12	act 62:5,15,20	adopted 107:16	allow 83:21	65:4,22 85:13
122:21,24,25	75:22 82:23	107:22 108:1,4	allowed 71:21,24	86:3 91:4
123:7	84:17 92:12	108:12,16	93:20	109:11 114:13
abnormal 68:10	93:15 95:22	advanced 52:21	allowing 19:20	115:7,16 119:8
abridge 11:13	101:9 105:19	53:9	27:21 59:1	119:10 124:1,5
abridging 128:24	105:21 106:7	advice 6:8 8:15	100:6 109:22	124:5
absolutely 55:10	115:8 116:22	119:11	123:18	analyze 26:25
101:5,15	action 111:11,20	advised 99:23	allows 10:11	Anne 87:15
absorbing 80:20	135:7,8	advising 53:12	122:1	announced
absurd 100:4	acts 112:2	advisory 5:1,10	alludes 60:15	131:14
accept 129:24	ad 70:13	advocate 111:21	alluding 61:8	answer 36:11
acceptable 11:2	add 32:13 37:4	affect 46:11 75:4	alternative 43:10	49:25 50:18,18
access 92:3,4	40:5 41:2,8	86:16 87:5,6	78:13 85:11	50:22 54:5
108:19 113:4	44:8 46:20	African 73:12	alternatives 99:8	57:25 60:1
114:14	52:25 53:17	115:21	ambiguous 85:7	62:18,25 64:22
accessible 36:24	54:21 65:10,15	African-Ameri...	92:23	83:7 85:22 87:3
accommodation	76:2	117:21	amended 121:11	90:25 94:22
134:9	added 15:25	age 10:22 11:1	amendment	95:1,8
accomplish 70:19	98:22	26:24 63:20	100:23 101:13	answered 59:3
accomplished	adding 9:25 64:1	75:20 76:3	amendments	62:21 79:3
95:15	addition 8:2 9:13	92:24 105:11	64:10,11 68:23	answering 52:17
accomplishes	39:12 41:10,20	105:14 106:19	68:24 72:7,8	answers 58:21

<p>59:21 anti- 109:15 anticipate 37:16 anticipation 37:20 54:21 anybody 126:11 apologies 34:9 56:8 apologize 25:1 57:1 64:14 113:13 apology 45:17 appear 113:2 114:14 appearance 4:2 104:12 appearing 78:9 appendage 66:8 67:5,22 68:3 appendages 66:4 68:8 applaud 81:8 application 12:4 35:5 applications 101:14 applied 51:16 52:8 68:13 applies 47:22 apply 60:25 84:19 applying 32:7 apportionment 103:12 128:20 appreciate 47:3 49:12 57:4 60:23 62:22 89:19 95:9 100:8 104:5 116:10 121:22 123:6,21 124:15 127:1,5 129:9 appreciated 127:2 approach 7:22 44:4 130:19</p>	<p>approached 8:2 appropriate 5:15 18:20 approved 118:24 approximately 14:7 17:10 19:9 21:17 105:12 area 15:16,16 17:19 18:18 20:17 21:17,21 22:25 33:7 39:25 41:17 42:19,23 51:21 57:13 69:7 74:23 75:4 107:21 110:14 127:7 areas 40:10,16 45:9 71:11 120:8 122:20 arises 91:3 arrays 97:9 Article 91:13 Arundel 87:15 aside 5:22 99:18 128:5 asked 34:10 51:11 59:23 67:21 77:14 80:17 85:23 95:7 100:17,20 102:13 109:1 123:22 asking 29:6 33:20 60:19 62:18 71:20 90:19 93:13 95:21 111:2 assigned 127:4 assistance 119:11 assisted 52:22 assuage 131:6 assume 96:20 assuming 35:23 100:21 101:2 assumption 35:23,24</p>	<p>assure 36:21 attention 70:12 127:20 attorney 84:9,12 90:18 91:18 93:12 135:6 Augustine 14:12 15:3 authority 82:22 103:10 available 9:3 12:3 40:6 53:24 55:6 Aventura 22:23 avenue 18:13 23:1,1 average 9:10,15 49:17 54:14 58:12,20 65:4 86:18 avoid 55:21 107:14 108:10 aware 11:20 79:20,21 83:7 83:11,12 89:2 90:1,6 96:9 100:21 awesome 119:25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <hr/> <p>back 4:22 5:16 13:17 27:12,25 30:9,12 44:21 45:8 47:20 50:7 51:7 55:9,17 58:17 69:2 103:14 116:11 116:14 124:4 124:24 128:18 129:18 133:13 backed 114:22 backwards 84:21 bake 126:6 Baker 13:9 69:13 balance 39:11 65:18 balances 125:9</p>	<p>balancing 7:22 93:15 ballot 113:4 ballpark 99:14 band 50:12 75:2 banter 120:9 bar 6:3 8:9 barely 98:4 barest 106:18 barriers 112:1 Bartlett 84:17 based 6:9 8:15 34:15 35:18 77:24 80:24 122:21 basically 33:23 115:10 basis 73:7 92:13 Bay 17:19 18:18 24:1,9 38:21 74:4 87:10,11 87:14 Beach 10:14 20:11,24 21:2,4 21:7,8,15,16,18 bear 4:7 99:11 becoming 75:23 75:24,24 began 4:25 beginning 6:7 12:15 27:17 121:19 129:16 behalf 26:16 110:1 believe 24:22 25:6 27:19 30:11 33:21 41:18 49:7 56:13 57:2 60:18 67:20 68:8 73:1,8,9 73:14 74:24 76:22 86:19 88:7,10,12 92:2 92:6,25 95:18 96:13,20,24 98:14 99:21</p>	<p>102:20,25 110:11,25 117:17 120:14 benchmark 9:7 9:13,22 10:7,21 10:23 11:6 13:12 16:18,23 17:8 20:10 22:20 23:11 28:13,19 31:17 33:23 36:1 51:20 52:11 55:18 56:10 61:17 62:6 63:21 71:8 107:6,23 108:1 108:6 123:5 benchmarks 31:5 34:13 Bend 18:16 benefit 111:5 Benjamin 2:12 131:17 best 91:24 96:18 96:20,24 111:6 111:8 126:7,17 127:12 better 37:1 96:16 97:14 108:16 beyond 54:5 100:5 big 18:16 91:23 bigger 50:21 biggest 34:25 bill 6:5,14,15,17 6:23 8:10 24:12 36:18 104:11 116:12 130:24 bills 102:20,21 biography 79:9 Biscayne 22:23 38:21 bit 41:17 45:10 47:4 63:10 64:6 104:4 121:9 black 10:18 13:11 20:9</p>
--	--	--	--	---

22:15 27:9,19 28:15,20 29:19 30:15,16 31:10 31:15,19 33:12 39:9 48:6 63:19 63:20 68:18 92:24 93:5 106:2 107:12 108:4,8,10,14 111:21,23 112:2,7,20 black-performi... 25:15 28:3 35:20 blacks 116:3 block 6:18,18 40:6,13,23 51:14,19 52:10 blocks 40:9 41:7 43:1,1 49:2 board 64:24 Boca 21:15 body 37:21 127:23 book 112:19 booming 104:22 boots 110:14 border 18:14 19:14 21:5 22:1 24:2 86:24 87:1 87:8,9 borders 21:3 born 110:4 borne 80:20 bottom 49:22 Boulevard 18:14 20:3 21:2 22:8 22:9 boundaries 7:25 12:5 24:1 36:4 41:14,16 42:8 42:22 43:9 44:13 65:19 73:12 129:7 boundary 8:25 12:2,22 13:23 15:4,14 16:13	17:20 18:12 21:1,7,17,22 23:17,24 24:8 40:1 41:13 42:12 43:12,13 43:14 46:10,17 66:11,13 74:2 87:2 122:23 bowl 110:20 114:16 115:5 box 113:4 Bradford 14:25 branch 125:11 break 112:1 Brevard 15:21 bridge 19:23 87:14 93:21 bring 89:19 116:11 129:14 brought 37:7 44:5 63:23 70:13 129:17 Broward 10:14 20:12 21:20,24 21:25 22:3,3,11 22:19 23:14 41:10 brown 2:13,14 24:16,17 25:3 26:1,2 27:7 28:9,10 29:16 29:25 31:1,2,3 32:22 33:17,18 34:9 106:2 122:10,11 131:19,20 Brown's 35:17 36:12 45:7 build 35:8 115:1 Bureau 26:23 Burney 111:11 111:13 Burney- 111:18 burning 115:4 Bush 18:13 business 130:5 Byrd 1:6	C	cake 126:6,6 calculated 74:20 call 2:5 43:22 76:21 79:16 85:8 108:13 114:25 131:13 called 12:2 51:8 Caloosahatchee 19:23 Canal 19:22 candidate 27:22 27:23 28:21,22 29:9 30:17,23 33:12 48:1 60:17 61:11,15 61:23 101:1 candidates 28:24 92:17 106:6 108:9 capacity 117:19 118:10 Cape 20:5 capture 98:2,3 captured 88:9,9 88:10,11 captures 97:24 98:2,4 cards 104:13 care 94:19 carefully 114:8 cares 94:20 case 75:21 82:12 84:13,14 95:17 114:10,12,18 114:22 115:2 115:12 118:2,4 118:16 cases 82:11 categorical 29:14 Cause 1:2 118:1 CD 24:20 25:5,8 27:8 28:13,19 31:5,8,12,15,24 33:13,23 34:12 34:14 35:18,25 37:25 38:10,11	39:22 43:15 45:18,21 47:8,9 47:11 51:4 58:9 58:14,17 63:5,8 66:16,22 67:16 67:22 83:25 84:5 86:1 106:21 107:1 111:25 112:8 112:12,21 113:5,6 122:19 123:20 124:8 124:13,13 125:21 Cecile 113:23 114:1 census 6:9,18 7:15 8:16 26:23 40:6,9,13,23 41:7 43:1,1 49:2 81:15 104:23 106:12 107:4,4 center 40:22 100:2,3 centered 5:2 centers 15:17 Central 34:2 106:11,25 121:17 certain 83:17 97:11 125:7 certainly 100:4 114:19 127:24 CERTIFICATE 135:1 certify 135:2,5 CET-1036 135:14 chair 2:6 3:22 4:13 7:2,9 24:11,13,18 25:1,4,12,13 26:3,12 28:6,11 29:3 31:4,25 32:1,12,16,17 33:1,19 34:4,10	34:19,20 35:15 36:8,9,21 37:8 37:11,12 38:14 38:15,25 39:1,5 39:18 40:2,3 41:5,6 42:1,13 43:2,7,25 44:2 44:5,7 45:2,5,6 45:11,15,23 46:19,22 47:1,2 47:12,13,17,18 51:3,8,15,23,24 52:2,14,16,20 52:24 53:1,4,7 53:8,22,25 54:9 54:13,18 55:13 56:3,4,18,20 57:17,19,21 58:2,25 59:8,10 60:3,4,7,11,12 60:17 61:3,25 62:8,9,18 63:4 63:12,13,18 64:20 65:6,7,15 66:5,6,18,23 67:21 68:1,2 69:10 70:1,8 71:1,3,15,25 72:16 74:19 77:5 78:2,3 79:8 81:6 84:9 85:9,10,18,22 87:7 88:4,14 89:8,17 90:18 91:18 95:3,6,15 95:21 96:7 98:24 100:16 101:21 102:11 103:1,4 104:8 116:8 119:15 119:21,22 120:21,22 121:6 122:5,6 122:12,12 123:15,17 124:3,24 125:5 126:2,23
--	---	----------	---	---	--

127:15,18 130:8,12 131:4 131:10,15 133:11,13,15 133:21 134:1,4 chairman 2:2,7 3:23 4:19 7:11 24:23 25:13 32:1 34:5,20 36:9 38:15 39:1 40:3 42:14 44:1 45:6,24 47:13 51:24 52:5,15 53:8,17 54:1,19 56:4,19 57:1,18 59:9 60:3,4 61:4 62:9 63:13 64:21 65:7 66:6 66:17,20,25 67:9,14,24 70:2 70:9 71:2 72:1 78:3,6 79:4 85:10,18 103:3 103:16,22 110:2,5,6 127:17 131:16 134:9 Chairs 67:23 challenging 121:9 chamber 6:4 8:9 122:25 chance 38:5 72:5 112:20 113:6 change 40:13 46:15 121:11 changes 11:1 28:4 106:14 120:23 changing 86:15 characteristics 16:23 characterize 34:22 Charlotte 4:15 19:17 Chattel 115:20	checks 125:9 Chesapeake 74:4 87:10,11 Chief 82:13 choice 11:17 27:23 28:21,22 30:18,23 33:13 48:1 60:17 61:11,15,24 71:22 92:6,17 93:24 101:1 106:7 108:9 117:9,21 129:2 choices 94:9 choose 34:2,16 70:18,21 choosing 32:6 chronological 30:10 circle 97:15 circular 50:10 circumscribing 97:15 cited 118:11 cities 8:1 10:8,10 17:21 20:19,19 21:15,22 22:22 31:21 69:5 70:15,22 71:23 127:5 Citrus 17:4 18:5 44:16 city 8:24 10:6 17:23 19:11 21:10,16 24:9 43:18 46:10 69:17,18,18,18 71:3,8,14 107:21 Civil 105:25 clarification 49:17 clarifies 47:3 clarify 32:19 71:18 80:23 116:13 clarity 29:13	87:22 Clark 111:19 class 105:1 clause 75:14 90:11 91:6 105:22 Clay 14:16,25 clear 33:3 59:5 84:11,11 86:15 93:3,6,7 118:19 124:6 cleared 60:23 Clearwater 17:22 CLEMENS 3:19 Clemons 3:18 80:5,7,12,15 81:5,14,24 82:4 133:6,7 client 94:16 client's 115:4 close 99:2 119:15 123:17 124:25 127:16 closed 131:11 closeness 115:11 closer 35:25 40:17 closing 112:19 coalition 84:23 coast 21:4,25 40:20 Coconut 21:23 cohesion 51:13 51:19 52:10 53:23 54:11,17 cohesive 28:20 cohesiveness 60:25 coincides 43:11 43:12 collaborated 77:21 colleague 69:2 colleagues 102:14 123:18 124:8 127:9	131:2 Collier 20:2,3 23:12,14 39:24 41:9,22 42:21 43:17 44:13,14 55:20 56:11 107:25 Colombia 13:10 13:22,24 Color 24:9 Columbia 69:14 column 30:4 combat 105:25 combining 84:25 85:2 come 2:4 26:8 44:21 55:9 57:4 70:15 89:21 93:17,25 94:7 99:2 102:13 120:4,8 comes 70:6 93:4 112:12 128:7 coming 120:11 commend 119:21 commentators 99:19,20,21,25 comments 72:11 114:6,7,11 116:11 117:10 126:12 committed 36:22 committee 4:17 5:19 6:1,5,8 8:6 8:10,14 11:21 24:12 35:4 36:14,16,19,20 36:21 44:6 50:8 57:23 59:1 70:14 73:2,3,10 76:9 77:2,11,13 79:11 81:11,16 87:22 97:1 109:12 110:4 120:6,12,14,16 121:7 123:9,19 128:18 129:10	130:8,8,25 133:18,24,25 134:4,12 Committee's 130:21 committees 81:20 common 1:2 104:25 118:1 124:11 commonly 60:20 communicate 126:17 communities 75:9 98:17 100:25 107:16 107:23,24 108:2,4,14 109:9 128:7 community 108:10 122:23 community's 6:23 compact 7:23 9:12 14:20 16:13 24:2 35:2 46:12 64:7 65:3 76:11 78:20,20 83:9,12,14 85:14 86:9,16 87:2 93:25 96:8 97:13 98:16,20 107:15 108:7 129:6 compactly 17:15 compactness 9:11,15,18 12:6 45:20 46:4,5 47:4,5,23 49:4 49:14,18,21,21 50:2,4,20 58:4 58:6 64:15,17 65:16,22 68:11 68:20 70:23 71:23 74:10 76:16 85:24,25 86:14 87:5,7,24
---	---	---	--	---

87:25 88:2 90:20,22 91:3 91:19 92:8 97:11 98:10 100:1 comparable 11:5 33:23 34:12,17 compared 9:7 10:23 98:7,9 108:4 112:17 comparing 31:5 48:10 comparison 48:12 compelled 128:16 compelling 75:16 83:19 91:7 92:1 92:3,6,14 93:8 95:12 101:4,6,7 compensated 77:17 80:17,25 81:3 102:1 complete 18:22 19:10 21:4 109:8 completely 62:23 completion 54:23 compliance 10:16 12:11 43:23 62:13 109:15 compliant 12:5 16:13 56:1 62:23 64:7 131:8 complicated 99:25 127:22 compliment 126:23 comply 38:22 101:8 complying 61:24 101:3 component 26:21 33:8,9 50:6 components	26:20 61:13 64:17 comprise 6:19 105:6 comprised 105:4 comprising 105:1 computer 86:22 concept 44:4 47:22 115:24 115:25 concerned 69:3 concerns 121:17 122:17,19 123:10 124:8 127:11 concludes 28:6 82:5 134:12 conclusion 26:9 conclusions 54:10 conduct 130:4 conducted 11:3 11:12 13:14 20:13 22:16 23:7 54:11 119:23 conducting 52:23 confidence 120:21 123:2 configure 34:17 configuration 14:14 18:1 33:5 34:2 123:4 configurations 10:9 85:12 confirm 25:8 69:23 conflict 93:17,25 Congress 105:18 congressional 1:11 2:3 4:22 5:3,4,18,21 6:5 6:15 7:4 8:11 9:7,8,14,20,25 10:11,15 12:14 12:16,18,20	13:2,3,4,5,7,17 13:21,23 14:1,4 14:6,9,15,18,21 14:24 15:2,8,12 15:19,20,24 16:1,5,17,25 17:6,11,14,17 17:18,25 18:1,4 18:10,11,19,23 18:24 19:8,12 19:18 20:1,7,8 20:22 21:3,6,8 21:19 22:2,4,13 22:14 23:4,10 23:12,17,22 24:4 25:14,19 28:5 32:20 33:4 35:1 40:15 44:17 48:2,3 49:13,20 51:17 52:8 56:5 64:3 65:2 66:10 68:5 68:6 69:3 83:22 89:25 105:9,15 106:16 107:4 107:18 108:6 108:11 117:14 133:23 connect 75:9 87:14 connected 68:4,6 connecting 18:2 connects 18:19 20:1,11 21:20 23:11 24:5 consider 5:17 25:9 31:18 39:24 42:12 47:4 111:7,8 115:14 consideration 7:3 65:24 68:20 72:2 116:25 117:3,7 considerations 44:11 66:4 73:8 considered 67:21	115:19 consist 11:19 129:3 consistent 7:21 11:7 27:15 30:15 106:9 130:18 consistently 71:5 129:16 consolidated 110:24 consolidation 110:23 111:6 constituents 104:21 109:7 130:4 constitution 6:10 8:17 10:17 62:13 91:14 101:4 105:23 118:13 constitutional 5:24 35:6 62:24 72:11,22 90:2 125:7 127:23 128:10,19 130:3 constitutionally 111:17 131:8 constraints 49:5 49:6 construing 114:13 consult 79:25 consulted 80:1 contained 13:20 40:9 54:24 contains 8:20 13:9,19 14:24 16:5 69:11 contend 117:24 contention 115:3 context 12:7 30:25 36:25 46:6 49:5 50:3 58:7,15,19 64:23 65:9,23	66:10 68:7 contiguous 11:19 129:3 continue 5:14 14:10 21:13 26:25 37:2 55:23 71:16 126:18 129:11 131:1,5 continued 30:14 continuing 126:5 127:10 continuous 122:13,16 contort 74:2 contortions 74:5 97:12 contract 53:14 contrast 105:11 107:22,25 contrasted 98:7 contributed 38:2 control 27:20 conversation 57:20 71:16 114:5 123:21 130:25 131:5 conversations 122:13 125:18 conversely 14:15 Convex 9:16 50:11 58:11,13 58:19 64:16 74:22,25 75:6 88:6,7 98:3 99:11,16 convinced 121:15 convolutions 88:18 cook 126:6 Cooper 90:9 coordinator 110:21 copy 6:22 Coral 20:5 21:22 Cord 1:6 corporate 65:20
--	---	--	---	--

<p>correct 25:11 32:21,23 34:18 35:24 70:7 81:19 89:7 96:17 100:22 102:2 103:21 103:22 correlate 73:12 corridor 111:22 Council 110:3 Councilman 110:16 counsel 6:8 8:15 52:22 53:11,15 94:16 109:11 119:9 count 40:11 74:20 110:8 counted 104:23 counties 8:1 9:23 9:23 10:13 13:8 13:9,11,18,19 13:22,25 14:23 14:25 15:21 19:4,7,16,18 20:23 35:1 44:15,16 48:18 68:15 69:4,11 69:12,13,17 70:15,22 71:23 74:7 107:25 country 125:7 county 4:15 8:24 9:19,21 12:17 12:18 13:20,24 14:1,3,5,6,10 14:13,16,17 15:1,4,6,7,8,10 15:11,13,13,14 15:18 16:2,6,7 16:8,12,18,19 16:24 17:1,3,3 17:4,6,8,12,20 17:23,24 18:2,3 18:5,5,6,9,12 18:15,15,20,21 19:1,2,5,7,9,10</p>	<p>19:11,15,21,24 20:2,2,11,12,24 21:2,7,15,18,21 21:24,25 22:3,3 22:4,12,19,22 23:12,13,14 24:3,5,6,8 27:6 27:8 35:3 39:9 39:24 41:9,10 41:20,22 42:20 42:21 43:9,13 43:16 44:13,14 44:15,16 65:20 66:16,22 67:1 67:22 68:4,5,11 68:17,18 69:14 69:14,15,15 73:13 87:15 107:20 110:3,8 110:12,12,13 110:15,24 111:4,9 112:21 couple 35:16 44:20 77:8,12 78:17 84:24 111:1 course 36:19 37:4 113:6 court 5:2,7,9 6:11 7:18 8:18 10:25 11:8 52:18 54:3,22 62:14 73:9 75:13 76:12 78:21 83:11,13 84:21 89:3,6 90:2 91:11 94:5 94:15,18,20 99:5,15,23 100:18 103:11 103:20 104:1 111:15 114:18 114:19 115:1,3 116:10 117:1 118:1,5,16,16 118:24,25 119:3 130:15</p>	<p>130:16 court's 82:18 83:7 court-ordered 55:22 courts 61:18 68:9 82:24 99:9,10 99:18,24 covers 42:9 COVID-19 108:23 crack 107:11 cracking 107:14 107:18 108:10 cracks 107:15,24 108:3 create 20:16 41:11 64:7 75:10,19 85:5 106:10,17 116:24 129:22 created 14:17,19 28:3 110:25 111:20,25 creating 17:15 21:10 24:2 121:1 creation 107:5 Creek 21:23 criteria 32:7 35:19 36:2 57:10 63:9 73:15 74:24 76:16 96:1 criterion 73:18 73:19,21 criticized 98:12 99:6,16 cross 19:6,20 crossed 55:19 56:11 crosses 22:19 39:22 43:16 crossing 55:21 crossover 84:14 85:1 CRS 131:13</p>	<p>CRS22- 8:10 CRS22-01 6:5 7:4 curious 80:12 91:20 102:5 current 14:14 33:5 83:25 84:5 87:13 89:25 113:10 currently 80:2 Curried 16:10 cut 128:13 cycle 22:5 89:4 cycles 6:6 8:12 27:4,5 28:2 111:25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <hr/> <p>D.C 1:24 Dade 39:9 55:19 56:11 Dade-Collier 43:13 data 6:9 8:15,22 26:22,24 29:6,7 29:11 30:2,4,14 32:10 33:14,15 38:1 40:6,23 50:21 52:20 53:5,9,23 55:6 58:3 60:20 61:19 106:12 107:5 109:11 112:19 113:8 119:9 date 81:11 David 109:20,22 Davie 22:8 Davis 3:20 58:24 58:25 59:23 60:5,22 62:1,17 101:18,20,25 102:4,10 123:13,15 133:8,9 day 36:23 days 111:2</p>	<p>DC 72:19 deal 115:13 116:18,19 dealing 5:20 115:16,17 debate 24:14 104:5,13 114:4 119:14,18 121:4 123:14 125:3 126:3,21 127:14 decade 6:4 7:16 8:9 9:23,24 10:3 16:7 17:9 20:15,21 27:9 27:15,17 30:9 30:10,12,14 82:11 104:25 105:6 112:17 113:7,8 decade's 9:25 decades 27:25 decennial 7:14 decision 38:7 82:20 83:13 90:2 103:12 decisions 83:11 93:15 100:18 decline 5:10 decrease 10:9 27:15 30:15 35:21 38:3 decreased 112:24 decreases 10:24 deep 51:9 defensive 110:21 defer 42:14 deficiencies 43:21 definitely 89:23 97:9 123:16,19 Defuniak 13:1,3 democratic 28:13 28:23 31:9,13 105:19 Democrats 79:23 demographic</p>
---	---	---	---	--

16:23 106:13 demographics 28:12 demonstrate 35:5 demonstrated 30:8 117:22 demonstrates 117:19 deny 11:13 61:9 93:20 denying 128:24 depends 101:9 depicted 6:20 depiction 32:8 deprives 109:7 DeSantis 77:15 descent 115:21 described 30:7 56:9 describes 82:14 deserving 108:24 designated 41:15 designed 112:18 Desoto 19:16 desperately 105:17 despite 112:23 detail 59:19 determination 32:11 82:18 determine 51:13 85:13 determined 75:13 determining 45:20 64:14 develop 73:19 developed 73:18 deviates 12:25 deviation 10:2 devices 3:25 devoted 72:19 dicta 114:25 115:2,4 dictates 29:9 104:25	difference 34:21 59:6,24 different 25:18 44:4 46:9 48:13 48:15 49:4 50:6 61:19 64:17,18 79:25 81:13 89:23 122:25 123:4,8 124:18 differently 48:10 48:14,15 60:21 99:24 difficult 73:11 91:15 94:9,9 96:2 113:3 difficulty 24:24 digital 1:23 135:3 diluted 61:14,22 diluting 113:7 dilution 61:1 diminish 11:15 61:9 78:14 84:6 85:6 93:20,23 112:7 129:1 diminished 13:16 20:15 22:18 23:9 61:23 diminishes 84:1 diminishing 31:19 85:15 100:25 diminishment 82:15 83:24 84:4 95:12 103:8 directed 7:13 direction 97:19 directly 29:19 86:7 115:2 director 111:19 disagreement 122:2 disclose 129:17 discrimination 105:20 109:16 115:15 discriminatory	106:1 117:4,10 discuss 121:22 discussed 46:1 discussing 45:9 45:18 76:15 97:7 114:24 discussion 120:20 131:3 discussions 35:7 disenfranchised 106:2 disfavor 128:22 disfavour 11:23 dismantling 108:5 dissenting 82:14 distance 100:2,3 district 5:3 6:19 9:14,20 10:1,4 10:12,21 11:6 11:12 12:6,10 12:16,18,21,23 13:2,3,4,5,6,7 13:11,13,14,17 13:18,21,23,25 14:2,4,7,7,9,9 14:12,14,15,15 14:18,18,20,24 15:2,5,8,12,20 15:22,23 16:1,5 16:8,14,15,17 16:19,20,22,24 16:25 17:6,11 17:15,16,25 18:1,4,10,11,19 18:23,24 19:1,6 19:8,12,19,19 20:1,8,9,10,13 20:16,22,25 21:1,3,6,9,14 21:19,20,24 22:2,4,6,12,14 22:15,16,18,21 23:6,10,13,17 23:18,18,22 24:2,4,10 25:9 25:15,15,19,21	25:25 28:2,3,20 32:5,9,20,20 33:5,10 35:1,21 38:5,12 39:6,8 39:9,10,10 41:8 41:13,18 43:18 43:20 45:18 46:6,8,17 47:5 47:6,7,7 48:2,3 48:6,6,7 49:13 49:20 50:6,10 50:13,17 55:18 56:5,6,10,13,15 56:16,21 57:9 58:5 59:25 61:14 63:19,20 63:21 64:3 65:2 66:10,12 67:2,3 68:5,6,12,16 69:3,6,11,15 72:23 73:7,24 73:24 74:1,3,6 74:21 75:3,7,11 75:15 76:10,21 76:24 77:3 78:11,14,18,23 82:25 83:8,14 83:19,21 84:1,6 84:14,20,23 85:1,3,6,12,14 86:7,12,16,18 86:20,21,25,25 87:2,7,9,13,17 87:17 88:23 90:1,5 91:5 92:15,19,21,24 94:6,14 97:13 97:24,25,25 98:19,21 100:19,24 101:16,17 102:24 106:11 106:13,17,17 106:24 107:10 108:6,6 109:25 110:16,23 111:1,4 112:16	113:1 117:14 117:20,24 123:5 124:10 124:16 129:6 district's 9:11 18:22 59:18 districting 73:15 74:24 76:16 82:17 96:1 districts 5:18 6:6 6:20 7:4,23 8:5 8:11,23 9:8,12 9:18,25 10:1,3 10:15,18,19,20 10:23 11:6,9,11 11:18,19,22 12:8,15 14:21 14:23 15:19,25 17:9,17,18 18:25 19:3 20:6 20:7 21:11 22:13,21 23:4,5 34:24 39:8,11 39:13,15 40:15 46:3,7,12,14,18 48:1,4 51:20 52:12 56:23 60:25 61:16,18 62:5,7 63:24,25 64:1,6 68:14 70:20 73:20 74:5 76:13,20 83:17 84:22 85:7 86:1,4,6,8 86:9,10,16,23 87:10 89:22 90:24 93:3,4,24 95:18 96:2 98:16,21 101:13 103:9 105:3,11,15 106:8,14 107:6 107:7,12,19 108:11 112:18 114:14 115:8,9 116:21,24 118:3,14,23,24
---	--	--	---	---

126:14 128:21 128:23 129:2,4 129:5 Districts' 118:18 dive 9:5 divided 17:8 18:6 88:17 DJ 2:5 3:23 6:24 131:13 134:8 doctor 4:14,14,19 documents 115:23 doing 14:11 55:22 57:11 61:11 117:2 118:7 119:9 125:14 DOJ 79:12 Dolphin 23:16,23 Doral 23:20 doubt 81:7 131:6 draft 33:21 34:11 drafted 6:7 8:14 drafting 61:1 draw 11:22 86:23 90:4 drawing 7:17 12:3 48:20 97:17 100:19 111:16 drawn 10:16 11:6 73:7 77:4 83:21 84:20 85:14 92:15 106:8,9 106:18 128:21 128:23 drop 61:19 DS 90:8 due 44:11 97:16 112:10 Dunnellon 17:22 duties 127:23 duty 107:13 108:13 130:3 Duval 13:10 14:5 69:15 73:13 110:3,7,13,15	110:24 111:4,8 <hr/> E earlier 8:6,13 22:15 25:7 40:8 43:2 44:10 47:21 80:9 85:22 101:22 103:6 109:10 112:14 120:3 early 79:12 earth 100:7 easier 45:10 east 18:15 19:8 21:18 40:20 63:6 88:17 97:16 110:9 eastern 13:23 17:12 23:18 87:15 Eatonville 16:21 echo 41:6 46:22 ecological 51:12 Econ 16:11 Econlockhatchee 16:11 edge 66:16,22 Edgewood 16:21 educate 111:23 education 6:2 8:7 111:20 educational 119:24 120:6 effect 59:18 86:13 efficient 78:19 effort 61:21 64:5 67:3 egregious 107:17 108:5 eight 31:10 74:7 either 28:4 elaborate 50:4,19 60:8 67:5,21 elect 11:16 13:15 20:14 22:18 23:8 27:22,22	28:14,22 30:17 30:22 39:14 47:25 48:22 60:16 61:11,14 61:23 84:1,7 92:5,16 93:24 101:1 106:6 108:9 112:25 129:2 elected 79:24 126:1 130:1 electing 33:12 election 6:6 8:12 27:3,4,5,21 28:23 30:7 31:13 33:10 112:16,19 elections 11:4 31:11 electoral 106:3 electorate 28:20 29:17,19 electronic 3:25 elementary 90:19 elements 116:25 eliminated 56:12 eliminates 56:13 elongated 33:14 emailed 73:2 emotions 128:8 emphasize 30:3 73:14 76:9 emphasized 73:5 employee 135:6 employment 115:14,15 enable 17:22 enables 18:1 encourage 5:21 129:14 130:11 134:1 endeavouring 7:23 8:1 endorsed 89:3 ends 38:24 enforce 101:8 enforceable	118:19 enforcing 105:25 engage 7:21 130:18 engaged 81:23 121:8 English 108:22 English- 109:6 English-only 106:3 enhance 92:15 enjoy 105:2 128:11 ensure 5:14 7:7 11:3,12,22 12:25 23:7 47:24 ensures 13:14 19:6 20:14 22:17 ensuring 48:21 61:13 entire 7:8 16:3 19:16 21:10 37:15 41:9,21 65:9 68:18 76:25 77:9 entirely 16:6 92:22 entirety 12:16 18:4 23:21 68:6 entities 99:5 entrusted 105:24 equal 7:24 11:13 12:19,21 13:25 15:5 17:4 20:4 20:25 41:23 44:12,18 70:3 72:2 75:14 79:2 90:23 91:5 93:21 105:22 111:11,19 113:19 115:24 117:15 128:24 129:5 equality 14:11 15:24	equalize 92:15 equally 69:24 Eric 79:13,15 80:1 Escambia 12:17 Esri 42:6 essentially 27:9 27:11 established 112:1 118:15 establishes 6:5 establishing 7:4 Estimation 96:12 et 1:2 ether 126:15 evaluate 107:14 evaluating 12:9 evaluation 35:19 109:15 eventually 124:23 Everglades 39:23 39:25 40:17 42:8,18 43:2,12 48:24 49:1 55:19,21 56:11 everybody 45:10 93:16 everyone's 95:24 118:17 evidence 1:23 92:13 Ex 58:24 Ex-officio 3:18 3:19,20 123:13 133:6,8 exacerbate 105:17 exact 6:19 10:3 19:1 29:6 103:11 exactly 19:3 37:18 54:2 97:21 examination 44:6 example 31:8 35:1 40:17 44:4
--	--	---	--	---

<p>44:13,16 46:11 66:15,21 70:21 74:3 92:15 97:12 107:18 108:5 119:4 exceed 84:25 85:2 98:13 exceedingly 65:3 83:18 excellent 44:4 exception 20:4 exclusively 8:14 Excuse 9:5 14:3 24:23 excused 2:12 3:3 131:18 132:10 executive 110:4 125:11 exercise 108:13 exist 54:20 existed 11:5 33:6 existence 124:12 existing 11:8 129:7 exists 53:5 75:9 105:21 109:18 expect 25:21 82:25 expectation 35:20 expected 78:7 expenses 80:19 80:20,22 experience 77:24 89:19 expert 53:10 81:7 82:19 95:23,24 95:25 102:24 115:15 expertise 80:10 81:18 89:19 explain 31:23 66:7 75:8 explained 30:13 93:9 explanation 7:7 26:4 28:7 37:13</p>	<p>42:2 47:3 49:12 63:15 83:20 93:9 explore 85:11 expose 126:11 exposing 126:8 expressions 100:1 Expressway 22:7 23:16,23 extends 21:7 extension 41:12 41:22 extent 88:25 94:19 external 5:22,23 128:6 extremely 73:22 73:25 76:13 extruded 38:19 eyeball 9:19 68:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <p>Fabricio 2:15,16 44:25 45:1,14 46:25 49:11,19 50:23 55:4,5 64:13 65:1 66:2 66:15,21 67:6 67:12,15,20 85:19,21 131:21,22 Fabricio's 57:25 Facebook 111:1 faced 93:14 facing 112:2 fact 38:11 40:13 60:19 74:14 81:21 83:16 factor 45:20,20 46:4 85:25 factors 38:2,4,23 43:15 47:23 fails 107:1 failure 109:4 fair 46:5 82:17</p>	<p>100:22,23 101:13 105:2 115:8,9 116:21 118:3,14,18,23 118:24 119:1 faltering 4:7 familiar 83:4 familiarity 83:4 far 26:17 61:19 68:3 81:19 108:23 fastest 16:6 favor 92:7 128:21 favorable 79:24 favorably 133:13 favour 11:23 feasible 7:25 9:17 129:6 feasibly 106:8 feature 66:11 February 1:12 2:1 federal 6:11 8:17 62:14 73:11 76:14,17,19 78:21 82:21,24 83:2,5,11,15 84:13,14 90:10 90:13,21,22 94:6,7,15,18 95:20 118:4,8,9 feedback 35:8 36:23 37:3 54:2 126:5 129:20 feel 9:2 60:14 62:22 felt 128:16 FEMALE 3:21 Fetterhoff 2:17 2:18 4:10,12,21 131:23,24 fidelity 72:20 field 88:12 fifths 115:22 fighting 38:5 113:6</p>	<p>figuration 11:13 figure 123:4 126:16 figures 92:25 fill 4:2 filled 50:13 final 37:3 103:1 finally 8:25 109:10 119:5 121:21 financially 135:7 find 124:11 finding 76:1 findings 76:3,7 finds 15:9 fine 44:23 89:9 finger 38:20 Finishing 18:18 firm 82:1 first 9:6 13:6 22:5 26:21 27:11 29:5 36:6 36:16 39:13 40:5 47:23 48:5 72:14 78:17 102:8 103:12 106:10 107:17 111:14 119:21 120:2,16 126:23 130:14 fit 17:25 five 10:13 34:25 90:8,9 flagged 74:17 Flagler 14:25 flags 15:11 flat 87:8,9 flight 81:2 102:1 floor 51:6 52:21 130:9 Florida 5:2,3,7 6:10 7:13,16,17 7:18 8:16 10:17 10:24 11:7 20:18 22:8 23:23 24:7,9 34:3 48:3,4,17</p>	<p>48:23 51:18,21 52:9,12,18 54:22 56:17 73:8,23 76:18 76:20 78:25 79:11 82:12,12 82:17,19,24 83:2,3,4 89:6 89:21 91:2,14 91:25 94:3,5,19 95:19 99:12 101:3 103:11 103:20,25 104:24 105:24 106:12,25 109:24 112:3 113:24 114:2 114:19 118:2 118:11,16,21 120:4 121:17 121:18 Florida's 10:13 68:17 87:5 91:25 103:7 104:22 105:2,4 105:7,8,13 107:3 118:18 floridaredistrict... 6:12 109:3 129:21 Floridians 105:12 106:3 106:15 108:22 focus 83:24 88:5 88:13 91:19,22 123:20 127:5 focuses 79:22 focusing 84:4 87:23 97:23 folks 39:21 99:6 follow 5:6,15,25 15:15 35:16 41:14 45:10 82:24 91:16 93:10 98:6 100:16 102:9 112:11 128:9,9</p>
--	---	--	---	---

<p>129:8 130:13 follow-up 35:7 37:9 39:16 41:24 43:5 44:22 46:24 49:10,11 53:2 53:16,20 54:7 57:6 59:22 61:25 62:16 64:25 66:1,14 69:20 70:4 81:5 81:9,14 following 4:24 7:14 16:8 37:25 46:9 55:5 99:1 111:15 117:6 124:17 follows 17:21 18:12 21:1 Folulee 113:13 football 110:20 footnote 118:3 Ford 16:10 forego 81:1 foregoing 135:2 forget 57:8 89:8 forgive 42:5 74:19 90:18 103:13 forgiving 74:14 89:1 forgotten 76:3 FORLULEE 113:14 form 4:2 36:1 76:22 98:13 108:18 112:4 125:8 formal 54:19 forms 109:2 forth 124:4 forum 108:25 forward 25:21 37:13 57:23 77:5 111:16 120:23,24 121:24 122:3</p>	<p>123:7,11 125:15 127:10 129:14 found 6:12,24 10:20 founded 111:24 founder 111:19 founding 115:22 four 13:7,9 18:25 26:20 39:15 69:11 74:8 77:10 fragment 107:11 framework 91:3 frankly 73:10 frayed 68:9 free 9:2 Freeport 13:1,2 friends 111:3 front 6:24 8:20 12:11 81:17 103:16 109:23 110:21 131:7 fruitful 104:2 fueled 107:3 fulfill 83:17 full 6:23 36:19 62:12 87:22 120:21 123:9 130:24 133:24 fully 37:15 function 125:11 125:11 functional 8:4,22 11:2,11 13:13 20:13 22:16 23:6 25:16 26:18 29:8 32:4 32:9 33:8 48:9 48:11 52:19 54:1,4,23 59:6 59:14,14,20,24 60:1,15 61:12 85:13 124:1,4 functionally 117:18 Fund 111:12,20</p>	<p>fundamental 109:5 fundamentally 107:9 further 36:12 44:5 50:4 71:13 93:9 131:2 135:5 future 112:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>Gadsden 13:8 66:16,22 67:1 67:22 68:4,5,17 69:12 110:12 Gainesville 31:7 31:21 Galindo 104:11 104:16,17 game 54:20 Gardens 23:20 gavel 6:25 133:13 geek 42:3 gender 116:19 general 11:4 27:5 27:21 28:23,24 28:25 29:10 31:13 59:4 112:19 generally 51:22 52:13 97:13 107:10 Genesis 113:16 113:17 gentleman 123:25 geographic 39:25 42:12 geographical 7:25 36:3 41:15 42:22 48:16 49:5 65:18 129:7 geographically 107:14 108:7 gerrymander 97:18</p>	<p>gerrymandered 73:20 90:1 gerrymandering 81:13,21 99:22 112:11 118:7 118:14,21 getting 116:14 125:15 Giallombardo 2:19,20 89:13 131:25 132:1 Gilchrist 13:24 Gingles 116:25 give 4:1 38:4 58:6 77:10 113:5 119:15 123:16 given 77:12 88:7 113:8 gives 74:11 giving 22:3 58:3 glad 4:20,23 5:16 124:11 Glades 19:17 go 10:1 16:9,12 25:1 30:2,8,12 37:17 47:20 49:24 51:9 52:6 54:14 55:8 56:2 57:15 58:4 69:4 70:24 81:20 128:17 goes 17:2 68:3,19 87:14 123:8 going 15:14 16:1 21:3 27:12,25 37:17 40:4 44:20 45:8,16 47:20 48:8 49:16 54:14 58:17 69:2,22 76:24,25 81:22 83:25 84:5 89:10 93:1 94:7 94:15,17,19,21 104:3 110:14 115:6 118:4 119:13,13</p>	<p>120:11,12 124:3 125:22 126:13 130:6 130:22,24 golden 4:14 12:9 good 2:2 4:13 37:14 45:7,25 53:1 57:15 70:20 72:16 78:4 88:8,22 89:13 95:5,8,10 104:16 109:21 111:13 113:25 119:6 125:18 gotten 126:4 governed 82:21 government 116:6,19 118:5 118:8,9 125:8 Governor 5:1 77:15 102:7 110:25 112:5 118:7 125:13 125:14 Governor's 81:3 84:1,6 102:2,17 Governors 112:6 grass 42:9 grateful 125:6,25 gravity 100:2,3 great 119:22 127:1 greater 75:20 greatest 106:22 grew 115:23 ground 110:14 111:11,20 113:19 117:15 124:11 group 1:23 6:18 11:4 60:16 61:10 66:2 80:1 85:1 117:8 group's 10:22 11:1 13:15 20:14 22:17 groups 84:24</p>
--	---	--	--	--

