
Commission Meeting

of

NEW JERSEY REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

“The purpose of the meeting will be to vote on a plan to establish congressional districts in New Jersey that will be in effect for the next 10 years”

LOCATION: Committee Room 11
State House Annex
Trenton, New Jersey

DATE: December 23, 2011
10:00 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION PRESENT:

John J. Farmer Jr., Chair
Assemblyman Joseph Roberts Jr., Delegation Chair
Michael J. Baker, Delegation Vice Chair
Michael Duhaime, Delegation Chair
Assemblywoman Caroline Casagrande
Sherine El-Abd
Edward Farmer
Aubrey Fenton
Jeannine Frisby LaRue
Eric Jaso
M. Susan Sheppard
Philip Thigpen



ALSO PRESENT:

Frank J. Parisi
Raysa Martinez Kruger
Office of Legislative Services
Commission Secretaries

Meeting Recorded and Transcribed by
The Office of Legislative Services, Public Information Office,
Hearing Unit, State House Annex, PO 068, Trenton, New Jersey

(A teleconference meeting of the New Jersey Redistricting Commission was held on December 23, 2011. Members present via telephone were Commissioner Michael J. Baker and Commissioner Philip Thigpen.)

JOHN J. FARMER JR. (Chair): Public notice having been duly given, I hereby call this meeting of the New Jersey Redistricting Commission to order.

I note that we have a couple Commissioners who are joining by phone because they are out of town, and that's what you're hearing in the background.

I'm going to begin with a brief statement of my own.

Oh, yes. First, Mr. Secretary, please call the roll.

MR. PARISI: Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Michael Baker.

MICHAEL J. BAKER (Delegation Vice Chair): Present.

MR. PARISI: Caroline Casagrande.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CASAGRANDE: Here.

MR. PARISI: Nilsa Cruz-Perez.

MS. CRUZ-PEREZ: Here.

MR. PARISI: Michael Duhaime.

MICHAEL DUHAIME (Delegation Chair): Here.

MR. PARISI: Sherine El--

MS. EL-ABD: El-Abd (indicating pronunciation).

MR. PARISI: El-Abd. Thank you.

Ed Farmer.

MR. E. FARMER: Here.

MR. PARISI: Aubrey Fenton.

MR. FENTON: Here.

MR. PARISI: Jeannine Frisby LaRue.

MS. LaRUE: Yes, here.

MR. PARISI: Eric Jaso.

MR. JASO: Here.

MR. PARISI: Joseph Roberts.

JOSEPH ROBERTS JR. (Delegation Chair): Here.

MR. PARISI: Susan Sheppard.

MS. SHEPPARD: Here.

MR. PARISI: Philip Thigpen.

MR. THIGPEN: Present.

MR. PARISI: Dean Farmer.

MR. J. FARMER: Here.

MR. PARISI: You have a quorum, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. FARMER: Thank you and good morning, everybody.

The map that I am prepared to support today is in every measure an improvement over the pre-existing current map. First and most important, it complies with the constitutional requirement of one person, one vote. It draws 12 districts with equal population. It complies with the mandate while splitting only 14 municipalities, and none of them more than once. The current map contains 29 municipal splits with two municipalities split among three districts.

The map also honors more completely New Jersey's diversity. It contains two majority-minority districts, and two other districts in which minorities and coalition can constitute a majority. It respects communities of interest indentified for us in testimony in meetings with sitting members of Congress and in written submissions from the public. It does not strain geography to accomplish this. By every measure the districts drawn on the map are more compact than the districts on the current map and they raise no issues of contiguity. Given the constraints posed by losing a district while having to add population to existing districts, the map also respects continuity and representation.

In short, the map I am prepared to support today is legally sound; its districts are compact, contiguous, respect communities of interest, and honor our state's diversity.