<p>115:18 116:4 116:17 groups' 23:8 growing 7:15 16:7 grown 105:5 growth 16:15 17:9 106:23 107:2 guardrails 5:15 guards 11:21 guess 29:4 43:10 48:25 55:14 79:15 93:7 94:10 95:24 99:12 guidance 5:8,12 guide 125:20 guidelines 116:21 116:22 117:6 118:10,12 Gulf 38:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <p>H- 107:23 H-8011 105:10 105:15 107:1,8 107:15,18 108:3 H-8060 107:17 H000C8011 6:13 8:13 half 63:22 104:24 Hamilton 13:8 69:12 Hancock 19:23 hand 5:19 6:25 40:12 77:3 handle 125:12 hang 42:4 happen 28:5 87:16 92:20,20 96:21 happened 63:10 happens 16:14 65:4 75:3 96:24 128:1</p>	<p>happy 59:19,20 71:14,15 121:21 131:4 Harbor 17:22 hard 104:18 Hardee 19:16 harder 75:7 Harding 2:21,22 89:15,16 100:17 119:19 119:20 121:3 132:2,3 harm 76:1 harmony 105:21 Harris 90:9 havoc 98:16 hazards 4:8 HD 31:6,7,9,15 31:17,18,20,23 head 57:12 heading 21:9 87:19 97:16 hear 67:13 84:2 100:7 110:15 122:16 129:13 131:4 heard 26:19 85:24 93:16 98:12,12 102:14 108:25 120:18 124:7 125:19 126:4 127:9,11 hearing 24:24 128:17 hearings 108:20 108:21 heart 128:14 heel 116:5 held 69:24 75:18 75:22 92:19 109:11 115:19 116:2 118:22 119:3 help 4:17 54:17 112:1 118:6 125:19 134:8</p>	<p>helps 12:4 59:16 Hendry 19:17 107:25 Hernando 18:5 hexagons 98:18 hey 118:9 Hialeah 23:19,19 41:19 hide 109:18 high 6:3 8:9 61:20 128:8 high-level 25:17 higher 50:10,13 Highland 21:16 Highlands 19:17 highlight 11:18 37:19 highly 125:13 Highway 18:7 Hill 16:3 Hillsborough 10:14 17:13 18:12,13,21,25 19:2 35:3 107:20 hip 78:9 Hispanic 10:19 16:15,15 23:5 38:13 48:7 55:18 56:6,13 56:15,16 105:10,12 106:19 historic 127:25 historical 117:5 historically 106:1 history 116:16 117:22 hit 130:19,20 Holder 79:14,15 Holder's 80:1 holding 7:5 77:2 90:2 hole 51:9 holistic 29:12 32:4,10 77:11 holistically 33:4</p>	<p>Holtzman 77:25 home 4:24 74:4 Homestead 24:10 hone 47:22 honeycomb 98:18 honor 134:5 honored 128:2 hope 30:24 79:3 121:10 hopeful 125:17 hopefully 58:21 124:23 hotel 80:19 81:3 102:2 House 1:11 5:4 7:20,21 8:2 32:19 33:10 37:4 51:5,11,18 52:9,23 53:12 53:19 55:17 56:22 57:8 77:2 106:10,18,20 107:13 108:9 108:13 124:9 130:2,17,18 Houses 7:17 26:17 124:22 huge 40:19 Hull 9:16 50:11 58:11,13,19 64:16 74:22,25 75:6 88:6,7 98:3 99:11,16 Hunschofky 2:23 2:23 132:4 Hunschofsky 68:25 69:1,21 70:3,5,10,11 71:19 72:3 90:16,17 91:17 93:11 94:24 95:5,6 126:21 126:22 128:12 132:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p>	<p>I- 16:8 I-195 23:1 I-4 18:14 111:22 I-75 20:3 22:7 23:15 I-95 15:15 16:2 20:18 22:8 idea 116:7 ideal 9:24 10:4,5 17:11 19:20 43:17,19 64:2 ideally 126:10 identified 25:20 40:12 62:19 99:7 identify 30:22 58:5 59:17 62:4 III 91:13 illustrate 124:2 image 38:18 imagine 75:1 90:12 immediately 109:17 impact 46:17 57:14 63:24 impacted 13:5 38:11 39:14 108:23 implemented 11:21 implications 84:21 implore 110:22 importance 64:15 76:24 important 36:14 47:21 59:12 70:14 71:4 90:20,23 91:15 111:24 127:6 impressive 80:9 improve 9:18 10:6 34:25 35:9 71:7 improved 108:19 improvement 9:9</p>
--	--	--	---	--

<p>17:7 22:20 34:22 71:10 120:20 127:7,8 in-line 68:12 include 17:2 21:9 42:25 62:15 68:14 included 6:16 14:6 18:9 21:19 23:12 40:23 68:11 includes 15:7,10 15:12,15,20 16:2,8 20:22,23 22:21 23:19 24:4 42:7 including 22:23 23:1 76:4 102:22,23 106:3 inclusion 127:10 inclusive 10:17 incorporate 66:12 incorporates 19:9 increase 86:21 112:22 increased 30:13 increases 10:24 107:8 incredibly 91:20 99:25 incumbent 11:24 128:22 indentation 87:18 indentations 50:16 74:16 98:3 indented 86:11 Indian 15:21 19:5 indicates 30:4 indicating 83:14 indication 84:18 indigenous 106:2</p>	<p>indiscernible 31:14 107:21 113:14,17,21 individual 11:11 49:18 84:10,12 127:24 128:20 individually 23:7 individuals 99:5 129:19,22 indulgence 95:9 inexcusable 109:6 inference 51:12 infirmities 43:21 72:23 97:1,8 98:9 99:7 influence 85:5,6 influences 5:23 information 53:13,18 54:24 59:15 109:9,17 129:12 ingredients 114:16 initially 35:3 injustice 105:17 inlet 21:4,8 inoperative 75:25 input 109:2 126:7 129:10 129:11,20,24 129:25 130:11 133:17 insight 36:12 instance 50:7 instances 42:5 insufficient 90:4 insulations 40:21 intent 11:23 128:23 intently 114:2 interact 48:10,14 Interchangeable 60:23 interchangeably 60:14</p>	<p>interest 95:13 98:17 100:8 101:4,6,8 111:6 128:21 interested 51:4 135:8 interesting 97:4 120:5,9 interests 111:8 128:5 Interim 50:8 internally 75:3 International 40:18 interpretation 83:8,16 introduce 4:13 introduction 4:11 invalidate 100:23 invited 102:5 involved 51:12 85:23 109:3 involving 100:1 ironically 48:25 irregular 14:17 Island 19:24 issue 5:10 71:3 120:19 issued 5:5,7,9,11 issues 37:7,19 39:12 46:9 72:25 117:16 123:12 126:9 it'll 49:24 item 48:5 items 9:1 iteration 36:6 113:10 iterations 112:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <hr/> <p>Jacksonville 69:19 109:24 110:10,13,24 111:3,8 jagged 41:18</p>	<p>jammed 86:24 87:1 January 129:23 Jasmine 111:11 111:18 Jason 134:8 Jefferson 13:10 13:22 69:14 job 90:11 108:16 119:6,22 125:12,23 127:1 133:20 Johns 14:10,13 14:16 15:1,4 110:8 Johnson 75:13 83:13 90:7 104:10 join 131:8 joined 78:8 Joseph 2:24,25 35:13,14 36:10 37:10 38:17 39:17 41:25 42:24 43:6 44:3 44:23 51:6,11 55:11,12 56:8 56:24 57:5,7 63:2,3 96:5,6 96:11,12,14,16 96:19,23 97:5 98:5,23 99:18 100:9,12 112:13 125:3,4 129:9 132:6,7 Joseph's 55:8 Josh 77:25 judicial 62:14 72:14,18,18 82:2,4 102:22 Julie 135:14 jump 13:6 47:14 jumping 64:14 jurisprudence 75:12 justice 82:13 104:17 108:17</p>	<p>117:15 justification 75:16,19 83:20 91:8 92:2,3,7 92:14 justify 76:2 83:19 90:4 92:18 101:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <hr/> <p>Karen 134:8 keep 8:1 9:19 14:11,22 16:20 46:11 70:14 72:10 89:10 102:15 104:14 108:14 119:16 keeping 16:4 20:19 21:22 35:25 46:10 70:21 71:22 83:23 keeps 15:8 17:6 19:7 20:18 Kelly 26:10,12 28:8 29:1,3,20 29:22 30:1 32:13,14,16,24 47:14,15,17 49:15,16,23,24 52:24 55:7,10 57:24 58:2 60:7 60:9,11 61:4,5 61:7 65:10,12 65:14 68:1 123:7 Kelly's 32:3 Kennedy 40:21 Kennedy's 82:13 kept 9:22 13:1 16:17,19 17:19 19:11 20:5 21:6 22:2 36:4 69:5 69:5,7 107:23 108:2 127:5 kidding 56:24 kind 25:17 34:1</p>
---	--	--	---	---

34:11 38:18,18 51:7 54:2 62:1 63:7 64:18 66:11 91:19 93:1 96:3 101:20 126:3 126:14 kinds 74:15 97:11 knew 5:7 know 24:20,21 25:6 26:15 27:24 28:18 30:9,18,21 32:2 32:5 33:12 36:5 36:13 37:2,6 40:5 46:1,4,5 50:9 52:17 54:5 54:12,13,16 57:3,22 59:12 59:18 61:12 62:10 63:8 65:8 66:7 71:4 75:8 76:23 77:1 78:6 82:10 83:18 91:21 93:8 94:3 99:15 108:15 115:1 117:23 120:3,18 121:18 122:18 123:7,20 124:10,21,22 125:1 126:13 128:4,11 knowledge 99:4 122:22 known 16:11 Kristen 113:13	75:6 landmark 82:11 105:25 language 11:14 61:10 92:4 93:18,22 106:6 108:19 117:8 128:25 large 15:13 39:22 40:22 89:22 120:5 largely 13:4 39:7 39:14 107:3 108:1 112:21 larger 86:13 largest 10:13 lastly 70:12 late 64:14 Latino 38:12 51:20 52:11 104:17,22 105:3,18 106:8 106:11,15,17 106:18,21,22 106:25 107:2 107:15,16,19 107:24 108:14 108:17 117:15 126:14 Latinos 104:24 105:4,7 lauded 7:18 law 5:6,25 6:11 8:17 62:14 72:20 73:11 76:14,17,18,19 78:25 82:1,12 82:13,19,24 83:4,5,15 84:13 84:14 90:13,21 90:22 91:3 94:1 94:2,3,6,7 95:19,20 105:25 112:5 114:18 115:13 116:3,4 128:9,9 129:8 130:13	laws 109:16 113:3 116:1,2 Lawson 110:18 lawyer 92:10,11 92:18 94:14,14 lawyers 77:25 114:25 laying 118:9 layperson 91:20 92:22 lead 93:1 111:15 112:12 124:17 134:5 League 113:23 114:1 117:13 learn 112:8 127:3 128:6 learned 128:12 learning 127:2 learnt 120:10 leaves 14:7 15:21 19:19 21:17 led 112:10 Leda 67:24 134:8 Lee 19:21 20:2 Leek 36:22 44:5 51:8,15 52:21 54:13 57:21 71:15 120:22 130:12 131:4 134:1,4 Leeks 130:8 left 104:13 119:14 legal 6:8 8:15 52:22 53:11 62:23 91:3 103:9 119:9,10 legally 131:7 legislation 112:5 legislative 36:17 37:21 56:23 121:25 legislator 4:9 120:1 Legislature 7:13 37:15 99:12	105:24 109:7 125:10 legislatures 102:22 length 12:24 41:9 74:16 98:19 99:4 lengthy 6:14 Leon 13:10,22 14:1 69:14 73:13 110:11 lessons 112:9 let's 9:5,6 12:13 13:6 level 11:5 51:13 80:9 81:10,18 88:21 levels 27:18 61:17 Levy 13:24 liberty 36:2 licensed 83:3 light 45:21 86:1,3 limited 108:22 109:6 line 15:3,4 16:13 19:5,13 21:16 21:22,25 22:12 22:19 23:18 32:3 36:13 41:10,19 130:14 lines 13:24 15:14 17:21 19:7 21:21 22:10 23:15,24 24:8 41:16,21 42:20 43:16 57:9 65:20,21 74:2 86:25 98:22 linked 67:7,16 list 8:23,24 49:25 listen 114:8 listening 114:2 120:7 literally 42:9 114:12,15	115:12 118:2,2 118:14,18 125:23 litigation 54:21 76:25 litigator 72:24 little 34:8 38:20 41:17 42:6 43:3 45:10 63:10 64:6 104:4 121:9 126:9 live 49:1 lived 40:11 locally 16:11 located 18:11 locations 48:16 logical 97:17 102:25 long 11:2 33:11 42:11 74:6 81:12 89:22 97:24 123:16 longer 78:21 look 9:6 12:9 26:20 27:2,14 28:15,18 29:12 30:16 32:7 33:9 37:13 38:7 41:12,17 43:10 47:8 57:22 65:8 68:4 77:5 86:25 88:17 104:1 112:20 118:21 120:24 123:7 123:11 125:15 127:9 looked 12:12 64:19,24 118:23 119:3 looking 9:10,21 17:18 27:1,6 28:12 31:6 36:15 38:1,10 38:17,24 43:14 45:18 46:3 58:8 58:9 65:19 70:17,18 79:9
<hr/> L <hr/> laid 116:25 117:1 Lake 15:11 17:3 20:19 69:18 Lakes 23:20 land 18:3 40:19 40:22 67:8,17 landlocked 73:24				

<p>87:17 90:21 99:15 122:3 looks 31:17 39:23 92:21 lot 39:20 41:16 48:17,24 49:1,2 50:16 61:18 83:15 88:18 96:10 115:11 126:4 128:5 lots 44:14 louder 34:8 love 121:25 low 47:10,11 61:20 65:3 73:22,22 74:1 86:3,18 105:17 lower 31:12 lowest 49:13,20 58:6,8,14 73:23 Loxahatchee 21:12 Lucie 20:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <hr/> <p>M 1:24 ma'am 116:9 119:20 122:5 Madam 24:11,17 25:1,13 26:2,12 28:6,10 29:3 31:3 32:1,12,16 33:18 34:8,20 35:14 36:9 37:8 37:10 38:15 39:1,5,17 40:3 41:5,25 43:6 44:2,7 45:1,6 45:11,14 46:19 46:25 47:13,17 51:2,24 52:2,16 52:24 53:1,3,8 53:21 54:8 55:12 56:4,20 57:19 58:2 59:10 60:4,7,11 62:9 63:3,13,18</p>	<p>65:7 66:6,18 69:10 71:3 72:16 74:19 77:5 78:3 79:7 81:5 84:8 85:10 85:18,21 87:7 88:3 89:8,16 90:18 91:18 95:3,6,15,21 96:6 98:23 100:15 101:21 102:10 103:4 104:8 121:5 122:11 125:4 126:23 127:18 133:10 Madison 13:8 69:12 Maggard 3:1,2 132:8,9 maintain 11:8 31:20 34:12 43:22 maintained 33:22 117:24 maintenance 117:13 Maitland 16:21 major 15:2 20:17 22:6,25 39:25 42:12 121:17 majorities 106:19 majority 12:24 17:3 19:18 23:24 28:15 51:20 105:3,10 105:14 106:8 106:17,21,25 107:6,7,12 majority- 103:8 majority-mino... 11:9 16:14 20:9 23:5 67:2 68:18 makeup 112:18 making 30:1 32:11 58:15</p>	<p>63:8 93:14 94:9 123:25 malapportion... 106:4 man-made 86:25 87:13 Management 15:16 Manatee 19:9 manmade 74:5,5 manner 11:7 map 5:21 6:11,15 6:20 8:13,21 9:6,7,14,22 10:7,7,11,17,21 11:17 12:3 16:18 17:7,8 22:20 23:11 25:9 28:5 33:22 34:23 35:2,9 36:6 37:1 40:16 44:15,17 46:14 47:23 51:17 52:8 55:18,23 56:22 57:8,13 62:6 65:9 68:13 71:6,8 76:25 97:17 99:20 104:20 105:10 107:6,17,23 108:1 111:16 113:10 120:12 120:25 121:21 123:20 124:13 124:14,20 127:8,12,13 131:7,8 133:24 map's 55:15 109:15 Mapping 42:6 maps 7:18 12:20 26:5,9 33:24 35:4 37:22 45:8 51:6 55:23 61:2 62:23 72:12 107:10 112:10 122:13 124:12</p>	<p>124:17,23 125:13,16 126:18 129:23 March 81:22 Marcus 113:19 Margate 20:20 Marion 15:8 mark 130:19,20 marker 30:21 Martin 20:23 Maryland 74:4 80:14,16 81:21 87:10,14 101:23 mass 110:9 Massullo 3:3 132:10 materials 6:16 27:25 mathematical 100:1,5 matter 59:13 85:5 94:2 128:14 135:4 matters 81:8 115:14 maximize 57:10 mayor's 110:4 McClure 3:4,5 132:11,12 McCoy 113:19 113:21 mean 38:1 49:17 87:7 88:16 94:10 95:22 99:20 118:16 meaningful 108:17 109:14 meaningfully 107:1 means 74:14 meant 82:20 measure 52:19 88:8,16 measured 74:16 measurement 74:11,18,25</p>	<p>measures 50:9,16 79:24 87:25 88:2,13,14 97:10 measuring 50:5 74:10 Medley 23:20 meet 21:8 meeting 6:16,17 24:21 63:9 79:1 126:24,25 129:24 134:3 134:12 meetings 28:1 110:17 128:18 129:25 130:8 meets 75:15 member 2:10,11 51:1 121:4 122:8 134:11 members 2:2 3:22,24 4:3,6 4:22 5:22 7:3 8:19 9:5 11:25 12:12,20 23:3 24:14 35:8,11 36:14,21 44:21 50:24 55:3 58:22 72:7 77:11,14 87:22 100:10 104:11 109:12 114:4 119:13,17 121:8 122:9 126:8 127:12 127:14,19,24 129:10 130:2,6 130:19 131:3,6 131:11 133:16 133:16,17 134:5 memos 54:16 mention 24:22 109:10 128:11 mentioned 8:6,13 25:7,7 26:5 27:8 30:6,11</p>
--	--	---	---	--

43:2 44:10 92:1 101:22 mentioning 25:4 met 75:16 79:15 method 74:9,13 74:13 97:2 methodologies 87:24 methodology 7:17 34:24 68:13 89:3 117:2 metric 98:13 99:7 metrics 9:13 12:7 32:6 96:8 98:9 Mexico 38:20 Miami 22:23,24 23:20 38:22 40:18,18 43:18 43:19 Miami- 39:8 Miami-Dade 10:13 22:11,19 22:22 23:13,14 24:3,6,8 39:20 39:24 41:10 42:21 51:21 52:12 Michael 104:10 microphone 4:5 67:11 mics 131:12 mid 79:13 middle 88:19 124:10 miles 42:10,10,11 74:6,7 military 40:21 Miller 75:12 83:13 90:7 million 104:24 mind 24:25 29:13 43:14 44:20 77:13 88:15 99:11 104:14 119:16 130:13	mindset 124:19 mine 73:16 minimal 109:5 minimum 98:19 100:2,3 minorities 11:14 92:4 93:19,22 106:6 128:25 minority 8:3,5,23 10:21 11:1,4,10 13:15 20:14 22:17 23:8 47:25 48:9 51:13,18 52:9 60:16 61:10,21 75:20 76:4 78:14 84:15,24 85:1,6 90:3 92:16 95:11,18 100:25 103:9 107:11 114:14 117:7 minority's 85:15 minority-majo... 52:11 minority-mino... 85:3 minus 12:21 48:20 minute 50:17 83:24 minutes 119:14 Miramar 22:11 Miranda 104:11 104:16 misconduct 112:10 missed 34:6 Missouri 81:12 misspoke 56:12 mistaken 43:11 mistakes 112:9 mitigate 105:16 mix 115:5 mixing 56:15 114:16 mobilize 111:23	mockley 43:16 modern 76:3 moment 51:25 money 115:4 Monroe 24:5 months 6:2 8:7 77:10 Morales 3:6,7 132:13,14 morning 2:2 4:13 59:2 72:17 78:4 78:5,10 103:7 103:18 104:16 109:21,23 111:13 113:25 127:20 move 11:17,25 36:17 38:10 44:20 57:22 100:11 104:4 129:4 130:24 moved 56:14,17 moves 120:22 134:13 moving 14:21 17:17 18:23 20:7 22:13 25:21 57:9 58:13 111:16 121:23 municipal 15:3 17:21 19:13 21:16,21 22:9 24:1 41:16,19 66:11 70:16 municipalities 12:25 14:13 16:20 20:5 23:19 24:9 69:16 municipality 16:3 65:21 muster 119:2 muted 86:14 myfloridahous... 9:4	N name 6:13 72:17 91:22 109:21 111:18 113:25 names 78:9 narrow 78:25 91:10 94:17 96:1 narrowly 75:17 76:10,21 78:12 78:15 83:20 91:8 94:21 95:15 101:11 114:13 116:20 narrows 74:6 87:19 Nassau 14:4 110:8 nation 81:16 115:18,20,23 118:22 National 21:12 nationally 73:23 natural 87:1 naturally 87:11 nature 45:17 65:24 nauseam 70:13 navigating 126:24 nays 133:10 near 58:19 107:20 nearly 7:24 104:23 129:4 129:21 necessarily 29:9 30:20 32:6 48:12 88:20 necessary 17:13 21:14 38:22 43:22 120:23 need 4:16 5:23 38:6 50:17 100:11 104:13 110:12,13,15 117:5 119:14	needed 9:3 14:8 15:23 17:14 75:25 120:24 needs 73:4 116:20 negative 57:14 neighborhoods 128:7 neither 135:5 Never 126:24 new 5:7 9:7,13 10:8 11:12 16:14 55:18 64:2 106:17 110:25 114:17 nice 121:20 noise 5:20,22 nominate 28:21 non- 14:19 86:15 103:7 105:11 non-compact 73:25 74:15 76:13 82:25 83:16,18 86:7,8 87:11,12 non-compactn... 73:20 75:7,8 non-lawyer 92:11 93:6 non-vote 61:1 nonprofit 72:19 normal 130:23 north 5:3 16:1,9 21:8 22:23 48:3 48:17 87:19 88:17 95:19 northern 16:12 17:20 18:8,14 21:1 23:25 note 4:6 105:20 123:24 noted 13:13 20:12 22:15 notice 5:11 noticed 6:14 79:11 129:23 noting 101:22
--	--	--	---	---

number 9:21 10:6,20 38:2 40:12 71:14 97:7 105:3 107:8 120:13 120:15 numbers 6:18 NW 1:24	98:11 99:2,14 oop 114:17 Opa-locka 22:24 open 36:23 37:2 122:15 openness 122:16 operative 101:7 opining 103:25 opinion 5:1,11 82:14 90:22 94:1 98:4,11 99:1 102:12,16 123:1 opinions 95:24 99:6 opportunities 108:18 opportunity 11:14 90:23 92:16 93:18,21 103:6 104:19 106:11,24 108:8 119:15 125:25 128:2 128:24 130:7 130:10 opposed 36:4 113:2 opposite 103:11 opposition 104:19 113:9 option 70:23 options 42:7 108:20 Orange 10:14 16:8,12,18,24 17:1 27:6,8 112:20 order 2:4 6:2 8:7 11:21 15:4,23 20:24 30:10 70:24 76:1 77:21 110:4 organization 79:21 organizations 99:5	oriented 97:14 originally 127:4 Orlando 108:7 Orlando's 108:10 Osceola 16:6 19:5 outcome 46:16 51:16 outranks 68:20 outside 5:20 53:15 108:21 109:11 119:8 outstanding 133:20 outvote 107:13 outward 75:2 overall 10:2 34:23 49:14 50:16 override 5:24 overtime 35:22 overview 12:13	18:25 19:13,15 23:11 28:1 33:6 33:20 37:17 53:13,14 67:1 68:19 71:18 79:21 87:18 89:21 120:2,4,6 120:6 121:1 123:18 participate 11:15 93:19,22 128:25 participation 84:15 108:18 108:20 particular 65:2 72:21 75:9,10 76:1 88:15 97:2 97:19 118:6 122:22 123:5 particularly 76:8 86:10 87:18 88:22 93:3 133:19 parties 135:7 partisan 79:22 parts 13:9,21 party 11:23 128:22 Pasco 18:6,20 107:20 pass 133:13 passed 36:18 105:18 passion 116:10 Pastor 113:19,21 path 125:20 patterns 33:15 pause 5:13 121:22 paused 5:4 paying 70:12 PCB 5:17 6:7 7:3 7:6,10 24:15 36:15 62:11 68:24 71:9 72:8 127:16 130:22	130:24 131:13 133:12 Pembroke 22:10 Pennsylvania 102:23 people 10:2 14:8 15:22 16:4 17:2 17:10,24 19:2,2 19:10 20:24 21:18 40:11,12 49:1 79:20 115:21 118:4 126:1 percent 28:16,16 28:17,17,18 29:18,18 30:11 30:19,21 31:10 31:11,14,15 41:14 63:21,22 63:23 73:22,24 74:11 75:20 76:5 84:11,16 84:25 85:2 86:19 92:23,25 93:2,4 105:4,6 105:9,13,14 106:20 percentage 12:4 27:16 Perez 3:8,9 79:5 79:7,19 80:4 84:19 100:13 100:15 132:15 132:16 134:13 perfect 98:20 perfectly 98:15 98:20 perform 38:8 48:14 performance 35:21 38:3 52:19 59:7,15 59:25 60:2,16 109:10 112:17 124:5 performed 53:10 53:11 54:4	
O					
Oak 16:3 object 91:9 objection 134:14 obligation 59:17 obstacle 109:6 obviously 120:8 124:18 Ocala 31:7,21 occupational 4:8 occur 88:19 115:5 offer 36:25 102:24 offered 81:1,10 102:1 office 70:16 81:4 102:2,17 109:24 officio 58:24 oftentimes 50:15 66:9 Oh 84:3 114:22 okay 30:1 32:24 38:17 52:25 55:7 63:9 72:3 80:15 82:4,5 89:10,14 96:23 97:3 100:10 Okeechobee 19:17 21:2 Oklaosa 12:17 once 5:5 123:8 130:13 one's 58:14 one-time 78:20 one-to-one 48:12 ones 30:6 34:15					
		P			
		packet 8:20 9:2,3 24:21 25:6 54:25 page 122:3 pages 6:22 Pairing 17:12 Palm 10:14 18:16 20:11,24 21:2,4 21:7,8,15,18 Palmetto 24:1 pandemic 108:23 panhandle 12:15 paper 6:22 parallel 26:15 parameters 114:24 Park 16:21 20:19 22:23 parkway 18:8 19:24 part 14:5 15:2,7 15:13 16:8 17:4 17:12 18:6,20			

85:12 117:19 performing 13:11 20:9 22:15 23:5 30:5 performs 54:2 perimeter 50:17 88:6 permit 77:4 permits 92:14 permitted 10:24 83:17 Perry 84:18 person 10:5 12:22 48:20 54:14 93:12 97:17 102:23 115:22 123:22 personal 4:6 5:23 128:5 personally 128:1 perspective 89:24 pertains 82:22 phonetic 113:13 phrased 118:2 physical 109:24 pick 97:8 picking 29:11 32:6 88:23 picture 91:23 pieces 35:5 piggybacking 60:18 Pine 19:24 Pinellas 17:20,23 17:24 18:9 Pines 22:10 pitted 91:1 placed 10:12 placing 112:14 Plakon 3:10,11 132:17,18 plan 7:20 34:11 107:17,22 108:1,5,12,16 128:20 130:17 plane 50:21	planned 6:13 play 35:24 42:3 46:9 please 2:5 3:25 4:1,4 9:2 59:7 89:11 90:18 119:16 131:3,3 131:8,11,13 pleasure 6:25 134:10 plurality 28:14 plus 12:21 48:20 point 21:11 25:6 27:12,13 29:8 30:4,14 33:15 37:3 48:5 50:21 58:10 76:8 78:13 97:19 99:4 114:11,12 114:12 115:9 116:14,14 117:25 121:12 121:19 122:1,2 125:16 pointed 48:23 75:6 88:24 112:13 points 9:8 27:16 29:6,11,14 30:2 32:10 38:21 49:8 61:20 73:14 75:2 131:2 polarized 51:14 51:19 52:10 policy 38:7 99:6 131:2 political 7:25 11:15,23 41:15 42:22 43:13 46:10 65:18 93:19,23 98:17 105:18 118:7 118:13,20 128:22 129:1,7 politician 93:6 94:12 95:22	Polk 9:19 17:6,8 17:12 19:5 Polsby 73:18 78:8 Polsby- 9:16 58:9 88:9 Polsby-Popper 58:16,17 64:16 73:17,21 74:9 74:12,16 78:7 86:2,19 88:5,11 88:21 97:20 98:1,2,8 99:10 99:16 Polsby-Popper 47:9,10 50:15 Popper 9:17 58:10 72:14,16 72:17 73:17 77:7,16,19,23 78:5,16 79:15 80:3,11,14,23 81:12,19 82:2,7 82:10,16 83:10 84:2,8 85:16 86:5 87:4,6 88:3,10 89:5,8 89:11 90:6,25 92:9 94:2 95:1 95:11,14,21 96:10,13,15,18 96:21 97:3,6 98:14 99:9,19 101:5,24 102:3 102:8,19 103:13,19,24 104:7 114:7,9 116:16 119:1 121:14 population 7:16 7:24 8:24 9:24 10:4,5,22 11:1 12:19,21 13:25 14:8,10 15:5,9 15:10,17,22,24 15:25 17:1,5,9 17:11,13,14	18:21,22 19:4 19:11,20,22 20:4,11,12,25 21:13,20 23:13 24:6 26:22,24 27:9,12,19 30:19 40:9 41:23 43:3 44:12,18 47:25 48:18,24 49:7 63:20,24 64:1,2 64:4 75:21 92:24 93:5 100:4 104:22 105:2,5,7,9,11 105:13,14 106:19,22 107:2,7 108:8 117:18 129:5 population's 30:17 33:12 populations 48:9 61:22 73:13 92:16 107:15 107:20 Poreda 39:2,3,5 40:4 41:1,3,5 42:15,16,18,25 43:24 44:7,9,10 46:19,21,22 63:15,16,18 69:8,10 portion 13:20 18:8 67:22 109:3 portions 18:2 69:14 87:15 position 73:11 90:13 94:9 124:9 possibility 112:14 possible 7:24 8:2 17:10 22:7 23:1 70:15 92:13 102:16 108:15 108:15 126:3	postures 48:11 potential 72:22 potentially 75:14 poured 115:10 power 105:18 113:7 powers 125:10 practical 85:4 129:5 practice 55:22 115:1 practices 106:1,4 110:22 practitioner 74:23 83:3 Pratt 78:1 precedent 46:2 prediction 94:22 preface 45:16 89:20 preferences 5:24 prelude 78:22 premise 100:22 prepare 77:21 prepared 129:15 129:17 present 3:7,22 5:17 7:9 76:22 104:19 110:17 130:3 presentation 7:6 9:1 12:1 130:16 presentations 40:8 50:8 presented 35:4 35:19 62:12 70:25 preserve 55:24 preserving 38:8 57:9 112:12 president 6:11 8:18 10:25 11:8 62:14 114:1 pressed 87:8 pressures 128:6 presume 94:8 pretty 120:1
--	---	---	---	---

prevail 28:24 29:10	105:16,19 109:8 111:16	118:13,20	125:8	122:20
prevented 35:25	119:23 120:16	protected 8:23	public 4:1 59:5	questions 7:6
previous 33:21 127:21	120:17 121:8	10:18,19,20	72:9 104:5,12	24:14,19 25:5
previously 24:21 30:8 80:16	121:11,19	11:10 25:10,21	108:18,20,21	29:15 32:4
primaries 28:13 106:4	122:1,4,15	25:24 26:7	109:2,13,14	35:12,17 36:24
primarily 12:23 18:6 19:22 20:2	123:10 125:23	31:18,24 34:1	126:5,8 129:24	37:18 50:25
22:1 41:8 44:11	125:25 127:2	34:14 39:9,11	129:25 133:17	51:7,10 55:2,8
primary 11:4	127:10 128:4,8	48:4,6,7 56:6	pull 58:3	58:23 62:2 64:9
16:9 18:13 24:7	129:1,14,16,20	59:17 61:13	purpose 12:22	68:23,25 72:6
27:5,20 28:14	130:10,23	62:5 63:19,25	pursue 46:16	77:6,8,13 79:6
28:22 29:10,16	133:22 134:6	67:2 95:19	put 5:22 27:24	80:6 82:6 89:13
29:17 30:7,16	produce 124:22	105:1 109:9	33:16 45:8	89:15 90:16
30:18 31:9	product 35:9	124:16	124:19 126:15	96:5 100:11,14
printed 6:20,22	120:14 121:9	protecting 39:13	Putnam 14:25	101:19 120:3,7
printers 6:21	130:21	95:11 114:14	puts 73:10	123:21 127:20
printout 8:21	professional	protection 8:3	putting 50:12	129:9 133:18
prior 75:22,25	88:12 99:13	75:14 79:2 91:5		133:25
80:2 116:1	Professor 73:18	105:22	Q	quick 4:24 37:25
prioritize 69:25	78:8	protections 62:21	qualification	quite 47:3
70:21 71:21,22	proficient 108:22	68:17 125:7	98:15	quote 7:19
prioritizing	109:7	protective 39:21	quantify 12:4	quoted 118:2
70:22	program 42:6	protects 57:13	quarter 105:1,8	
privy 53:6	progress 71:6	90:3 103:8	question 26:13	R
PRLDEF 104:17	prohibition	proud 37:23 71:6	29:5 34:7 36:11	rabbit 51:9
probably 26:19	100:24	119:6 125:17	36:13 42:5	race 83:22 90:4
119:25	proper 116:24	130:20 133:21	45:16,25 47:20	100:19 115:13
problem 96:2	properly 8:4	proudly 10:6	49:25 52:4,7	115:17 116:18
97:19,21 117:5	116:20	prove 113:9	54:6 56:2 58:1	117:3
problems 94:15	proponent	proven 33:11	58:21 59:3,11	race-based 75:11
94:17	104:10	112:6	59:21 62:18	83:21 91:5
proceeded	proposal 25:18	provide 36:11	63:2,14 64:22	92:18 101:15
112:24	propose 78:13,23	58:15 59:20	67:19 71:18	racial 11:14
process 5:4,6,13	proposed 5:18	63:15 87:22	78:11,16 79:3	61:10 73:8 92:4
5:13,20 6:3	6:4 8:10,21 9:8	88:1 106:14	81:9 83:10	93:18,21
7:17 8:8 11:15	9:14 10:7,8,11	109:4 129:19	85:22 86:5 87:3	105:20 106:5
26:15 33:6 35:7	10:15,17 24:11	130:11	89:20 90:19	117:8 128:25
36:17 37:5 48:8	55:19 83:25	provided 5:12	91:15 92:9,23	racially 51:14,19
53:13 57:23	84:5 104:20	26:23 103:6,18	93:13,14 94:5	52:10 90:1
59:20 62:3,4,6	105:10 106:16	124:1 133:17	94:17,23 95:2,7	railway 21:1
62:19 71:5 77:9	107:18 120:15	135:3	97:4 99:1	raised 71:4
81:23 93:19,23	133:23	provides 30:24	100:16,20	117:16
102:6,14,18	proposes 8:11	32:8 59:15	103:1 126:2,19	Ranches 22:10
	proposition	112:16	128:15,17	range 10:2
	103:10	providing 119:10	questioned	rank 49:21
	protect 59:17	provision 61:7,8	114:21	ranking 2:10,11
	67:3 105:19	90:3 91:13	questioning	50:20 121:4
		provisions 8:3	114:3,10	122:7 134:10

rate 58:14	65:13 66:19,24	47:21	37:14	80:8
Raton 21:15	69:9 72:15 79:6	referencing	relative 135:6	reported 54:15
re-reference 29:5	80:6 85:20	24:25 29:14	release 109:17	133:12
re-referencing	89:13 104:15	32:19	released 8:10	reports 54:10,20
29:13	109:20 111:12	referred 34:11	relevance 85:23	represent 52:1
reach 102:17	119:19 127:16	60:20	rely 99:10	105:8 110:2
134:2	recommendation	referring 46:8	remain 14:13	117:20
read 7:19 80:8	71:12	52:20 54:3 56:7	17:23 36:22	representation
103:6,14	reconciled 25:22	56:22	remainder 15:1,9	70:20 90:24
130:14	130:9	reflect 106:13	18:5	91:25 93:1
reading 78:7	reconciliation	reflective 16:15	remaining 13:20	103:19 110:13
ready 37:23	37:5	reflects 6:17	14:5 15:10,25	representative
real 37:25 115:24	reconfigured	refocus 5:19	17:1 18:2,20	2:12,14,16,18
real-world 35:5	33:7	Refuge 21:12	19:4,15,21 24:5	2:20,22,25 3:2
reality 91:23	reconsider	refuges 40:21	remains 56:5	3:5,7,9,11,13
realize 127:3	110:23	regard 71:7,10	59:18	3:15,17 4:10,12
really 26:8 31:17	record 7:20 26:6	regarding 36:24	remarks 32:3	4:21 24:16,17
36:14 42:22	27:24 33:11	54:11	remedial 28:2	25:3 26:1,2,13
47:21 55:20	117:17 124:15	regardless 33:25	33:6	27:7 28:9,10
57:7 91:14	124:19 130:17	34:13	remedy 75:17	29:4,16,23,25
94:24 120:5	recording 1:10	regards 119:9	76:2 95:16	31:1,2,3 32:18
reason 26:8 29:7	134:15 135:3	region 7:8 12:14	101:10,11	32:22 33:17,18
34:10 38:5	recreate 9:12	13:5 14:22	117:5	34:9 35:13,14
79:19 97:17	recreated 13:12	16:16 20:6 27:1	remember 50:7	35:17 36:10,12
reasoned 7:22	20:10 28:1	49:6,6,7 58:7	51:8 115:9	37:10 38:17
130:19	61:16,16	106:21	131:11	39:17 41:25
reasons 88:7	rectify 123:12	regional 108:21	remind 58:18	42:24 43:6 44:3
117:14 120:13	redistrict 7:14	regions 12:8	72:10 129:10	44:19,23,25
recall 40:7	redistricting 1:11	48:13	reminder 7:5	45:1,3,7,13,14
103:15,24	2:3 5:4 6:3 8:8	register 111:23	104:12 133:23	45:25 46:25
recap 4:25 26:18	22:5 28:2 36:20	registered 26:25	reminders 3:24	47:19 49:11,19
receipt 107:3	53:12 68:8	27:14 31:16	Reno 75:12	50:23 51:2 52:3
receive 72:2 81:2	79:22,24 81:11	registration	Reock 9:15 47:6	52:6 53:3,21
received 130:1	81:15 82:11	112:22	47:8 50:9,10	54:8 55:1,4,5,8
receiving 37:3	89:4 102:6,13	regression 51:12	58:8,15 64:16	55:11,12 56:8
129:9	102:18,21	regular 93:12	74:10,12,13,17	56:24 57:5,7,25
recognise 4:11	104:18 105:16	reimbursement	88:5,9,11,20,22	58:25 59:11,23
recognised 7:9	109:8 111:9	80:21	88:25 97:12,20	60:5,13,22 62:1
recognizable	127:22 130:25	reiterate 68:16	97:23 98:7 99:3	62:10,17 63:2,3
22:25	133:25 134:7	reiterates 108:17	99:10,16	63:14 64:12,13
recognized 24:16	redrawing	related 59:15	Rep 51:6,11	64:22 65:1 66:2
25:24 26:11	112:10	relates 82:12	112:13	66:15,17,21
29:2,21 32:15	reduce 71:13	relating 24:19	repeat 33:1 34:7	67:1,6,10,12,15
39:4 41:4 42:17	refer 9:2	122:13	52:4 66:20	67:18,20 68:25
47:16 52:18	reference 12:2	relationship	67:10 71:17	69:1,21 70:2,5
57:25 60:10	48:2	53:14	repeatedly 109:1	70:10,11 71:19
61:6 63:17	referenced 9:1	relationships	report 8:25 12:3	72:3 79:5,7,19

80:4,5,7,12,15 81:5,14,24 82:4 82:9 85:16,19 85:21 89:12,15 89:16 90:15,17 91:17 93:11,24 94:24 95:4,6 96:5,6,11,12,14 96:16,19,23 97:5 98:5,23 99:18 100:9,12 100:13,15,17 101:18,20,25 102:4,10,19 117:9,20 119:19,20 121:2,5 122:10 122:11 123:15 125:3,4 126:21 126:22 128:12 128:17 129:2,8 131:17,20,22 131:24 132:1,3 132:5,7,9,12,14 132:16,18,20 132:22,24 133:1,5,7,9 134:13 representatives 11:16 48:23 53:19 92:5 117:16 130:2 representatives' 109:14 represents 104:20 112:25 request 5:5 32:12 45:7,8 53:11 55:14 56:1 108:17 requested 5:1 55:6 required 15:24 76:14 79:2 83:15 84:22 85:12 requirement	47:24 48:21 68:21 78:18,21 79:1 requirements 45:19,19,22 61:9 78:24 83:1 90:12 requires 54:4,22 66:12 83:8 106:7 128:4,8 reservations 125:21 reside 80:13,16 87:9 101:23 108:23 residence 109:25 resident 109:23 112:8,25 residents 91:24 111:6 resolve 81:9 respect 11:7 35:17 36:3 82:23 121:25 126:14 respectfully 77:1 78:24 respective 27:1 respectively 10:15 respects 20:16 respond 29:23 78:17 responded 80:18 response 39:19 43:8 98:25 99:13 responses 85:24 responsibility 5:25 119:25 130:3 rest 20:1 58:20 67:16 68:12 118:11,22 119:4 restrictions 84:19	result 28:4 75:10 128:24 resulting 27:18 results 27:3 33:10 resume 80:8 resumed 5:13 retained 53:14 53:18 reveals 7:21 130:18 reverse 30:9 revert 51:7 review 7:20 12:13 25:17 32:10 35:18 128:19 130:17 revised 73:3 revisit 32:2 right 5:14 6:24 38:6 42:8,24 50:22 56:25 58:11 68:22 72:5,7 99:14 102:3 104:9 121:23 rights 62:5,15,20 75:22 82:23 84:17 90:3 92:12 101:9 105:19,21,25 106:7 111:21 115:7,25 116:22 rise 134:13 river 15:21 16:11 16:12 19:5,23 42:9 Riverbend 107:21 rivers 42:7 riverways 65:19 road 12:23 16:10 18:7,15,15,16 18:16 19:24,24 roads 15:6,15 18:13	roadways 15:3 16:10 20:17 22:6,25 Robert 72:14,17 Robinson 113:16 113:17 robust 106:25 114:4 roles 83:18 roll 2:5 37:23 131:13 rookie 134:9 room 120:19 127:8 Rosa 12:17 round 38:8 rounded 21:10 Route 22:1 routinely 107:13 rubber 50:12 75:1 Rucho 118:1,8 rudimentary 45:17 rule 72:20 ruling 5:10 7:19 62:14 130:15 run 26:17 57:3 62:6 128:8 running 26:15 runs 74:7 rural 48:18 89:21 120:4 rushed 7:8 Rutherford 110:16 <hr/> S <hr/> safe 11:21 Safety 17:22 salad 114:16,17 Sam 134:8 Santa 12:17 Sarasota 19:10 19:11,15 sat 86:22 satisfies 91:6,7	satisfy 76:11,12 82:25 84:16 save 6:21 saw 26:6,7 111:1 112:21 Sawgrass 22:7 saying 25:8 34:10 34:13,14 62:22 71:15 78:22 80:24 89:20 92:20 118:6 says 61:9 84:22 114:17 115:12 116:17 118:15 scale 86:11 97:9 scales 74:15 scenarios 97:22 scientists 88:4 Soon 113:23,25 114:1 116:8,9 116:13 score 9:11,15,16 9:17 47:8,9,10 49:14,18,21 50:2,5,9,10,11 50:14,15 58:5,8 58:10,11,13,15 58:17,19 75:5 86:2,3 87:24 88:20,22,25 97:12,14,20,21 97:23 98:8,8 scores 9:15 12:6 45:20 47:5,6,6 49:4,21 50:20 58:6 64:15 65:3 65:22 73:21 88:24 scoring 74:21 86:20 screen 45:9 scrutiny 75:15 76:11,12 79:1 91:6,7 115:25 116:3,6,15,18 116:23 117:2 season 104:18
--	--	---	---	---

seat 107:4 seats 105:10 second 45:4 49:24 71:18 94:10 106:16 111:18 secondary 47:24 65:24 SECRETARY 2:6,8,10,15,17 2:19,21,23 3:1 3:3,6,8,10,12 3:14,16,18,20 3:22 131:15,17 131:21,23,25 132:2,4,6,8,10 132:13,15,17 132:19,21,23 132:25 133:2,4 133:6,8,10 section 69:2 75:18,22,23,24 82:22,22 83:8 84:16,20 90:7,8 90:8,9,10 91:13 92:11,12 101:8 106:9 107:10 115:8,10,12 see 4:23 12:1 27:15 31:8 34:21,22 35:9 39:22 40:16,22 40:24 47:8,10 55:6,16,20,24 57:11 63:5,22 66:9 75:1 78:9 87:12 88:14,15 88:18,20 93:17 97:11 119:8 120:9 122:14 122:21,25 123:8,11 seeing 38:7 63:1 64:9 68:22 72:6 72:9 127:15 seen 28:16 74:1 75:4 78:7	124:16 Segueing 13:17 select 117:8,20 Seminole 15:13 Senate 25:23 26:5,14 33:24 37:6 55:23 107:17 112:12 124:9,14 130:9 Senate's 25:18 107:16,22 108:1,4,12,16 send 126:15 sense 46:7 59:5 92:23 104:25 sent 73:3 80:8 sentence 91:12 114:15 115:6 separate 108:11 separates 15:17 separation 125:10 sergeant 4:3 series 51:6 serrated 86:11 serrations 88:21 serve 75:19 serves 12:10 service 126:20 services 108:19 session 5:1 set 6:4 8:9 60:20 76:20 98:20 128:5 setup 52:7 seven 14:22 19:16 104:12 shaking 57:11 shape 13:4 14:20 23:11 38:19,22 39:6 43:16 64:8 87:5 98:13 shaped 14:17 17:15 shapes 39:15 68:9 share 30:15	31:15 77:20 80:18 81:17 127:25 shared 54:12 shares 8:24 14:1 23:17 27:20 sharing 124:2 Shaw 75:12 shifted 63:5 shifting 7:15 shooting 98:1 Shores 22:24 short 14:8 15:22 19:20 38:21 show 92:13 117:23 133:12 showed 40:8 showing 78:18 shows 30:13 shy 17:10 side 18:15,17 21:11 22:12 23:18 110:10 sidebar 101:21 sides 23:25 120:19 signed 112:5 significant 128:6 silence 3:25 silly 98:19 Silver 90:8 Silvers 3:12,12 132:19,20 similar 9:12,22 10:22 12:6 14:14 16:18,22 23:10 31:7,14 31:16,17 61:17 112:18 similarly 13:12 20:10 48:22 108:3 simply 64:4 84:22 124:21 single 9:20 10:4 17:25 46:6 sir 4:18 78:4	80:11 81:13 103:5,17 Sirois 2:2,6,7 3:23 4:19 7:9 7:11 24:23 25:12,13 31:25 32:1,17 34:4,5 34:19,20 36:8,9 38:14,15,25 39:1 40:2,3 42:13,14 43:25 44:1 45:6,23,24 47:2,12,13,18 51:23,24 52:5 52:14,15 53:7,8 53:17,25 54:1 54:18,19 56:3,4 56:18,19 57:1 57:17,18 59:8,9 60:3,3,4,12,17 61:3,4 62:8,9 63:12,13 64:20 64:21 65:6,7,15 66:5,6,17,20,23 66:25 67:9,14 67:23,24 70:1,2 70:8,9 71:1,2 71:25 72:1 78:2 78:3,6 79:4 85:9,10,16,18 103:2,3,16,22 119:15,22 122:12 124:3 127:15,17 131:10,15,16 133:14,15 sit 122:16 123:3 situated 112:21 six 11:10 size 43:18,20 Skidmore 2:10 2:11 51:1,2 52:1,3,6 53:3 53:21 54:8 55:1 121:4,5 132:21 132:22 sleeves 37:24	slides 40:8 slight 10:23,25 27:10 slightly 50:5 slim 67:7,16 106:21 sliver 67:8,17 small 15:7 17:12 86:11 smaller 43:17,19 86:12 88:21 97:15 120:8 snapshot 8:22 social 88:4 sole 65:22 solidly 31:13 somewhat 59:23 115:15 sorry 24:23 34:6 45:4 47:7 52:1 53:18 66:17 67:9,12 76:18 84:2,3 87:9 sort 24:20 26:4,9 31:20 33:24,25 34:12,16 123:3 123:3 sound 131:7 sounds 99:3 south 14:10 19:4 21:13,18 48:4 48:22 51:17,21 52:8,12 56:16 88:17 121:18 southern 18:16 19:13 21:5 22:12 24:2,6 Southwest 22:10 Space 40:22 spare 110:1 speak 4:4 26:14 26:16 71:15 84:8,9 86:22 109:22 110:1 114:7 speaker 4:2 134:4
---	--	---	---	--

speakers 72:10 123:23	134:1,8	100:18 101:4,6	stretching 38:19	superseded 78:25
speaking 29:19 30:5 51:22 52:13 89:5 93:5 110:18	staffs 126:18	101:7 110:10	Strickland 84:18	support 33:14 107:5 114:11 115:2,6 117:13 120:11 121:13
specialist 72:18	stage 54:20	112:3 113:3	strict 75:15 76:11 76:12 79:1 91:6 91:7 115:25 116:3,6,15,18 116:23 117:2	supported 106:12 114:20
specialized 76:1	stagnant 27:10 27:11	118:6,10,12 124:15	strong 92:13	supporting 120:25
specialty 73:16	stair-step 38:19	state's 5:18 92:25	strongest 77:3 103:9	suppose 78:22 90:25 97:23
specific 29:11 30:4,14 45:9 52:7 62:11	stairway 43:15	state-wide 8:21 9:10,14 12:13 49:17	stuff 57:3,15 126:16	supposed 126:10
specifically 26:23 27:7 30:6,18 51:17 79:23 100:24 111:22 128:9	stand 37:21 119:2	stated 5:6 114:12 120:3	Subcommittee 1:11 2:3 4:23 109:16 127:4 127:12 134:3	suppression 112:3,4
speculation 94:4	standards 7:22 9:9 46:2 61:24 62:24 65:16,23 65:25 66:3 70:17 72:12,13 112:15 128:10 128:19	statement 73:7 123:23	Subcommittee's 9:4	supremacy 90:11
spike 97:13,16,18 97:21	standard 44:12 44:18 61:1 65:17 103:8	statements 114:20	subdivisions 98:17	Supreme 5:2,7,9 7:18 10:25 11:8 52:18 54:22 73:9 75:13 76:12 82:17 83:13 89:3,6 91:11 94:5,20 99:23 103:11 103:20,25 111:15 114:18 114:19 117:1 118:1,5,15,16 118:24,25 119:2 130:15
spillover 86:10	standpoint 90:21	states 10:25 76:4 79:25 99:23 102:6 105:22 114:18 118:1,5 118:12,20,23 118:25	subject 52:25	sure 4:4 8:19 11:20 30:1 32:25 33:2 44:23 52:6 56:6 58:15 61:21 63:8 69:7 71:20 79:20,23 83:23 85:4 100:12 121:23 124:6 124:14
split 9:23,24 10:8 10:10 12:18 14:2 20:21 35:3 44:17 107:19	start 24:20 26:21 27:14 30:10 122:1	statewide 27:3	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
splits 8:24 9:22 10:6 15:5 43:17 43:18 69:17 71:3,8,14 74:8	started 27:17 32:3 46:2 115:18,21,23 116:5 125:19 128:18 130:15 131:1	stating 84:14	submitted 73:1 76:22	subsequent 35:7
splitting 21:14 31:21	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13	statistical 52:22 53:9	subordinate 79:17,17,17	substantial 107:2
spoke 52:21 79:10	starts 57:3	statistics 8:22 31:7 73:3	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
spot-checking 29:11	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24	stats 88:1	submitted 73:1 76:22	subordinate 79:17,17,17
Springs 13:1,3 21:23	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13	status 72:22 112:13	subordinate 79:17,17,17	subsequent 35:7
Sprowls 134:4	started 27:17 32:3 46:2 115:18,21,23 116:5 125:19 128:18 130:15 131:1	statute 83:2	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantial 107:2
square 42:10	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24	statutes 90:10	submitted 73:1 76:22	substantially 105:5
St 14:10,12,13,16 15:1,3,4 20:23 110:8	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13	stay 5:23 110:24	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
staff 4:3 6:8 8:14 13:14 20:14 22:17 23:7 57:11,21 123:3 123:6 126:8	starts 57:3	step 118:8	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24	Steven 4:14	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13	sticking 39:21	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3	stop 36:16,18 44:6 120:16 133:24	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24	strengthen 106:20	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13	stretch 39:23	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3	stretched 75:2	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24	stretches 88:23	submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	state 6:10 7:5,8 8:17 12:14,23 15:6,15 16:7 18:7,14 40:10 48:13,16 56:22 58:12,20 62:13 62:13 68:19 71:11 74:4,21 76:23 80:13 81:11,20 83:1 83:12 87:5,16 87:19 90:2 91:24 95:13,19 98:1 99:24		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starting 8:12 12:14 24:25 25:5 27:13		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	starts 57:3		submit 76:6,20 77:1 78:24 80:21 109:2 129:23	substantially 105:5
	<			

T	tended 88:5	50:23 51:1,2,24	55:16 60:6	tier 7:22 9:9
tactics 112:4	tends 86:9	52:5,15 53:1,3	78:19 95:23,25	10:16 12:5,7
tail 34:6 91:4	term 92:1 120:2	53:8,21 54:8	96:3 99:22	16:13 25:10
tailored 75:17	terms 32:10 46:3	55:1,12 56:4,9	116:15 119:7	31:18,23 33:25
76:10,21 78:12	60:14,23 63:9	56:19 57:5,15	things 33:2 68:10	34:14 36:1 38:4
78:15 83:21	71:13 73:11	57:18 58:2,3,20	88:8,10 97:7	38:12,23 39:7
91:8 94:21	territory 11:20	58:25 59:1,9,11	100:8 110:18	39:12 43:15,20
95:15 101:11	40:7 129:3	60:4,5,11,12,13	111:7 114:23	43:23 44:11
tailoring 79:1	test 6:14 9:19	60:22 62:9,17	117:12 120:23	45:18,19,21
91:10 94:18	52:20 68:11	62:24 63:3,13	125:21	46:2 47:24 48:4
96:1	testified 81:17	63:14,18 64:13	think 32:2 33:3,4	48:6,21 49:6
take 4:1 5:8 9:6	102:20 117:14	64:21 65:7,14	36:11,13 37:6	55:25 57:10,14
25:19 38:6 46:2	testify 72:21	66:6,25 68:1,2	37:17,23 38:3,6	61:8,24 62:5,20
49:24 55:8 64:5	102:6,13,17	68:21 69:1,10	40:7,17 44:3	63:9 64:6,7
taken 121:22	testifying 123:22	70:2,9 71:2	50:5,11,20 51:4	65:16,17,23,25
talk 63:10 68:8	testimony 4:1	72:3,15,16 77:7	55:25 56:21	66:3 68:17,19
77:25 90:20	72:10 73:1,6	78:3,10,16 79:4	57:10,12,21	68:21 69:6,22
94:12,13 96:25	77:11,22,24	79:7 80:4,7,11	59:12,21 62:21	69:22,23,23,25
100:7	78:1,12 81:10	80:23 82:5,6,6	63:23 66:7	70:3,5,6,17,24
talked 33:9	95:23 101:12	82:7,8 83:6,10	70:14 71:6 75:8	71:21 72:1
125:21	101:16 102:24	85:9,10,18,21	79:12 80:16	76:15,15,17,17
talking 40:19	103:5,17,23	86:5 87:21 89:9	81:24 88:8 91:1	76:18,19 78:24
56:10 59:4,13	104:1,5 114:3	89:16,18 90:17	92:10,22 93:16	90:12,12 93:18
60:24 82:1,2,16	121:15 124:2	91:17 92:9	94:4,12 95:22	94:20,20
84:10,23 90:7,8	125:19 126:4	94:25 95:8,10	97:6 99:17,24	112:13,15
90:9 91:4 93:2	130:1	96:4,6 98:5,23	100:20,20	115:10,11
94:13,14 111:5	text 6:15,17,23	98:25 100:5,15	102:25 103:7	128:10,10,19
118:17	thank 3:23 4:12	101:20,21	111:3,4,7	128:20 129:4
Tallahassee	4:17,19,21 7:2	102:10 103:3	119:24 120:14	tiers 35:6 37:1
69:18 108:21	7:11 24:13,17	103:13 104:3,6	120:17 122:18	time 4:2 7:7 22:5
108:24	24:24 25:3,13	104:7,8,17	124:13 126:25	25:2 37:15 58:3
Tamarac 20:20	26:2,12,13 28:7	109:18,19,22	127:7 128:14	72:25 86:12
Tamiami 23:15	28:8,10 29:3,4	111:9,10,13,14	129:13	87:12 104:13
41:11,21	29:22 30:25	113:10,12,15	third 74:18,21	110:1 113:11
Tampa 17:19	31:1,3 32:1,16	113:18,22	Thompson	115:4 116:1
18:18	32:17,22 33:16	116:14 117:12	135:14	123:17 127:20
task 5:19 127:25	33:18 34:5,8,20	119:11,12,20	thorough 114:10	timeline 33:11
tasked 111:17	35:14 36:9,10	120:25 121:2,5	thought 56:14	times 70:13
team 110:20,21	37:8,10,12	121:7 122:5,5,7	three 10:18,18	122:19
technical 6:17	38:15 39:1,5,17	122:11,12,15	14:23 17:9 20:6	today 4:1,14,16
44:8	39:19 40:3 41:5	123:6,9,12,15	39:8,13 43:19	4:16,18 5:16,17
tell 25:17 49:12	41:25 42:2 43:6	123:18 125:2,4	64:1,17 74:6	7:3 9:2 12:1
57:2 62:11	43:8 44:1,24	126:19,22	87:24 108:11	35:10 36:16,19
85:11 88:4 94:3	45:1,6,11,12,14	127:13,17,19	three- 115:21	37:18,20 51:5
96:25 102:4	45:24 46:25	133:15,16,19	threshold 12:9	62:12 71:9
119:1	47:2,13,17,18	134:3,7,11	12:19	72:12 76:15
ten 7:14	47:19 49:8,19	thing 5:14 38:9	tied 46:15	77:12,15,18,22

78:8 80:2,19 81:9 109:25 114:21 119:21 120:12,18 121:10,16,24 122:14 123:2 123:19 124:20 124:25 126:25 127:11 128:15 130:7 131:7 133:17 134:13 today's 6:16 130:15 told 102:1 118:11 Toledo 3:12,13 132:23,24 Tomoka 15:16 tool 12:1,6 top 10:13 49:22 topic 72:11 topics 81:13 torpedo 76:19 tortured 68:9 total 88:6 98:22 105:2,5,7,8,13 totality 70:18 totally 56:12 touches 116:4 Trabulsy 3:14,15 132:25 133:1 track 6:18 121:23 tract 40:19 tracts 40:22 traditional 73:15 74:24 76:16 95:25 Trail 23:15 41:11 41:21 transcript 135:3 TRANSCRIPT... 1:10 TRANSCRIPT... 135:1 translation 109:1 translations 109:5	transparency 72:19 transparent 77:9 102:15 travel 80:19,22 travelled 4:15 travels 21:24 tremendous 134:5 trends 33:14 trial 81:22 tried 86:23 115:24 Trotti 109:20,21 109:22 trouble 94:6 true 69:23 70:16 80:24 101:2 106:15 135:2 trust 120:13,15 try 42:2,3 46:16 104:4 trying 39:11 57:8 57:9 70:19 91:23 97:18 102:15 115:3 117:5 119:1 Tuck 2:8,9 7:1,2 7:12 24:13 25:12 26:1,10 28:8 29:1,20 31:2,25 32:14 33:17 34:4,19 35:11 36:8 37:9 38:14,25 39:3 39:16 40:2 41:3 41:24 42:13,16 43:5,24 44:9,19 44:25 45:3,12 45:23 46:21,24 47:12,15 49:10 49:15,23 50:24 51:23 52:3,14 53:2,7,16,20,25 54:7,18 55:2,7 55:11 56:3,18 57:6,17,24	58:22 59:8,22 60:9 61:3,5 62:8,16 63:1,12 63:16 64:9,20 64:25 65:6,12 66:1,5,14,19,23 67:18,23 68:22 69:8,20 70:1,4 70:8 71:1,25 72:5 77:7,17,20 78:2 79:5 80:5 82:8 83:6,23 84:3 85:9,19 87:4,21 89:2,7 89:9,12 90:15 91:16 93:10 95:4,10,17 96:4 100:9,13 101:18 102:9 103:1 104:3,9 109:19 111:10 113:12,15,18 113:22 116:8 119:12 121:2 122:7 123:13 131:10 133:2,3 133:12,20 turn 4:3,4 94:13 124:24 131:11 turnout 27:2,14 76:5 112:7,23 Turnpike 20:18 22:8 23:23 24:7 two 7:22 22:21 31:11 37:1 65:2 74:15 87:23 88:13,24 90:7,9 90:10 93:17,25 100:10 111:25 115:18 120:13 120:15 124:22 two-hour 129:24 typical 51:10 typically 74:17 99:10	U.S 18:7 20:3,17 ultimately 27:18 37:20,21 125:15 unavailable 109:12,13 unclear 126:9 unconstitutional 75:23,24 101:14 underlying 35:22 undermined 106:5 undermines 109:13 underrepresen... 104:23 understand 6:2 8:8 12:11 35:18 36:15 38:1 54:17 57:2 59:16 67:3,4,6 73:2,4,19 76:14 82:19,20 91:21 understanding 80:25 81:2,4 122:22 123:10 understood 115:7 undertaken 6:1 8:7 undertaking 8:4 unfair 107:9 unfairly 104:20 unfolds 37:5 UNIDENTIFL... 3:21 union 14:24 76:4 unique 120:1 unison 37:22 United 99:23 105:22 114:18 117:25 118:5 118:23,25 unnecessarily 107:24 108:3 unnecessary 66:4	66:8 unpopulated 39:22 41:7 unusual 74:12 88:24 102:12 102:16 125:13 uphold 6:3 8:8 57:10 ups 122:23 urge 106:10,20 108:9 109:16 US- 41:10 US-41 23:15 24:7 42:20 use 38:4 90:4 116:18,23 useful 74:25 uses 12:23 21:12 21:15 22:9,24 23:22 41:9,16 41:19 usually 68:7 74:13 88:25 utilises 22:6 utilising 7:24 19:12 21:21 utilized 119:10 129:22 utilizing 129:6
V				
v 1:4 118:1 variation 40:24 variations 27:10 variety 62:2 vast 23:24 vehicle 129:11 Venice 19:13 versus 90:7,8,9 99:7 124:5 veteran 111:2 veterans 110:2,3 110:7,9,11,15 110:19 111:5 viability 45:21 vice 110:5 116:8 133:21				

<p>Vice-Chair 2:8,9 7:1,2,11 24:13 25:12 26:1,10 28:8 29:1,20 31:2,25 32:14 33:17 34:4,5,19 35:11 36:8 37:9 38:14,25 39:3 39:16 40:2 41:3 41:24 42:13,16 43:5,24 44:9,19 44:25 45:3,12 45:23 46:21,24 47:12,15 49:10 49:15,23 50:24 51:23 52:3,14 53:2,7,16,20,25 54:7,18 55:2,7 55:11 56:3,18 57:6,17,24 58:22 59:8,22 60:9 61:3,5 62:8,16 63:1,12 63:16 64:9,20 64:25 65:6,12 66:1,5,14,19,23 67:18,23 68:22 69:8,20 70:1,4 70:8 71:1,25 72:5 77:7,17,20 78:2 79:5 80:5 82:8 83:6,23 84:3 85:9,19 87:4,21 89:2,7 89:9,12 90:15 91:16 93:10 95:4,10,17 96:4 100:9,13 101:18 102:9 103:1 104:3,9 109:19 111:10 113:12,15,18 113:22 119:12 121:2 122:7 123:13 131:10 133:3,12,19 VIDEO 1:10</p>	<p>134:15 view 66:8 67:4 72:22 77:11 89:25 94:21 viewed 12:7 46:6 50:3 76:13 viewing 6:23 views 130:4 violate 107:10 violated 75:14 violates 73:15 91:5 violation 79:3 virtual 108:19 vis-à-vis 47:5,9 visit 4:15 visual 9:18 68:10 visually 14:19 Vogel 77:25 voice 4:7 voices 108:25 Volusia 15:7,11 15:13,14,17 16:2 vote 115:20 119:15 121:15 121:24 125:1 131:12,14 voter 27:2,14 112:3,7,22 voters 26:25 27:14 31:16 38:12,13 48:14 85:2 107:11 108:8 111:21 111:23 112:2 112:20 113:5 113:24 114:2 voters' 31:19 voting 8:3,4 10:22 11:1,3 26:24 51:14,14 51:19,20 52:10 52:11 53:23 62:5,15,20 63:20 72:12,17 72:25 75:20,22</p>	<p>76:4 78:14 82:23 84:17 85:15 90:3 92:12,24 95:12 101:9 102:21 105:11,14,18 105:21 106:7 106:15,19 107:7,12 111:21 113:7 115:7 116:22 117:17,17 121:16 131:9 vs 75:12,12 83:13 84:17,18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>wait 131:3 waiting 60:2 walk 63:7 Walton 12:17 13:20 44:15 wandering 97:25 want 5:19 8:19 24:20 26:16 30:3 32:7 43:21 50:19 51:7,9 52:17 54:14 59:19 69:23 77:2 97:18 100:7,10,16 118:12,20 119:21 120:25 121:7 123:16 123:17 126:13 126:16 127:19 127:24 128:11 130:14 131:6 133:19 wanted 4:13 25:7 32:19,24 33:2 35:16 49:8 71:20 77:10 114:6 116:13 117:11,11,25 119:7 124:19 128:16</p>	<p>Washington 1:24 72:19 wasn't 28:3 63:6 69:7 Watch 72:14,18 72:18 82:3,5 102:22 water 18:3 waterways 65:20 way 3:21 12:10 16:12 20:16 29:12 31:20 36:4 38:20 43:10 57:13 59:4 62:4,19 63:6,6 71:13 78:20 79:10,22 87:20 90:19 91:2 94:8,16 98:13 114:20 115:23 116:15 116:23 119:23 121:12 123:8 124:25 126:7 126:10,17 128:13 ways 43:19 78:17 82:21 95:7 we'll 37:16 50:22 55:8 124:22 we're 4:19 23:3 25:8 27:1 28:14 29:19 34:14 36:2,5,15 37:23 42:19,23 45:8,9 48:8 50:19 51:4 52:25 53:5 58:8 58:8 59:13 65:19 70:17,19 71:15 87:17 89:5 91:23 93:14,20 102:15 104:3 111:5 114:23 117:3 125:22 125:24 126:5 we've 5:6 9:22</p>	<p>10:9 12:12 28:16 34:16 37:14 46:1,2 61:15,16,20 68:13 77:8 82:11 93:16 120:18 122:14 125:18 126:4,4 127:9,11 weaker 90:13 webpage 9:4 website 109:4 129:22 weeds 100:6 week 4:8 5:9 8:10 weeks 4:25 50:9 51:5 127:21 131:1 weigh 39:2 40:4 65:5 67:25 91:24 weighing 70:6 96:3 weight 64:18 weird 42:6 welcome 4:22 57:20 79:10,10 79:11 Wellington 21:10 went 14:16 31:20 38:23 63:7 weren't 122:24 west 17:2 21:9 22:11 88:17 western 21:11 22:1 23:25 66:16,22 87:18 Weston 22:10 white 51:14,19 52:10 85:2 105:12 107:6,7 wholeheartedly 124:15 wholly 9:20 10:12 16:17,19 16:24 17:19 18:11 20:20</p>
--	--	--	---	---

21:6 22:2,4 24:3,10 wide 42:11 74:7 width 74:17 wildlife 15:16 21:12 40:21 willful 109:4 Williamson 3:16 3:17 133:4,5 wins 93:25 Winter 16:21 wish 4:4 129:19 wishing 119:17 witnessed 112:2 women 113:23 114:1 115:17 115:19 116:2,2 wondering 36:7 words 59:12 work 9:17 55:15 55:15 79:12,13 88:16 91:11 104:18 111:22 121:9 124:21 125:1,17,22,24 126:10 128:2 130:21,22 134:10 worked 72:25 working 36:5 37:14 55:23 79:16 123:11 126:18 128:11 works 80:2 workshop 33:22 34:16 35:4 workshopped 122:14 world 119:4 worst 73:25 74:18,21 wouldn't 29:12 30:20 63:24 93:8 101:15 wraps 14:18 wreak 98:16 writing 115:19	written 73:1,6 103:5,17,23 116:23 wrong 28:25 34:3 56:9 wrote 77:23 78:1 123:23 <hr/> X <hr/> Y <hr/> yards 38:21 yeah 39:19 41:6 70:11 71:19 96:15,20 99:19 years 7:14 31:10 61:19 72:24 73:19 106:23 112:6,24 128:1 yeas 133:10 Yep 100:12 <hr/> Z <hr/> 0 <hr/> 0.1 73:21 0.11 74:11 0.37 9:17 0.43 9:16 0.79 9:16 01 8:11 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 10:16 12:15,16 12:18,23 13:2 13:21 22:1 25:10 31:18,24 33:25 34:14 38:23 43:23 44:11 45:18,21 46:2 47:9,24 48:4,21 49:6 57:14 61:8,24 62:5,20 63:9 64:6 65:25 68:17,19 69:22 69:23,24,25 70:5 76:15	86:25 87:7 90:12 93:18 94:20 112:13 115:10,11 128:10,20 1-protected 38:12 39:7 1,986 16:3 10 16:17 24:20 25:5,8,15,19 27:8,16 28:13 28:19 31:5,8,12 31:15,24 32:20 33:5,13,23 34:12,14 35:18 35:25 37:25 58:10,18 73:22 74:1 76:5 86:2 86:20 93:2 106:23 108:6 111:25 112:8 112:12,21 113:5,6 117:14 122:20 124:8 125:21 128:1 100 42:10 129:21 11 15:15,19 16:25 47:9 58:9 74:11 112,723 19:2 12 17:17 18:4 19:3 120,000 110:9 13 17:19 18:1,10 14 18:11 28:17 107:19 126:13 133:10 14.2 105:9 14th 100:23 15 13:19 17:18 18:19 107:19 126:13 15,000 110:11 150 6:22 150,000 19:19 15th 81:22 16 15:20 17:6 17 18:23,24 19:8	19:12 107:6 1730 1:24 18 1:12 2:1 9:23 19:19 107:8 19 18:24 20:1 23:13 1965 105:19 1980 22:5 1986 110:5 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 9:9 12:5,7,23 13:3,4,17 16:13 36:1 38:4 39:12 43:15,20 45:19 55:25 57:10 63:23 64:7 65:16,17,23 66:3 68:21 69:6 69:22 70:6,17 70:24 71:21 72:1 75:18 76:15,17,17,18 76:19 78:24 82:22 84:16 90:12 92:11 94:20 106:9 107:10 112:15 115:8,10,12 128:10,20 129:4 2,800 15:22 20 9:23 15:6 20:7 20:8 21:3 31:6 31:7,9,15,17,18 31:20,23 32:20 33:10 35:1 73:24 91:14 96:13,14 200 74:6 200,000 21:18 2000s 79:13,13 20036 1:24 2010 105:3 2012 7:19 27:4 28:18 103:12 130:14	2015 118:17 2016 28:17 33:6 55:22 110:5 112:9,23 2018 28:16 29:18 112:23 2019 111:24 202 1:25 2020 6:9 8:15 27:4 28:15 29:17 104:23 107:4 110:6 112:23 2022 1:12 2:1 6:7 8:12 81:15 21 20:22 21:9 58:16 213,000 14:8 22 21:6 105:4 22-01 131:13 23 20:8 21:19 47:7 232-0646 1:25 24 15:6 22:13,14 23:17 39:9 41:18 58:16 63:5 25 20:8 22:2 250,000 19:10 26 22:14 23:4,10 38:10,11 39:6 39:22 41:8,13 45:18 47:5,7,9 48:3,7 51:4 56:5 63:24 105:6 27 10:1,3,10 23:4 23:22 31:15 39:10 63:8,25 71:9 27th 23:1 28 10:1 22:14 23:4 24:4 39:10 58:14 62:7 63:25 280,000 17:2 20:24
--	--	--	--	---

29 31:14	41:13 75:22,24			
<hr/>	82:22 83:8,25			
3	84:5,20 90:1			
3 13:5,7,23 14:2,7	92:12 101:8			
14:18 47:6,7,8	124:13			
47:10,11 48:2,6	50 30:21 75:20			
58:9,17 66:16	84:10,16,25			
66:22 67:16,22	85:2			
68:5,6,16 69:3	50.06 106:20			
72:23 73:7,25	51 28:17			
77:3 86:1 87:9	53 28:17 105:12			
87:17 92:24	54 18:7 28:18			
109:25 110:23	56 58:14			
123:20 124:13	<hr/>			
30 73:19 86:19	6			
87:25 88:1	6 15:8 43:15			
96:13,14	60 42:11			
32 72:24	63 58:11			
3400 110:12	64 105:14			
35 119:14	672 18:16			
37 86:19	<hr/>			
39 10:8 18:15	7			
71:8	7 14:22 15:12			
<hr/>	133:10			
4	700 38:21			
4 12:15 13:4 14:4	765 19:24			
14:16 15:2 16:9	769,211 10:1			
75:23 93:2	<hr/>			
110:16	8			
4:22-cv-109 1:4	8 15:19,20 16:1			
40 15:15	80,000 110:7			
41 18:7 20:3	8001 33:22 34:2			
41:11	34:11,17			
42 63:22,23 92:23	8011 107:24			
43 28:16 29:18	812 1:24			
30:11,19 31:9	83 12:24			
31:11 63:21	<hr/>			
4300 42:10	9			
44 31:11 92:24	9 16:5 106:17,21			
93:3	107:1			
44,000 17:10				
441 20:17				
46.7 31:10				
47 28:16 29:18				
47th 23:1				
<hr/>				
5				
5 5:3 14:21,24				

Exhibit H

Common Cause, et al.)
)
 v.) 4:22-cv-109
)
 Cord Byrd)
 _____)

TRANSCRIPTION OF VIDEO FILE
 HOUSE REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE
 FEBRUARY 25, 2022

DIGITAL EVIDENCE GROUP
 1730 M Street, NW, Suite 812
 Washington, D.C. 20036
 (202) 232-0646

1 FEBRUARY 25, 2022

2 CHAIRMAN LEEK: The Redistricting
3 Committee will come to order. DJ, please call
4 the roll.

5 THE SECRETARY: Chair Leek.

6 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Here.

7 THE SECRETARY: Vice Chair Fine.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Here.

9 THE SECRETARY: Ranking Member Geller.

10 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Here.

11 THE SECRETARY: Representative Andrade.

12 REPRESENTATIVE ANDRADE: Here.

13 THE SECRETARY: Bush.

14 REPRESENTATIVE BUSH: Here.

15 THE SECRETARY: Byrd

16 REPRESENTATIVE BYRD: Here.

17 THE SECRETARY: Clemons.

18 REPRESENTATIVE CLEMONS: Here.

19 THE SECRETARY: Drake.

20 REPRESENTATIVE DRAKE: Here.

21 THE SECRETARY: Driskell.

22 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Here.

23 THE SECRETARY: Goff-Marcil.

24 REPRESENTATIVE GOFF-MARCIL: Here.

25 THE SECRETARY: Grall.

1 REPRESENTATIVE GRALL: Here.

2 THE SECRETARY: Grant.

3 REPRESENTATIVE GRANT: Here.

4 THE SECRETARY: Jenne has been excused.

5 Latvala.

6 REPRESENTATIVE LATVALA: Here.

7 THE SECRETARY: Mariano.

8 REPRESENTATIVE MARIANO: Here.

9 THE SECRETARY: McClain.

10 REPRESENTATIVE MCCLAIN: Here.

11 THE SECRETARY: Omphroy.

12 Omphroy.

13 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: (No audible

14 response).

15 THE SECRETARY: Payne.

16 REPRESENTATIVE PAYNE: Here.

17 THE SECRETARY: Robinson.

18 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Here.

19 THE SECRETARY: Rommel.

20 REPRESENTATIVE ROMMEL: Here.

21 THE SECRETARY: Sirois.

22 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: Here.

23 THE SECRETARY: Slosber-King.

24 REPRESENTATIVE SLOSBER-KING: Here.

25 THE SECRETARY: Thompson.

1 REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Here.

2 THE SECRETARY: Tuck.

3 REPRESENTATIVE TUCK: Here.

4 THE SECRETARY: Ex Officio Skidmore.

5 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Here.

6 THE SECRETARY: Quorum is present, Mr.

7 Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you, DJ.

9 Members, a few reminders before we
10 begin. Please silence all electronic devices.

11 And if you're here today to give public
12 testimony, please take time now to fill out an
13 appearance form and turn it into the sergeant
14 staff.

15 Also, as a reminder, for our members and
16 speakers, please ensure that you turn your
17 microphone on when you are speaking and off when
18 you are finished.

19 Members, I'm going to kick off today's
20 meeting a little differently than I had planned
21 at the beginning of the week, such has been this
22 week. We had a pause in our congressional
23 redistricting process. We paused our process
24 when the governor voiced an opinion over the
25 legal standards of our maps and requested an

1 advisory opinion from the Supreme Court regarding
2 CD5, in which we joined.

3 Once the Court chose not to opine on
4 that request, we immediately resumed our process.
5 We have a lot of work ahead of us today; and
6 before regular session concludes, I want to make
7 sure we are focused.

8 We received a letter from Ranking Member
9 Geller. I think another letter. One of several.
10 All along, I have encouraged the members to
11 provide feedback and ask questions as we move
12 maps throughout this process. Myself, Chair
13 Sirois, and staff have met with dozens of members
14 from both sides of the aisles, who have brought
15 forth legitimate feedback and questions.

16 Despite all the fluidity that this
17 process has encountered, I was feeling optimistic
18 and like we had partners who wanted to work
19 collaboratively with us in this process for a
20 landing. This letter shakes my confidence in
21 that.

22 On Monday, I received a letter from the
23 Ranking Member requesting items that have been
24 discussed ad nauseam on the record. This letter
25 didn't espouse the same genuine concerns that

1 many of you have provided to us, rather it
2 reiterated questions that have already been
3 before us many, many times, with many, many
4 answers.

5 I want to stop here, and I want to thank
6 those of you who have engaged in the process.
7 Those of you who have come to us, those of you
8 who have brought your suggestions forth, many of
9 which we have been able to accommodate.

10 Specifically, I'd like to thank
11 Representative Brown. I would like to thank
12 Representative Woodson. And actually, I'd like
13 to thank the entire black caucus who took the
14 time to meet with us the other day. We have been
15 able to accommodate many, many of your requests,
16 and I appreciate you bringing those genuine
17 concerns to us.

18 So here's the deal. We're going to
19 knock this out right now. I'm going to directly
20 address this letter because we have a significant
21 amount of work ahead of us today, and I don't
22 want to spend any more time on things that don't
23 bring us closer to the finish line.

24 Point one of the Geller letter. Your
25 first point asked for functional analysis data.

1 That's the same data that has been before you,
2 available to you the entire time. You already
3 have it. Check your meeting packet. It's on the
4 desk in front of you, posted to our website,
5 emailed to you last night, and it's also
6 available in our software.

7 You also asked for us to run a
8 functional analysis on every single district in
9 the map. This question at this point has been
10 raised from the very first Committee meeting. I
11 will tell you again that the partisan analysis of
12 these maps that are not protected districts will
13 lead us down a road to disaster. Stop injecting
14 the partisan nature into this process. Let us do
15 our work.

16 Let me be clear, the Committee will
17 absolutely not run a functional analysis on every
18 single district in the map. What you're asking
19 us to do sets this Committee and this process up
20 for failure. This has never been done by the
21 House for any map drawn under the Fair District
22 amendments. It would compromise our process, and
23 I repeat, this Committee will not do it.

24 The second point of the letter. We have
25 hired outside counsel to advise us in this

1 process because we want the House to be
2 successful, because we want our maps to be
3 upheld, just like it looks like the House map is
4 going to be because we do not want to spend years
5 in litigation. But the reality is we all know
6 the chances of litigation are real.

7 The House is committed to a legal
8 process, but there are entities that want to see
9 us fail for their own selfish partisan benefit.
10 Our counsel advises us on the legalities of our
11 maps, period. The items you're seeking are not
12 public records retained by the House.

13 And I want to step back for a second
14 because, as I go through this and I see this come
15 up again, there's something called a consulting
16 expert, something called a testifying expert that
17 many of us lawyers would know. I was standing in
18 my office when I got a call from a reporter. I
19 think it was August.

20 And the reporter was asking me to
21 comment on the fact that the Fair Districts
22 Coalition had announced that they had planned to
23 file suit on redistricting. We didn't have
24 numbers. We didn't have census data yet. We
25 hadn't drawn the first line, and someone is

1 declaring that they're going to sue us over maps
2 that have yet to be drawn.