The map is a product of a process that began over the summer with an informal meeting, extended through public hearings in the fall and public input on our website, and concluded this week in four days of intense discussion in New Brunswick. This process included meetings with all members of our current delegation and numerous other interested parties from the public. I personally have been greatly assisted by counsel provided by 17 law students from Rutgers in Newark and Camden, under the supervision of former Public Advocate, current Vice Dean Ron Chen. I cannot thank them enough.

I think it is fair to say that I have exasperated all my colleagues at this table in an effort to drive points of compromise and bring the parties together. But I think the process largely worked. Although the map I am

prepared to support today was proposed by the Republican members, it benefitted in fundamental ways from the close criticism offered by former Speaker Roberts, Counsel Bill Castner, and the other Democratic members. The process produced, in my view, two excellent maps.

My consideration of the political implications of redistricting was guided by two objective realities that no one can ignore: first, New Jersey is losing a Congressional seat which will affect the current composition of seven Democrats and six Republicans. That in itself would make this a challenging task. To complicate matters further, every surviving district will have to add population ranging from 8,000 to 100,000 people. As I thought about this problem it became clear to me that the loss of a seat should be absorbed by the district with the greatest population deficit. As it turned out, three districts that had to add the greatest number of people were all in the same region and were contiguous with one another. Together those districts would have had to add some 250,000 in population. In this case, however, no one wanted to collapse the district with the greatest population deficit because that district is New Jersey's traditional majority-minority district. The next two districts in terms of population deficit were 8 and 9, represented by Congressmen Pascrell and Rothman. I became convinced that because they were contiguous and were second and third in population deficit, they should be combined. Because all three of the districts are represented by Democrats, this would mean the loss of a Democratic seat and an adjustment of the balance as we start to 6 to 6. I understood this, and I would've applied the same principle

regardless of which party held the seats in question. I began the negotiations this week with that in mind and informed the parties.

The Democrats changed my mind. Speaker Roberts made a compelling argument that allowing the voters to decide which party loses a seat is fair, despite the concentration of population deficit in the Democratic Districts 8, 9, and 10. So I told the Republicans they would have to change their map fundamentally, exposing one of their members by combining Congressman Garrett's district with that of Congressman Rothman. They resisted this notion for the reasons I mentioned earlier but, ultimately, relented. I told both parties that, balancing the equities, the new districts should be a challenging one for the Democrats to win.

At that point the points of difference started to narrow. The map respects continuity of representation for six Democratic members and four Republican members. The fifth Republican, Scott Garrett, will face a fight, albeit an uphill one, from Congressman Rothman. The 6th Republican incumbent, one-term Congressman Runyan, will face a competitive race. I was ultimately unable to bring the parties together on how competitive the Garrett-Rothman and Runyan districts should be. I was confronted with a blizzard of metrics and measures and impassioned advocacy from both sides -- who did an outstanding job. Some of the metrics, frankly, required suspension of common sense; all of them are instructive but, ultimately, manipulable. My role, as I saw it and as I see it now, was to attempt to bring the parties together and then, frankly, to make a judgment call. Because the Republican map preserves continuity representation for six Democrats, and because it exposes two incumbents --

Republican incumbents -- to a significant risk of losing and thus risks becoming an 8 to 4 map, and because it is excellent in the fundamentals of redistricting that I outlined earlier -- one person-one vote, compactness, contiguity, majority-minority and collation districts, and communities of interest -- I decided to vote for the Republican map.

Mike.

MR. DUHAIME: Thank You, Chairman; I appreciate it.

I'd like to thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for a collegial but spirited atmosphere throughout the week, in which we really drove toward compromise. And I really commend Dean Farmer for his efforts to make this a very open and transparent process throughout, one in which both parties shared ideas and shared maps and shared critiques of each other; and really, I believe, saw significant compromise from both parties throughout this map. We believe the final map that we're prepared to support today is fair and constitutional, it is balanced, the voters will have a true say in how their representatives will be selected. Communities of interest are held together; it complies with one person-one vote; as the Dean mentioned, there are many fewer split towns which we believed coming in was fundamentally important. Looking at the current map, it was something that did not make sense for the constituents in those towns. There are more compact districts, and I think it responded to and reflected the population flow both in North Jersey and in South Jersey in terms of those districts that have been mentioned before.