3 I want to go back to one of the things
4 that Ranking Member Geller has said in this
5 Committee. We all know where we're headed. We
6 all know that this will end up in litigation.
7 That is why it's necessary for the House to
8 retain its work product privilege. So you may not
9 like my answer, but that is the answer. The House
10 has conducted and analyzed the congressional map
11 exactly the same way as the House map, which has
12 gone unchallenged after receiving heavy
13 criticism.

14 Finally, as it relates to your request
15 for all alternate configurations of the maps,
16 again, a question that I've addressed countless
17 number of times, we have provided to the
18 Committee, the districts that we believe are the
19 best. All members have the exact same ability to
20 draw districts and produce maps. All members
21 have the same ability to come to staff with
22 alternate ideas. And many of you have. Thank
23 you for engaging.

24 This is not the same as changing a
25 "shall" to "may" in a bill text. Every single

1 time you move a line means a ripple effect across
2 multiple districts. Besides my amendment today,
3 there has not been a single alternative district
4 configuration produced for consideration during
5 the Committee process, House or congressional,
6 for the last five months.

7 I want to commend the members that have
8 spent time to understand the maps and to ask
9 questions. That is what this process is all
10 about. So let's stop the political theater.
11 Let's stop focusing on moving pieces across the
12 litigation chessboard, and let's just do our
13 work. With that, I'm moving on to the important
14 business that we have before us today.

15 I'm not done. I'll call you. I'll call
16 on you at the appropriate time.

17 You may have noticed the lengthy bill
18 and amendment text for the congressional map and
19 was once again not included in the meeting
20 materials for today's meeting. The bill text
21 reflects the technical census block, block group,
22 and track numbers that comprise each district.
23 These are the exact same districts that are
24 depicted in the printed maps before you. DJ has
25 the printed copy of the bill text, about 300

1 pages for the Committee's viewing right here at
2 the desk.

3 To kick things off, I'm going to hand
4 the gavel over to Vice Chair Fine in a second.

5 Ranking Member Geller, we'll get to you
6 in just a minute in the appropriate order.
7 You'll have all the time that you need to ask
8 questions or debate and respond in any way you'd
9 like. But we're going to make sure we get the
10 work that we actually have to get done today over
11 with first.

12 So now I'm going to hand the gavel over
13 to Vice Chair Fine.

14 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Thank you,
15 Mr. Chairman.

16 Members, up for consideration today we
17 have one bill, it is HB 7503, Establishing the
18 Congressional Districts of the State. And I
19 would again remind everyone, we have a fair
20 amount of time to do this. So everyone should
21 have adequate time to have their questions,
22 answers, and have whatever debate.

23 I think we did this well the last time
24 when we did state redistricting. Hopefully, we
25 can do this again here.

1 And with that said,
2 Representative Sirois, you are recognized to
3 present the bill.

4 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: Thank you,
5 Mr. Chairman.

6 House Bill 7503 contains the
7 congressional map that passed out of
8 Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee last
9 Friday. Chair Leek has offered an amendment to
10 this bill, and I request that we take up the
11 amendment to ensure we're discussing the most
12 updated congressional map, as there have been
13 updates made to it.

14 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay.
15 Representative Sirois has addressed the
16 Committee, are there questions on the bill?
17 Members, we are in questions, and I'm sure you
18 have a lot of questions. I would prefer,
19 although you have the right, I'd prefer that we
20 take up the strike-all amendment so we can get
21 into the proper posture on the correct map. But
22 I will recognize folks if they have questions for
23 Rep. Sirois on the map that we're hoping to amend
24 in a strike-all.

25 Ranking Member Geller, you are

1 recognized for a question on the existing map
2 that we're planning to amend.

3 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Has the counsel
4 retained by the House performed any analysis on
5 that map or on the maps that are being offered as
6 an amendment?

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You can ask questions
8 relating to the other maps. I would note that it
9 is my understanding that the amendment, which has
10 two maps effectively, the second map is very
11 similar to Representative Sirois's existing bill.
12 But if you want to ask about the existing bill,
13 I'll allow him to answer that question but not
14 about the amendment until we get to the
15 amendment.

16 Representative Sirois, would you like to
17 answer that question?

18 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: Mr. Chairman,
19 could you repeat the question, please?

20 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm not going to try
21 that. I'm going to let Ranking Member Geller do
22 that, within the confines of the map that is
23 before us, which again, I think
24 Representative Sirois and Chair Leek intend to
25 amend away anyway.

1 You're recognized.

2 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: My question is
3 whether or not counsel retained by the House has
4 performed any analysis or retained an expert to
5 look at that particular version of the map.

6 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, I'm going
7 to recognize you to answer that question.

8 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah. That same
9 question was asked and answered in the prior
10 Committee stop. And because we're now wasting
11 time on a map that's going to be amended out of
12 this bill, I would recommend that we move on.
13 But that question has certainly been asked and
14 answered, and I know you know the answer to it.

15 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Well --

16 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Would you like a
17 follow-up, Ranking Member Geller?

18 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: If can respond
19 to that, since I was addressed directly. With
20 all deference, I was not in the prior Committee,
21 the congressional subcommittee. I'm not a member
22 of that committee. I didn't attend it, so saying
23 that some other committee talked about it does
24 not really go to my question.

25 But my question does go to the

1 statements that you made earlier. And I guess
2 what I'm really trying to find out, first of all,
3 was did counsel analyze it? I'll ask the same
4 question about the amended maps when they're in
5 front of us. But as to the existing one, did
6 counsel analyze it? Did they retain an expert?
7 Did the expert provide an opinion?

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Rep. Geller, I'm going
9 to let you ask one question at a time. So if you
10 want to ask --

11 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: We'll stop with
12 that on. That's fine.

13 VICE-CHAIR FINE: That was three. I'm
14 relatively good at math.

15 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Okay. Then let
16 me --

17 VICE-CHAIR FINE: So you can ask one
18 question.

19 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: I'll be happy to
20 rephrase it.

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: And then you can ask a
22 follow-up. You're recognized.

23 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: The question is:
24 Did counsel analyze it --

25 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. You've asked a

1 question.

2 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: No. I'm not
3 done with that question, sir.

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Nope. There was a
5 question mark after that.

6 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Did counsel
7 analyze it --

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm going to move.

9 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: -- retain an
10 expert --

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. I'm going to
12 move on. We're going to be done with this. You
13 can ask one question that ends with a question
14 mark. I will recognize someone to answer it. If
15 you're going to ask three or four again, we're
16 going to be done and we're just going to move on
17 to the amendment.

18 Would you like to ask one question?
19 I'll ask more, but we're not going to do a
20 three-minute soliloquy with 47 questions for
21 Chair Leek. If you have a question, you can ask
22 it. You're recognized to ask a question. Last
23 chance --

24 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: I promise it
25 will not be a three-minute soliloquy --

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: All right.

2 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: -- with 47
3 questions. My question is: Did counsel analyze
4 it or --

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: That's a --

6 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: -- or retain an
7 expert who performed an analysis?

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. Chair Leek,
9 you're recognized to answer the question.

10 CHAIRMAN LEEK: The question is moot,
11 Vice Chair, as this map's about to be amended
12 away.

13 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: I'm sorry, sir,
14 but this map is still -- my understanding is --

15 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Ranking Member Geller,
16 you don't have --

17 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: No. Excuse me,
18 sir, point of order.

19 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yep.

20 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Point of order.

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: What's your point?

22 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: I cannot be told
23 that I can't ask about the maps that are about to
24 be introduced because they're not in front of us
25 yet and simultaneously be told I can't ask about

1 the map that is in front of us because the
2 amendment hasn't occurred yet. One or the other,
3 sir.

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Rep. Geller, what I
5 would say is you've asked a question about the
6 map. Chair Leek has answered the question. I
7 don't think you find his answer satisfactory, and
8 that is your right. But he has asked a question
9 about the map in front of you. And to --

10 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: No, sir. The
11 question --

12 VICE-CHAIR FINE: No. You don't like
13 his answer. I'll recognize you for another
14 follow-up on the map that is before us now. I
15 would again note, it's Friday afternoon, many of
16 us want to go home, and we're asking questions
17 about -- I'm missing my son's first track meet.
18 To lighten the mood, I can't understand why my
19 son wants to be in a track meet, since he's my
20 son. But you know, despite that, if you want to
21 ask questions about a map that I believe the
22 sponsor is hoping is amended, you can do that.
23 So I'm going to recognize you for a question on
24 this exact map.

25 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,

1 Mr. Chair.

2 And let me say that since we were to
3 meet yesterday and it was postponed not because
4 of me or anyone else, that to say, oh, now it's
5 Friday, is not really appropriate. Now is when
6 the Committee has decided to call the meeting.

7 My question is: Did counsel perform an
8 analysis of the map that is before us or retain
9 an expert to perform such an analysis?

10 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. That question
11 has been asked and answered. You don't like
12 Chair Leek's answer. I understand that, but he's
13 asked that question. So since you're asking the
14 same question again and again, you all will
15 remember, I had a three-word answer to this
16 question before on the floor last year, I don't
17 want to say it again in this room. We're going
18 to move on.

19 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Sir, if I might?

20 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yes.

21 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Being told my
22 question is moot and will not receive an answer
23 is not asked an answer.

24 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I did not say it --
25 well, okay. That wasn't what I said.

1 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: No. So you said
2 I got an asked and answered. "The question is
3 moot" is not an answer.

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I think --

5 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: It's a punch
6 line from a TV show.

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek is entitled
8 to answer the question however he sees fit and
9 that's how he chose to answer the question.
10 Okay. We're going to move on.

11 All right. We are going to take up our
12 first amendment. It's amendment barcode 258203
13 by Chair Leek. This is going to take a little
14 bit of time.

15 As a reminder, we are holding questions
16 until the end of the amendment presentation to
17 ensure we have time to get through an explanation
18 of the entire state and no one region is rushed.

19 So Chair Leek, you are recognized to
20 explain the amendment.

21 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you, members.
22 We're going to focus on the substantive work in
23 front of us now. And I'm going to go through
24 some high-level items first, and we'll then
25 explain the structure of the amendment and the

1 changes that were filed last night. Again, this
2 is a strike-all, so this will replace everything
3 that was before you initially.

4 Representative Sirois will also be
5 helping me to explain those changes throughout
6 the map. The Florida Legislature is directed to
7 redistrict every ten years following the
8 decennial census to account for growing and
9 shifting population across Florida. A decade
10 ago, the Florida House's process and methodology
11 for drawing maps was allotted by the Florida
12 Supreme Court. And I'd like to read a quote from
13 the 2012 ruling.

14 "A review of the House plan in the
15 record reveals that the House engaged in a
16 consistent and reasoned approach, balancing the
17 two-tier standards by endeavoring to make
18 districts compact and as nearly equal in
19 population as possible and utilizing political
20 and geographical boundaries were feasible by
21 endeavoring to keep counties and cities together
22 where possible. In addition, the House
23 approached the minority voting protection
24 provision by properly undertaking a functional
25 analysis of voting strength in minority

1 districts."

2 As I mentioned earlier, this Committee
3 has undertaken several months of education in
4 order to understand the redistricting process and
5 uphold the high bar that was set for this chamber
6 last decade. Last week, the Congressional
7 Redistricting Subcommittee passed map H000C8011,
8 what is now HB 7503, which proposes congressional
9 districts that will be used on election cycle
10 starting in 2022. Today, we will walk through an
11 amendment to HB 7503 that has two maps. And I'll
12 explain that further here in a few minutes.

13 As I mentioned earlier, this map has
14 been drafted exclusively by Committee staff with
15 the advice of legal counsel based on the data
16 from the 2020 census and to be in alignment with
17 the Florida Constitution, state and federal law,
18 as well as court precedent.

19 Members, I want to make sure each of you
20 has a map packet in front of you. This contains
21 a printout of the proposed map itself, the
22 statewide snapshot of statistics, the functional
23 analysis data for our six protected minority
24 districts, a list of county shares of population,
25 a list of city splits, and finally, the boundary

1 analysis report. These items will be referenced
2 throughout the presentation today, so please feel
3 free to refer to your packet as needed. This
4 packet is also available on our subcommittees
5 webpage on myfloridahouse.gov.

6 Now, let's talk about the structure of
7 the amendment before we segue into its specific
8 contents. This is new, and I want to take time
9 to explain. This amendment contains a primary
10 map, H000C8017, that addresses concerns about the
11 shape of Congressional District 5 by creating a
12 more compact North Florida district that will
13 enable minority voters to elect the candidates of
14 their choice. We believe this solution creates a
15 singular exception to the diminishment standard.

16 The amendment also contains a secondary
17 map, H000C8015. The legislature knows it's
18 legally compliant under the current law and keeps
19 the previously proposed configuration of District
20 5. Outside of the districts impacted by the
21 change to District 5, the structure of both maps
22 is exactly the same throughout the rest of the
23 state.

24 The amendment also includes other
25 adjustments that have been made, the same in both

1 maps, to bring us more in alignment with our
2 Senate partner so we can bring this process in
3 for landing prior to the conclusion of the
4 regular session. I want to emphasize that.
5 Prior to the conclusion of the regular session.

6 So why two maps and one amendment, you
7 may be asking. The primary map was put forward
8 as a way to address the novel legal theory raised
9 by the governor, while still protecting a black
10 minority seat in North Florida. If this
11 configuration of CD5 and the primary map is
12 struck down by a court, the secondary map is
13 postured to take immediate effect and contains a
14 district configuration similar to the benchmark
15 district.

16 I know this has a lot to take in. I
17 acknowledge these maps look visually different,
18 even having two maps is a unique setup. However,
19 we are faced with a unique situation, and this is
20 the House attempt at continuing to protect the
21 minority group's ability to elect a candidate of
22 their choice, addressing compactness concerns,
23 and working to make sure we bring this process in
24 for a landing during the regular session.

25 And perhaps most importantly, we want to

1 make sure all Floridians have clarity and
2 finality, going into our upcoming election cycle
3 with where our map stands. Now let's dive into
4 the details of the primary map, and we'll walk
5 through the secondary map after that.

6 Here's an overview of the primary map.
7 Let's first look at the map as a whole. When
8 compared to the benchmark congressional map, the
9 new map of new proposed congressional districts
10 has several points of improvement throughout tier
11 2 standards. When looking at a statewide average
12 of each district's compactness scores, we have
13 been able to recreate compact districts that
14 improve on our benchmark metrics even after the
15 addition of the new congressional district.

16 The proposed map statewide average
17 compactness scores are a Reock score of 0.48, a
18 Convex-hull score of 0.82, an Polsby-Popper score
19 of 0.42. Where feasible, we also worked to
20 improve visual compactness of districts or the
21 eyeball test, such as being able to keep Polk
22 County wholly within a single congressional
23 district. When looking at the number of counties
24 splits, we've kept similar to the benchmark map
25 with 18 counties split last decade and only 18

1 counties split this decade.

2 The ideal population for this decade's
3 congressional districts after adding the 28th
4 district is 769,211 people. The overall
5 deviation range is the same as it was last
6 decade, with 27 districts being the exact ideal
7 population and one district having a single
8 person less than the ideal population. We also
9 are proudly able to improve the number of cities
10 split in our proposed map. In the benchmark map
11 there were 39 cities split. In the PCB that
12 passed last week, there were 27 cities split.

13 In today's amendment we've been able to
14 decrease that to just 17 cities split. This
15 proposed congressional map also allows a district
16 to be placed wholly within each of Florida's top
17 six largest counties, Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm
18 Beach, Hillsborough, Orange, and Duval
19 respectively. The proposed map is inclusive of
20 three protected black districts and three
21 protected Hispanic districts. This is the same
22 number of protected districts as found in the
23 benchmark map.

24 All six of these protected minority
25 districts have had an individual functional

1 analysis conducted. And in performing this
2 analysis, we can confirm each district will be a
3 solidly performing district as under the
4 benchmark map. And we will continue to provide
5 minority voters with the ability to elect
6 candidates of their choice and the equal
7 opportunity to participate in the political
8 process.

9 These districts are also drawn in a
10 consistent manner, with respect to the Florida
11 Supreme Court precedent, to maintain existing
12 majority-minority districts. As we move
13 throughout the map, I will highlight these
14 districts as well. All of our districts consist
15 of contiguous territory. And as I'm sure you're
16 aware, the Committee has also implemented
17 safeguards in order to ensure that we do not draw
18 districts with the intent to favor or disfavor a
19 political party or an incumbent.

20 Now that we've looked at the statewide
21 overview, let's begin to review each region of
22 the state. I'm going to hand it over to
23 Representative Sirois to walk through each
24 region.

25 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative Sirois,

1 you're recognized.

2 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: Thank you very
3 much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Chair Leek. Good
4 afternoon, members. Let's start with
5 Congressional Districts 1 through 5.

6 Starting in the Panhandle, Congressional
7 District 1 has the entirety of Escambia, Santa
8 Rosa, and Okaloosa County. Walton County is then
9 split as Congressional District 1 achieves the
10 equal population threshold here.

11 Again, members, for congressional maps
12 equal population for each district is plus or
13 minus one person. And for the purpose of the
14 boundary between District 1 and 2 primarily uses
15 State Road 83 for the majority of its length,
16 except where it deviates to ensure that the
17 municipalities of Freeport and DeFuniak Springs
18 are kept whole, with Freeport within
19 Congressional District 1 and DeFuniak Springs in
20 Congressional District 2.

21 Congressional District 2 and three 3 two
22 of the districts that are affected by the changes
23 we've made to Congressional District 5. Both
24 Congressional District 2 and Congressional
25 District 3 are compact districts that are made up

1 almost entirely whole counties, except where both
2 districts need to add the necessary population to
3 achieve equal population. Those districts that
4 are split for this purpose are Lafayette and
5 Marion Counties. However, Congressional District
6 3 contains the entire city of Ocala in Marion
7 County.

8 These two districts alone contain 25
9 whole counties throughout the Panhandle and the
10 Big Bend regions. Congressional District 4
11 contains all of Nassau and Clay County, along
12 with the remaining part of Duval County that is
13 not included in Congressional District 5, which
14 I'll talk about more shortly. This leaves the
15 district approximately 234,000 people short of
16 the population needed for a congressional
17 district.

18 So the district includes part of
19 St. Johns County for population equality and to
20 create a more compact district shape in the
21 region. The part of the district in St. Johns
22 County keeps all of St. Augustine and
23 St. Augustine Beach within the district, and all
24 the other municipalities in St. Johns County
25 remain whole. The most striking visual

1 difference in this new configuration of the map
2 is Congressional District 5, which is now wholly
3 within Duval County.

4 Duval County itself is too large for a
5 single congressional district and, therefore, has
6 to be split. This district faithfully adheres to
7 all tier 2 principles. This new district
8 configuration creates a very compact district
9 that utilizes the Duval County line for much of
10 its boundary as well as I-295 and many other
11 major roadways, while keeping this district
12 within Duval County.

13 It also has compactness scores above the
14 statewide averages for compactness, a Reock score
15 of 0.51, a Convex-hull score of 0.91, and a
16 Polsby-Popper score of 0.49.

17 The configuration of this district,
18 although very visually different than the
19 benchmark district, is still a protected
20 black-performing district. There is a reduction
21 in voting-age population; however, our functional
22 analysis concludes that this is a reliable
23 performing district.

24 We believe this configuration balances
25 the feedback we've been perceived dealing with

1 the compactness of current Congressional District
2 5 and still protects the minority voting group of
3 this district and helps to ensure the citizens of
4 Florida have an enforceable congressional map
5 before the fast approaching 2022 election cycle.

6 Congressional District 6 through 11 and
7 16. Moving south, Congressional District 6 is
8 created in a circular compact shape that is tied
9 for the highest Reock score of any district in
10 the map at 0.71. It does this by keeping Flagler
11 and Putnam County wholly within it, while
12 including the southern part of St. Johns County,
13 as well as parts of Volusia, Lake, and Marion
14 Counties.

15 The oddly shaped flags of Lake and
16 Volusia Counties are absorbed by this compact
17 district, while also keeping every municipality
18 and these counties whole, with the exception of
19 Port Orange and Volusia County, which is split
20 between District 6 and 7 to achieve equal
21 population.

22 Because Congressional District 6 was
23 created with such a compact shape, it left about
24 212,000 people in Volusia County without a
25 district. So that population is included in

1 Congressional District 7, which also includes the
2 entirety of Seminole County. Within Volusia
3 County, Congressional District 7 primarily uses
4 municipal lines keeping DeBary, Deltona, Orange
5 City, and Lake Helen whole.

6 District 7 is then left approximately
7 85,000 short of the ideal district population,
8 and it continues south into Orange County to get
9 this remaining population. Congressional
10 District 8 includes all of Brevard and Indian
11 River Counties, which leaves the district about
12 2,800 people short of the population needed for a
13 district. In order to achieve the population
14 equality required for congressional districts,
15 the remaining population is added to
16 Congressional District 8 by going north into
17 Volusia County along I-95 and then including the
18 entire municipality of Oak Hill and it's 1,986
19 people keeping it whole.

20 Congressional District 9 contains the
21 entirety of Osceola County, which was the
22 fastest-growing county in the state this past
23 decade. The district includes part of Orange
24 County following almost entirely primary roadways
25 such as State Road 50, known as Colonial Drive;

1 State Route 436, known as Boulevard; and
2 U.S. 441, known as Orange Blossom Trail; as well
3 as others before using the Orange County line as
4 well.

5 This compact tier 2 compliant district
6 also happens to be a new majority-minority
7 Hispanic district reflective of the Hispanic
8 growth in this region.

9 Congressional District 10 is kept wholly
10 within Orange County, similar to the benchmark
11 map where a district is kept wholly within the
12 county. After receiving feedback on this
13 district, adjustments were made to align it
14 closer to the district that exists in the
15 benchmark map, as well as to -- excuse me. Let
16 me go back, members, to clarify. I want to
17 restate that.

18 After receiving feedback on this
19 district, adjustments were made to align it
20 closer to the district that exists in the
21 benchmark map as well as to the proposal by our
22 Senate partners. We accomplished this by
23 bringing its western border all the way to the
24 Orange County line, which enabled us to keep the
25 municipalities of Edgewood, Belle Isle,

1 Eatonville, Maitland, Winter Park, Ocoee, Winter
2 Garden, and Oakland whole within the district,
3 while at the same time improving to have three
4 mathematical compactness measures for the
5 district bringing the Reock score to 0.50, up
6 from 0.35 in the previous version of the
7 district; and the Polsby-Popper score to 0.39, up
8 from 0.35.

9 Congressional District 11 has the
10 remaining population in Orange County, which is
11 about 194,000 people, and goes west to include
12 the majority of Lake County, all of Sumter
13 County, and part of Marion and Citrus County
14 where it achieves equal population.

15 Congressional District 16 keeps Polk
16 County hole in this map. This is an improvement
17 from the benchmark map where Polk County was
18 divided in between three districts. Population
19 growth this decade made this possible and is
20 approximately 44,000 people shy of the ideal
21 population of a congressional district. Pairing
22 Polk County with a small part of Eastern
23 Hillsborough County achieves the necessary
24 population needed for the population of a
25 congressional district while creating a very

1 compactly shaped district.

2 Moving on to Congressional Districts 12
3 through 15. Now looking at Congressional
4 District 13 in the Tampa Bay area, which is kept
5 wholly within Pinellas County. Its northern
6 boundary follows the municipal lines of the
7 cities of Dunedin, Clearwater, and Safety Harbor
8 to enable every city within Pinellas County to
9 remain whole. Because Pinellas County has more
10 people than can fit into a single congressional
11 district, this configuration of Congressional
12 District 13 enables connecting the remaining
13 portion of the county overlay into another county
14 rather than over water.

15 Congressional District 12 is the
16 entirety of Hernando County, the remainder of
17 Citrus County, part of Pasco County, which is
18 divided primarily along U.S. Highway 41, State
19 Road 54, and the Suncoast Parkway, as well as the
20 portion of Northern Pinellas County, not already
21 included in Congressional District 13.

22 Congressional District 14 is located
23 wholly within Hillsborough County. Its boundary
24 follows primary roads Hillsborough Avenue, Busch
25 Boulevard and I-4 for its northern border, State

1 and County Road 39 on the east side, and County
2 Road 672, Balm Road and Big Bend Road on the
3 southern side.

4 Finishing out the Tampa Bay area,
5 Congressional District 15 then connects the
6 remaining part of Pasco County with the
7 appropriate amount of population from
8 Hillsborough County to complete the district's
9 population.

10 Moving on to Congressional Districts 17
11 through 19. Congressional District 17 is the
12 last of the four districts that have part of
13 Hillsboro County. This district actually has the
14 exact amount of people in Hillsborough County,
15 112,723 people, so that exactly 12 districts make
16 up all the remaining population in the counties
17 to the south of the Polk, Osceola, and Indian
18 River County line. This ensures that no other
19 district has to cross these county lines and
20 keeps the counties to the east whole.

21 Congressional District 17 then
22 incorporates all of Manatee County and
23 approximately 250,000 people in Sarasota County
24 to complete its population. Every city in
25 Sarasota County is kept whole with Congressional

1 District 17 utilizing the Venice municipal line
2 for part of its southern border.

3 The remaining part of Sarasota County,
4 along with six entire counties, Hardee, DeSoto,
5 Charlotte, Highlands, Okeechobee, and Glades
6 County, make up the majority of Congressional
7 District 18. This leaves the district about
8 192,000 short of the ideal population, allowing
9 it to cross into Lee County to acquire this
10 remaining population using primarily the
11 Caloosahatchee River, State Road 82, the Fort
12 Myers municipal line, and other roadways.

13 Congressional District 19 connects the
14 rest of Lee County with Collier County using
15 primarily I-75, U.S. 41, and Collier Boulevard,
16 creating a very recognizable boundary with the
17 county, except where it deviates to achieve equal
18 population.

19 Moving on to Congressional Districts 20
20 through 23 and 25. Congressional District 20 is
21 a performing majority-minority black district
22 that was recreated similar to the benchmark
23 district that connects population in Palm Beach
24 County to population in Broward County. As noted
25 before, the functional analysis on this district

1 conducted by staff ensures the minorities'
2 ability to elect does not diminish.

3 This decade, we were able to create this
4 district in such a way that respects more major
5 roadways in the area, such as U.S. 441, I-95, and
6 the Florida Turnpike, and keeps more cities
7 whole, keeping the cities of Lake Park, Margate,
8 Tamarac, and others wholly within it, which were
9 split a decade ago.

10 Congressional District 21 includes all
11 of St. Lucie and Martin counties and includes
12 just over 280,000 people in Palm Beach County in
13 order to achieve equal population for this
14 district. The district boundary follows a
15 railway in the northern Palm Beach County to
16 Okeechobee Boulevard, where it borders
17 Congressional District 20 before going out to the
18 coast, using the Palm Beach inlet to complete its
19 southern border.

20 Congressional District 22 is kept wholly
21 within Palm Beach County. Its boundary extends
22 north through the Palm Beach inlet to meet
23 Congressional District 21, before heading west to
24 include the entire city of Wellington, creating
25 the rounded point of the western side of the

1 districts.

2 It then uses the Loxahatchee National
3 Wildlife Refuge to continue south until it gets
4 the population necessary for a district without
5 splitting any other city in Palm Beach County.

6 It uses the Boca Raton and Highland Beach City
7 municipal line for much of its boundary in this
8 area.

9 This leaves approximately 200,000 people
10 in southeast Palm Beach County that is then
11 included in Congressional District 23. This
12 district then connects this population with
13 Broward County utilizing many municipal lines in
14 this area for the boundary line, keeping the city
15 of Coral Springs, Coconut Creek, and many others
16 whole within Broward County.

17 Congressional District 25 is kept wholly
18 in Broward County, giving Broward County a
19 congressional district wholly within the county
20 for the first time since the 1980 redistricting
21 cycle. The district utilizes as many major
22 roadways as possible, such as I-75, the Sawgrass
23 Expressway, the Florida Turnpike, I-95, Davie
24 Boulevard, Sunrise Boulevard, among others.

25 It also uses municipal lines of Weston,

1 Southwest Ranches, Pembroke Pines, Miramar, and
2 Hallandale Beach, as well as the
3 Broward/Miami-Dade County line on the southern
4 side of the district.

5 Within these five districts, several
6 adjustments were made to improve visual
7 compactness, improve the boundary analysis
8 scores, as well as keep more municipalities
9 whole. One specific example of those changes is
10 shown here. In the previous version of the map,
11 the city of Royal Palm Beach was split between
12 three districts. In this new map, an adjustment
13 was made so that is now wholly within
14 Congressional District 20.

15 Members, Congressional District 24 is a
16 performing black district. As noted earlier, the
17 functional analysis on this district conducted by
18 staff ensures the minority group's ability to
19 elect is not diminished. This is the only
20 district that crosses the Miami-Dade/Broward
21 County Line, which is an improvement over the
22 benchmark map that had two such districts.

23 This district also includes many whole
24 cities within Miami-Dade County, including
25 Aventura, North Miami, Biscayne Park, Miami

1 Shores, Miami Gardens, Opa-locka, and others, and
2 uses many other major recognizable roadways in
3 the area as possible. This is another district
4 that we heard some great feedback on by members
5 regarding Miami Gardens and Opa-locka. Similar
6 to our Senate partners, we have now been able to
7 keep these two municipalities whole within
8 Congressional District 24.

9 Moving on to Congressional Districts 26
10 through 28. Congressional Districts 26, 27, and
11 28, are all performing majority-minority Hispanic
12 districts where the functional analysis on each
13 district individually was conducted by staff,
14 ensures the minority group's ability to elect is
15 not diminished.

16 Congressional District 26, similar in
17 shape to the benchmark map, connects part of
18 Collier County, not including in Congressional
19 District 19, with population in Hendry County, as
20 well as Miami-Dade County using the Collier,
21 Broward, and Miami-Dade County lines, as well as
22 I-75, U.S. 41, the Tamiami Trail, and the Dolphin
23 Expressway. It additionally shares a boundary
24 line with the Congressional District 24 line in
25 the eastern side of the district.

1 This district includes the
2 municipalities of Hialeah, Hialeah Gardens,
3 Medley, Doral, and Miami Lakes in their entirety.

4 Representative Latvala, did I pronounce
5 that correctly?

6 REPRESENTATIVE LATVALA: (No audible
7 response).

8 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: Our adjustments
9 to Congressional Districts 27 and 28 mirror those
10 of the districts that were in the map approved
11 off the Senate floor. We were able to include
12 these districts in this way as we try to bring
13 this process in for a landing as soon as
14 possible.

15 Congressional District 27 uses the
16 Dolphin Expressway and the Florida Turnpike for
17 the vast majority of its boundary line on its
18 northern and western sides, while using the
19 Cutler Bay municipal boundary along its southern
20 border, creating a very compact district wholly
21 within Miami-Dade County with a very high Reock
22 score of 0.71.

23 Congressional District 28 includes all
24 of Monroe County and then connects with the
25 remaining population in southern Miami-Dade

1 County using U.S. 41 and the Florida Turnpike as
2 its primary boundary lines in Miami-Dade County.
3 The municipalities of Sweetwater, Florida City,
4 and Homestead are whole within the district.

5 And I'd like to highlight a couple of
6 technical changes. Along with the changes we've
7 already highlighted, staff made other technical
8 changes in the map by adjusting lines to improve
9 the visual shape of the districts, clean up
10 roadblocks, or make small adjustments to improve
11 the mathematical compactness of districts.

12 Two examples are included here. Now
13 using I-75 as the major roadway between Districts
14 17 and 18, on the left and following the cleaner
15 railway as a boundary line between Districts 12
16 and 15 on the right.

17 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
18 recognized.

19 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you.

20 Members, I want to pause for a second
21 and refocus before we move on to our secondary
22 map. What we just heard described by
23 Representative Sirois, was a description of the
24 primary map that is part of this amendment. As I
25 mentioned before, the secondary map that we are

1 about to segue into would only take effect should
2 CD5 and the primary map be struck down by a
3 court.

4 The secondary map is labeled H000C8015.
5 The structure of this map is exactly the same as
6 the primary map except for six districts that are
7 impacted by the changes to CD5. The other 22
8 congressional districts are identical to the
9 districts in the primary map. For everyone's
10 sanity, in this next presentation, we are only
11 going to walk through those districts that are
12 different than the primary map.

13 All right. Let's begin. Overall, this
14 map splits 20 counties, which is the same as the
15 map that passed our subcommittee last week. It
16 now only splits 18 cities, an improvement of nine
17 cities when compared to the previous version of
18 this map. There were also improvements made in
19 the overall mathematical compactness score and in
20 the boundary analysis. The mathematical
21 compactness scores are now Reock, 0.45; Convex-
22 hull, 0.80; and Polsby-Popper at 0.40.

23 So even though this is our secondary
24 map, it is still an improvement over the map that
25 passed through the subcommittee with the same

1 methodology being applied for the improvements.
2 And similarly, this map still maintains three
3 protected black districts and three protected
4 Hispanic districts.

5 I'd now like to hand it back over to
6 Representative Sirois to take us through the
7 differences in the secondary map from the primary
8 map.

9 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Rep. Sirois, you're
10 recognized to explain the secondary map.

11 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: Thank you.
12 Thank you, Chair Leek.

13 The changes to Congressional District 5
14 impact an additional five districts, Districts 2,
15 3, 4, 6, and 11. Let's start with Congressional
16 District 5. The configuration of this district
17 is very similar to the map passed out of the
18 subcommittee and has had slight changes made to
19 bring it more in alignment with our Senate
20 partners and improve our boundary analysis
21 metrics.

22 It still of course remains a protected
23 black district as well. Additionally, we have
24 been able to equalize our population in Leon
25 County, which prevents Congressional District two

1 from having to split Marion County to find the
2 remainder of its population. This is a
3 combination of both the House and Senate
4 configurations of this district with the
5 additional benefit of not splitting Lake City in
6 Columbia County.

7 Segueing back to Congressional District
8 2. This district is made up mostly whole of
9 whole counties. It contains 15 whole counties
10 along with the remaining portion of Walton County
11 not contained within Congressional District 1 and
12 the parts of Leon, Jefferson, and Columbia County
13 that are not in Congressional District 3. Its
14 eastern boundary is the county lines of Levy,
15 Gilchrist, and Columbia Counties.

16 Congressional District 3 is made up of
17 five whole counties: Alachua, Bradford, Union,
18 Clay, and Putnam Counties. It then splits Marion
19 County for its remaining population, while
20 keeping the city of Ocala wholly within it,
21 creating a very compactly shaped district,
22 similar to the current Congressional District 3.

23 Congressional District 4 has all of
24 Nassau County along with the remaining part of
25 Duval County that is not included in

1 Congressional District 3. This leaves the
2 district approximately 213,000 people short of
3 the population needed for a congressional
4 district. So the district must continue south
5 into St. Johns County for population equality.

6 In doing so, it is able to keep all of
7 St. Augustine within the district, and all of the
8 other municipalities in St. Johns County remain
9 whole. This district configuration is similar to
10 the current district.

11 In an effort to impact as few districts
12 as possible with regard to the primary map,
13 Congressional District 6 uses the same boundary
14 line with Congressional District 7 in Volusia
15 County, while including all of Flagler County and
16 a part of St. Johns, Lake, and finally, Marion
17 County. This district helps absorb the uniquely
18 shaped parts of Lake and Volusia Counties to
19 create a compact district for this area.

20 Congressional District 11 is very
21 similar to the district in the primary map as it
22 adds the remaining population in Orange County,
23 which is about 194,000 people, and goes west to
24 include the majority of Lake County, all of
25 Sumter County, and part of Marion and Citrus

1 County, where it achieves equal population.

2 The final slide shows all the remaining
3 districts throughout the state that are unchanged
4 between the two maps. The gray area represents
5 the area of the six districts impacted by the
6 changes to Congressional District 5, where the
7 changes occurred.

8 And that, Mr. Chair, are both maps in
9 the amendment.

10 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Thank you for the
11 presentation of the amendment.

12 Members, are there any questions on the
13 amendment? Are there any questions?

14 Mr. Representative Driskell, you're
15 recognized for a question.

16 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you, Mr.
17 Chair. I have a lot of questions, actually.

18 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Well, you're welcome
19 to ask them, but one at a time.

20 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay. Thank
21 you. So I know, as we've been going through this
22 process, we talk a lot about the methodology that
23 we've used and that we have to make sure that
24 they're compliant with tier 1 and tier 2 criteria
25 in the Constitution. So looking at the primary

1 map, could you identify the districts where those
2 criteria were in tension with one another?

3 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm sorry, can you
4 identify those criteria where what? I just
5 didn't hear the end of the question.

6 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Yep. Sure.
7 So we've got methodology that we have to follow,
8 tier 1 and tier 2. We have to look at those
9 criteria. And when they're in tension with one
10 another, you have to --

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Oh, "in tension."
12 Okay.

13 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Yes.

14 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Or in conflict, I
15 understand.

16 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Sorry.
17 Probably did not articulate that, enunciate it
18 clearly enough. And when they're in tension with
19 one another, you have to reconcile or harmonize
20 or prioritize them. And so, in trying to make
21 sure that we did that, I just want to identify
22 like were there any districts --

23 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I understand.

24 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: -- where those
25 criteria were in tension, and if so, can we

1 identify them?

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Two words, in tension
3 as opposed to an intention. So I understand.

4 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: In tension.
5 Yes.

6 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
7 recognized to answer the question.

8 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you. I'll do the
9 best I can with it.

10 And Representative Driskell, I want to
11 thank you again for all of your work on this and
12 engaging in the process.

13 So as I think we know, there's tier 1
14 and tier 2. Each of the pieces of tier 1 are in
15 tension with the other pieces of tier 1, so one
16 doesn't get priority over the other.

17 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Right.

18 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Same thing with tier 2.
19 So there is no tension between tier 1 and tier 2.
20 There is tension between each of the categories
21 within each tier, and that tension happens in
22 every district.

23 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. You're
24 recognized.

25 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you, Mr.

1 Chair.

2 So then how did the Committee staff --
3 I'm presuming Committee staff -- resolve the
4 times where they had tension? What policy
5 decisions were made to resolve the tension in the
6 districts set out in the primary map?

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
8 recognized.

9 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you.

10 I don't think there's any way to answer
11 that question as asked. If you look at the maps
12 in front of you, you can see where a railway was
13 chosen over a road, or you can see where a
14 waterway was chosen over a county line. That's
15 the best I'm going to be able to do with that
16 question as it's asked.

17 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay.

18 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

19 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: And was the
20 same methodology used throughout both maps, both
21 the primary and the secondary map?

22 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
23 recognized.

24 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yes.

25 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay.

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: And by the way, I'll
2 do this the same way I did the state
3 redistricting map. So if people want to ask a
4 few questions, take another bite at the apple, it
5 won't get held against you if you want to round
6 robin. And so you don't have to know all your
7 questions right now. So feel free to keep going,
8 but this isn't your only shot. So you're
9 recognized for another question.

10 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you, Mr.
11 Chair.

12 So I know in dealing with the state
13 House maps, it seemed like we relied primarily on
14 census data. But for purposes of the
15 congressional maps, did we use more than census
16 data?

17 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

18 CHAIRMAN LEEK: We relied primarily on
19 census data again.

20 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay.

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

22 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: So no
23 secondary data was used?

24 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
25 recognized.

1 CHAIRMAN LEEK: The process that we use
2 in the congressional maps is the exact same
3 process that we used in the state maps.

4 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: So to be very
5 clear --

6 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

7 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: I probably
8 didn't ask that clear enough. So was only census
9 data used in preparing the primary and secondary
10 congressional maps?

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
12 recognized.

13 CHAIRMAN LEEK: There's a lot more that
14 goes into that. So what I'm having trouble with
15 is confining it to "only census data," because we
16 used a lot of member input as well. There's also
17 elections data and performing a functional
18 analysis. So to state that it's "only census
19 data," I think would be inaccurate.

20 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay.

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Rep. Driskell, you're
22 recognized if you want to couple more, or do you
23 want to take a break?

24 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: No. I want to
25 I want to follow up on that thread to just make

1 sure that we get absolute clarity.

2 Was there anything other than census
3 data, member input, I think you said political
4 data, that was used?

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You recognized.

6 CHAIRMAN LEEK: I said elections data.

7 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Oh, elections
8 data. I apologize.

9 CHAIRMAN LEEK: You know, the only data
10 used was the data that we are permitted to use.
11 Now, I don't want to get in a situation where
12 we're quibbling whether this was member input or
13 communities of interest or those types of things
14 because sometimes member input crosses over into
15 arguments about communities of interest or, you
16 know, whether tier 2 standards are being met. Is
17 it appropriate to use this road, is it
18 appropriate to use this highway, et cetera.

19 So I'm having trouble confining it to a
20 single set of lists, which I know we, as lawyers,
21 like to get a single set of list. I can't do
22 that for you. But the only information that was
23 used was information that is appropriate in
24 drawing maps.

25 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay.

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

2 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Yes. So let's
3 talk about those six districts where we receive
4 the performance data for. And I know we've gone
5 through this with the House maps too. Could you
6 talk about the process for the congressional maps
7 for how we selected those six districts that were
8 identified as protected districts?

9 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized,
10 Chair Leek.

11 CHAIRMAN LEEK: It was the exact same
12 process that we use for the state maps.

13 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Follow up?

14 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Yes.

15 So just to get clarity because it's been
16 a couple of weeks since we had that meeting. So
17 that means that we looked at the BVAP scores, and
18 I believe that was the primary metric that we use
19 for purposes of the House maps? Oh, and HVAP.
20 Sorry. Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah, thank you. No.
22 That would be inaccurate. So you have to look at
23 the process as a whole. You take the benchmark
24 maps. You layer on top of it the 2020 census
25 data. You'd look at the benchmark. Then you

1 perform a functional analysis, and it could be
2 BVAP, HVAP. Could also be election data. It
3 could be a number of different things that go
4 into a functional analysis.

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

6 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: I had another
7 question about Tampa Bay, in the area where I
8 represent. So the old Congressional District 15,
9 actually, the way that is in the benchmark map
10 actually is designed to be -- I know we don't
11 identify it as protected, but it is thought of,
12 at least back home, as like a black district or a
13 district where there are a lot of black voters
14 who could elect the candidate of their choice,
15 even though their candidate of their choice
16 happens to be non-black.

17 I guess my question is: Did the
18 Committee staff take a look at that district and
19 make a decision about it, that, no, it doesn't
20 look like it could be a black district, and is it
21 possible to take another look at that one?

22 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative Sirois,
23 you're recognized to answer that question.

24 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: Thank you,
25 Mr. Chairman.

1 Congressional District 15 in the
2 benchmark map is not presently a protected
3 district.

4 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: To follow up,
5 my question was: Can we take another look at
6 that one?

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative Sirois,
8 you're recognized.

9 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: Thank you,
10 Mr. Chairman.

11 No. The functional analysis process
12 that occurs on the benchmark map is to make sure
13 that protected districts have been properly
14 identified in the benchmark map.

15 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm going to recognize
16 our staff director, Ms. Kelly --

17 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay.

18 VICE-CHAIR FINE: -- to add a little
19 more color on that.

20 STAFF DIRECTOR KELLY: Thank you,
21 Mr. Chair.

22 And I'll just piggyback off what Rep.
23 Sirois had said. So if you'd like to stop by,
24 you know, we can take a look at that. And I will
25 piggyback off of what Chair Leek had said

1 originally as well.

2 Going into additional functional
3 analysis on districts that aren't protected may
4 lead us down a path of having information that
5 would potentially lead to improper intent behind
6 the decisions we're making. So we would not
7 analyze that district normally because it was not
8 a performing district in the benchmark map. So
9 again, I know that was kind of a combination of
10 what they said, but just to help clarify. Thank
11 you.

12 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

13 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you,
14 Leda. So that actually is really helpful. So it
15 sounds like, on the benchmark map -- by the end
16 of this, we're all going to be redistricting
17 experts, I hope. On the benchmark map, the
18 functional analysis was performed on all
19 districts to identify which might be protected
20 and CD15 did not rise to that threshold.

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I know the answer to
22 that's no. But Chair Leek, you're recognized to
23 answer the question.

24 CHAIRMAN LEEK: No. Functional analysis
25 is only performed on the protected districts.

1 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay.

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yeah. I'll come back.

3 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay.

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: So Ranking Member
5 Geller, you're recognized.

6 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
7 Mr. Chair.

8 If I'm not mistaken, I believe,
9 Chair Leek, that you used the phrase "singular
10 exception" when you were discussing, I think it's
11 the primary map, and I think it was the proposed
12 District 5. Would you explain what you mean by
13 "singular exception" and why there is this
14 singular exception? What does that mean?

15 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
16 recognized.

17 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you. CD5 in the
18 primary map has a reduction in the BVAP, and
19 that's the only place that that reduction has
20 been more than immaterial. That is the singular
21 exception of it. CD5, however, still is a
22 performing district.

23 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Follow up?

24 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: What is the
25 reduction in BVAP in that particular map, that

1 district?

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
3 recognized.

4 CHAIRMAN LEEK: It goes from about 43 to
5 about 35 and a half percent BVAP.

6 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Follow up.

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yep. You're
8 recognized.

9 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: What is the
10 effect of that reduction in the functional
11 analysis of the ability of the minority voter
12 population to elect representatives of their
13 choice?

14 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
15 recognized.

16 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Well, the district still
17 performs, so the answer is none.

18 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yep. Follow up.

19 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Okay. Thank
20 you, Mr. Chair. My ears play tricks on me. Did
21 you say the districts still perform so the answer
22 is there is no effect of that reduction?

23 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
24 recognized.

25 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah. The question that

1 you asked was: What affect would it have on the
2 functional analysis? Functional analysis is a
3 combination of several factors to determine
4 whether something performs. This district, CD5,
5 as drawn even in the primary map, still performs.
6 So there was no effect on the functional analysis
7 for CD5.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

9 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
10 Mr. Chair.

11 Under the non-dilution standards that
12 apply to drawing constitutionally compliant maps,
13 isn't weakening of the performance of
14 historically performing districts considered
15 dilution?

16 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

17 CHAIRMAN LEEK: No. Remember we're
18 talking about overall performance, right. So a
19 change, a variation, in any of the factors that
20 go into that performance analysis, that doesn't
21 impact performance. It's not a weakening, and
22 you know, ultimately, a court is going to have to
23 decide what diminishment means, which is, I
24 think, what you're getting after. Ultimately, a
25 court's going to have to decide that, but this

1 district drawn in the primary map still performs.

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

3 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
4 Mr. Chair.

5 The House filed a brief for the Florida
6 Supreme Court in the state legislative
7 reapportionment case, apparently with the
8 assistance of Andy Bardos of GrayRobinson. And I
9 think it said that, in a prior case called
10 Apportionment I, new districts may not weaken
11 historically performing districts and that that
12 constituted diminishment. And then further said,
13 reducing a safe district to a competitive
14 district is a downward shift and that differences
15 are at the margins where many elections are
16 decided. And I'm quoting from the position that
17 the House itself just took in court.

18 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Is there a question?

19 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: I'm getting
20 there, Chair Fine. Called a predicate.

21 Doesn't that contradict this statement
22 that moving from 43 to 35, which is considered to
23 be in that questionable margin, does not
24 constitute dilution or weakening?

25 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're

1 recognized.

2 CHAIRMAN LEEK: You know, again, the
3 ultimate question of diminishment is going to
4 have to be one determined by a court. But I can
5 tell you looking at all of the factors, this
6 district still performs. So what we know is we
7 don't have to stay strictly where it was before,
8 right. The courts have been out saying you can
9 move, in this case, BVAP up and down, right, as
10 long as the district still performs.

11 Ultimately, I think a court is going to
12 decide whether that constitutes diminishment or
13 not. But in our analysis, the functional
14 analysis, that district still performs.

15 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

16 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
17 Mr. Chair.

18 Isn't it so that, in the analysis that's
19 actually released to us, that very limited
20 analysis that we've gotten to look at, that
21 instead of performing in 14 out of 14 test
22 elections under the old configuration, under the
23 new configuration, approximately one-third of
24 those same test elections, it does not perform to
25 allow minorities to elect the candidate of their

1 choice?

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm going to recognize
3 Staff Director Kelly to answer that question.

4 STAFF DIRECTOR KELLY: Thank you,
5 Mr. Chair.

6 And thank you, Representative, for that
7 question. I think this is a really good point to
8 drive home why a full functional analysis is
9 needed, right.

10 So we have primary and general elections
11 for every statewide election throughout the
12 entire decade. So what you're referencing, the
13 portions where that district would not perform
14 for a candidate of choice, we're in the earlier
15 parts of the decade. So as we look at the trends
16 of how that portion of the state performs and how
17 it's moved over the decade, the portions that you
18 said where it does perform are actually the more
19 recent elections, which again, is why
20 wholistically, not only election results, but
21 looking at voter registration turnout is also
22 important.

23 I think it's also important to
24 acknowledge, you know, the primary maps
25 configuration of CD5 does have a slightly

1 different electorate than the secondary map or
2 the maps that we've previously put before the
3 Committee as well.

4 So again, with having a different
5 electorate, that could change voting patterns as
6 well. Hopefully that provides some context.

7 Thank you.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Ranking Member Geller,
9 you're recognized.

10 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you.

11 Thank you for that answer. Does that
12 answer mean that it doesn't perform as well based
13 on the analysis but there is some suppositions
14 that are being made about possible trends and how
15 much weakening still allows it to, as the Chair
16 calls it, "perform"?

17 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
18 recognized.

19 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Okay. You know, first
20 of all, performance is not an air quote thing.
21 It's an actual part of the law. So the district
22 itself --

23 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: It's all air
24 quote stuff, Chair. It's all air quotes in here.

25 CHAIRMAN LEEK: The district still

1 performs. You know, when you redraw districts
2 necessarily, they're going to change. I mean,
3 that happens with every redistricting, so
4 necessarily going to change. They're not
5 suppositions. The trends are what the trends
6 are. This district that we have that is now in
7 this primary map, CD5, would still perform.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

9 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
10 Chair.

11 Chairman, I hear you. I think I
12 understand the word. When you say "perform," you
13 don't mean -- and go ahead and correct me, I'm
14 sure you will -- you don't mean it will have the
15 same result; you mean that based on assumptions
16 about things like trends, you think it's likely
17 that it would get to the same place when you say
18 "perform" but statistically, it is less likely to
19 get there. But you think it'll get there anyway.
20 Is that basically what you're saying?

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
22 recognized?

23 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you.

24 The ultimate measure is performance.
25 And every time you move a line and you put this

1 neighborhood in that district now, the
2 performance of that district may change. But the
3 ultimate measure is whether the district that is
4 drawn before you performs. This district under a
5 functional analysis still performs.

6 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Ranking Member Geller,
7 you're recognized,

8 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
9 Mr. Chair.

10 And I hear you, Chair. But every time
11 you move a line, it changes, but you can move
12 those lines in a way that makes it more likely
13 that it will perform or less likely that it will
14 perform. And we're moving those lines in a way
15 that makes it less likely that it will perform,
16 right?

17 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

18 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you.

19 That happens in every map drawing every,
20 changes in every map drawing. And what I can
21 tell you is after the functional analysis of CD5,
22 is still performs. Is it less likely to perform?
23 Honestly, I don't know. Is it more likely to
24 perform? But what I want you to understand is
25 you can't take and pull BVAP out alone and draw

1 the conclusion that it's less likely to perform.
2 So it's important that you look at all of the
3 factors and then come up with the performance
4 scale. This one performs.

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm going to ask a
6 question real quick, if that's okay. Just to
7 maybe help move this long.

8 Chair Leek, would it be fair to say,
9 just since we can talk about performance, it's
10 not a guess, it's not a trend, it's an actual
11 data thing, would it be fair to say, looking at
12 the 2020 performance in this district, that the
13 district outperformed by 13 points? So it wasn't
14 close in 2020 in terms of the performance of the
15 district based on how we do the functional
16 analysis, a 13-point overperformance?

17 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Can I object to
18 the leading question?

19 VICE-CHAIR FINE: No. You can and
20 you're denied. So I'm asking a question.

21 Chair Leek.

22 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you. And you
23 raise an excellent point. So it's relative
24 performance, right. And so that's the trends,
25 right. When you look at the trends, that

1 district performs stronger and stronger in each
2 election cycle. So it's relative. The district
3 still performs. It is not a diminishment unless
4 the district does not perform.

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: But one follow-up by
6 me, but 13 percent's not close, right?

7 CHAIRMAN LEEK: I would agree with you.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. Great. Ranking
9 Member Geller, we'll come back to you now.

10 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
11 Mr. Chair.

12 Was outside counsel retained to analyze
13 that congressional district or to hire an expert
14 to analyze that congressional district?

15 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
16 recognized.

17 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Okay. I'm going to
18 answer this one more time again, right, because I
19 know you know the answer to this question.

20 Outside counsel has been retained. They've
21 spoken to you. Outside counsel has performed all
22 of the required analyses for each protected
23 district.

24 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Ranking Member Geller,
25 you're recognized.

1 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
2 Mr. Chair.

3 Who is their client?

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
5 recognized.

6 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Ultimately, the House is
7 by and through the Speaker. And I want to
8 correct something I just said. Remember staff
9 performs functional analysis. So I said outside
10 counsel, but staff performs the functional
11 analysis.

12 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Ranking Member Geller,
13 you're recognized.

14 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Well, thank you,
15 Mr. Chair.

16 Let's clarify that. Was an expert
17 retained by counsel to review and opine on the
18 functional analysis or performance of that
19 district? Let's get that clear.

20 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
21 recognized.

22 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Staff performs the
23 functional analysis, and our counsel advises the
24 staff and Committee through the staff.

25 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: And the expert?

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm sorry. You're
2 recognized, Ranking Member Geller. Is there an
3 expert, I guess, was the question.

4 Chair Leek, you're recognized.

5 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you.

6 Our expert is not retained for
7 functional analysis, but experts advise staff.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm going to -- sort
9 of go into round robin, so if you --

10 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Let me just --

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: If you want to bring
12 this kind of question in for a landing --

13 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Just this one
14 point. Let me --

15 VICE-CHAIR FINE: -- you'll get a second
16 bite at the apple to collect your thoughts.

17 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Let me just
18 close this one point, Mr. Chairman.

19 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yep. Ranking Member
20 Geller, you're recognized.

21 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Is my
22 understanding of your other answer that the
23 client is the House? Is that correct?

24 VICE-CHAIR FINE: He answered that, but
25 yes, so --

1 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Okay. So if the
2 client is the House, and last time I looked, I'm
3 still a member of it, why is it not available to
4 every member of the House to see what the outside
5 counsel's opinions were and what the expert they
6 retained included, recommended, studied, advised,
7 or whatever it is that the expert did?

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
9 recognized.

10 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you.

11 It seems we're going to go down the path
12 here of consulting expert versus testifying
13 expert. But the short answer, and probably the
14 one that you want to hear, is you, along with
15 many folks out there, have gone on record saying
16 you're going to sue the House. So if you take
17 your analogy to its end, you would be suing
18 yourself under that analogy and not accepting the
19 decision as of the whole.

20 So because we are in anticipation of
21 litigation, as previously announced by you, and
22 because the House moves through the Speaker, we
23 are retaining the consulting expert work product
24 privilege.

25 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Still on this?

1 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Oh, yeah.

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. Ranking Member
3 Geller.

4 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Mr. Chair, and I
5 say this with the greatest respect for you
6 personally, but with all deference, you totally
7 have misstated what I said. And since I said it,
8 I think I have a pretty good idea of what I've
9 said. I assure you I never said I was going to
10 sue the House, possibly for some of the reasons
11 you just mentioned but others as well.

12 When I said, undoubtedly, there will be
13 litigation, it was a comment on the process and
14 results that we have followed. But I never said
15 I was going to sue the House. And by the way, I
16 don't think any of my colleagues on my side of
17 the aisle have ever said they were going to sue
18 the House. Predicting that there will be
19 litigation is not the same as saying that we
20 would, or I would, be the author of it.

21 If that's the only reason why some
22 decision apparently has been made, that I, as a
23 member of the House, are not entitled to see what
24 our counsel has done or the experts --

25 VICE-CHAIR FINE: If you'd bring it in

1 for a question.

2 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: -- to that
3 counsel, I would say, respectfully, that I'd like
4 that information today because I at present --

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm going to ask you
6 for a question.

7 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: -- have no
8 intention --

9 VICE-CHAIR FINE: What's your question?

10 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: -- of suing the
11 House.

12 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. So all right.
13 I let you talk there for a while. Is there a
14 question? I'm not recognizing Chair Leek. You
15 didn't ask a question.

16 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Yes. There is
17 ask a question.

18 There is a question.

19 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Let's ask a question
20 quickly.

21 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Okay. Thank
22 you.

23 The question that I would follow that
24 with is: Will that information be released to
25 any House member who verifies they have no

1 present intention of suing the House?

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
3 recognized.

4 CHAIRMAN LEEK: No.

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: All right.

6 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Why? I'd just
7 like to ask why that is.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized,
9 Chair Leek.

10 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Work product doctrine
11 privilege.

12 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. We're going to
13 move on. And again, you'll get another bite at
14 the apple. I know Representative Skidmore has
15 been waiting to ask a --

16 You had questions, correct? Yeah.

17 So you're the only other hand I've seen.
18 So if other people -- okay. All right. I'll
19 come to you guys.

20 So your next, Rep. Skidmore. Go ahead,
21 you're recognized for a question.

22 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you,
23 Mr. Chair.

24 And I think we kind of were touching on
25 this, but I'm still a little confused about a

1 CD5. And this may be a question for either Chair
2 Leek or staff or Chair Sirois.

3 But when I'm looking at the primary map
4 and we are talking about performance, in more
5 than one-third of the time that districts did not
6 elect the candidate of its choice. But in the
7 secondary map, 100 percent of the time they did.
8 So can you explain, again, for me how that's not
9 diminishment under the definition, as I
10 understand it?

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
12 recognized.

13 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: And I hope I
14 asked that the right way.

15 CHAIRMAN LEEK: You did. I appreciate
16 the question. The answer is going to be the
17 same. Ultimately a court is going to have to
18 determine what diminishment means. Diminishment
19 is a legal conclusion. We have determined that
20 that district still performs.

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Follow up?

22 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you,
23 Mr. Chair.

24 And when you say that "it still
25 performs," the rest of that sentence is for the

1 candidate of choice for that district?

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

3 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Correct. Yeah. Under
4 the legal standards. I'm sorry. I'm trying to
5 move the meeting along. When I say "performs," I
6 mean the functional analysis still demonstrates
7 to the candidate that they're able to choose or
8 elect a candidate of their choice.

9 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Okay. Follow
10 up, Mr. Chair?

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yes, you're
12 recognized.

13 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you.
14 I'm sorry I have so many papers. I lost one of
15 my questions. But it ultimately has to do with
16 the 30-day statute of limitations for filing
17 against the maps. And is there any precedent for
18 that? Have we done that before in this type of a
19 situation, and does federal law not supersede
20 that at some level?

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized,
22 Chair Leek.

23 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you.

24 And listen, I think that is a very, very
25 fair question. Of course, throughout law, there

1 are statute of limitations. In this particular
2 instance, we have qualifying in what, four
3 months? I think we have an election, let's call
4 it nine months. So the statute of limitation is
5 designed to move the process along and get to an
6 end so people know what districts they're running
7 in.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Follow up?

9 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you,
10 Mr. Chair.

11 Thank you for that answer. That filing
12 of the lawsuit, however, doesn't end,
13 necessarily, the lawsuit in time for that. So
14 how does that really jive with us being able to
15 know what districts we're going to run in or any
16 candidate know what districts they're going to
17 run in?

18 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
19 recognized.

20 CHAIRMAN LEEK: The filing of the
21 lawsuit is the initial step that gets us to that
22 answer. And the Court can then accelerate the
23 process such that you can get an answer prior to
24 June, but this is the part of it that we can
25 control is when the lawsuit, when it must be

1 initiated.

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

3 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you,
4 Mr. Chair.

5 And the second part of that is does
6 federal law, VRA, you know, I think there's a
7 six-year statute of limitations on that level,
8 does that now in conflict with the 30 days?

9 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
10 recognized.

11 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Potentially it could
12 conflict if it has a longer statute of
13 limitations and if the person -- but potentially
14 it may not. So if the challenge is solely within
15 federal court on federal law, then I would say
16 the federal statute of limitations would likely
17 prevail. Ultimately, a court's going to have to
18 decide this. I'm just giving you my opinion as I
19 sit here today. But if it's going to be filed in
20 state courts, it's a 30-day statute of
21 limitations.

22 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Rep. Skidmore, do you
23 have another question?

24 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: I'm good for
25 now. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. Again, everyone
2 can have a second.

3 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: I may
4 reorganize.

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yep, that's fine. I
6 think it keeps us moving a little more smoothly.

7 Representative Thompson, I think I saw
8 your hand. Did you have a question?

9 REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Yes. Thank
10 you, Mr. Chairman.

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

12 REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: I have a
13 question regarding the increase in the minority
14 population across the state of Florida. And I'd
15 like to know, given the proportional increase of
16 minorities in Florida, was there the possibility
17 of creating additional minority districts that
18 are not in either the primary or the secondary
19 plans that we've seen?

20 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm actually going to
21 answer that question myself since I spoke to it
22 on the floor. The proportion of black voters in
23 Florida has not materially changed in the last
24 ten years.

25 REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Thank you,

1 Representative Fine. And yes. I did raise this
2 same issue on the floor, and I guess I just don't
3 understand, given 1.5 million individuals who,
4 when they responded to the census, identified
5 themselves as Hispanic and 500,000, who
6 identified, additional individuals, as black, why
7 there's no change, you indicated that there's no
8 change?

9 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'll take this, again,
10 particularly as it relates to black voters. Let
11 me give a mathematical example.

12 If ten years ago, there was there were
13 ten people who lived in Florida and one of them
14 were black and ten years later, there are two
15 people in Florida that are black, that would be a
16 100 percent increase. But if the population of
17 Florida has gone from 10 to 20, even though the
18 black population has doubled, their proportion
19 remains the same at 10 percent. That is the
20 situation in the state of Florida as it relates
21 to the black population.

22 Yes. There are more. But there are
23 more of everybody, so the black percentage has
24 not materially changed.

25 REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Thank you. So

1 I should understand, then, from your response
2 that there was not an opportunity to create
3 additional minority districts. Is that correct?

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: That'd be a question
5 for Chair Leek.

6 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yep. We've maintained
7 the benchmark. They're not entirely in the same
8 places, but we've maintained the benchmark.

9 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Do you have a
10 follow-up?

11 Okay. You're good for now.

12 Representative Slosber-King, I see you.
13 And then Rep. Omphroy, you'll be up
14 next.

15 REPRESENTATIVE SLOSBER-KING: Thank you,
16 Chair. My question centers around the statute of
17 limitations. So what is the current statute of
18 limitations that somebody can bring to challenge
19 the maps?

20 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
21 recognized.

22 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah. So remember that
23 each one of these redistricting bills lives its
24 own life, and that life necessarily ends at the
25 end of the decade. So there's not a current one,

1 period. There was not, to my knowledge, a
2 statute of limitations on the prior set of maps.
3 Right.

4 But because of where we are, because we
5 know this is headed to litigation, and because we
6 want finality for people out there to know what
7 district they live in, to know what district they
8 want to run in, a 30-day statute of limitations
9 works.

10 Listen, people are going to have to make
11 that decision and qualify in four months, right.
12 You know, people are going to have to make that
13 decision and win or lose an election in nine
14 months. So forcing the initiation of a lawsuit
15 early is the best course of action to have some
16 finality of what district you live in and what
17 district you're going to run in.

18 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Follow up.

19 REPRESENTATIVE SLOSBER-KING: Thank you.

20 Is there any other laws that you're
21 aware of that has a 30-day statute of
22 limitations?

23 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
24 recognized.

25 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Not that I'm aware of,

1 but again, this is its own beast.

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. All right.

3 Again, there'll be more bites of the apple.

4 Rep. Omphroy, you're recognized for a
5 question.

6 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Thank you so
7 very much, Chair.

8 So I'm looking at the protected
9 districts. And when I look at the protected
10 districts, all six of them, my concern happens to
11 be -- well, I know the House and the Senate
12 worked on this map. Unfortunately, the senator
13 for my part of Broward County is not in seat. So
14 I'm looking at this map, and I'm noticing that
15 Congressional District 20, there's eight city
16 splits. And I only compared it to the other
17 protected districts.

18 There are eight city splits in
19 Congressional District 20. There are two city
20 splits and Congressional District 24. There is
21 one in 5. There is one in 26. There is one in
22 27 and zero in 28. So my question is: Why is it
23 that CD20 has been split eight times?

24 I'm going to recognize our Chief Map
25 Drawer, Mr. Poreda, to answer that question.

1 CHIEF MAP DESIGNER POREDA: Thank you,
2 Mr. Chair.

3 That's a good question. That revolves
4 heavily around there being so many municipalities
5 all right up against each other in Broward
6 County, where that district -- and really, into
7 Palm Beach County too. And the other areas,
8 where a lot of the other minority districts that
9 you're referring to, they're either not cities or
10 their cities that can be incorporated differently
11 into the district.

12 So it's simply that there are just so
13 many municipalities in Broward County that are
14 all right up against each other.

15 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Follow up.
16 You're recognized.

17 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: How many
18 municipalities are in Miami-Dade County?

19 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I don't know that
20 that's the subject of the bill.

21 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: My reason for
22 asking the question, Chair, is that we're talking
23 about Broward County having all these cities all
24 configured all together. I'm almost certain that
25 Miami-Dade has a similar amount of cities, and

1 yet Miami-Dade does not have a similar amount of
2 splits.

3 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Do you want to take a
4 shot at that?

5 CHIEF MAP DESIGNER POREDA: I don't have
6 that exact number in front of me, Representative.
7 But I'd be happy to get the total number of
8 municipalities for both Broward and Miami-Dade
9 County. You are correct that Miami-Dade County
10 does have a great number of municipalities just
11 like Broward County, but it's where those
12 minority populations are distributed throughout
13 those cities and how the districts can be
14 constructed where it might lend itself to
15 splitting fewer in Dade County than in Broward
16 County because, if you remember, the keeping of
17 municipalities being closed at tier 2 concern and
18 all of these districts are tier 1 protected
19 districts.

20 So splitting them sometimes is a
21 requirement to make sure those districts can
22 perform rather than trying to keep the
23 municipalities whole. So it's just a function of
24 where their geography is, but I'll be happy to
25 get you the total number of municipalities in

1 both those particular counties.

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Follow up?

3 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Yes. Is there
4 any way for us to -- because, you know, when we
5 look at these maps, we can't necessarily see all
6 the cities that are in the particular protected
7 districts. And is there any way for me to get
8 all the cities within 20, all the cities within
9 24, all the cities within -- I know 5 only has
10 one city, all the cities within 27, all the
11 cities within 28.

12 I just want to be able to look at actual
13 cities within the protected districts. And I
14 thank you very much for allowing me to ask
15 questions.

16 VICE-CHAIR FINE: of course. And I'm
17 going to let Chair Leek answer this in a minute.
18 But I would note that in the software, you can
19 zoom in. I've done it. You can zoom in and you
20 can see cities and you can do that. It's hard to
21 see on the maps, but it is available on the
22 software that we all have access to and we've
23 been trained on.

24 I don't know if you have anything you
25 want to add to that, Chair Leek.

1 CHAIRMAN LEEK: That was precisely what
2 I was going to say. I would also invite you, if
3 you would like, to sit down with any of the
4 staff, and we can walk you through all of that.

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized,
6 Representative Omphroy.

7 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Thank you so
8 very much, Chair.

9 I have zoomed in, zoomed around, sat
10 with staff. It is extremely difficult for me to
11 see because some of my cities are very, very
12 tiny, and that's why my area had to be zoomed in
13 the way it is where it has a southeast section.
14 It is extremely difficult, and so that's why I'm
15 asking for a printout of the actual cities within
16 each of the protected districts because I have
17 zoomed. I have swum through these maps. So I
18 please ask for that consideration. I thank you.

19 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Sounds like we need to
20 ask the Speaker for bigger computer monitors, but
21 staff has said they're happy to sit down and
22 provide that to you.

23 Okay. Is there any member who has not
24 yet asked a question who would like to before we
25 move on to round two?

1 Okay. I see Ranking Member Geller.

2 You're recognized. Okay.

3 And you'll be next, Rep. Driskell.

4 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you very
5 much, Mr. Chair.

6 The obligation we have is to produce a
7 map that is constitutionally compliant. Is it
8 the belief of -- I'll direct it to whoever wants
9 to answer whether that's the Chair or the
10 staff -- that the so-called primary map is
11 constitutionally compliant?

12 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
13 recognized.

14 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you.

15 You know, so you've hit on the crux of
16 the question, right. It is a novel legal
17 question that is being put forth, and if that
18 question is answered in the affirmative, it will
19 be constitutional. But that's also why we have a
20 secondary map in case that that question is not
21 answered in the affirmative.

22 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Ranking Member Geller,
23 you're recognized.

24 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you.

25 Appreciate that answer. Is it therefore

1 fair to say -- and watch for what follows that --
2 is it therefore fair to say that there is a
3 serious legal question in the mind of the
4 proponents of the so-called primary map as to
5 whether it will be found constitutionally
6 compliant and that's why a secondary map is being
7 proposed?

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
9 recognized.

10 CHAIRMAN LEEK: You know, I think all
11 questions that go to the Supreme Court are
12 serious legal questions. So it is a serious
13 legal question, and what we've done is we put
14 forth a primary map. But we don't know the
15 answer to the question, right. So we put forth a
16 primary map, and if that primary map is found to
17 be unconstitutional, then the secondary map kicks
18 in.

19 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

20 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
21 Mr. Chair.

22 Is it a fair paraphrase of what you've
23 just said that there is -- watch again, be
24 careful here -- is it a fair paraphrase of what
25 you just said to say that there is a serious

1 doubt or question as to the constitutional
2 compliance of the so-called primary map?

3 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you can
4 answer that question.

5 CHAIRMAN LEEK: No. I mean, the nature
6 of a novel question is that it's unknown. It's
7 unanswered. And so, you know, what you see is
8 the effort to make sure that we're covered if the
9 novel question is if the answer is not as
10 expected.

11 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Follow-up
12 question.

13 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

14 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Has the Chair, a
15 noted attorney, or any of the staff or our -- I
16 use the word "our" in a colloquial
17 sense -- outside legal expert opined as to
18 whether or not proposing two different maps
19 violates the single-subject rule because we're
20 being asked to vote on two completely distinct
21 legal propositions as part of a single bill?

22 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
23 recognized.

24 CHAIRMAN LEEK: No.

25 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Follow up?

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

2 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Has there been
3 consideration given to whether or not voting on
4 two alternative propositions in a single bill
5 violates the single-subject rule?

6 VICE-CHAIR FINE: And before Chair Leek
7 answers that, I would note that -- I don't
8 remember what the vote was, but the House passed
9 HJR. And that did have two maps in it, a House
10 map and a Senate map, even though it was a single
11 --

12 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Not the same,
13 but --

14 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Maybe not, but there
15 were two -- one bill, two maps, and by the way,
16 completely different. One was the House, and one
17 was the Senate.

18 But with that, Chair Leek, you're
19 recognized to answer the question.

20 CHAIRMAN LEEK: And this doesn't violate
21 the single subject. The subject is
22 redistricting, and this has two maps, one
23 secondary and one primary. Doesn't violate the
24 single subject.

25 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yes, you're

1 recognized.

2 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: My next set of
3 questions is intended to focus on how this
4 primary/secondary approach, which is apparently
5 novel, would work. Is it intended that if the
6 reviewing court makes any change whatsoever in
7 the so-called primary map, if it does not strike
8 it in its entirety, if it says there's a problem
9 here or a problem there, we have to adjust this
10 district or the boundaries of this district,
11 which of course affects at least the contiguous
12 ones, or if it says this precinct is in the wrong
13 place, is it the intent of this -- because I
14 can't tell from the way the bill was worded --
15 that any change whatsoever automatically
16 disqualifies the entire primary map and
17 automatically moves us to the secondary or is the
18 secondary only intended if the whole map gets
19 struck?

20 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
21 recognized?

22 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah. I addressed that
23 upfront, and it's also in the bill language. If
24 the Court strikes down CD5, then the secondary
25 map goes into place.

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yep, you're
2 recognized.

3 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
4 Mr. Chair.

5 If there is any other change made
6 anywhere else in the map by the Court, am I to
7 understand that the secondary still doesn't kick
8 in?

9 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Before he asks that, I
10 mean, isn't the map the same, the primary and the
11 secondary, other than the CD, so they're the same
12 map other than that. So I'm not sure it would
13 matter.

14 But Chair Leek, you're recognized to
15 answer the question.

16 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah. The secondary
17 only kicks in if the court finds a problem with
18 CD5.

19 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: I'm good for
20 now.

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: All right.
22 Rep. Driskell, you're recognized, and then
23 Rep. Omphroy will be after you.

24 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you,
25 Mr. Chair.

1 So it sounds like, I just want to go
2 back to CD10, that the Senate views CD10 as a
3 protected black performing minority access
4 district but that the House maintains that it's
5 not. Could you talk to us about why it's not now
6 that we have the Senate data to understand why
7 they believe it is?

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
9 recognized.

10 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah. The underlying
11 data is roughly the same, but the conclusion is
12 different. And if you look at the performance
13 trends of CD10, we've come to the conclusion that
14 it's no longer a protected district. The Senate
15 came to the opposite conclusion.

16 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Rep. Driskell, you're
17 recognized. Or do you want to wait and come
18 back?

19 There could be --

20 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Just I guess -
21 -

22 VICE-CHAIR FINE: -- a third bite of the
23 apple even. So if you don't know your question,
24 you can take a few minutes.

25 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you. I

1 guess the question is, you know, it's why. I
2 mean, why are we drawing that opposite
3 conclusion?

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
5 recognized.

6 CHAIRMAN LEEK: I'll kick part of this
7 over to staff, but we're drawing that opposite
8 conclusion based on the trends and the
9 performance data.

10 But if somebody wants to go through
11 those trends, I'm happy to do it.

12 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Staff Director Kelly,
13 you're recognized.

14 STAFF DIRECTOR KELLY: I'll piggyback
15 off of -- thank you, Chair. I appreciate it.

16 And thank you, other Chair, for that
17 answer. I'll piggyback off of what you were
18 saying.

19 So I can't speak to the Senate's
20 process. I want to be real clear about that.
21 The House, whether it's going through the state
22 House map, the state Senate map, or any other
23 congressional proposals that have come before us,
24 we've run independent processes. So I want to be
25 clear that we're not opining on what the Senate

1 has done or the conclusions that we've reached.

2 Whenever we analyze this district, as we
3 know, going through the subcommittee and the
4 other maps we put out, we don't feel that it's
5 performing. I think one thing that's good to
6 focus on with, you know, the primary, and again,
7 it's the same district in the secondary map for
8 this proposal as well, we've been able to bring
9 it more in alignment with where we know the
10 Senate is. I think that's important because it
11 shows that we're working towards an in-process
12 and it's also as a direct result of several
13 members' feedback actually, some that was given
14 in committee and some that have come to talk with
15 staff as well. Thank you.

16 VICE-CHAIR FINE: All right. It's going
17 to be Rep. Omphroy, and then I will come back to
18 Rep. Skidmore.

19 Rep. Omphroy, you're recognized.

20 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Thank you so
21 very much, Chair.

22 Okay. So my question this time around
23 is in regards to CD24. And I'm looking at the
24 2012 information for the black voting-age
25 population, and then I'm looking at the proposed.

1 And I'm trying to figure out why there's a 6
2 percent difference between what it was before
3 compared to what it is currently being proposed.

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Rep. Omphroy, could
5 you point us exactly --

6 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Sure. I'm on
7 page 3 on -- and I'm looking at --

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: "The total registered
9 voters percentage" at the top?

10 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Yes.

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. So what
12 exactly? Which line are you looking at and which
13 column are you looking at?

14 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: So I'm looking
15 at column 2012, and it's 48.21. And then I'm
16 looking at the proposed BVAP, and it's 42.7,
17 which I'm trying to figure out why we have gone
18 down 6 percent in eight years.

19 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. So thank you.
20 We see the data.

21 And Mr. Poreda, you're recognized to
22 answer that.

23 CHIEF MAP DESIGNER POREDA: Thank you.

24 Just to make sure I'm looking at the
25 right column, you're on the packet for 8017, and

1 you're on page 4. And you're looking at the --

2 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: No, sorry.

3 Page 3.

4 CHIEF MAP DESIGNER POREDA: Oh, I'm
5 sorry, page 3. So page 3, and you're looking at
6 District 24, and you're looking at the black
7 column from 2012 to 2012 and wondering why there
8 was -- and here, it looks like in 2012, it was
9 48.21 percent black total registered voters, and
10 in 2020, it was 44.01 percent registered voters.
11 Am I looking at the right data points?

12 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Correct.

13 CHIEF MAP DESIGNER POREDA: Okay. So
14 that just indicates that over the course, from
15 2012 to 2020, and you look at the other data
16 points in between, there's been a steady decline
17 of the share that black total registered voters
18 are of the total electorate in that particular
19 district. So over the course of the decade, with
20 the five election cycles that we have, that black
21 population has decreased from 48 percent to 44
22 percent just naturally throughout the decade.

23 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

24 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Thank you for
25 the follow-up, Chair.

1 So my question is: When I look at,
2 let's say, 26 or 27 and 28, I see that we have
3 tried to intensify the Hispanic voting-age
4 population in those districts, is there a reason
5 why we didn't intensify the black voting-age
6 population in 24?

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized,
8 Mr. Poreda.

9 CHIEF MAP DESIGNER POREDA: I mean,
10 you're dealing with different types of
11 population, and you're just dealing with the
12 different geographies for the different
13 districts. And 24, that black population has
14 just naturally decreased over the decade, and in
15 Districts 26, 27, and 28, it's just a different
16 segment of population that you're looking at.

17 That's also why the functional analysis
18 is individual for each individual district in
19 looking at its individual functional analysis to
20 determine that. And looking here, I would say
21 looking at the Hispanic total registered voters
22 over the course of the decade in all three of
23 those districts, they, all three of them are less
24 in 2020 that they were in 2012.

25 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

1 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Thank you,
2 Chair.

3 I just want to say thank you.

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. Thank you.

5 Okay. Rep. Skidmore, you are recognized
6 for your second round.

7 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you, Mr.
8 Chair.

9 And this is a question that has probably
10 been asked, and I apologize. During the period
11 of time that the maps could be under litigation,
12 do we adopt what has been proposed in the primary
13 map or secondary map in terms of what candidates
14 would be able to prepare for?

15 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
16 recognized.

17 CHAIRMAN LEEK: I think I'm answering
18 your question, but once it's adopted, the primary
19 map becomes the map.

20 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: I'm sorry.
21 Say it again.

22 CHAIRMAN LEEK: So the primary map
23 becomes a map upon adoption. And if it's
24 challenged, it is the map that is being
25 challenged, but it is in place.

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: And the secondary
2 map's like that backup plan if the primary map
3 gets thrown out for whatever reason.

4 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Okay.

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I'm going to do a
6 third round in a minute. Let's let Rep. Skidmore
7 go ahead.

8 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: So I'm just
9 trying to sort of play out the scenario in my
10 head knowing we don't have crystal balls. I
11 don't mean to suggest that. So because we have
12 an additional congressional seat, we wouldn't be
13 able to stick with our current map while that
14 litigation is taking place. We'd have to adopt
15 either the primary or secondary.

16 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
17 recognized.

18 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah. Let me see if I
19 can explain it. So when this comes out of the
20 legislature as a bill, it will either be signed
21 or vetoed or become law without being signed,
22 that is then the adoption time that map is in
23 place unless it's overturned or replaced.

24 VICE-CHAIR FINE: And Chair Leek,
25 wouldn't it be fair to say that if we only passed

1 one map and it was litigated, same thing? It
2 would still be in place. The only difference
3 being that, if it got tossed for whatever reason,
4 there's a plan B, and the other instance, it's
5 back to the drawing board, correct?

6 Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Right.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: All right. I'll let
9 us have a third bite at the apple in a minute,
10 but I do want folks to be aware that we do have
11 two amendments to the amendment that we're going
12 to be considering. There won't be questions back
13 on it afterwards, but I just want people to know
14 from a sense of timing here that I want everybody
15 to know what's coming up. I'm happy to allow
16 more questions on the amendment if there are
17 questions.

18 Rep. Omphroy, are you ready for round
19 three?

20 All right. You're recognized.

21 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: You might have
22 answered this already, Chair, but very
23 hypothetical, maps are passed out of the House,
24 they're passed out of the Senate, governor says
25 no, and he vetoes it, how does that work? And

1 has that ever happened in the history -- and this
2 is just me being completely curious.

3 VICE-CHAIR FINE: It's a process
4 question.

5 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Yeah. I'm just
6 wondering what that looks like for us as a
7 committee.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. So even though
9 this isn't a question relating to the bill, I
10 mean, I think it's a question relating to the
11 process. People have the right to know.

12 Staff Director Kelly, would you like to
13 talk about the process?

14 STAFF DIRECTOR KELLY: Absolutely. And
15 I don't know about the entire history of
16 Florida's redistricting, so I don't want to
17 misspeak on that. I'd say in recent history that
18 hasn't happened.

19 And so, you know, as you described, you
20 know, we'll have a congressional map that goes
21 out of the House. It'll eventually pass out of
22 the Senate. And since the congressional map is
23 formed just like any other bill or piece of
24 litigation, as opposed to the House and Senate
25 maps, it doesn't go to the Supreme Court for

1 review.

2 It will go straight through to the
3 governor, and he has three options. He has the
4 ability to veto it, the ability to sign it, or
5 the ability to allow it to pass into law. So
6 depending on what happens at that stage in the
7 game, would indicate what comes next.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Did that answer your
9 question?

10 Okay. So anyone else wishing to ask any
11 more questions before we move on?

12 Yes. Representative Thompson, you're
13 recognized.

14 REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Thank you,
15 Representative Fine.

16 Is the primary map that you're proposing
17 essentially the same as what the governor is
18 proposing in terms of the congressional maps?

19 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, even
20 though it's not a question relating to the bill,
21 you're welcome to answer that.

22 CHAIRMAN LEEK: No, it's not.

23 REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Thank you.

24 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Any additional
25 questions?

1 Representative Driskell, you're
2 recognized.

3 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you.

4 With this novel process that we're
5 proposing with having a primary and a secondary
6 map, there's nothing in the legislation that
7 would preclude the Court -- not saying that the
8 Court would, but if the Court decided that it
9 didn't like either map, from just tossing both of
10 them out?

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
12 recognized.

13 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah. This doesn't
14 restrict the authority of the Court. Right.

15 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Okay.

16 VICE-CHAIR FINE: All right. Yep.
17 Ranking Member Geller, round three.

18 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Four? No, five.

19 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I don't know. I'm
20 losing track.

21 All right. Ranking Member Geller,
22 whatever round it is, you're recognized.

23 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you. I
24 think it's round and round to be technical.

25 But Chair, are you concerned and have

1 you considered whether the adoption of a 30-day
2 statute of limitations is not authorized in the
3 Florida Constitution Fair District Amendment?

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
5 recognized.

6 CHAIRMAN LEEK: No.

7 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Follow-up,
8 please.

9 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

10 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Given the --
11 let's just say, does that mean that you're not
12 concerned about it or you haven't considered it,
13 which?

14 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you're
15 recognized.