I want to thank Chairman Farmer again for his leadership throughout the process; and thank Speaker Roberts for all he has done with his team as well.

MR. J. FARMER: Speaker Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: Dean, thank you.

I want to begin by acknowledging your hard work and commitment to the process, of the unique role that the Rutgers Law School students played. I think it was extraordinary; a great idea on the part of Dean Farmer to involve students from Rutgers and, frankly, give them a skill set and an exposure to this process so that in the next cycle we're going to have a whole host of folks who have that experience and can contribute significantly.

All the members of the Commission -- the staff with whom it was a pleasure to work and renew some old acquaintances, and get to know some other people as well.

Let me just acknowledge particularly the extraordinary work of our Chief Counsel Bill Castner and the members of his team. Everyone involved in this process knows what an intense, draining, all-out commitment it was; and certainly the case for Bill and the folks who just put their lives on hold to work so hard relative to this.

The goal of the Democratic Commissioners as we approached this with respect to the consolidation of Districts 5 and 9 -- the Rothman-Garrett districts -- was to create a fair fight district, as the Dean indicated, so that the voters have the opportunity to make a decision. The map that is before us today is not a fair fight district; it is a map that has a very

significant advantage for Congressman Garrett. Having said that, Congressman Rothman is someone who is up to that challenge, and I have no doubt that he is going to work hard and is going to prevail. But frankly, this landscape tilts that district against him.

Secondly, I was referenced to District 3. The notion that District 3 is a competitive district is, frankly, a work of fiction. It is less competitive than the current District 3. It is a district that removes Cherry Hill from the 3rd District where it has historically been a part. Cherry Hill, the community of late Congressman John Adler, and it is a district in its current composition that Governor Christie would have won by 21 points. So it certainly is not a competitive district.

The Democrats worked very closely with members of the minority community who supported and endorsed our map. And I think they did so because of some of the key provisions in it. It preserved District 10 and 13, and two new majority, non-white districts. The Democratic map keeps the Asian communities in Bergen together versus the GOP map which splits Teaneck, Bergenfield, and Dumont from Englewood and Fort Lee. The GOP cracks Asbury Park and Long Branch from Red Bank and Neptune -- both significant concerns of our state's African-American and Latinos communities. And the Democratic map is better in uniting Latino communities in Passaic and southern Bergen in Congressional District 8.

The Democratic map used the traditional, 30-year anti-gerrymandering test to ensure that the map was not gerrymandered to the benefit of one party. The GOP map which is before us today for

consideration is the first map in the history of either the State or Federal redistricting commissions which does not use that test.

Those are my concerns, and I think we all have different views about this process. But more important than my concerns are the concerns and input of the public. We began this process with public hearings and we received some of the testimony particularly from the minority communities that I referenced a moment ago. But there is no reason for us at this point to not give the public the opportunity to look at this map and weigh in with their concerns.

I saw a few moments ago all the members of the media who circled around the map to take pictures of it and to look at it; many, I sense, seeing it for the first time. Our deadline to adopt this map which will make a determination about our congressional delegation for the next 10 years -- our deadline is not today. Our deadline is three-and-a-half weeks from today. There is no time imperative for us to act today in a way that, frankly, is reckless and a way that denies the public the opportunity to be heard. I think that I'm-- I've obviously spent a lot of time in Trenton, and I'm used to how things kind of get rushed at the last minute when you're up against the clock. We are not up against the clock. And I think that -- and I say this sincerely -- it's disrespectful to the public for us not to give them an opportunity. The public was heard before the map was created; why should there not, in my view, be an opportunity for the public to look at it now, to give us their input. And would note that in 1981, when the Legislature played a role in redistricting, that a map was adopted and

ultimately, based upon public input, was reconsidered. That was a model that made sense.