16 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah. There's nothing
17 set forth in the Constitution that would require
18 it or disallow it.

19 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Follow-up,
20 please.

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

22 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: You don't think
23 there is anything in the abruptness of that
24 30-day statute that would interfere with the
25 constitutional right of access to courts?

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: I think that's a
2 different question than what you asked before.

3 But Chair Leek, you're recognized.

4 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: It is a
5 different -- yes, sir. That's correct.

6 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yeah. You're asking my
7 legal opinion, and no. I don't think it would
8 interrupt or disrupt access to court.

9 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Okay.

10 VICE-CHAIR FINE: You're recognized.

11 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you.

12 Am I correct that we have been unable to
13 determine anytime in the history of this state in
14 any previous separate beasts, as you call them,
15 these individual redistricting or reapportion
16 laws, where a statute of limitations has been
17 imposed?

18 VICE-CHAIR FINE: One second. When
19 you're ready, Chair Leek, you're going to be
20 recognized.

21 Just a minute.

22 CHAIRMAN LEEK: I'm sorry. I needed a
23 little refresher. But this is very much akin to
24 the 30-day challenge to ballot language. So your
25 specific question is whether it's ever happened

1 in reapportionment or redistricting. And I
2 actually don't know the answer to that question,
3 but the 30-day challenge actually goes on each
4 time you've tried to put something on the ballot.

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, just a
6 follow-up, isn't the reason for that is the
7 timeliness because there's an election coming up?

8 CHAIRMAN LEEK: That's exactly right.
9 So the reasoning would be consistent with what we
10 have here.

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Ranking Member Geller,
12 you're recognized.

13 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
14 Mr. Chair.

15 Given that the previous redistricting
16 and reapportionment plan adopted after the 2010
17 census and the plan that was voted in 2012,
18 including the congressional plan which was struck
19 down, did not occur until 2015, affecting
20 elections in 2016, what's the policy reason
21 behind the rush to try to compel this litigation
22 to be filed when it's manifest that if it takes
23 longer to resolve, if it's filed later, heard
24 later, tried later, ordered later, it simply
25 doesn't kick into effect until it kicks into

1 effect?

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Chair Leek, you can
3 answer that.

4 But my understanding is when that
5 happened, that lawsuit, by the way, was filed
6 almost immediately. They didn't even need 30
7 days. It sounds like they needed like 30
8 minutes.

9 You're recognized, Chair Leek.

10 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you. Yeah. You
11 know, we're trying to give the Court every
12 opportunity to expedite resolution of any
13 litigation that happens.

14 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. Any other
15 questions before we move on to the amendment to
16 the amendment?

17 Okay. Seeing none, we're going to move
18 on. You should each have yellow papers on your
19 desk. These were not distributed in advance. So
20 I am going to take up -- and they don't have
21 barcode on them, so I'm going to explain which
22 one we're going to do by basically reading the
23 amendment so you know.

24 They're both by Rep. Driskell. The one
25 we're going to do is the one that says, "Remove

1 lines 7129 to 7136 of the amendment." It's Draft
2 Request 84152. So we're going to take that
3 amendment to the amendment up.

4 Representative Driskell, you're
5 recognized to explain the amendment.

6 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you,
7 Mr. Chair.

8 This amendment removes the portion --
9 the amendment to the amendment removes a portion
10 of the amendment that is imposing the 30-day
11 statute of limitations. Presently, the statute
12 of limitations for challenge to districts will be
13 four years under statute 95.11(3)(p). Moving
14 this statute of limitations from four years to 30
15 days, I believe, would be highly problematic, and
16 actually, it does nothing to help the Court
17 expedite litigation.

18 It expedites the timeframe to file
19 litigation. But in terms of the judicial economy
20 or judicial efficiency, it's not an apples-to-
21 apples comparison. So what we're trying to do is
22 make sure that we remove that to give potential
23 litigants the time that they need to review the
24 information and to file a lawsuit.

25 And while it may not be the intention, I

1 sincerely doubt it is the intention of this
2 Committee or the legislature when we vote on this
3 map to appear as though we're using procedure as
4 a weapon to stave off substantive challenges, I'm
5 concerned about the appearance of that. And I'm
6 trying to save us from that and just remove that
7 language in the amendment so that we can leave
8 things with the status quo as they've always
9 been.

10 And that is the amendment, Mr. Chair.

11 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. Thank you.

12 Representative Driskell having explained
13 her amendment, members, are there questions on
14 the amendment to the amendment?

15 Representative Mariano, you're
16 recognized for a question.

17 REPRESENTATIVE MARIANO: Thank you,
18 Chair. Thank you, Representative.

19 Can you please explain why a potential
20 litigate would not be able to meet the
21 requirements within 30 days?

22 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative
23 Driskell, you're recognized.

24 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Absolutely.
25 And there may be a number of reasons why they

1 couldn't. For example, look at how thick this
2 packet is and thick this packet is. I mean, it's
3 a lot of data that we're considering. It takes a
4 lot of time to analyze it. It may take time to
5 develop legal theories and to make sure that the
6 lawsuit is in the posture that they want. It may
7 take time for them to do pre-suit discovery and
8 talk to people who were involved, if they can get
9 that. It may take time to go through legislative
10 records, for example.

11 So with these hearings that we've been
12 having, sometimes these committee meetings have
13 gone on hours long. And the meeting that we're
14 in right now, we've already been here for an hour
15 and 52 minutes. It takes a lot to review that
16 material. It can take a lot of time to do legal
17 research, take a lot of time to read briefs. It
18 could take a lot of time to do comparative
19 analyses under the law.

20 In other words, in sum, it could take a
21 lot of time. And I keep saying "a lot of time,"
22 and maybe I shouldn't use that descriptive. What
23 I'm just saying is that it could take more than
24 30 days. Thirty days sounds like a lot, but I
25 can tell you, as a business litigator, it's not a

1 lot of time to review an entire record and the
2 evidence that you may want to rely on in bringing
3 a case.

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative
5 Mariano, follow up.

6 REPRESENTATIVE MARIANO: Thank you.
7 And are you aware of any previous
8 challengers not filing within this deadline? How
9 quickly do they normally file?

10 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative
11 Driskell.

12 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: You know, I
13 can't answer that for you. And to be very honest
14 with, you know, this being filed overnight and it
15 only coming to my attention this morning, on the
16 same day that we had session, I've done the best
17 that I could to try to make sure that we're not
18 wading into a situation where we could appear
19 that we want to use procedure as a way to stave
20 off litigation.

21 Listen, if we believe that our maps are
22 good and they're constitutional, we should give
23 people every right that they're afforded under
24 the law to challenge those because, hopefully,
25 and I do believe we'll come up with congressional

1 maps, this is not the way to stave off
2 litigation.

3 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative
4 Mariano. Good?

5 All right. Any other members wishing to
6 ask a question on this amendment to the
7 amendment?

8 Okay. Seeing none, we don't have any
9 public testimony, I don't think, on the amendment
10 to the amendment?

11 No? Okay. Seeing no public testimony,
12 members, is there anyone wishing to debate on the
13 amendment?

14 Ranking Member, you're recognized.

15 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
16 Mr. Chair.

17 I support this amendment. I urge the
18 members to support it. We've only heard about
19 this idea, for one thing, since pretty late last
20 night, and 13 and a half hours in advance of our
21 meeting today. I did try to use a couple of
22 those to get a little bit of sleep.

23 I actually also think not only that it's
24 not harmful to have people file a little bit
25 later and take a little more time to be able to

1 investigate so things can go more quickly, even
2 if that means that the maps we vote might turn
3 out to be the ones that govern the elections at
4 the end of this year.

5 In fact, there was recently a decision
6 that was made in regard to Alabama, that the
7 Supreme Court, by a narrow vote, decided to leave
8 the map that had been put forth in place for the
9 moment. They said that that can be reviewed and
10 decided in the fullness of time. And perhaps
11 that's what will happen here in this state and
12 maybe it'll take more time and maybe it won't get
13 done before 2022 since I don't personally plan to
14 be that litigant. I have no idea how long they
15 might need.

16 But I'll point out one other unintended
17 consequence. If you require people to file
18 within 30 days, you're likely to force some
19 litigation that perhaps, in the fullness of time,
20 might not occur.

21 If you simply gave people enough time to
22 study all the issues, gather all the data,
23 perhaps they would find that the plan that's
24 ultimately adopted is satisfactory, that they
25 don't need to challenge it, and forcing them to

1 run down and get to the courthouse and get
2 something in before the 30 days is up might
3 actually result in unnecessary litigation, which
4 I know we would all not like to see happen.

5 So I strongly support the amendment to
6 delete the 30 days, and I urge you to vote in
7 support of it.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative Rommel,
9 were you wishing to debate?

10 REPRESENTATIVE ROMMEL: Thank you,
11 Chair.

12 And Rep. Driskell, I understand your
13 concern in making sure possible litigants have
14 proper time to prepare for a possible lawsuit,
15 but I truly don't think it's necessary. And I
16 urge our members to vote down on this.

17 Before we even started session this
18 year, multiple groups on the outside already
19 indicated there were prepared to file lawsuits
20 before we even filed a bill. So I think 30 days
21 is more than ample time since they've already
22 threatened to file lawsuits. So please vote
23 down.

24 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Any of the members
25 wish to debate?

1 Representative Skidmore, you're
2 recognized.

3 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chair.

5 Because the 30 days doesn't really
6 indicate how long litigation is going to take, it
7 just really just a number picked out of the air.
8 Just filing doesn't do anything about restricting
9 how long it's going to take. So it doesn't help
10 in terms of, oh, we need to know what we're
11 doing, candidates need to know where they're
12 running, because the litigation could take, you
13 know, two, three years before it's completed. So
14 I'm not sure I really understand the purpose for
15 that.

16 And I also think one year is certainly a
17 compromise between what we understand four years
18 is what we have at the moment in terms of other
19 types of statutes of limitation. So I certainly
20 think one year is an appropriate compromise from
21 30 days giving the folks who want to be able to
22 understand all of this process.

23 And Rep. Driskell, you know, she
24 motioned to some of the things on our desks that
25 we're going through, not to mention the bill

1 itself that is sitting on the counter that has
2 repeatedly been, we've been reminded is, you
3 know, in excess of 300 pages.

4 So I certainly think one year is a
5 significant compromise, and we should definitely
6 vote up on this amendment.

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative
8 Goff-Marcil, you are recognized.

9 REPRESENTATIVE GOFF-MARCIL: Thank you,
10 Chair.

11 I need to reiterate as well, because
12 going from four years to 30 days, that's enough
13 of a red flag to have people file a lawsuit just
14 from that. So I definitely think that this is a
15 great amendment, and we should vote up on it.

16 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yes. Representative
17 Thompson, you are recognized.

18 REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Thank you,
19 Representative Fine.

20 I just want to point out that in 2012,
21 there was a challenge to the State Senate maps,
22 not to the House but to the Senate that certainly
23 took considerably more than 30 days. So I wanted
24 to point that out and ask for your support of
25 Representative Driskell's very good amendment.

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: And not to -- just
2 that challenge, while it took a long time, it was
3 filed within 30 days. It was filed, my
4 understanding is within 30 minutes. So just so
5 folks understand.

6 Any other members wishing to speak in in
7 debate? Anyone else?

8 Representative Leek, you are recognized.
9 Chair Leek.

10 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you. I appreciate
11 it. And listen, the first lawsuit, 2012, was
12 filed within the first hour of the maps. We need
13 to disabuse ourselves of the fantasy that these
14 lawsuits aren't already prepared and weren't
15 started before we got census data.

16 Any serious challenge to the maps can
17 easily be achieved within the first 30 days, and
18 we can start the clock running to get the Court
19 to expedite the case and give some finality to
20 our voters. That's the purpose of the 30 days.
21 I urge you to vote this amendment down.

22 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Before I recognize
23 Representative Driskell to close on her
24 amendment, look, I would add to what Chair Leek
25 said. There's a compelling public policy

1 interest for this to be done quickly. And
2 anyone, frankly, who has concerns with the maps
3 and who wishes to sue, if they don't sue fast,
4 they're not all that concerned because we have an
5 election very soon.

6 Let's just hypothetically play this out.
7 If the governor were to sign this, we get this
8 done over the next couple of weeks, governor
9 signs that by the end of March, you know,
10 qualifying is two months later. The primary is
11 four months later.

12 So voters have a right, we have an
13 obligation to help our voters have some funding
14 to vote on. And frankly, if people think those
15 districts are wrong, then they owe it to those
16 voters to do it fast to try to change it before
17 the election.

18 If they're going to drag it out, then
19 they're actually hurting the same people that
20 they claim to want to help.

21 With that, Representative Driskell,
22 you're recognized to close on your amendment.

23 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you, Mr.
24 Chair, and thank you, members, for the robust
25 conversation around this.

1 I suppose what I would say is a few
2 points. The first is that the measure of concern
3 that a member of the public or group may have
4 about the constitutionality of the maps is not a
5 perfect measure for how quickly that lawsuit
6 should be filed.

7 I think that the rules of civil
8 procedure are enacted to provide guardrails and
9 make sure that litigation has a cognizable basis
10 and that a lawsuit is reasonable when it is
11 brought. It doesn't track or comport to say I
12 really don't like this map, I really want to
13 bring this lawsuit, and slap something together
14 within 30 days. No. You want to take your time
15 and make sure that you get it right.

16 Second, there was a lot of comment about
17 groups that have made statements in the public.
18 I don't know what all groups have done that, but
19 it sounds like there's been some conversation
20 today that there are groups that have made
21 comments around wanting to sue. Well, that's
22 great. And it sounds to me -- I mean, I don't
23 want to say that's great. I'm just like, well,
24 you know, whatever, that they did that. But my
25 suspicion is that any group that would say that

1 might have more resources than just say like an
2 average citizen who wanted to bring a lawsuit.
3 We keep talking a lot about groups.

4 But this is a statute of limitations
5 that would govern everybody. And so you think
6 about the members of the public who have been
7 doing their best to track the process, to use the
8 website to submit their maps, and you think about
9 what resources they may have. They may not have
10 the resources to retain counsel or, you know, to
11 mount a large challenge, but they certainly would
12 have standing to bring a challenge if they wanted
13 to. And 30 days is far too short a time for
14 something that this important.

15 And the third thing that I would
16 mention. I really don't understand the arguments
17 that are being made. To me, it's just a red
18 herring around wanting to have the Court resolve
19 these issues as quickly as possible.

20 I've yet to see in any of the
21 jurisprudence that I've read around
22 redistricting, the Court saying that it hasn't
23 had sufficient time, or if only these lawsuits
24 had been brought sooner, they could have done
25 their job better. This has nothing to do with

1 the Court's ability to do its job. What we're
2 talking about is on the front end, giving
3 litigants the time, potential litigants the time
4 that they would need to bring an effective
5 lawsuit.

6 And if we think that these maps are
7 constitutional, if we believe in our work, and I
8 believe that through this process, we will be
9 able to get to a place where we can all stand
10 behind our work, then we should stand behind our
11 work and not use a procedural and, frankly,
12 arbitrary deadline that is removing it from four
13 years, 48 months. If my math is right, Randy's
14 probably better, Chair Fine's better at math
15 tonight than I am. He always says. Forty-eight
16 months down to one month to do it.

17 We're using procedure as a weapon and
18 it's wrong. We're using procedure as a weapon to
19 stave off substantive challenges and that is
20 wrong. That's why I brought the amendment. You
21 know, I regret that there was not enough time to
22 talk to the Chair about it. It all kind of came
23 together pretty fast this morning. But that's
24 the intention of the amendment because I do not
25 believe that it would be the intention of this

1 Committee or the legislative body to not stand
2 behind its work product. So please vote up on
3 the amendment.

4 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Having closed on the
5 amendment, members will vote on the amendment
6 now. All in favor say yea.

7 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Yea.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: All opposed, nay.

9 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Nay.

10 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Show the amendment
11 failed.

12 Okay. We're now going to move on to our
13 second amendment. Again, you should have the
14 yellow piece of paper in front of you. At the
15 bottom, it says Draft Request 84153. And just so
16 you know, we're talking about the amendment
17 having three lines in it. They're on line 7, 8,
18 and 9. So that's the amendment.

19 Representative Driskell, you are
20 recognized to explain the amendment.

21 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you, Mr.
22 Chair.

23 So this amendment, rather than maintain
24 the status quo, which would be four years under
25 statutes, would bring it to one year. Although

1 one year is only 25 percent of the current
2 statute of limitations, at least it's longer than
3 30 days, and I think it would be a reasonable
4 compromise to require litigants to bring a
5 lawsuit within one year. And that is the
6 amendment to the amendment.

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. Thank you. And
8 that math is correct.

9 Members, are there any questions on the
10 amendment?

11 All right. Seeing no questions. We
12 don't have any public comment on this amendment
13 to the amendment. Members, is there anyone
14 wishing to debate on the amendment?

15 Yes. Representative Goff-Marcil, you
16 are recognized.

17 REPRESENTATIVE GOFF-MARCIL: Thank you,
18 Mr. Chair. And thank you for this really good
19 amendment. I think the other amendment was
20 better than this amendment that this amendment,
21 but this seems like a compromise.

22 I feel when we go from 48 months to 30
23 days, that just seems -- we're starting to go
24 into violating notice and due process of law,
25 which is very concerning. And again, there will

1 be a lot of red flags going up on that.

2 But going from 48 months to 12 months,
3 is a very good compromise. And as Representative
4 Driskell said, if these maps are fine, this is
5 all a moot point because it doesn't matter how
6 many lawsuits are out there or are brought up,
7 they would have to be successful to overturn the
8 map. And these are congressional maps, and
9 they're constitutional maps, then there's not a
10 problem. So please accept this, vote up on this
11 amendment.

12 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Any other members
13 wishing to debate on this amendment to the
14 amendment? Okay.

15 Oh, yes. Representative Leek you're
16 recognized.

17 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you. Members, I
18 urge you to vote down on this. And if you think
19 about what you're asking, right, you're asking
20 for someone to initiate a challenge. Not the
21 conclusion. This 30-day statute of limitations
22 doesn't require the Court to rush, doesn't
23 require the Court to conclude it within 30 days.
24 But you're telling the world that you can file a
25 lawsuit three months after we've elected a member

1 into one of the districts.

2 I mean, that just does not make any
3 sense. All this requires is that you initiate
4 the lawsuit within the 30 days. I urge you to
5 vote down on this.

6 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Seeing no additional
7 debate, Representative Driskell, you are
8 recognized to close.

9 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you, Mr.
10 Chair.

11 I'm having a hard time with this one
12 because we already have process and procedure in
13 place for if the maps get challenged. We just
14 move forward with the maps that we passed. Why
15 do we do that? Because we believe in the maps
16 that we passed. And that's the process that's
17 allowed.

18 The process is the process. I know
19 we've wanted this process to be very
20 collaborative. This is a change that I was
21 surprised to see. Maybe with some further
22 conversation, we can talk about a compromised
23 position as these head to the floor, because
24 moving it from four years to 30 days, it's quite
25 drastic. And I don't think that this is an

1 invitation to litigation in any way. It's not an
2 invitation. We're not asking people to sue us.

3 I'm sure the Committee would prefer that
4 they didn't and that they, you know, like our
5 work product. But that's not what statute of
6 limitations are for. Statute of limitations are
7 to recognize, with a sense of equity and fairness
8 and justice under the law, that you cannot
9 restrict people's access to the Court. And part
10 of access to the Court is providing a reasonable
11 amount of time for people to bring a lawsuit.

12 We have statutes of limitations for like
13 everything under the law, whether it's a wrongful
14 death suit, you know, whether it's an action in
15 tort, an action in contract, if it's not clear
16 what it is, you've got latches, you got all sorts
17 of things to make sure that people have the
18 access that they need.

19 And I'm here to tell you that this looks
20 like we're weaponizing procedure to cut off
21 substantive challenges to the map. And I don't
22 think that's right. And so this is a compromise
23 position to try and do this within one year,
24 which frankly, probably also is still too short,
25 but at least we're trying to work with what's

1 been proposed by the Committee staff and by the
2 Chair and try to reach a compromise position.

3 And if the amendment is voted down
4 today, I do hope that maybe we can continue
5 conversations and see what a compromise position
6 might be. With that, I asked you to vote up on
7 this amendment to the amendment. Thanks.

8 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative
9 Driskell having closed on her amendment, all in
10 favor say yea.

11 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Yea.

12 VICE-CHAIR FINE: All opposed, nay.

13 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Nay.

14 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Show the amendment
15 failed.

16 Okay. That concludes both of our
17 amendments to the amendment. So we will now
18 return to the original amendment that has been
19 unchanged. We're now at the point in the process
20 where we would do public testimony.

21 We do have one public testimony card on
22 this amendment. It is Cecile Scoon, with the
23 League of Women Voters of Florida who wishes to
24 speak for information only.

25 MS. SCOON: Thank you for this

1 opportunity. Cecile Scoon, president of the
2 League of Women Voters of Florida. And I've been
3 listening. It's been a very interesting debate
4 and a lot of information without a whole lot of
5 time to absorb it. The league would say that we
6 would like this body to exercise caution with
7 regards to the primary map that has been
8 presented with the change in the voting-age
9 population of the black population.

10 As Chair Leek indicated, it is not a
11 de minimis change. He indicated it was
12 substantial and when asked, readily admitted, he
13 didn't know for sure if a court or anybody would
14 say it was constitutional or not because it's
15 kind of a new concept to present two maps in this
16 way.

17 And the concern that we have is, when
18 you all were presenting your prior map, I believe
19 on Friday, there was only one real force against
20 your map at that time, a strong force, and that
21 was the governor's office and his representative,
22 Mr. Popper, came and spoke before you. And of
23 course, we know that the governor had presented a
24 map that diminished the voting strength of
25 African Americans by two districts.

1 And so to have this map here now before
2 us, that is the only entity that we know that was
3 pushing in that direction was the governor who
4 has indicated that his desire was to limit
5 access, it is concerning that anything would
6 change that may be possibly go in that direction.

7 So I think that -- just ask everyone to
8 be very cautious about this move. Your analysis
9 from Friday, I think was interesting and strong.
10 And you asked a lot of really good questions of
11 Mr. Popper. He had no case law to support what
12 he was advising you to do.

13 So I would just ask you to be cautious
14 in adhering in any way to the guidance from that
15 direction from Mr. Popper and his efforts, when
16 he could not cite any case law to support his
17 position and actions. So we'll just leave it
18 there.

19 There's not a lot of time to do the deep
20 analysis that we would normally like to, you
21 know, work on, and we know that everybody's
22 working as hard as they can. But we just asked
23 you to be very cautious in this move. Thank you.

24 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Thank you for your
25 testimony. I would note, however --

1 We're good. You're welcome.

2 I would note, however, most of us aren't
3 on the committee last Friday. And while we said
4 there was one, you said there's only one strong
5 force against what was presented Friday, it was
6 my understanding that every single democratic
7 member of the Committee voted against it. So I
8 don't know that it's very respectful of them to
9 say they're not a strong force because it didn't
10 pass unanimously.

11 Ranking Member Geller.

12 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: I had a question
13 if Ms. Scoon would entertain one.

14 VICE-CHAIR FINE: That's fine. You're
15 welcome to come back up.

16 MS. SCOON: Absolutely. And
17 Representative Fine, I was referring to
18 District 5 with regards to that part of the map.
19 Just to clarify for you. Thank you.

20 Yes, sir.

21 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you,
22 Mr. Chair.

23 Ms. Scoon, I understand they haven't
24 been out very long and we're all in the same
25 boat. But so far, has your organization been

1 able to develop any analysis as to whether or not
2 the proposed primary map with an all in Duval
3 County purported minority district to elect
4 representatives of the Community's own choice is
5 constitutionally compliant or whether conversely,
6 it constitutes diminishment, dilution, or
7 backsliding?

8 MS. SKOON: No, we have not had that
9 opportunity.

10 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Thank you. Okay.

11 Seeing that, we're going to move on to
12 debate on the amendment. We will obviously still
13 have debate on the bill as amended, assuming it
14 is amended.

15 Members, is there anyone wishing to
16 debate on Chair Leek's amendment?

17 Okay. Well, seeing none, Chair Leek --
18 oh. Okay.

19 Ranking Member Geller, you are
20 recognized to debate on the amendment.

21 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: Thank you.

22 I don't believe that the change in the
23 proposed minority district contained wholly
24 within Duval County is constitutionally compliant
25 in that I think that it represents a substantial

1 dilution or diminishment of the minorities'
2 ability to elect representatives of that
3 community's own choice. In that sense, I believe
4 that proposed map is constitutionally deficient.

5 I understand there have been concerns
6 raised about compactness. Compactness is a
7 tier 2 standard. Tier-two standards are not
8 supposed to imperil tier 1 standards.

9 This is a protected district or ought to
10 be a benchmark district. The proposed dilution
11 of having that district entirely within Duval
12 County, which is a substantial numerical
13 dilution, is not, in my opinion, satisfied by
14 reliance on trends, especially where we've not
15 been able to see that analysis, the work of
16 outside counsel, or any of what the consulting
17 expert may have determined.

18 The notion that that map is
19 constitutionally compliant is belied by the very
20 fact that there is a so-called secondary map in
21 an effort to assure constitutional compliance.
22 If there was confidence that the proposed
23 district in Duval County was constitutionally
24 compliant, we would not have a secondary map or a
25 need for a secondary map. And it is therefore

1 apparent that even the proponents of that map
2 have no confidence in it as being
3 constitutionally compliant.

4 It may, in fact, be a novel legal
5 theory, or it may be simply a blatantly
6 unconstitutional violation of all the
7 jurisprudence we have seen under Voting Rights
8 Act cases and the precedent set when this map
9 was, in fact, drawn only a few years ago by the
10 same courts that we're now saying, well, who
11 knows what they'll do.

12 If it was as unconstitutional as we've
13 been led to believe, why did the Court draw it?
14 At the conclusion of that, I also think the
15 process of a primary and secondary is improper.
16 I think it violates the single-subject rule, and
17 I think it is a terrible precedent for us to set.

18 Can you imagine applying that precedent
19 to every law, that this body votes? We're going
20 to have a new law. We don't know if it's legal,
21 but we're going to have a new law. And in case
22 it turns out it's not legal, we'll have a
23 different law.

24 What if we did that on everything? I
25 don't think it's the right approach. I have

1 serious questions as to whether it's authorized
2 by law, and it is, in fact, the culmination of a
3 process that has left minority members of this
4 Committee seriously in the dark.

5 It is the culmination of a process that
6 has seen our lawyers and our experts working for
7 our House produce information and analyses and
8 opinions which are not shared with us, though
9 they are paid for by the taxpayers of Florida,
10 whom the minority members of this Committee
11 represent, as well as the majority members of the
12 Committee.

13 This primary secondary approach is
14 flawed. Perhaps the secondary map, if adopted,
15 with some tweaks that have been put on it, would
16 be something there that an agreement could be
17 reached with the Senate. I can't say that that
18 map would be constitutionally compliant based on
19 the fact that I haven't seen all of the data I
20 would need to look at, apparently based on some
21 incorrect assumption that I said I personally was
22 going to sue the House, which I have no intention
23 of doing it this time.

24 But regardless of whether I have the
25 information to determine if that secondary map is

1 or is not constitutionally compliant, I think it
2 is abundantly clear that that so-called primary
3 map is not constitutionally compliant.

4 And again, if the people voting it in
5 thought it was, we would not have a secondary
6 map. So I oppose this amendment. And I would
7 ask, respectfully, that the Chair and the
8 majority party members of the Committee make a
9 choice. Pick a map that you think will survive
10 constitutional review and pass that map because
11 this primary/secondary approach unprecedented in
12 the history of our state is wrongheaded, bad
13 precedent, and in my opinion, unconstitutional.

14 Vote down on this proposed amendment and
15 make a choice as to what you think is
16 constitutional. Thank you.

17 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Any other members
18 wishing to speak in debate?

19 Yes, Representative Sirois, you are
20 recognized.

21 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: Thank you very
22 much, Mr. Chairman.

23 And you know, as I'm sitting here
24 listening to these comments and I hear that, you
25 know, the amendment before us is improper, I look

1 at it and find it to be prudent and reasonable
2 given the circumstances ahead of us.

3 This amendment, I think, is making the
4 best decision that we can with the information
5 that we have in front of us in our awareness of
6 the timetable moving forward. We also have an
7 election cycle ahead of us. And I think that
8 Floridians deserve some clarity in terms of
9 district boundaries.

10 I think candidates deserve some clarity
11 in terms of qualifying. You know, so I think
12 that this is a good step for us to take to kind
13 of lay the groundwork but also recognize the time
14 constraints that exist as we approach the end of
15 session.

16 You know, we also have a Senate that we
17 have to work with, and obviously, take into
18 consideration their views on these matters. The
19 governor has proposed a novel legal theory that,
20 you know, remains somewhat of an open question
21 for us moving forward. So I think that the
22 amendment, you know, takes all of that
23 wholistically into account and puts us in a good
24 position to proceed.

25 The other thing that I feel compelled to

1 talk a little bit about, because with all due
2 respect, Ranking Member, you know, I think this
3 suggests that this hasn't been an effort where
4 there's been collaboration and communication
5 among members. That's not been my experience.

6 And I think as Chair Leek indicated in
7 his comments at the start of our Committee
8 meeting, both of us have been open and receptive
9 to feedback from members, perspectives,
10 experiences that members have in their own
11 communities and neighborhoods that they're
12 bringing to the table. And I think that there's
13 a lot in this map, in the amendment that we can
14 all be very proud of in terms of member input and
15 a collaborative effort towards, you know, a final
16 product.

17 And I've been a participant in those
18 meetings around the Capitol with many of you and
19 members not on this Committee, and I think those
20 conversations have been very productive and
21 helpful and have resulted in the amendment, the
22 maps that are before us today.

23 So I encourage members to be proud of
24 this work product to vote up on this amendment,
25 and I appreciate the continued conversation.

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Any other members
2 wishing to speak in debate?

3 Before I give it to Chair Leek to close,
4 a couple of comments of my own. I want to reject
5 a couple of the comments that were made, because
6 I don't think they're accurate, relating to the
7 process.

8 The notion of the secondary map,
9 frankly, is probably a good idea that might have
10 been done before, because I would note that, even
11 if what we're proposing is a secondary map or the
12 primary map, there are folks who have said they
13 would litigate against it. And so the notion
14 that was put forth as though like the second map
15 is like the safety school, if you think about
16 college admissions, that you know you're going to
17 get into if you don't get into your stretch
18 school, I think is a false analysis.

19 I mean, frankly, there's no guarantee
20 because there are folks who take issue with that
21 map as well. So the notion is it's a guaranteed
22 backup. And so if we were so confident about it,
23 why wouldn't we put that out as the only map I
24 think is false equivalence.

25 Again, there are folks who have

1 legitimate concerns about that map. And I think
2 the notion, you know, that the governor's
3 argument is going to be so easily dismissed, I
4 think there's a lot of reason to support that.

5 The other thing I would note is this
6 notion of "what if's." I'd like to remind folks
7 that a number of months ago, we did something
8 exactly like this in what is one of our other
9 most significant things we will work on the
10 legislature because of the time horizon. When we
11 passed the Seminole Compact, which had a 30-year
12 time horizon, this is a 10-year time horizon, we
13 all knew that there was a risk in the compact.
14 And so we put in that compact, distinct
15 severability that said, if X is found illegal by
16 the courts, the rest of it can still exist.

17 Now, unfortunately, the Biden
18 administration did not share that information
19 with the courts, and so we are in a different
20 place than we expected to be. But all of us who
21 voted for that compact explicitly voted for
22 something that included severability and a backup
23 plan if there was an issue with the Court. So
24 something we actually all thought was a good idea
25 just a few months ago, and I think this builds on

1 that here as well.

2 With that, Representative Leek, you are
3 recognized to close.

4 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you. Very well
5 said. And in fact, good enough I don't think I
6 need to add any more of the substantive arguments
7 here.

8 But what I do want to tell you is where
9 we are procedurally. This, much like a budget,
10 even though we pass a budget out of a committee,
11 then it goes on to the floor, we pass it on the
12 Committee then goes to conference, and the budget
13 that you end up eventually may not resemble
14 entirely the budget that you passed out of the
15 committee. That's where we are today.

16 So what we're doing is we're putting
17 this in a posture to move on to the next step.
18 The next step for us will be the floor, and then
19 potentially it's in conference and then
20 potentially, to the governor's office. So that's
21 what we're doing today. I urge you to vote up on
22 this amendment. Let's keep us moving. Our
23 timeline is getting shorter, so we need to get
24 this thing moving and out of Committee now. And
25 with that I close.

1 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Having closed on the
2 amendment, all in favor of this amendment say
3 yea.

4 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Yea.

5 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Opposed nay?

6 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Nay.

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Show the amendment
8 adopted.

9 All right. Members, we are on the bill
10 as amended. Are there any questions on the bill
11 as amended? There shouldn't be because it's the
12 same thing we just talked about.

13 All right. Seeing none, we're going to
14 move on to public testimony on the bill as
15 amended. We do have two appearance forms.

16 The first is Jerry Nolan, who's
17 representing himself as an individual citizen and
18 voter. Multiple titles. Are you here,
19 Mr. Nolan?

20 He is not here, but he is a proponent.

21 And our second speaker is Lashonda
22 Holloway, who is representing, I think herself.
23 Is she here?

24 Okay. And she is also a proponent of
25 the bill. All right.

1 Unless there's anybody else, public
2 testimony? All right. Seeing none, members, are
3 there any members wishing to debate?

4 Yes. Representative Skidmore, you're
5 recognized in debate.

6 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: Thank you, Mr.
7 Chair.

8 And as a member of the Congressional
9 Redistricting Subcommittee, I was encouraged by
10 our meeting last week and encouraged by the
11 individual meetings that Chair Sirois has
12 acknowledged. So this big change overnight has
13 me, you know, a little caught off guard a little
14 bit. And I do have some major concerns with a
15 couple of things. Not as many as maybe Ranking
16 Member Geller, but a couple of things.

17 I am very concerned about the primary
18 map District 5 because it does seem to me, based
19 on language that the House actually used, that it
20 does reflect diminishment. And I recognize that
21 the secondary map is there in case the Court does
22 rule that way. But to me, I feel like we should
23 have just gone forward with the secondary map.
24 And I really reject the governor's interference
25 in our legislative process. I think it's wrong.

1 He gets to, you know, to veto or approve
2 the maps that we create. He has no authority
3 here. And I'm kind of disappointed that our
4 House acquiesced based on testimony that was
5 given that really did not have a lot of substance
6 behind it.

7 I also think 30 days is an inappropriate
8 maneuver, and it's a false narrative that that 30
9 days would somehow compel the Court to rule more
10 quickly or sooner rather than later, in any
11 litigation that was brought forward. And I also
12 believe that the work product that's created by
13 the general counsel and Mr. Alford, the expert
14 consultant, is mine. I am the client. We are
15 all the client. And I truly believe that.

16 And I don't see any reason why that
17 information has been withheld from us, so that we
18 can understand this map better and be more
19 collaborative partners so that we understand some
20 of the analysis, some of the things threshold
21 data that we don't have and we don't know how to
22 analyze.

23 So I think there are some flaws here,
24 and I won't be able to vote for it. I still have
25 high hopes at the end of the day, with our Senate

1 partners, we're going to get somewhere that we
2 all agree on. And I think we all want to do
3 that. And so that is the direction I will
4 continue to move in.

5 But for today, I will not be able to
6 support the bill as amended. Thank you.

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative
8 Robinson, you're recognized in debate.

9 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr.
10 Chair.

11 Look, our Committee has met six or seven
12 times this session. We've done a lot of
13 different things, whether it's education or our
14 workshop maps, and I'm very proud of what we've
15 done over the past several weeks. But frankly,
16 we only have one charge, and that's to produce a
17 legally compliant map to the full vote by the
18 House.

19 And to me what we're doing today, while
20 being unique, I frankly, don't think it's
21 terribly unique. As Chair Fine mentioned, we do
22 severability stuff all the time here, and so I
23 have no problem changing our goal from a legally
24 compliant map to a legally compliant product,
25 which is exactly what we're doing here.

1 And to me, we accomplished our primary
2 goal, which is to produce a legally compliant
3 product to the full House for consideration. And
4 look, this product is closer to our Senate
5 colleagues. So that's very good. And frankly,
6 to me, the voters and the candidates in these
7 congressional districts deserve some certainty
8 and deserve us to do this work to move it
9 forward, to give them all certainty.

10 So I'm very pleased with what we've
11 done, and I look forward to voting on this
12 product. Thank you.

13 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Ranking Member Geller,
14 you are recognized.

15 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: I won't waste my
16 colleagues' time with a repetition of what I've
17 already said. I just ask that for the record my
18 comments against the amendment be considered
19 against the bill as amended. Thank you.

20 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Representative Tuck,
21 you are recognized.

22 REPRESENTATIVE TUCK: Thank you,
23 Mr. Chair.

24 And members, I think we need to keep in
25 mind here that every redistricting cycle was very

1 different, very unique. I had the privilege to
2 sit on both the congressional and this Committee
3 as well. And it's been incredible to see the
4 input from members from the public, from
5 everybody to get it in a posture to what we see
6 today. And I want to commend staff and everybody
7 involved for that.

8 I think the changes that we see here are
9 a great effort to make sure that members, all
10 members have the opportunity to participate in
11 the entire process in a meaningful way while
12 still bringing a constitutionally compliant
13 product in for a landing during our regular
14 session. So with that, I would encourage
15 everyone to vote up on this great change to this
16 map. Thank you.

17 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Okay. Representative
18 Driskell, you are recognized.

19 Yep, Representative Driskell.

20 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: Thank you,
21 Chair.

22 So just a few things I'm not sure had
23 been raised and just wanted to make sure that
24 they were covered. When it comes to CD10, I
25 don't think we're there yet. The Senate

1 recognizes that as a protected district, the
2 House does not. I have concerns around that. As
3 Rep. Skidmore pointed out, and as I attempted to
4 correct in my amendments to the amendments, 30
5 days is not a lot of time. It's not sufficient
6 time for litigation to be brought. I'm concerned
7 about us shortening that statute of limitations.

8 And then the third point that I wanted
9 to make was around CD5. I have real concerns
10 about how it's drawn in the primary map. And
11 while it's capable of -- it appears under this
12 analysis of being drawn wholly within Duval
13 County, you know, I think about those voters in
14 Tallahassee and Gadsden and other places who
15 would be perhaps losing their ability to elect
16 the candidate of their choice.

17 And so, for those reasons, I'll have to
18 be down. You know, I would echo that I
19 appreciate the staff for taking time to meet and
20 try to help answer some of my questions about
21 this process. And I think that's a good thing.
22 I think we're headed on the right track in terms
23 of having this be a collaborative process. And I
24 remain optimistic that we can get there.

25 But we have some work to do. We have

1 some real work to do around CD5, around CD10.
2 And you know, just to echo Rep. Skidmore and Rep.
3 Geller's comments, you know, I hope we can
4 continue this conversation around legal counsel
5 because I was personally not satisfied with the
6 rationale that I heard today for why, as members
7 of the House, we aren't all able to have access
8 to that counsel.

9 And if it's the situation where, you
10 know, we can't have access to that counsel, then
11 could resources be made available to provide
12 counsel for those who of us who would appreciate
13 the opportunity to talk to counsel in this
14 process? So thank you. And for those reasons,
15 I'll be down today.

16 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Additional debate?

17 Representative Byrd, you are recognized
18 in debate.

19 REPRESENTATIVE BYRD: Thank you,
20 Chairman Fine.

21 A decade ago when litigation arose over
22 redistricting, Congresswoman Corrine Brown said
23 redistricting makes strange bedfellows, and it
24 certainly does because, while I'm going to join
25 Representative Geller in opposing the bill under

1 constitutional grounds, I'm going to do so for
2 very different reasons.

3 And I'm sure it's no surprise to any of
4 you that I'm going to focus my comments on the
5 concept of the constitutionality of what we're
6 about to do.

7 So I think it's a necessary to
8 understand the legal landscape, which includes
9 the Federal Constitution, the Federal Voting
10 Rights Act, and the rules contained in
11 Article III, Section 20 of the Florida
12 Constitution.

13 Since 1993, the Supreme Court has held,
14 under the equal protection clause and the 15th
15 Amendment to the Constitution, that states are
16 prohibited from using race as a predominant
17 factor in drawing district lines unless the state
18 can show a compelling state interest and that its
19 reason for doing so are narrowly tailored to
20 pursue that compelling state interest. This is
21 the strict scrutiny test, and outside of
22 redistricting litigation, states are almost never
23 able to meet it.

24 There's been some discussion about what
25 the Supreme Court of Florida did back in 2015.

1 But redistricting cases continue to evolve. And
2 I want to look at three cases that have come out
3 from the United States Supreme Court. Cooper v.
4 Harris in 2017, Bethune-Hill v. Virginia State
5 Board of Education in 2017, and Abbott v. Perez
6 in 2018.

7 Cooper struck down racial gerrymanders
8 designed to create majority-minority House
9 districts in North Carolina. So I want to read
10 from the Cooper case, and once again, this is
11 2017. Supreme Court of Florida case in the last
12 redistricting round was 2015.

13 And this opinion was delivered by
14 Justice Kagan she wrote the majority opinion for
15 the Court. She says, "The Constitution trusts
16 states with the job of designing congressional
17 districts, but it also imposes an important
18 constraint. A state may not use race as the
19 predominant factor in drawing district lines
20 unless it has a compelling reason. The Equal
21 Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment limits
22 racial gerrymanders and legislative redistricting
23 plans. It prevents a state in the absence of
24 'sufficient justification' from separating its
25 citizens into different voting districts based on

1 race.