And I completely understand when there's a need to have a quick-moving process when you're up against the deadline. But that's not the case today. The deadline is three-and-a-half weeks from today, and I will be suggesting a little bit later in this meeting that we create a meaningful opportunity for the public to see this map; not just see the map at 8 o'clock and be forced to make comments on it at 10, but have the opportunity to see the map and digest it and give us their input. That would make the process better.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. FARMER: Mr. Duhaime.

MR. DUHAIME: I don't believe I need to defend the map that we voted on any further today. Chairman Farmer related why it is a superior map, and I think that he did a -- he spoke (indiscernible) we would do on that.

In terms of public hearings and timeline, I would just say that we had had a discussion and we agreed, bipartisanly, to this timeline. We agreed to the timeline of public hearings in the summer, and we agreed to this week and the decision being made this week. At no point, until this morning, was there any objection from my colleagues on the other side. So I don't understand why we would not follow the process we agreed to, other than the fact that your map hasn't been selected. So I believe we should follow the same method that was followed in the spring: the map was revealed and then voted on. And I don't understand any other reason,

other than the map that you support not being supported by the majority of this Commission, as to this sudden change.

MR. J. FARMER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Chairman, thank you.

I would just note that this has been a very fluid process. And as recently as yesterday or the day before there was an indication that we might not finish our work this week, and we might put it on hold and bring it back after Christmas and the New Year to continue our deliberations. And that would have been acceptable to everyone. I think there was a commitment to work hard and try and achieve as much progress as we could.

But I think that the process benefits when the public is heard. And I think it makes zero sense to have the public heard at the beginning of the process -- before there was anything to react to -- and not give them the opportunity to be heard when there is a document that's going to determine who their representatives are for the next 10 years.

MR. J. FARMER: Anybody else like to be heard on the map, or the process issue -- or both?

MS. FRISBY LaRUE: I-- Chairman, I would like to be heard--

MR. J. FARMER: Ms. LaRue, yes.

MS. FRISBY LaRUE: --just for a couple of minutes, please.

I don't have a lot to add to what our Chairman has said of our delegation. The first thing I would like to do is really thank you for the continuing dialogue that's gone on, particularly this week. I have been really satisfied -- you were very instructive throughout the process and I, as

one Commissioner, I was satisfied that with every instruction you gave us we followed it and really worked diligently to work with this process.

I guess as one Commissioner here, I'm really, really baffled at the final map. We received it at 7:15, 8 o'clock this morning. I thought-- Yesterday afternoon I thought that we would get the map in the evening; that's basically what we were told. And so I really haven't had an opportunity to look as closely at the map as I was hoping that I would do. But we heard throughout the process from the minority coalition -- they made great testimony; but not only that, they have really been engaging throughout this process. I have my own concerns about the map; I can't imagine what concerns they would have. And I think that because we stuck to the timeline that you set -- which is really an artificial deadline, with the constitutional deadline as January 17 -- I don't know why, since we do have time, that we won't engage the public. And I guess, you know, my final comment: I was thinking this morning as I'm looking at this map, and I have to tell you, I was really, really shocked when I saw some portions of Bergen County, and Monmouth County -- what was done in those areas. I was thinking, "I'm almost 62 years old. And the minority communities that have asked to be engaged, to be given an opportunity in a Congressional election -- when they get an opportunity again -- the hope to do it again -- I'm going to be over 70." And that's a long time. We're not talking about, today, simply redrawing lines. Today we're talking about decreasing our representation in Washington, D.C. by one person. And I think that that is critical enough of an issue that we really should be able to give the public a second look at this map in this process.

MR. J. FARMER: Thank you.

MR. E. FARMER: Dean Farmer, may I also add my comments?

MR. J. FARMER: Yes, sir, Mr. Farmer.