2 "First, the plaintiff must prove that
3 race was the predominant factor motivating the
4 legislature's decision to place a significant
5 number of voters within or without a particular
6 district. That entails demonstrating that the
7 legislature subordinated other factors.
8 Compactness, respect for political subdivisions,
9 partisan advantage, as have you, to racial
10 considerations. The plaintiff may make the
11 required showing through direct evidence of
12 legislative intent, circumstantial evidence of a
13 district shape and demographics, or a mix of
14 both.

15 "Second, if racial considerations
16 predominated over others, the design of the
17 district must withstand strict scrutiny. The
18 burden now shifts to the state to prove that its
19 race-based sorting of voters serves a
20 'compelling interest' and is narrowly tailored to
21 that end. This Court has long assumed" -- again
22 assumed not required -- "that one compelling
23 interest is complying with operative provisions
24 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

25 "So how do racial gerrymanders survive

1 such strict scrutiny? Supreme Court has assumed
2 the Voting Rights Act sometimes requires drawing
3 racial gerrymanders and, therefore, states have a
4 compelling interest in complying with federal law
5 that is itself an exercise of Congress's power to
6 enforce the 14th and 15th amendments.

7 "A state doesn't have to prove that its
8 racial gerrymander was literally required by the
9 VRA, only that the state had good reasons or a
10 strong basis to believe that it needed to
11 discriminate on the basis of race and drawing
12 district lines in order to create a VRA district.

13 "The state then must meet the narrow
14 tailoring requirement, it must show that the
15 actual district doesn't go too far in packing
16 disparate voters into a district just because
17 they are black. States are more commonly faulted
18 for excessive packing than for the creation of
19 such districts in the first place."

20 So now, I want to focus a little bit on
21 the secondary map, which was the primary map
22 before the amendment. And I think that's where
23 some of the disagreement begins because we
24 assume, and I understand why there's the illegal
25 assumption that that map is the benchmark map,

1 because it is the one that the Supreme Court of
2 Florida approved last redistricting cycle.

3 But I want to read from Justice
4 Polston's dissenting opinion. And in the 2015,
5 Florida Supreme Court case, he said -- and this
6 is under our current map, which is the same or
7 essentially the same as the secondary map. And
8 this is so this is concerning the district that
9 runs from Jacksonville, west of Tallahassee.

10 This is what Justice Polson said. "This
11 is a court adopted map, not a legislative-drawn
12 map. The map the trial court recommended and the
13 majority adopts was drawn by a democratic
14 consulting firm, a firm that has performed
15 mapping and data analysis for numerous democratic
16 candidates and causes.

17 "It traditionally adopts a remedial plan
18 drawn entirely by Democrat operatives.
19 Plaintiffs even stated in oral argument, and the
20 majority opinion agrees, that if the remedial
21 plan had been drawn by the Democratic National
22 Committee itself, the outcome would be the same.
23 Not only is this ironic, it is an
24 unconstitutional violation of the Fair District's
25 amendments in the separation of powers."

1 And Justice Polston, therefore,
2 dissented. I think it's important to put that in
3 the proper context.

4 It's also important to note that we've
5 talked a little bit when we were going through
6 the historical analysis, the Shelby County
7 opinion, which struck down the pre-clearance
8 requirements under the Voting Rights Act. Fair
9 District amendments were passed prior to the
10 United States Supreme Court's opinion in Shelby,
11 and that's important for this reason.

12 So in addition to the federal law, there
13 is the Florida rule that districts shall not be
14 drawn with the intended result of denying or
15 abridging the equal opportunity of racial or
16 language minorities to participate in the
17 political process or to diminish their ability to
18 elect representatives of their choice and
19 district shall consist of contiguous territory.

20 The requirements of compactness and
21 following existing boundaries are flagrantly
22 violated by the secondary map, in my opinion and
23 the opinion of others. It's really not in
24 dispute, and I think that's why we've gone to the
25 primary map.

1 But the Florida rule incorporates
2 language similar to Sections 2 and 5 of the
3 Voting Rights Act and gives those rules
4 preference over compactness, and this is where
5 things get tricky.

6 The prohibitions on districts that
7 diminish racial minorities' ability to elect a
8 representative of their choice is a state analog
9 to Section 5 of the VRA. Section 5 was written
10 to apply only to states that were required to
11 pre-clear changes in their voting rules or
12 districts before implementing them. Covered
13 jurisdictions had to show that they were not
14 retrogressive a rule that the Court read to mean,
15 among other things, that states could not reduce
16 the number of majority-minority districts.

17 Proponents have argued that once a VRA
18 district exists, a VRA territory exists forever.
19 Here's what's important to note, the state of
20 Florida was never one of the pre-clearance
21 districts. Five counties in Florida were
22 pre-clearance districts. None of those five
23 counties are in the district in question.

24 So if we call Florida's little
25 Section 5, it prompts the question of complying

1 with Section 5 of the VRA is a compelling state
2 interest that justifies racial discrimination, is
3 complying with the state version of Section 5
4 also enough to justify racial discrimination?

5 I would submit that it does not because,
6 last week when Mr. Popper testified, and I
7 watched the entirety of the committee, and he was
8 asked the question, you know, do you have any
9 case law to support your proposition? He said,
10 no. The flip side is true as well. There's no
11 case law addressing whether or not the State Fair
12 Districts amendments are or constitute a
13 compelling state interest for the State of
14 Florida to draw racially gerrymandered districts,
15 or use race as the predominating factor in
16 opposition to the 14th and 15th amendments.

17 So now we come to the primary map, which
18 I think during the presentation of the amendment,
19 it was conceded that, you know, while it
20 addresses the compactness issue, it's still a
21 racially gerrymander or a district drawn upon a
22 racial basis that violates the 14th amendment.

23 It has been suggested that the governor
24 has a novel legal theory. I don't think it's a
25 novel at all. I think it's well grounded in the

1 United States Constitution, the 14th and 15th
2 amendments which, let's remember, the 14th and
3 15th Amendments were specifically written to
4 prevent states from using race in voting and in
5 redistricting. We have to remember that.

6 So the State Fair Districts, I do not
7 believe can constitute the compelling state
8 interest to draw maps based on racial lines. And
9 so therefore, just because the Court approved the
10 districts in 2015 and they were court-approved,
11 does not mean today that they are
12 constitutionally valid when looked in light of
13 the 14th and 15th amendments and the subsequent
14 case law and cases that are continuing, you know,
15 currently and before the Supreme Court, such as
16 the Alabama opinion.

17 So for that reason, because I believe
18 that both the primary and secondary maps violate
19 the United States constitutional provisions of
20 the 14th and 15th Amendment, I regretfully must
21 be down today. Thank you.

22 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Additional members
23 wishing to speak in debate?

24 Okay. Seeing none, just a couple of
25 points. I did want to address the comment that I

1 thought was inappropriate here about the
2 governor's involvement. Neither map that we are
3 voting on today is the governor's map. The
4 governor has a separate map that we have not
5 considered here.

6 And I also want to belie the notion that
7 his interest and his opinions are not
8 appropriate. He's a citizen of the state of
9 Florida. And he submitted a map the same way any
10 other citizen did. In addition, he does have the
11 right to veto whatever we pass.

12 And frankly, if you don't talk to the
13 governor's office when you're running any bill in
14 the process to make sure you're getting their
15 opinion as you move through the process, then
16 you're not doing a good job of being a bill
17 sponsor because he does have that right. We
18 sometimes assume if you get a bill through the
19 House and Senate, he's just automatically going
20 to sign it. I think some of you have experienced
21 that that is not necessarily the case.

22 I certainly respect his view. And I
23 certainly respect the opinion that Chair Byrd has
24 put forth. I think that it's an interesting
25 concept, and it's one that certainly does need to

1 be explored. But I also recognize we're 14 days
2 from the end of session, and we do have an
3 obligation to keep a product moving forward.

4 I think you've seen, this Committee
5 listens at every step of the process, and you see
6 changes. There have been changes, I think, on
7 every map and every committee at every stage, and
8 I'm assuming that there will continue to be as
9 all of the stakeholders are involved in all of
10 the opinions are weighed as it moves through the
11 process.

12 So I'm optimistic that at the end of
13 these next 14 days, we've got something that
14 everyone can be excited about, hopefully, whether
15 it is my good friend and, I think, future law
16 professor Cord Byrd or Rep. Driskell and our
17 Ranking Member. Hopefully that is where we will
18 end up over the next two weeks, but we will see.

19 And with that, I'm going to let
20 Rep. Sirosis close on his bill.

21 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: I appreciate the
22 time, members, this afternoon. I won't spend too
23 much of your time revisiting subjects that we
24 have already talked about. But I do want to
25 mention I'm proud of the significant member input

1 that we have had, and I also appreciate all of
2 the comments that my colleagues have made in
3 supportive Chair Leek's amendment.

4 I'm not much of a legal scholar, far
5 from it. But I believe that the bill that we
6 have in front of us today is the best outcome
7 that we could have given the information and the
8 realities in front of us.

9 When I embarked on this process over the
10 summer, a lot to learn, especially from you,
11 Chair Leek, and I appreciate that and the time
12 that we have spent together.

13 But part of my understanding is that
14 this process of redistricting is not as much
15 about what the law could be, as it is as much
16 about what it is. And I feel compelled to
17 revisit what the law is related to this process
18 that we have touched on time and time again in
19 this Committee and in my subcommittee, and I just
20 want to take a moment to read from our
21 constitutional standards because we haven't had
22 an opportunity to do that today. And I think we
23 should before we have an opportunity to vote on
24 the work product that is in front of us.

25 So our tier 1 standards. "No

1 apportionment of planned or individual districts
2 shall be drawn with the intent to favor or
3 disfavor a political party or an incumbent.
4 Districts shall not be drawn with the intent or
5 result of denying or abridging the equal
6 opportunity of racial or language minorities to
7 participate in the political process or to
8 diminish the ability to elect a representative
9 their choice. Districts shall consist of
10 contiguous territory."

11 Our tier 2 standards. "Districts shall
12 be nearly equal in population as practical. We
13 know with our congressional districts, they must
14 be drawn to the person. Districts shall be
15 compact. Districts, where feasible, shall
16 utilize existing political and geographical
17 boundaries."

18 Members, the work product that is in
19 front of you today is legally compliant. I am
20 proud to have my name attached to it. I am proud
21 to have spent the last six months working with
22 members and receiving their input and perspective
23 on it. I think is the best product that we could
24 have given the information and the reality that
25 is in front of us. And I ask for you to join me

1 in voting yes today.

2 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Thank you. Having
3 closed on his bill, members, please remember to
4 turn on your microphones when you vote.

5 DJ, please call the roll.

6 MS DJ: Chair Leek.

7 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Yes.

8 THE SECRETARY: Representative Andrade.

9 REPRESENTATIVE ANDRADE: Yes.

10 THE SECRETARY: Bush.

11 REPRESENTATIVE BUSH: No.

12 THE SECRETARY: Byrd.

13 REPRESENTATIVE BYRD: No.

14 THE SECRETARY: Clemons.

15 REPRESENTATIVE CLEMONS: Yes.

16 THE SECRETARY: Drake.

17 REPRESENTATIVE DRAKE: No.

18 THE SECRETARY: Driskell.

19 REPRESENTATIVE DRISKELL: No.

20 THE SECRETARY: Fine.

21 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Yes.

22 THE SECRETARY: Geller:

23 REPRESENTATIVE GELLER: No.

24 THE SECRETARY: Goff-Marcil.

25 REPRESENTATIVE GOFF-MARCIL: No.

1 THE SECRETARY: Grall.
2 REPRESENTATIVE GRALL: Yes.
3 THE SECRETARY: Grant.
4 REPRESENTATIVE GRANT: Yes.
5 THE SECRETARY: Jenne has been excused.
6 Latvala.
7 REPRESENTATIVE LATVALA: Yes.
8 THE SECRETARY: Mariano.
9 REPRESENTATIVE MARIANO: Yes.
10 THE SECRETARY: McClain.
11 REPRESENTATIVE MCCLAIN: Yes.
12 THE SECRETARY: Omphroy.
13 REPRESENTATIVE OMPHROY: Yes.
14 THE SECRETARY: Payne.
15 REPRESENTATIVE PAYNE: Yes.
16 THE SECRETARY: Robinson.
17 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Yes.
18 THE SECRETARY: Rommel.
19 REPRESENTATIVE ROMMEL: Yes.
20 THE SECRETARY: Sirois.
21 REPRESENTATIVE SIROIS: Yes.
22 THE SECRETARY: Slosber-King.
23 REPRESENTATIVE SLOSBER-KING: No.
24 THE SECRETARY: Thompson.
25 REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: No.

1 THE SECRETARY: Tuck.

2 REPRESENTATIVE TUCK: Yes.

3 THE SECRETARY: Ex Officio Skidmore.

4 REPRESENTATIVE SKIDMORE: No.

5 THE SECRETARY: Fifteen yeas, nine nays,
6 Mr. Chair.

7 VICE-CHAIR FINE: Show the bill reported
8 favorably.

9 Members, I will now give the gavel back
10 to Chair Leek.

11 CHAIRMAN LEEK: Thank you, all. Boy,
12 this is a technical, tedious process. And I want
13 to thank, you know, the few members of the public
14 who showed up at the committee meetings and all
15 the members in this Committee for your thorough
16 and thoughtful questions.

17 I also want to thank our staff. When I
18 say this is a tedious process, I mean that it
19 requires hours upon hours upon hours of work to
20 achieve the first piece of work product. So I
21 want to thank our staff: Leda, Jason, Sam, DJ,
22 Karen. Am I missing anybody? Don't get me in
23 trouble. Kyle.

24 I want to thank all of you because I
25 know how much work that you've put in coming up

1 with any work product. I also want to thank you
2 for sitting down with every member who engaged in
3 the process in a substantive way and walking them
4 through the same thing that I'm sure you had
5 walked us all through at some point or another so
6 that they had an understanding of how to
7 participate and how to engage in the process.

8 This concludes our committee meeting for
9 this Committee. I want to thank you all for
10 stepping up, engaging in the process, and I want
11 to encourage you all to know that this is not the
12 end. We'll keep going. You'll see this on the
13 floor, probably see this on conference, and the
14 work product, much like the budget, the work
15 product that we end up with may look different
16 than what we're doing here today. But thank you
17 for keeping the process moving.

18 And with that, Vice Chair Fine moves, we
19 rise.

20 (END OF VIDEO RECORDING)

21

22

23

24


25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST

I certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the digital recording provided to me in this matter.

I do further certify that I am neither a relative, nor employee, nor attorney of any of the parties to this action, and that I am not financially interested in the action.



Julie Thompson, CET-1036

A				
Abbott 153:5	account 21:8 139:23	12:15 14:19 93:22	28:4 162:22	13:15 16:17
ability 9:19,21 24:21 27:5 38:2 40:18 41:14 60:11 105:4,4,5 124:1 135:2 150:15 157:17 158:7 164:8	accurate 141:6 169:3	addresses 23:10 159:20	ago 21:10 38:9 81:12 136:9 142:7,25 151:21	18:2 20:12,12 20:16,20,25 22:11 23:7,9,16 23:24 24:6 26:13 43:24 48:9,11,13 103:11,16 107:3 110:15 110:16,23 111:1,3,3,5,8,9 111:9,10 112:7 112:10,13,14 112:14 115:6,7 115:9,10,13,17 117:5 119:6,15 119:25 120:21 120:24 121:22 124:20,24 125:3,5,5,10,13 125:16,18,20 125:23 126:6,6 126:10,12,13 126:14,19,19 126:20,20 127:11,13,14 130:3,7,7,9,14 130:17,18,22 134:12,16,20 138:6,14,25 139:3,22 140:13,21,24 143:22 144:2,2 144:7 148:18 152:15 153:21 155:22 159:18 159:22 160:20 163:3
able 6:9,15 25:13 25:21 26:9,13 38:3 41:6 42:11 45:24 47:6 51:15 77:7 78:14 87:12 97:8 101:14 102:13 112:20 115:25 118:21 124:9 134:1 135:15 146:24 147:5 151:7 152:23	achieve 29:3 31:20 32:13 37:17 38:13 167:20	addressing 24:22 159:11	agree 69:7 147:2	
abridging 157:15 164:5	achieved 120:17	adds 47:22	agreement 137:16	
abruptness 107:23	achieves 28:9 34:14,23 48:1	adequate 11:21	agrees 156:20	
absence 153:23	acknowledge 24:17 64:24	adheres 30:6	ahead 5:5 6:21 66:13 75:20 102:7 139:2,7	
absolute 54:1	acknowledged 145:12	adhering 132:14	air 65:20,23,24 118:7	
absolutely 7:17 104:14 112:24 133:16	acquiesced 146:4	adjust 93:9	aisle 73:17	
absorb 47:17 131:5	acquire 37:9	adjusting 43:8	aisles 5:14	
absorbed 31:16	Act 136:8 152:10 154:24 155:2 157:8 158:3	adjustment 40:12	akin 108:23	
abundantly 138:2	action 83:15 129:14,15 169:7,8	administration 142:18	al 1:2	
accelerate 78:22	actions 132:17	admissions 141:16	Alabama 116:6 160:16	
accept 127:10	actual 65:21 68:10 87:12 88:15 155:15	admitted 131:12	Alachua 46:17	
accepting 72:18	ad 5:24	adopt 101:12 102:14	Alford 146:13	
access 87:22 95:3 107:25 108:8 129:9,10,18 132:5 151:7,10	add 29:2 57:18 87:25 120:24 143:6	adopted 101:18 109:16 116:24 137:14 144:8 156:11	align 33:13,19	
accommodate 6:9,15	added 32:15	adoption 101:23 102:22 107:1	alignment 22:16 24:1 45:19 97:9	
accomplished 33:22 148:1	adding 26:3	adopts 156:13,17	allotted 21:11	
	addition 21:22 25:15 157:12 161:10	advance 110:19 115:20	allow 13:13 63:25 103:15 105:5	
	additional 45:14 46:5 58:2 80:17 81:6 82:3 102:12 105:24 128:6 151:16 160:22	advantage 154:9	allowed 128:17	
	address 6:20 24:8 160:25	advice 22:15	allowing 37:8 87:14	
	addressed 9:16	advise 7:25 71:7	allows 26:15 65:15	
		advised 72:6 70:23	alternate 9:15,22	
		advises 8:10 70:23	alternative 10:3 92:4	
		advising 132:12	amend 12:23 13:2,25	
		advisory 5:1	amended 14:11 15:4 17:11 18:22 134:13 134:14 144:10 144:11,15 147:6 148:19	amendments 7:22 103:11 130:17 150:4,4 155:6 156:25 157:9 159:12 159:16 160:2,3 160:13
		affect 61:1	amendment 10:2 10:18 12:9,11 12:20 13:6,9,14	Americans 131:25
		affirmative 89:18 89:21		
		afforded 114:23		
		African 131:25		
		afternoon 18:15		

amount 6:21 11:20 36:7,14 85:25 86:1 129:11	51:10 56:23 58:21,23 60:17 60:21 64:3 65:11,12 69:18 69:19 71:22 72:13 76:16 78:11,22,23 80:21 84:25 87:17 89:9,25 90:15 91:4,9 92:19 94:15 96:17 98:22 105:8,21 109:2 110:3 114:13 150:20	apply 61:12 158:10	18:5,8 19:11,13 19:23 20:2 51:11,16 61:1 76:14 88:24 91:20 101:10 108:2 130:6 131:12 132:10 132:22 159:8	available 7:2,6 23:4 72:3 87:21 151:11
ample 117:21	answered 14:9,14 18:6 19:11 20:2 71:24 89:18,21 103:22	applying 136:18	18:16 19:13 24:7 68:20 85:22 88:15 108:6 127:19 127:19 129:2	Aventura 40:25
analog 158:8	answering 101:17	apportionment 62:10 164:1	asking 7:18 8:20	Avenue 35:24
analogy 72:17,18	answers 6:4 11:22 92:7	appreciate 6:16 76:15 89:25 96:15 120:10 140:25 150:19 151:12 162:21 163:1,11	108:2 130:6 131:12 132:10 132:22 159:8	average 25:11,16 123:2
analyses 69:22 113:19 137:7	anticipation 72:20	approach 21:16 93:4 136:25 137:13 138:11 139:14	18:16 19:13 24:7 68:20 85:22 88:15 108:6 127:19 127:19 129:2	averages 30:14
analysis 6:25 7:8 7:11,17 13:4 14:4 17:7 19:8 19:9 21:25 22:23 23:1 27:1 27:2 30:22 37:25 40:7,17 41:12 44:20 45:20 53:18 56:1,4 57:11 58:3,18,24 60:11 61:2,2,6 61:20 63:13,14 63:18,20 64:8 65:13 67:5,21 68:16 70:9,11 70:18,23 71:7 77:6 100:17,19 132:8,20 134:1 135:15 141:18 146:20 150:12 156:15 157:6	anybody 131:13 145:1 167:22	appropriate 10:16 11:6 19:5 36:7 54:17,18 54:23 118:20 161:8	asks 94:9	aware 27:16 83:21,25 103:10 114:7
analyze 15:3,6,24 16:7 17:3 58:7 69:12,14 97:2 113:4 146:22	anytime 108:13	approved 42:10 156:2 160:9	127:19 129:2	awareness 139:5
analyzed 9:10	anyway 13:25 66:19	approve 146:1	assistance 62:8	
Andrade 2:11,12 165:8,9	apologize 54:8 101:10	approved 42:10 156:2 160:9	assume 155:24 161:18	<hr/> B <hr/>
Andy 62:8	appear 112:3 114:18	approve 146:1	assumed 154:21 154:22 155:1	B 103:4
announced 8:22 72:21	appearance 4:13 112:5 144:15	approved 42:10 156:2 160:9	assuming 134:13 162:8	back 8:13 9:3 33:16 45:5 46:7 56:12 59:2 69:9 95:2,18 97:17 103:5,12 133:15 152:25 167:9
answer 9:9,9 13:13,17 14:7 14:14 16:14 17:9 18:7,13 19:12,15,22,23 20:3,8,9 50:7	appears 150:11	approve 146:1	assumption 137:21 155:25	backsliding 134:7
	apple 52:4 71:16 75:14 84:3 95:23 103:9	approved 42:10 156:2 160:9	assumptions 66:15	backup 102:2 141:22 142:22
	apples 111:21	approved 42:10 156:2 160:9	assure 73:9 135:21	bad 138:12
	apples-to- 111:20	approve 146:1	attached 164:20	balances 30:24
	applied 45:1	approve 146:1	attempt 24:20	balancing 21:16
		approve 146:1	attempted 150:3	ballot 108:24 109:4
		approve 146:1	attend 14:22	balls 102:10
		approve 146:1	attention 114:15	Balm 36:2
		approve 146:1	attorney 91:15 169:6	bar 22:5
		approve 146:1	audible 3:13 42:6	barcode 20:12 110:21
		approve 146:1	August 8:19	Bardos 62:8
		approve 146:1	Augustine 29:22 29:23 47:7	based 22:15 65:12 66:15 68:15 96:8 137:18,20 145:18 146:4 153:25 160:8
		approve 146:1	author 73:20	basically 66:20 110:22
		approve 146:1	authority 106:14 146:2	basis 122:9 155:10,11
		approve 146:1	authorized 107:2 137:1	
		approve 146:1	automatically 93:15,17 161:19	

159:22 Bay 35:4 36:4 42:19 56:7 Beach 26:18 29:23 37:23 38:12,15,18,21 38:22 39:5,6,10 40:2,11 85:7 beast 84:1 beasts 108:14 bedfellows 151:23 beginning 4:21 begins 155:23 belie 161:6 belied 135:19 belief 89:8 believe 9:18 18:21 23:14 30:24 55:18 59:8 95:7 111:15 114:21 114:25 124:7,8 124:25 128:15 131:18 134:22 135:3 136:13 146:12,15 155:10 160:7 160:17 163:5 Belle 33:25 benchmark 24:14 25:8,14 25:24 26:10,23 27:4 30:19 33:10,15,21 34:17 37:22 40:22 41:17 55:23,25 56:9 57:2,12,14 58:8 58:15,17 82:7,8 135:10 155:25 Bend 29:10 36:2 benefit 8:9 46:5 best 9:19 50:9 51:15 83:15 114:16 123:7 139:4 163:6	164:23 Bethune-Hill 153:4 better 123:25 124:14,14 126:20 146:18 Biden 142:17 big 29:10 36:2 145:12 bigger 88:20 bill 9:25 10:17,20 10:25 11:17 12:3,6,10,16 13:11,12 14:12 85:20 91:21 92:4,15 93:14 93:23 102:20 104:9,23 105:20 117:20 118:25 134:13 144:9,10,14,25 147:6 148:19 151:25 161:13 161:16,18 162:20 163:5 165:3 167:7 bills 82:23 Biscayne 40:25 bit 20:14 115:22 115:24 140:1 145:14 155:20 157:5 bite 52:4 71:16 75:13 95:22 103:9 bites 84:3 black 6:13 24:9 26:20 37:21 40:16 45:3,23 56:12,13,20 80:22 81:6,10 81:14,15,18,21 81:23 95:3 97:24 99:6,9,17 99:20 100:5,13 131:9 155:17 black-performi...	30:20 blatantly 136:5 block 10:21,21 Blossom 33:2 board 103:5 153:5 boat 133:25 Boca 39:6 body 125:1 131:6 136:19 border 33:23 35:25 37:2 38:19 42:20 borders 38:16 bottom 125:15 Boulevard 33:1 35:25 37:15 38:16 39:24,24 boundaries 21:20 93:10 139:9 157:21 164:17 boundary 22:25 28:14 30:10 35:6,23 37:16 38:14,21 39:7 39:14 40:7 41:23 42:17,19 43:2,15 44:20 45:20 46:14 47:13 Boy 167:11 Bradford 46:17 break 53:23 Brevard 32:10 brief 62:5 briefs 113:17 bring 6:23 24:1,2 24:23 42:12 45:19 71:11 73:25 82:18 97:8 122:13 123:2,12 124:4 125:25 126:4 129:11 bringing 6:16 33:23 34:5 114:2 140:12	149:12 brought 5:14 6:8 122:11 123:24 124:20 127:6 146:11 150:6 Broward 26:17 37:24 39:13,16 39:18,18 41:21 84:13 85:5,13 85:23 86:8,11 86:15 Broward/Mia... 40:3 Brown 6:11 151:22 budget 143:9,10 143:12,14 168:14 builds 142:25 burden 154:18 Busch 35:24 Bush 2:13,14 165:10,11 business 10:14 113:25 BVAP 55:17 56:2 59:18,25 60:5 63:9 67:25 98:16 Byrd 1:6 2:15,16 151:17,19 161:23 162:16 165:12,13	77:7,8 78:16 150:16 candidates 23:13 27:6 101:13 118:11 139:10 148:6 156:16 capable 150:11 Capitol 140:18 card 130:21 careful 90:24 Carolina 153:9 case 62:7,9 63:9 89:20 114:3 120:19 132:11 132:16 136:21 145:21 153:10 153:11 156:5 159:9,11 160:14 161:21 cases 136:8 153:1 153:2 160:14 categories 50:20 caucus 6:13 caught 145:13 Cause 1:2 causes 156:16 caution 131:6 cautious 132:8 132:13,23 CD 94:11 CD10 95:2,2,13 149:24 151:1 CD15 58:20 CD20 84:23 CD24 97:23 CD5 5:2 24:11 44:2,7 59:17,21 61:4,7 64:25 66:7 67:21 76:1 93:24 94:18 150:9 151:1 Cecile 130:22 131:1 census 8:24 10:21 21:8 22:16 52:14,15 52:19 53:8,15
---	--	--	---	--

53:18 54:2	91:22 92:6,18	76:15 77:3,23	28:22 40:9 43:6	32:5 35:8 36:24
55:24 81:4	93:20 94:4,14	78:20 79:11	43:6,8 44:7	38:24 39:5,6,14
109:17 120:15	94:25 95:8 96:4	80:10 82:6,22	45:13,18 48:6,7	40:11 43:3 46:5
centers 82:16	96:15,16 97:21	83:25 88:1	67:11,20 149:8	46:20 84:15,18
certain 85:24	99:25 101:2,8	89:14 90:10	158:11 162:6,6	84:19 87:10
certainly 14:13	101:15 102:16	91:5,24 92:20	changing 9:24	civil 122:7
118:16,19	102:24 103:22	93:22 94:16	147:23	claim 121:20
119:4,22	105:19 106:11	95:10 96:6	charge 147:16	clarify 33:16
123:11 151:24	106:25 107:4	101:17,22	Charlotte 37:5	58:10 70:16
161:22,23,25	107:14 108:3	102:18 103:7	Check 7:3	133:19
certainty 148:7,9	108:19 109:5	105:22 106:13	chessboard 10:12	clarity 25:1 54:1
CERTIFICATE	109:14 110:2,9	106:18 107:6	Chief 84:24 85:1	55:15 139:8,10
169:1	111:7 112:10	107:16 108:6	86:5 98:23 99:4	clause 152:14
certify 169:2,5	112:18 115:16	108:22 109:8	99:13 100:9	153:21
CET-1036	117:11 118:4	110:10 120:10	choice 23:14	Clay 29:11 46:18
169:13	119:10 120:9	127:17 138:22	24:22 27:6	clean 43:9
cetera 54:18	120:24 121:24	143:4 151:20	56:14,15 60:13	cleaner 43:14
Chair 2:5,7 4:7	124:14,22	165:7 167:11	64:1,14 76:6	clear 7:16 53:5,8
5:12 11:4,13	125:22 126:18	challenge 79:14	77:1,8 134:4	70:19 96:20,25
12:9 13:24 14:6	128:10 130:2	82:18 108:24	135:3 138:9,15	129:15 138:2
16:21 17:8,11	131:10 133:22	109:3 111:12	150:16 157:18	clearly 49:18
18:6 19:1,12	134:16,17	114:24 116:25	158:8 164:9	Clearwater 35:7
20:7,13,19 28:3	138:7 140:6	119:21 120:2	choose 77:7	Clemons 2:17,18
43:17 45:12	141:3 145:7,11	120:16 123:11	chose 5:3 20:9	165:14,15
48:8,17 50:6	147:10,21	123:12 127:20	chosen 51:13,14	client 70:3 71:23
51:1,7,22 52:11	148:23 149:21	challenged	circular 31:8	72:2 146:14,15
52:24 53:11	161:23 163:3	101:24,25	circumstances	clock 120:18
55:10 57:21,25	163:11 165:6	128:13	139:2	close 68:14 69:6
58:22 59:7,9,15	167:6,10	challengers	circumstantial	71:18 120:23
60:2,14,20,23	168:18	114:8	154:12	121:22 128:8
61:10 62:4,20	Chairman 2:2,6	challenges 112:4	cite 132:16	141:3 143:3,25
62:25 63:17	4:8 11:15 12:5	124:19 129:21	cities 21:21 26:9	162:20
64:5 65:15,17	13:18 14:8	chamber 22:5	26:11,12,14	closed 86:17
65:24 66:10,21	17:10 20:21	chance 16:23	35:7 38:6,7	125:4 130:9
67:9,10 68:8,21	28:3 43:19 50:8	chances 8:6	40:24 44:16,17	144:1 165:3
69:11,15 70:2,4	50:18 51:9,24	change 23:21	85:9,10,23,25	closer 6:23 33:14
70:15,20 71:4	52:18 53:1,13	61:19 65:5 66:2	86:13 87:6,8,8	33:20 148:4
72:8 73:4 74:14	54:6,9 55:11,21	66:4 67:2 81:7	87:9,10,11,13	Coalition 8:22
75:2,9,23 76:1	56:25 57:10	81:8 93:6,15	87:20 88:11,15	coast 38:18
76:2,11,23	58:24 59:17	94:5 121:16	citizen 123:2	Coconut 39:15
77:10,22 78:10	60:4,16,25	128:20 131:8	144:17 161:8	cognizable 122:9
78:18 79:4,9,25	61:17 63:2	131:11 132:6	161:10	collaboration
82:5,16,20	65:19,25 66:11	134:22 145:12	citizens 31:3	140:4
83:23 84:7 85:2	66:23 67:18	149:15	153:25	collaborative
85:22 87:17,25	68:22 69:7,17	changed 80:23	Citrus 34:13	128:20 140:15
88:8 89:5,9,12	70:6,22 71:5,18	81:24	35:17 47:25	146:19 150:23
90:8,21 91:3,14	72:10 75:4,10	changes 21:1,5	city 22:25 29:6	collaboratively

<p>5:19 colleagues 73:16 148:5 163:2 colleagues' 148:16 collect 71:16 college 141:16 Collier 37:14,15 41:18,20 colloquial 91:16 Colonial 32:25 color 57:19 Columbia 46:6 46:12,15 column 98:13,15 98:25 99:7 combination 46:3 58:9 61:3 come 2:3 6:7 8:14 9:21 59:2 68:3 69:9 75:19 95:13,17 96:23 97:14,17 114:25 133:15 153:2 159:17 comes 102:19 105:7 149:24 coming 103:15 109:7 114:15 167:25 commend 10:7 149:6 comment 8:21 73:13 122:16 126:12 160:25 comments 122:21 138:24 140:7 141:4,5 148:18 151:3 152:4 163:2 committed 8:7 committee 1:11 2:3 7:10,16,19 7:23 9:5,18 10:5 12:16 14:10,20,22,23 19:6 22:2,14</p>	<p>27:16 51:2,3 56:18 65:3 70:24 97:14 104:7 112:2 113:12 125:1 129:3 130:1 133:3,7 137:4 137:10,12 138:8 140:7,19 143:10,12,15 143:24 147:11 149:2 156:22 159:7 162:4,7 163:19 167:14 167:15 168:8,9 Committee's 11:1 Common 1:2 commonly 155:17 communication 140:4 communities 54:13,15 140:11 community's 134:4 135:3 compact 21:18 23:12 25:13 28:25 29:20 30:8 31:8,16,23 33:5 42:20 47:19 142:11 142:13,14,21 164:15 compactly 35:1 46:21 compactness 24:22 25:12,17 25:20 30:13,14 31:1 34:4 40:7 43:11 44:19,21 135:6,6 154:8 157:20 158:4 159:20 comparative 113:18</p>	<p>compared 25:8 44:17 84:16 98:3 comparison 111:21 compel 109:21 146:9 compelled 139:25 163:16 compelling 120:25 152:18 152:20 153:20 154:20,22 155:4 159:1,13 160:7 competitive 62:13 complete 36:8,24 38:18 completed 118:13 completely 91:20 92:16 104:2 compliance 91:2 135:21 compliant 23:18 33:5 48:24 61:12 89:7,11 90:6 134:5,24 135:19,24 136:3 137:18 138:1,3 147:17 147:24,24 148:2 149:12 164:19 complying 154:23 155:4 158:25 159:3 comport 122:11 comprise 10:22 compromise 7:22 118:17,20 119:5 126:4,21 127:3 129:22 130:2,5 compromised 128:22</p>	<p>computer 88:20 conceded 159:19 concept 131:15 152:5 161:25 concern 84:10 86:17 117:13 122:2 131:17 concerned 106:25 107:12 112:5 121:4 145:17 150:6 concerning 126:25 132:5 156:8 concerns 5:25 6:17 23:10 24:22 121:2 135:5 142:1 145:14 150:2,9 conclude 127:23 concludes 5:6 30:22 130:16 168:8 conclusion 24:3,5 68:1 76:19 95:11,13,15 96:3,8 127:21 136:14 conclusions 97:1 conducted 9:10 27:1 38:1 40:17 41:13 conference 143:12,19 168:13 confidence 5:20 135:22 136:2 confident 141:22 configuration 10:4 23:19 24:11,14 30:1,8 30:17,24 35:11 45:16 47:9 63:22,23 64:25 configurations 9:15 46:4 configured 85:24</p>	<p>confines 13:22 confining 53:15 54:19 confirm 27:2 conflict 49:14 79:8,12 confused 75:25 Congress's 155:5 congressional 4:22 9:10 10:5 10:18 11:18 12:7,8,12 14:21 22:6,8 23:11 25:8,9,15,22 26:3,15 28:5,6 28:9,11,19,20 28:21,23,24,24 29:5,10,13,16 30:2,5 31:1,4,6 31:7,22 32:1,3 32:9,14,16,20 33:9 34:9,15,21 34:25 35:2,3,10 35:11,15,21,22 36:5,10,11,21 36:25 37:6,13 37:19,20 38:10 38:17,20,23 39:11,17,19 40:14,15 41:8,9 41:10,16,18,24 42:9,15,23 44:8 45:13,15,25 46:7,11,13,16 46:22,23 47:1,3 47:13,14,20 48:6 52:15 53:2 53:10 55:6 56:8 57:1 69:13,14 84:15,19,20 96:23 102:12 104:20,22 105:18 109:18 114:25 127:8 145:8 148:7 149:2 153:16 164:13</p>
---	---	---	---	---

Congresswoman 151:22	90:5 134:5,24 135:4,19,23	Convex- 44:21	33:10,12,24	111:16 116:7
connecting 35:12	136:3 137:18	Convex-hull	34:10,12,13,13	120:18 123:18
connects 36:5	138:1,3 149:12	25:18 30:15	34:16,17,22,23	123:22 127:22
37:13,23 39:12	160:12	Cooper 153:3,7	35:5,8,9,13,13	127:23 129:9
41:17 42:24	constraint	153:10	35:16,17,17,20	129:10 131:13
consequence	153:18	copy 10:25	35:23 36:1,1,6	136:13 142:23
116:17	constraints	Coral 39:15	36:8,13,14,18	145:21 146:9
considerably	139:14	Cord 1:6 162:16	36:19,22,23,25	152:13,25
119:23	constructed	correct 12:21	37:3,6,9,14,14	153:3,11,15
consideration	86:14	66:13 70:8	37:17,24,24	154:21 155:1
10:4 11:16	consultant	71:23 75:16	38:12,15,21	156:1,5,11,12
88:18 92:3	146:14	77:3 82:3 86:9	39:5,10,13,16	158:14 160:9
139:18 148:3	consulting 8:15	99:12 103:5	39:18,18,19	160:15
considerations	72:12,23	108:5,12 126:8	40:3,21,24	court's 61:25
154:10,15	135:16 156:14	150:4	41:18,19,20,21	79:17 124:1
considered 61:14	contain 29:8	correctly 42:5	42:21,24 43:1,2	157:10
62:22 107:1,12	contained 46:11	Corrine 151:22	45:25 46:1,6,10	court-approved
148:18 161:5	134:23 152:10	counsel 7:25 8:10	46:12,14,19,24	160:10
considering	contains 12:6	13:3 14:3 15:3	46:25 47:5,8,15	courthouse 117:1
103:12 113:3	22:20 23:9,16	15:6,24 16:6	47:15,17,22,24	courts 63:8 79:20
consist 27:14	24:13 29:6,11	17:3 19:7 22:15	47:25 48:1	107:25 136:10
157:19 164:9	32:20 46:9	69:12,20,21	51:14 84:13	142:16,19
consistent 21:16	contents 23:8	70:10,17,23	85:6,7,13,18,23	covered 91:8
27:10 109:9	context 65:6	73:24 74:3	86:9,9,11,15,16	149:24 158:12
constitute 62:24	157:3	123:10 135:16	134:3,24	create 29:20 38:3
159:12 160:7	contiguous 27:15	146:13 151:4,8	135:12,23	47:19 82:2
constituted 62:12	93:11 157:19	151:10,12,13	150:13 157:6	146:2 153:8
constitutes 63:12	164:10	counsel's 72:5	couple 43:5	155:12
134:6	continue 27:4	counter 119:1	53:22 55:16	created 31:8,23
Constitution	39:3 47:4 130:4	counties 21:21	115:21 121:8	146:12
22:17 48:25	147:4 151:4	25:23,25 26:1	141:4,5 145:15	creates 23:14
107:3,17 152:9	153:1 162:8	26:17 29:1,5,9	145:16 160:24	30:8
152:12,15	continued 140:25	31:14,16,18	course 45:22	creating 23:11
153:15 160:1	continues 32:8	32:11 36:16,20	77:25 83:15	34:25 37:16
constitutional	continuing 24:20	37:4 38:11	87:16 93:11	38:24 42:20
89:19 91:1	160:14	44:14 46:9,9,15	99:14,19	46:21 80:17
107:25 114:22	contract 129:15	46:17,18 47:18	100:22 131:23	creation 155:18
124:7 127:9	contract 62:21	87:1 158:21,23	court 5:1,3 21:12	Creek 39:15
131:14 135:21	contradict 62:21	countless 9:16	22:18 24:12	criteria 48:24
138:10,16	control 78:25	county 22:24	27:11 44:3	49:2,4,9,25
152:1 160:19	conversation	25:22 28:8,8	61:22 62:6,17	criticism 9:13
163:21	121:25 122:19	29:7,11,12,19	63:4,11 76:17	cross 36:19 37:9
constitutionality	128:22 140:25	29:22,24 30:3,4	78:22 79:15	crosses 40:20
122:4 152:5	151:4	30:9,12 31:11	90:11 93:6,24	54:14
constitutionally	conversations	31:12,19,24	94:6,17 104:25	crux 89:15
61:12 89:7,11	130:5 140:20	32:2,3,8,17,21	106:7,8,8,14	crystal 102:10
	conversely 134:5	32:22,24 33:3	108:8 110:11	culmination