MR. E. FARMER: First of all, thank you very much, Chairman Farmer, and my fellow Commissioners on the other side of the aisle and my colleagues here, for the time and effort and professionalism you have treated this process. And to the staff -- I know how hard our side worked; I'm extremely proud of them and I'm sure the Republican staff and your staff, Dean Farmer, put a tremendous amount of effort into this. An amazing job, and thank you all very much.

I'd like to echo my fellow Commissioners asking for this vote not to take place today. The Commission as a whole has had very little time to review this map; and the public has had no time, as it was just released a few moments ago, to review or much less comment on this map. I strongly believe we should table this vote to a later date in January, affording us more time for public participation -- some time for public participation, I should say.

If we do move forward today, I would like to register my disappointment in the outcome, and specifically how this process became solely focused on population lost in the north. That's the main reason -- the principal reason -- we have the map we do today. All districts need to add population. In terms of population needed, seven congressional districts, including the three that are impacted today -- most impacted today, needed to -- were approximately within 2 percentage points of each

other, with 735,000 -- approximately 735,000 people in each district. To simplify the process in such a way that more traditional redistricting criteria such as partisan fairness, communities of interest, and a true gerrymandering test were relegated to secondary issues is extremely unfortunate.

Despite this questionable outcome, I'm still confident that come November 2012, due to the incredible quality of our Democratic representation, we'll still maintain seven Democratic seats in Congress.

Once again, thank you for your time, your efforts, and your consideration in this process.

MR. J. FARMER: Mr. Jaso.

MR. JASO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to just reiterate what Chairman Duhaime said, which is that this process was agreed to a long time ago. And we have been observing this deadline -- this intended deadline -- for the entire process; certainly during the entire week. So to suggest that somehow now we need additional public meetings, I think, is something new and surprising to me.

What is not new and surprising to either side, I think, are the makeups of the final maps. And I think to sit here and say somehow, or to create the public impression for our esteemed colleagues on the other side, that they had seen this Republican map for the first time is, frankly, disingenuous. These maps have been coming closer and closer together through the hard work of Chairman Farmer who, as he has publicly stated, has been exasperating all of us trying to get us to concede and to cajole and to refine our maps in ways that, frankly, neither side wanted to refine. But

they have been refined. This is not a new map that is being presented today.

So there are no surprises here. It is clear that the public is seeing the resultant map for the first time. And as we move forward, that is something that may be addressed in future Commissions. But this Commission, on a bipartisan level, has operated in a cooperative way and on a cooperative schedule.

The last point I'd like to make is the misimpression, I think, that minority voices are not being regarded in the Republican map. Speaking for myself, I'm a Hispanic; my father is from Mexico. I'm an active member of the leadership of the Hispanic National Bar Association and the Hispanic Bar Association of New Jersey. Those issues-- The Hispanic issues have been voiced by me to my colleagues; I have no doubt that they were heard by the other side and by Chairman Farmer. I can speak firmly for myself; but if you look at the composition of our side, many voices, including the Arab-American community and the African-American community, have been heard and taken into account. We did our darndest to preserve, as Chairman Farmer recognized, the traditional majority African-American district; we have a majority Hispanic district; and we have two additional districts that are majority -- although not all one ethnicity or race, they are all, as combined, majority-minority districts.

So the communities of interest have been observed and incorporated into this Republican map. Minority interests have been observed and incorporated into this Republican map. So we have nothing, I think, to be embarrassed about. There are no surprises here and the one

person-one vote has been respected. This is a legal map, it is a constitutional map, and it's a map that this entire Commission can and should be proud of.

MS. CRUZ-PEREZ: Good morning.

I'm going to start by saying thank you to Dean Farmer, the Rutgers students, the Republican Commissioners on the other side; but especially to Chairman Roberts, my Commissioner, colleagues on the Democratic side, and our amazing staff: Bill Castner, Tom Bonier, Adam, Matt, Mike, and Angela Genova.