137:2,5 curious 104:2 current 23:18 31:1 46:22 47:10 82:17,25 102:13 126:1 156:6 currently 98:3 160:15 cut 129:20 Cutler 42:19 cycle 22:9 25:2 31:5 39:21 69:2 139:7 148:25 156:2 cycles 99:20	128:24 146:7,9 150:5 162:1,13 de 131:11 deadline 114:8 124:12 deal 6:18 dealing 30:25 52:12 100:10 100:11 death 129:14 Debary 32:4 debate 11:8,22 115:12 117:9 117:25 120:7 126:14 127:13 128:7 131:3 134:12,13,16 134:20 138:18 141:2 145:3,5 147:8 151:16 151:18 160:23 decade 21:9 22:6 25:25 26:1,6 32:23 34:19 38:3,9 64:12,15 64:17 82:25 99:19,22 100:14,22 151:21 decade's 26:2 decennial 21:8 decide 61:23,25 63:12 79:18 decided 19:6 62:16 106:8 116:7,10 decision 56:19 72:19 73:22 83:11,13 116:5 139:4 154:4 decisions 51:5 58:6 declaring 9:1 decline 99:16 decrease 26:14 decreased 99:21 100:14	deep 132:19 deference 14:20 73:6 deficient 135:4 definitely 119:5 119:14 definition 76:9 DeFuniak 28:17 28:19 delete 117:6 delivered 153:13 Deltona 32:4 Democrat 156:18 democratic 133:6 156:13,15,21 demographics 154:13 demonstrates 77:6 demonstrating 154:6 denied 68:20 denying 157:14 164:5 depending 105:6 depicted 10:24 described 43:22 104:19 description 43:23 descriptive 113:22 deserve 139:8,10 148:7,8 design 154:16 designed 56:10 78:5 153:8 DESIGNER 85:1 86:5 98:23 99:4 99:13 100:9 designing 153:16 desire 132:4 desk 7:4 11:2 110:19 desks 118:24 DeSoto 37:4 despite 5:16 18:20	details 25:4 determine 61:3 76:18 100:20 108:13 137:25 determined 63:4 76:19 135:17 develop 113:5 134:1 deviates 28:16 37:17 deviation 26:5 devices 4:10 difference 30:1 98:2 103:2 differences 45:7 62:14 different 24:17 30:18 44:12 56:3 65:1,4 91:18 92:16 95:12 100:10 100:12,12,15 108:2,5 136:23 142:19 147:13 149:1 152:2 153:25 168:15 differently 4:20 85:10 difficult 88:10,14 digital 1:23 169:3 dilution 61:15 62:24 134:6 135:1,10,13 diminish 38:2 157:17 158:7 164:8 diminished 40:19 41:15 131:24 diminishment 23:15 61:23 62:12 63:3,12 69:3 76:9,18,18 134:6 135:1 145:20 direct 89:8 97:12 154:11 directed 21:6	direction 132:3,6 132:15 147:3 directly 6:19 14:19 director 57:16,20 64:3,4 96:12,14 104:12,14 disabuse 120:13 disagreement 155:23 disallow 107:18 disappointed 146:3 disaster 7:13 discovery 113:7 discriminate 155:11 discrimination 159:2,4 discussed 5:24 discussing 12:11 59:10 discussion 152:24 disfavor 27:18 164:3 dismissed 142:3 disparate 155:16 dispute 157:24 disqualifies 93:16 disrupt 108:8 dissented 157:2 dissenting 156:4 distinct 91:20 142:14 distributed 86:12 110:19 district 7:8,18,21 10:3,22 23:11 23:12,19,21 24:14,15 25:15 25:23 26:4,7,15 27:2,3 28:7,9 28:12,14,19,20 28:21,23,24,25 29:5,10,13,15
D				
D.C 1:24 Dade 86:15 dark 137:4 data 6:25 7:1 8:24 22:15,23 52:14,16,19,23 53:9,15,17,19 54:3,4,6,8,9,10 55:4,25 56:2 68:11 95:6,11 96:9 98:20 99:11,15 113:3 116:22 120:15 137:19 146:21 156:15 Davie 39:23 day 6:14 114:16 146:25 days 79:8 110:7 111:15 112:21 113:24,24 116:18 117:2,6 117:20 118:5 118:21 119:12 119:23 120:3 120:17,20 122:14 123:13 126:3,23 127:23 128:4				

29:17,18,20,21	84:15,19,20	86:13,18,19,21	103:5 152:17	22:13 40:16
29:23 30:2,5,6	85:6,11 93:10	87:7,13 88:16	153:19 155:2	64:14
30:7,8,11,17,19	93:10 95:4,14	100:4,13,15,23	155:11	early 83:15
30:20,23 31:1,3	97:2,7 99:6,19	111:12 121:15	drawn 7:21 8:25	ears 60:20
31:6,7,9,17,20	100:18 107:3	128:1 131:25	9:2 27:9 61:5	easily 120:17
31:22,25 32:1,3	133:18 134:3	148:7 153:9,17	62:1 67:4 136:9	142:3
32:6,7,10,11,13	134:23 135:9	153:25 155:19	150:10,12	east 36:1,20
32:16,20,23	135:10,11,23	157:13 158:6	156:13,18,21	eastern 34:22
33:5,7,9,11,13	139:9 145:18	158:12,16,21	157:14 159:21	41:25 46:14
33:14,19,20	150:1 152:17	158:22 159:12	164:2,4,14	Eatonville 34:1
34:2,5,7,9,15	153:19 154:6	159:14 160:6	Driskell 2:21,22	echo 150:18
34:21,25 35:1,4	154:13,17	160:10 164:1,4	48:14,16,20	151:2
35:11,12,15,21	155:12,12,15	164:9,11,13,14	49:6,13,16,24	economy 111:19
35:22 36:5,11	155:16 156:8	164:15	50:4,10,17,25	Edgewood 33:25
36:13,19,21	157:9,19	dive 25:3	51:17,19,25	education 22:3
37:1,7,7,13,20	158:18,23	divided 34:18	52:10,20,22	147:13 153:5
37:21,23,25	159:21	35:18	53:4,7,20,21,24	effect 10:1 24:13
38:4,10,14,14	district's 25:12	DJ 2:3 4:8 10:24	54:7,25 55:2,14	44:1 60:10,22
38:17,20,23	36:8 156:24	165:5,6 167:21	56:6 57:4,17	61:6 109:25
39:4,11,12,17	districts 7:12	doctrine 75:10	58:13 59:1,3	110:1
39:19,21 40:4	8:21 9:18,20	doing 47:6	89:3 94:22,24	effective 124:4
40:14,15,16,17	10:2,23 11:18	118:11 123:7	95:16,20,25	effectively 13:10
40:20,23 41:3,8	21:18 22:1,9,24	137:23 143:16	106:1,3,15	efficiency 111:20
41:13,16,19,24	23:20 25:9,13	143:21 147:19	110:24 111:4,6	effort 47:11 91:8
41:25 42:1,15	25:20 26:3,6,20	147:25 152:19	112:12,23,24	135:21 140:3
42:20,23 43:4	26:21,22,25	161:16 168:16	114:11,12	140:15 149:9
45:13,16,16,23	27:9,12,14,14	Dolphin 41:22	117:12 118:23	efforts 132:15
45:25 46:4,7,8	27:18 28:5,22	42:16	120:23 121:21	eight 84:15,18,23
46:11,13,16,21	28:25 29:2,3,8	Doral 42:3	121:23 125:19	98:18
46:22,23 47:1,2	32:14 34:18	doubled 81:18	125:21 127:4	either 76:1 80:18
47:4,4,7,9,10	35:2 36:10,12	doubt 91:1 112:1	128:7,9 130:9	85:9 102:15,20
47:13,14,17,19	36:15 37:19	downward 62:14	149:18,19,20	106:9
47:20,21 48:6	39:1 40:5,12,22	dozens 5:13	162:16 165:18	elect 23:13 24:21
50:22 56:8,12	41:9,10,12 42:9	Draft 111:1	165:19	27:5 38:2 40:19
56:13,18,20	42:10,12 43:9	125:15	Driskell's 119:25	41:14 56:14
57:1,3 58:7,8	43:11,13,15	drafted 22:14	drive 32:25 64:8	60:12 63:25
59:12,22 60:1	44:6,8,9,11	drag 121:18	due 126:24 140:1	76:6 77:8 134:3
60:16 61:4 62:1	45:3,4,14,14	Drake 2:19,20	Dunedin 35:7	135:2 150:15
62:13,14 63:6	47:11 48:3,5	165:16,17	Duval 26:18	157:18 158:7
63:10,14 64:13	49:1,22 51:6	drastic 128:25	29:12 30:3,4,9	164:8
65:21,25 66:6	55:3,7,8 57:13	draw 9:20 27:17	30:12 46:25	elected 127:25
67:1,2,3,4	58:3,19,25	67:25 136:13	134:2,24	election 22:9
68:12,13,15	60:21 61:14	159:14 160:8	135:11,23	25:2 31:5 56:2
69:1,2,4,13,14	62:10,11 66:1	Drawer 84:25	150:12	64:11,20 69:2
69:23 70:19	76:5 78:6,15,16	drawing 21:11		78:3 83:13
76:20 77:1 83:7	80:17 82:3 84:9	54:24 61:12	E	99:20 109:7
83:7,16,17	84:10,17 85:8	67:19,20 96:2,7	earlier 15:1 22:2	121:5,17 139:7

<p>elections 53:17 54:6,7 62:15 63:22,24 64:10 64:19 109:20 116:3 electorate 65:1,5 99:18 electronic 4:10 emailed 7:5 embarked 163:9 emphasize 24:4 employee 169:6 enable 23:13 35:8 enabled 33:24 enables 35:12 enacted 122:8 encountered 5:17 encourage 140:23 149:14 168:11 encouraged 5:10 145:9,10 endeavoring 21:17,21 ends 16:13 82:24 enforce 155:6 enforceable 31:4 engage 168:7 engaged 6:6 21:15 168:2 engaging 9:23 50:12 168:10 ensure 4:16 12:11 20:17 27:17 28:16 31:3 ensures 36:18 38:1 40:18 41:14 entails 154:6 entertain 133:13 entire 6:13 7:2 20:18 29:6 32:18 37:4 38:24 64:12 93:16 104:15</p>	<p>114:1 149:11 entirely 29:1 32:24 82:7 135:11 143:14 156:18 entirety 28:7 32:2,21 35:16 42:3 93:8 159:7 entities 8:8 entitled 20:7 73:23 entity 132:2 enunciate 49:17 equal 21:18 27:6 28:10,12 29:3 31:20 34:14 37:17 38:13 48:1 152:14 153:20 157:15 164:5,12 equality 29:19 32:14 47:5 equalize 45:24 equity 129:7 equivalence 141:24 Escambia 28:7 especially 135:14 163:10 espouse 5:25 essentially 105:17 156:7 Establishing 11:17 et 1:2 54:18 eventually 104:21 143:13 everybody 81:23 103:14 123:5 149:5,6 everybody's 132:21 everyone's 44:9 evidence 1:23 114:2 154:11 154:12 evolve 153:1</p>	<p>Ex 4:4 167:3 exact 9:19 10:23 18:24 26:6 36:14 53:2 55:11 86:6 exactly 9:11 23:22 36:15 44:5 98:5,12 109:8 142:8 147:25 example 40:9 81:11 113:1,10 examples 43:12 excellent 68:23 exception 23:15 31:18 59:10,13 59:14,21 excess 119:3 excessive 155:18 excited 162:14 exclusively 22:14 excuse 17:17 33:15 excused 3:4 166:5 exercise 131:6 155:5 exist 139:14 142:16 existing 13:1,11 13:12 15:5 27:11 157:21 164:16 exists 33:14,20 158:18,18 expected 91:10 142:20 expedite 110:12 111:17 120:19 expedites 111:18 experience 140:5 experienced 161:20 experiences 140:10 expert 8:16,16 14:4 15:6,7</p>	<p>16:10 17:7 19:9 69:13 70:16,25 71:3,6 72:5,7 72:12,13,23 91:17 135:17 146:13 experts 58:17 71:7 73:24 137:6 explain 20:20,25 21:5 22:12 23:9 45:10 59:12 76:8 102:19 110:21 111:5 112:19 125:20 explained 112:12 explanation 20:17 explicitly 142:21 explored 162:1 Expressway 39:23 41:23 42:16 extends 38:21 extremely 88:10 88:14 eyeball 25:21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <hr/> <p>faced 24:19 fact 8:21 116:5 135:20 136:4,9 137:2,19 143:5 factor 152:17 153:19 154:3 159:15 factors 61:3,19 63:5 68:3 154:7 fail 8:9 failed 125:11 130:15 failure 7:20 fair 7:21 8:21 11:19 68:8,11 77:25 90:1,2,22 90:24 102:25 107:3 156:24</p>	<p>157:8 159:11 160:6 fairness 129:7 faithfully 30:6 false 141:18,24 146:8 fantasy 120:13 far 123:13 133:25 155:15 163:4 fast 31:5 121:3 121:16 124:23 fastest-growing 32:22 faulted 155:17 favor 27:18 125:6 130:10 144:2 164:2 favorably 167:8 feasible 21:20 25:19 164:15 FEBRUARY 1:12 2:1 federal 22:17 77:19 79:6,15 79:15,16 152:9 152:9 155:4 157:12 feedback 5:11,15 30:25 33:12,18 41:4 97:13 140:9 feel 23:2 52:7 97:4 126:22 139:25 145:22 163:16 feeling 5:17 fewer 86:15 Fifteen 167:5 figure 98:1,17 file 1:10 8:23 111:18,24 114:9 115:24 116:17 117:19 117:22 119:13 127:24 filed 21:1 62:5</p>
--	--	---	--	---

79:19 109:22 109:23 110:5 114:14 117:20 120:3,3,12 122:6 filing 77:16 78:11 78:20 114:8 118:8 fill 4:12 final 48:2 140:15 finality 25:2 83:6 83:16 120:19 finally 9:14 22:25 47:16 financially 169:8 find 15:2 18:7 46:1 116:23 139:1 finds 94:17 fine 2:7,8 11:4,13 11:14 12:14 13:7,20 14:6,16 15:8,12,13,17 15:21,25 16:4,8 16:11 17:1,5,8 17:15,19,21 18:4,12 19:10 19:20,24 20:4,7 27:25 43:17 45:9 48:10,18 49:3,11,14,23 50:2,6,23 51:7 51:18,22 52:1 52:17,21,24 53:6,11,21 54:5 55:1,9,13 56:5 56:22 57:7,15 57:18 58:12,21 59:2,4,15,23 60:2,7,14,18,23 61:8,16 62:2,18 62:20,25 63:15 64:2 65:8,17 66:8,21 67:6,17 68:5,19 69:5,8 69:15,24 70:4 70:12,20 71:1,8	71:11,15,19,24 72:8,25 73:2,25 74:5,9,12,19 75:2,5,8,12 76:11,21 77:2 77:11,21 78:8 78:18 79:2,9,22 80:1,5,5,11,20 81:1,9 82:4,9 82:20 83:18,23 84:2 85:15,19 86:3 87:2,16 88:5,19 89:12 89:22 90:8,19 91:3,13,22 92:1 92:6,14,25 93:20 94:1,9,21 95:8,16,22 96:4 96:12 97:16 98:4,8,11,19 99:23 100:7,25 101:4,15 102:1 102:5,16,24 103:8 104:3,8 105:8,15,19,24 106:11,16,19 107:4,9,14,21 108:1,10,18 109:5,11 110:2 110:14 112:11 112:22 114:4 114:10 115:3 117:8,24 119:7 119:16,19 120:1,22 125:4 125:8,10 126:7 127:4,12 128:6 130:8,12,14 132:24 133:14 133:14,17 134:10 138:17 141:1 144:1,5,7 147:7,21 148:13,20 149:17 151:16 151:20 160:22 165:2,20,21	167:7 168:18 Fine's 124:14 finish 6:23 finished 4:18 Finishing 36:4 firm 156:14,14 first 6:25 7:10 8:25 11:11 15:2 18:17 20:12,24 25:7 39:20 65:19 120:11 120:12,17 122:2 144:16 154:2 155:19 167:20 fit 20:8 35:10 five 10:6 40:5 45:14 46:17 99:20 106:18 158:21,22 flag 119:13 Flagler 31:10 47:15 flagrantly 157:21 flags 31:15 127:1 flawed 137:14 flaws 146:23 flip 159:10 floor 19:16 42:11 80:22 81:2 128:23 143:11 143:18 168:13 Florida 21:6,9,10 21:11 22:17 23:12 24:10 27:10 31:4 38:6 39:23 42:16 43:1,3 62:5 80:14,16,23 81:13,15,17,20 107:3 130:23 131:2 137:9 152:11,25 153:11 156:2,5 157:13 158:1 158:20,21 159:14 161:9	Florida's 26:16 104:16 158:24 Floridians 25:1 139:8 fluidity 5:16 focus 20:22 93:3 97:6 152:4 155:20 focused 5:7 focusing 10:11 folks 12:22 72:15 103:10 118:21 120:5 141:12 141:20,25 142:6 follow 49:7 53:25 55:13 57:4 59:23 60:6,18 74:23 76:21 77:9 78:8 83:18 85:15 87:2 91:25 114:5 follow-up 14:17 15:22 18:14 69:5 82:10 91:11 99:25 107:7,19 109:6 followed 73:14 following 21:7 32:24 43:14 157:21 follows 35:6,24 38:14 90:1 force 116:18 131:19,20 133:5,9 forcing 83:14 116:25 foregoing 169:2 forever 158:18 form 4:13 formed 104:23 forms 144:15 Fort 37:11 forth 5:15 6:8 89:17 90:14,15 107:17 116:8	141:14 161:24 Forty-eight 124:15 forward 24:7 128:14 139:6 139:21 145:23 146:11 148:9 148:11 162:3 found 26:22 90:5 90:16 142:15 four 16:15 36:12 78:2 83:11 106:18 111:13 111:14 118:17 119:12 121:11 124:12 125:24 128:24 frankly 121:2,14 124:11 129:24 141:9,19 147:15,20 148:5 161:12 free 23:3 52:7 Freeport 28:17 28:18 Friday 12:9 18:15 19:5 131:19 132:9 133:3,5 friend 162:15 front 7:4 15:5 17:24 18:1,9 20:23 22:20 51:12 86:6 124:2 125:14 139:5 163:6,8 163:24 164:19 164:25 full 64:8 147:17 148:3 fullness 116:10 116:19 function 86:23 functional 6:25 7:8,17 21:24 22:22 26:25 30:21 37:25
---	--	---	---	---

40:17 41:12 53:17 56:1,4 57:11 58:2,18 58:24 60:10 61:2,2,6 63:13 64:8 67:5,21 68:15 70:9,10 70:18,23 71:7 77:6 100:17,19 funding 121:13 further 22:12 62:12 128:21 169:5 future 162:15	91:11,14,25 92:2,12 93:2 94:3,19 106:17 106:21,23 107:7,10,19,22 108:4,9,11 109:11,13 115:15 133:11 133:12,21 134:19,21 145:16 148:13 148:15 151:25 165:22,23 Geller's 151:3 general 64:10 146:13 genuine 5:25 6:16 geographical 21:20 164:16 geographies 100:12 geography 86:24 gerrymander 155:8 159:21 gerrymandered 159:14 gerrymanders 153:7,22 154:25 155:3 getting 61:24 62:19 143:23 161:14 Gilchrist 46:15 give 4:11 81:11 110:11 111:22 114:22 120:19 141:3 148:9 167:9 given 80:15 81:3 92:3 97:13 107:10 109:15 139:2 146:5 163:7 164:24 gives 158:3 giving 39:18 79:18 118:21	124:2 Glades 37:5 go 8:14 9:3 14:24 14:25 18:16 20:23 33:16 56:3 61:20 66:13 71:9 72:11 75:20 90:11 95:1 96:10 102:7 104:25 105:2 113:9 116:1 126:22,23 132:6 155:15 goal 147:23 148:2 goes 34:11 47:23 53:14 60:4 93:25 104:20 109:3 143:11 143:12 Goff-Marcil 2:23 2:24 119:8,9 126:15,17 165:24,25 going 4:19 6:18 6:19 8:4 9:1 11:3,9,12 13:20 13:21 14:6,11 15:8 16:8,11,12 16:15,16,16,19 18:23 19:17 20:10,11,13,22 20:23 25:2 27:22 32:16 38:17 44:11 48:21 51:15 52:7 57:15 58:2 58:16 61:22,25 63:3,11 64:2 66:2,4 68:5 69:17 71:8 72:11,16 73:9 73:15,17 74:5 75:12 76:16,17 78:15,16 79:17 79:19 80:20	83:10,12,17 84:24 87:17 88:2 96:21 97:3 97:16 102:5 103:11 108:19 110:17,20,21 110:22,25 111:2 118:6,9 118:25 119:12 121:18 125:12 127:1,2 134:11 136:19,21 137:22 141:16 142:3 144:13 147:1 151:24 152:1,4 157:5 161:19 162:19 168:12 good 15:14 28:3 64:7 73:8 79:24 82:11 85:3 94:19 97:5 114:22 115:4 119:25 126:18 127:3 132:10 133:1 139:12 139:23 141:9 142:24 143:5 148:5 150:21 155:9 161:16 162:15 gotten 63:20 govern 116:3 123:5 governor 4:24 24:9 103:24 105:3,17 121:7 121:8 131:23 132:3 139:19 159:23 161:4 governor's 131:21 142:2 143:20 145:24 161:2,3,13 Grall 2:25 3:1 166:1,2 Grant 3:2,3	166:3,4 gray 48:4 GrayRobinson 62:8 great 41:4 69:8 86:10 119:15 122:22,23 149:9,15 greatest 73:5 grounded 159:25 grounds 152:1 groundwork 139:13 group 1:23 10:21 31:2 122:3,25 group's 24:21 40:18 41:14 groups 117:18 122:17,18,20 123:3 growing 21:8 growth 33:8 34:19 guarantee 141:19 guaranteed 141:21 guard 145:13 guardrails 122:8 guess 15:1 56:17 68:10 71:3 81:2 95:20 96:1 guidance 132:14 guys 75:19
<hr/> G <hr/> Gadsden 150:14 game 105:7 Garden 34:2 Gardens 41:1,5 42:2 gather 116:22 gavel 11:4,12 167:9 Geller 2:9,10 5:9 6:24 9:4 11:5 12:25 13:3,21 14:2,15,17,18 15:8,11,15,19 15:23 16:2,6,9 16:24 17:2,6,13 17:15,17,20,22 18:4,10,25 19:19,21 20:1,5 59:5,6,24 60:6 60:9,19 61:9 62:3,19 63:16 65:8,10,23 66:9 67:6,8 68:17 69:9,10,24 70:1 70:12,14,25 71:2,10,13,17 71:20,21 72:1 73:1,3,4 74:2,7 74:10,16,21 75:6 89:1,4,22 89:24 90:20				<hr/> H <hr/> H000C8011 22:7 H000C8015 23:17 44:4 H000C8017 23:10 half 60:5 115:20 Hallandale 40:2 hand 11:3,12 27:22 45:5 75:17 80:8 happen 116:11 117:4

<p>happened 104:1 104:18 108:25 110:5 happens 33:6 50:21 56:16 66:3 67:19 84:10 105:6 110:13 happy 15:19 86:7 86:24 88:21 96:11 103:15 Harbor 35:7 hard 87:20 128:11 132:22 Hardee 37:4 harmful 115:24 harmonize 49:19 Harris 153:4 HB 11:17 22:8,11 head 102:10 128:23 headed 9:5 83:5 150:22 heading 38:23 hear 49:5 66:11 67:10 72:14 138:24 heard 41:4 43:22 109:23 115:18 151:6 hearings 113:11 heavily 85:4 heavy 9:12 held 52:5 152:13 Helen 32:5 help 58:10 68:7 111:16 118:9 121:13,20 150:20 helpful 58:14 140:21 helping 21:5 helps 31:3 47:17 Hendry 41:19 Hernando 35:16 herring 123:18 Hialeah 42:2,2</p>	<p>high 22:5 42:21 146:25 high-level 20:24 highest 31:9 Highland 39:6 Highlands 37:5 highlight 27:13 43:5 highlighted 43:7 highly 111:15 highway 35:18 54:18 Hill 32:18 Hillsboro 36:13 Hillsborough 26:18 34:23 35:23,24 36:8 36:14 hire 69:13 hired 7:25 Hispanic 26:21 33:7,7 41:11 45:4 81:5 100:3 100:21 historical 157:6 historically 61:14 62:11 history 104:1,15 104:17 108:13 138:12 hit 89:15 HJR 92:9 holding 20:15 hole 34:16 Holloway 144:22 home 18:16 56:12 64:8 Homestead 43:4 honest 114:13 Honestly 67:23 hope 58:17 76:13 130:4 151:3 hopefully 11:24 65:6 114:24 162:14,17 hopes 146:25 hoping 12:23</p>	<p>18:22 horizon 142:10 142:12,12 hour 113:14 120:12 hours 113:13 115:20 167:19 167:19,19 House 1:11 7:21 8:1,3,7,12 9:7,9 9:11 10:5 12:6 13:4 14:3 21:14 21:15,22 24:20 46:3 52:13 55:5 55:19 62:5,17 70:6 71:23 72:2 72:4,16,22 73:10,15,18,23 74:11,25 75:1 84:11 92:8,9,16 95:4 96:21,22 103:23 104:21 104:24 119:22 137:7,22 145:19 146:4 147:18 148:3 150:2 151:7 153:8 161:19 House's 21:10 hull 44:22 hurting 121:19 HVAP 55:19 56:2 hypothetical 103:23 hypothetically 121:6</p> <hr/> <p>I</p> <p>I-295 30:10 I-4 35:25 I-75 37:15 39:22 41:22 43:13 I-95 32:17 38:5 39:23 idea 73:8 115:19 116:14 141:9</p>	<p>142:24 ideal 26:2,6,8 32:7 34:20 37:8 ideas 9:22 identical 44:8 identified 55:8 57:14 81:4,6 identify 49:1,4,21 50:1 56:11 58:19 if's 142:6 III 152:11 illegal 142:15 155:24 imagine 136:18 immaterial 59:20 immediate 24:13 immediately 5:4 110:6 impact 45:14 47:11 61:21 impacted 23:20 44:7 48:5 imperil 135:8 implemented 27:16 implementing 158:12 important 10:13 64:22,23 68:2 97:10 123:14 153:17 157:2,4 157:11 158:19 importantly 24:25 imposed 108:17 imposes 153:17 imposing 111:10 improper 58:5 136:15 138:25 improve 25:14 25:20 26:9 40:6 40:7 43:8,10 45:20 improvement 25:10 34:16 40:21 44:16,24</p>	<p>improvements 44:18 45:1 improving 34:3 in-process 97:11 inaccurate 53:19 55:22 inappropriate 146:7 161:1 include 34:11 38:24 42:11 47:24 included 10:19 29:13 31:25 35:21 39:11 43:12 46:25 72:6 142:22 includes 23:24 29:18 32:1,10 32:23 38:10,11 40:23 42:1,23 152:8 including 31:12 32:17 40:24 41:18 47:15 109:18 inclusive 26:19 incorporated 85:10 incorporates 36:22 158:1 incorrect 137:21 increase 80:13,15 81:16 incredible 149:3 incumbent 27:19 164:3 independent 96:24 Indian 32:10 36:17 indicate 105:7 118:6 indicated 81:7 117:19 131:10 131:11 132:4 140:6 indicates 99:14</p>
---	---	--	--	--

<p>individual 26:25 100:18,18,19 108:15 144:17 145:11 164:1</p> <p>individually 41:13</p> <p>individuals 81:3 81:6</p> <p>information 54:22,23 58:4 74:4,24 97:24 111:24 130:24 131:4 137:7,25 139:4 142:18 146:17 163:7 164:24</p> <p>initial 78:21</p> <p>initially 21:3</p> <p>initiate 127:20 128:3</p> <p>initiated 79:1</p> <p>initiation 83:14</p> <p>injecting 7:13</p> <p>inlet 38:18,22</p> <p>input 53:16 54:3 54:12,14 140:14 149:4 162:25 164:22</p> <p>instance 78:2 103:4</p> <p>intend 13:24</p> <p>intended 93:3,5 93:18 157:14</p> <p>intensify 100:3,5</p> <p>intent 27:18 58:5 93:13 154:12 164:2,4</p> <p>intention 50:3 74:8 75:1 111:25 112:1 124:24,25 137:22</p> <p>interest 54:13,15 121:1 152:18 152:20 154:23 155:4 159:2,13 160:8 161:7</p>	<p>interest' 154:20</p> <p>interested 169:8</p> <p>interesting 131:3 132:9 161:24</p> <p>interfere 107:24</p> <p>interference 145:24</p> <p>interrupt 108:8</p> <p>introduced 17:24</p> <p>investigate 116:1</p> <p>invitation 129:1 129:2</p> <p>invite 88:2</p> <p>involved 113:8 149:7 162:9</p> <p>involvement 161:2</p> <p>ironic 156:23</p> <p>Isle 33:25</p> <p>issue 81:2 141:20 142:23 159:20</p> <p>issues 116:22 123:19</p> <p>it'll 66:19 104:21 116:12</p> <p>items 5:23 8:11 20:24 23:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <hr/> <p>Jacksonville 156:9</p> <p>Jason 167:21</p> <p>Jefferson 46:12</p> <p>Jenne 3:4 166:5</p> <p>Jerry 144:16</p> <p>jive 78:14</p> <p>job 123:25 124:1 153:16 161:16</p> <p>Johns 29:19,21 29:24 31:12 47:5,8,16</p> <p>join 151:24 164:25</p> <p>joined 5:2</p> <p>judicial 111:19 111:20</p> <p>Julie 169:13</p>	<p>June 78:24</p> <p>jurisdictions 158:13</p> <p>jurisprudence 123:21 136:7</p> <p>justice 129:8 153:14 156:3 156:10 157:1</p> <p>justification' 153:24</p> <p>justifies 159:2</p> <p>justify 159:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <hr/> <p>Kagan 153:14</p> <p>Karen 167:22</p> <p>keep 21:21 25:21 33:24 40:8 41:7 47:6 52:7 86:22 113:21 123:3 143:22 148:24 162:3 168:12</p> <p>keeping 30:11 31:10,17 32:4 32:19 38:7 39:14 46:20 86:16 168:17</p> <p>keeps 23:18 29:22 34:15 36:20 38:6 80:6</p> <p>Kelly 57:16,20 64:3,4 96:12,14 104:12,14</p> <p>kept 25:24 28:18 33:9,11 35:4 36:25 38:20 39:17</p> <p>kick 4:19 11:3 94:7 96:6 109:25</p> <p>kicks 90:17 94:17 109:25</p> <p>kind 58:9 71:12 75:24 124:22 131:15 139:12 146:3</p> <p>knew 142:13</p>	<p>knock 6:19</p> <p>know 8:5,17 9:5 9:6 14:14,14 18:20 24:16 48:21 50:13 52:6,12 54:9,16 54:20 55:4 56:10 57:24 58:9,21 61:22 63:2,6 64:24 65:19 66:1 67:23 69:19,19 75:14 78:6,15 78:16 79:6 80:15 83:5,6,7 83:12 84:11 85:19 87:4,9,24 89:15 90:10,14 91:7 95:23 96:1 97:3,6,9 103:13 103:15 104:11 104:15,19,20 106:19 109:2 110:11,23 114:12,14 117:4 118:10 118:11,13,23 119:3 121:9 122:18,24 123:10 124:21 125:16 128:18 129:4,14 131:13,23 132:2,21,21 133:8 136:20 138:23,25 139:11,16,20 139:22 140:2 140:15 141:16 142:2 145:13 146:1,21 150:13,18 151:2,3,10 159:8,19 160:14 164:13 167:13,25 168:11</p>	<p>knowing 102:10</p> <p>knowledge 83:1</p> <p>known 32:25 33:1,2</p> <p>knows 23:17 136:11</p> <p>Kyle 167:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <hr/> <p>labeled 44:4</p> <p>Lafayette 29:4</p> <p>Lake 31:13,15 32:5 34:12 38:7 46:5 47:16,18 47:24</p> <p>Lakes 42:3</p> <p>landing 5:20 24:3 24:24 42:13 71:12 149:13</p> <p>landscape 152:8</p> <p>language 93:23 108:24 112:7 145:19 157:16 158:2 164:6</p> <p>large 30:4 123:11</p> <p>largest 26:17</p> <p>Lashonda 144:21</p> <p>latches 129:16</p> <p>late 115:19</p> <p>Latvala 3:5,6 42:4,6 166:6,7</p> <p>law 22:17 23:18 65:21 77:19,25 79:6,15 102:21 105:5 113:19 114:24 126:24 129:8,13 132:11,16 136:19,20,21 136:23 137:2 155:4 157:12 159:9,11 160:14 162:15 163:15,17</p> <p>laws 83:20 108:16</p> <p>lawsuit 78:12,13</p>
---	---	--	---	--

78:21,25 83:14 110:5 111:24 113:6 117:14 119:13 120:11 122:5,10,13 123:2 124:5 126:5 127:25 128:4 129:11 lawsuits 117:19 117:22 120:14 123:23 127:6 lawyers 8:17 54:20 137:6 lay 139:13 layer 55:24 lead 7:13 58:4,5 leading 68:18 league 130:23 131:2,5 learn 163:10 leave 112:7 116:7 132:17 leaves 29:14 32:11 37:7 39:9 47:1 led 136:13 Leda 58:14 167:21 Lee 37:9,14 Leek 2:2,5,6 4:8 12:9 13:24 14:6 14:8 16:21 17:8 17:10 18:6 20:7 20:13,19,21 28:3 43:17,19 45:12 50:6,8,18 51:7,9,22,24 52:18,24 53:1 53:11,13 54:6,9 55:10,11,21 57:25 58:22,24 59:9,15,17 60:2 60:4,14,16,23 60:25 61:17 62:25 63:2 65:17,19,25 66:21,23 67:18	68:8,21,22 69:7 69:15,17 70:4,6 70:20,22 71:4,5 72:8,10 74:14 75:2,4,9,10 76:2,11,15 77:3 77:22,23 78:18 78:20 79:9,11 82:5,6,20,22 83:23,25 87:17 87:25 88:1 89:12,14 90:8 90:10 91:3,5,22 91:24 92:6,18 92:20 93:20,22 94:14,16 95:8 95:10 96:4,6 101:15,17,22 102:16,18,24 103:7 105:19 105:22 106:11 106:13,18 107:4,6,14,16 108:3,6,19,22 109:5,8 110:2,9 110:10 120:8,9 120:10,24 127:15,17 131:10 134:17 140:6 141:3 143:2,4 163:11 165:6,7 167:10 167:11 Leek's 19:12 134:16 163:3 left 31:23 32:6 43:14 137:3 legal 4:25 8:7 22:15 24:8 76:19 77:4 89:16 90:3,12 90:13 91:17,21 108:7 113:5,16 136:4,20,22 139:19 151:4 152:8 159:24 163:4	legalities 8:10 legally 23:18 147:17,23,24 148:2 164:19 legislation 106:6 legislative 62:6 113:9 125:1 145:25 153:22 154:12 legislative-dra... 156:11 legislature 21:6 23:17 102:20 112:2 142:10 154:7 legislature's 154:4 legitimate 5:15 142:1 lend 86:14 length 28:15 lengthy 10:17 Leon 45:24 46:12 let's 10:10,11,12 23:6 25:3,7 27:21 28:4 44:13 45:15 55:2 70:16,19 74:19 78:3 100:2 102:6 107:11 121:6 143:22 160:2 letter 5:8,9,20,22 5:24 6:20,24 7:24 level 77:20 79:7 Levy 46:14 life 82:24,24 light 160:12 lighten 18:18 limit 132:4 limitation 78:4 118:19 limitations 77:16 78:1 79:7,13,16 79:21 82:17,18 83:2,8,22 107:2	108:16 111:11 111:12,14 123:4 126:2 127:21 129:6,6 129:12 150:7 limited 63:19 limits 153:21 line 6:23 8:25 10:1 20:6 30:9 33:3,24 36:18 37:1,12 39:7,14 40:3,21 41:24 41:24 42:17 43:15 47:14 51:14 66:25 67:11 98:12 125:17 lines 32:4 35:6 36:19 39:13,25 41:21 43:2,8 46:14 67:12,14 111:1 125:17 152:17 153:19 155:12 160:8 list 22:24,25 54:21 listen 77:24 83:10 114:21 120:11 listening 131:3 138:24 listens 162:5 lists 54:20 literally 155:8 litigant 116:14 litigants 111:23 117:13 124:3,3 126:4 litigate 112:20 141:13 litigated 103:1 litigation 8:5,6 9:6 10:12 72:21 73:13,19 83:5 101:11 102:14 104:24 109:21 110:13 111:17	111:19 114:20 115:2 116:19 117:3 118:6,12 122:9 129:1 146:11 150:6 151:21 152:22 litigator 113:25 little 4:20 20:13 57:18 75:25 80:6 108:23 115:22,24,25 140:1 145:13 145:13 155:20 157:5 158:24 live 83:7,16 lived 81:13 lives 82:23 located 35:22 long 63:10 68:7 113:13 116:14 118:6,9 120:2 133:24 154:21 longer 79:12 95:14 109:23 126:2 look 14:5 24:17 25:7 49:8 51:11 55:22,25 56:18 56:20,21 57:5 57:24 63:20 64:15 68:2,25 84:9 87:5,12 95:12 99:15 100:1 113:1 120:24 137:20 138:25 147:11 148:4,11 153:2 168:15 looked 27:20 55:17 72:2 160:12 looking 25:11,23 35:3 48:25 63:5 64:21 68:11 76:3 84:8,14 97:23,25 98:7 98:12,13,14,16
--	--	---	--	--

98:24 99:1,5,6 99:11 100:16 100:19,20,21 looks 8:3 99:8 104:6 129:19 lose 83:13 losing 106:20 150:15 lost 77:14 lot 5:5 12:18 24:16 48:17,22 53:13,16 56:13 85:8 113:3,4,15 113:16,17,18 113:21,21,24 114:1 122:16 123:3 127:1 131:4,4 132:10 132:19 140:13 142:4 146:5 147:12 150:5 163:10 Loxahatchee 39:2 Lucie 38:11	153:8 158:16 making 58:6 117:13 139:3 Manatee 36:22 maneuver 146:8 manifest 109:22 manner 27:10 map 7:9,18,21 8:3 9:10,11 10:18 12:7,12 12:21,23 13:1,5 13:10,22 14:5 14:11 17:14 18:1,6,9,14,21 18:24 19:8 21:6 22:7,13,20,21 23:10,17 24:7 24:11,12 25:3,4 25:5,6,7,8,9,16 25:24 26:10,10 26:15,19,23 27:4,13 30:1 31:4,10 33:11 33:15,21 34:16 34:17 40:10,12 40:22 41:17 42:10 43:8,22 43:24,25 44:2,4 44:5,6,9,12,14 44:15,18,24,24 45:2,7,8,10,17 47:12,21 49:1 51:6,21 52:3 56:9 57:2,12,14 58:8,15,17 59:11,18,25 61:5 62:1 65:1 66:7 67:19,20 76:3,7 84:12,14 84:24 85:1 86:5 89:7,10,20 90:4 90:6,14,16,16 90:17 91:2 92:10,10 93:7 93:16,18,25 94:6,10,12 96:22,22 97:7	98:23 99:4,13 100:9 101:13 101:13,19,19 101:22,23,24 102:2,13,22 103:1 104:20 104:22 105:16 106:6,9 112:3 116:8 122:12 127:8 129:21 131:7,18,20,24 132:1 133:18 134:2 135:4,18 135:20,24,25 136:1,8 137:14 137:18,25 138:3,6,9,10 140:13 141:8 141:11,12,14 141:21,23 142:1 145:18 145:21,23 146:18 147:17 147:24 149:16 150:10 155:21 155:21,25,25 156:6,7,11,12 156:12 157:22 157:25 159:17 161:2,3,4,9 162:7 map's 17:11 102:2 mapping 156:15 maps 4:25 5:12 7:12 8:2,11 9:1 9:15,20 10:8,24 13:5,8,10 15:4 17:23 21:11 22:11 23:21 24:1,6,17,18 28:11 48:4,8 51:11,20 52:13 52:15 53:2,3,10 54:24 55:5,6,12 55:19,24 61:12 64:24 65:2	77:17 82:19 83:2 87:5,21 88:17 91:18 92:9,15,22 97:4 101:11 103:23 104:25 105:18 114:21 115:1 116:2 119:21 120:12,16 121:2 122:4 123:8 124:6 127:4,8,9 128:13,14,15 131:15 140:22 146:2 147:14 160:8,18 March 121:9 Margate 38:7 margin 62:23 margins 62:15 Mariano 3:7,8 112:15,17 114:5,6 115:4 166:8,9 Marion 29:5,6 31:13 34:13 46:1,18 47:16 47:25 mark 16:5,14 Martin 38:11 material 113:16 materially 80:23 81:24 materials 10:20 math 15:14 124:13,14 126:8 mathematical 34:4 43:11 44:19,20 81:11 matter 94:13 127:5 169:4 matters 139:18 McClain 3:9,10 166:10,11 mean 59:12,14 65:12 66:2,13	66:14,15 77:6 91:5 94:10 96:2 100:9 102:11 104:10 107:11 113:2 122:22 128:2 141:19 158:14 160:11 167:18 meaningful 149:11 means 10:1 55:17 61:23 76:18 116:2 measure 66:24 67:3 122:2,5 measures 34:4 Medley 42:3 meet 6:14 18:17 18:19 19:3 38:22 112:20 150:19 152:23 155:13 meeting 4:20 7:3 7:10 10:19,20 19:6 55:16 77:5 113:13 115:21 140:8 145:10 168:8 meetings 113:12 140:18 145:11 167:14 member 2:9 5:8 5:23 9:4 11:5 12:25 13:21 14:17,21 17:15 53:16 54:3,12 54:14 59:4 65:8 67:6 69:9,24 70:12 71:2,19 72:3,4 73:2,23 74:25 88:23 89:1,22 106:17 106:21 109:11 115:14 122:3 127:25 133:7 133:11 134:19 140:2,14 145:8
M				
M 1:24 maintain 27:11 125:23 maintained 82:6 82:8 maintains 45:2 95:4 Maitland 34:1 major 30:11 38:4 39:21 41:2 43:13 145:14 majority 28:15 34:12 37:6 42:17 47:24 137:11 138:8 153:14 156:13 156:20 majority-mino... 27:12 33:6 37:21 41:11				