This has been another amazing experience for me. The Democrats created a fair map; we took into consideration the public input from the hearings. We kept community of interests together. We created a one person-one vote map. We worked with the New Jersey Minority Coalition, which endorsed our map, to preserve and create opportunities for minorities. And unfortunately, I can't comment on the Republican maps because the final version -- we saw other versions -- but the final we still didn't get to see until this morning. I think that the Democratic map is a map that is a fair and constitutional map.

I want to thank everyone for allowing me the opportunity to serve, and I wish everybody a healthy and happy holidays.

Thank you.

MR. J. FARMER: Thank you very much.

Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CASAGRANDE: Thank you, Chairman Farmer.

Thank you to my fellow Commissioners for what truly has been an excellent and wonderful experience in democracy, which I think many of us who are students of politics, who enjoy the process, really felt was a very fair and open process, a very responsive process from our Chairman, and I think a difficult process. Because we went into this process knowing that New Jersey was going to lose a representative. And that presented an enormous challenge for every member of this Commission who did not want to see that happen to the Garden State.

I think, though, in the end, we came together and we moved closer and closer with two maps that we both saw all week; that towards the end had very few tweaks. And, in fact, I just wanted to quickly correct: the Republican final map not presented this morning -- delivered yesterday in the mid-afternoon. So we've had plenty of time since 3 o'clock yesterday to take a look at the same map that, unfortunately, was something that we worked very hard on and we can't all agree on necessarily. But certainly if you take a look at our map, you see that it preserves the communities of interest, preserves one person-one vote, takes into account the great diversity of the State of New Jersey, is a responsive map and, I think, certainly a map that will ensure New Jersey and our citizens are fairly, and adequately, and well represented in the United States House of Representatives for years to come.

Thank you.

MR. J. FARMER: Commissioner Baker or Thigpen, would you like to make remarks?

MR. BAKER: Dean Farmer, Mike Baker. I hope you can hear me on the speakerphone.

MR. J. FARMER: Yes, we can.

MR. BAKER: I also want to thank both the Democrat and Republican Commissioners for their hard work and for the collegial environment throughout the process. And Dean, I want to thank you, and Ron Chen, and the law students for how you ran this process. And while I obviously disagree with your conclusion, Dean, I still have enormous respect for you and how you ran this process.

I did think we had a fair map that did a better job of keeping together communities of interest, and I think a map that if scored on the traditional anti-gerrymandering test method would have scored higher than the map that you're supporting. However, you've made your decision and I respect that.

I do think, though, that it's appropriate-- Since there are communities of interest -- particularly in Monmouth County with the fracturing of the district and the removal of Neptune and Neptune City from the traditional links to the 6th Congressional District, and with some of the fracturing of the communities in Bergen County -- that it would be appropriate and would not hurt the process; and would, in fact, help the public understand the map better, if we were to allow for at least one public hearing where those communities of interest that are impacted can review the map and comment on the same. And if it's appropriate this time or after Commissioner Thigpen speaks, I would like to make a motion to postpone the vote today and to have a hearing in January.

Thank you.

MR. J. FARMER: Thank you, Commissioner Baker.
Commissioner Thigpen.

MR. THIGPEN: Well, much has been said about the maps, and I think that the Democratic map is more balanced and considerate. It meets the description of communities of interest, balance toward the various communities.

But I want to say something that's outside of the map. We are jeopardizing Congressman Rothman, the Congressman who has brought in the most money to this state at a time when we need it. There's no written (indiscernible) that you consider that, but I think that's a very, very important consideration and should have been in your calculations.

I also-- I don't see the rush. If we could take this map that has been recommended and give the people of the State an opportunity to look at it and perhaps even hear their reaction to the map, I think that we would be doing a public service. And I would hope that we could convince the Chairman, as well as members on both sides, to consider the fact that we still have time and there's no practical reason why we have to not go around the state, let the people see the maps -- both of them -- and get their reaction.

And I want also to commend our side for negotiating with the Chairman and responding to every one of his requests. And I think also I want to commend the Chairman for his accessibility, consideration for our recommendations. So I would hope that we would continue the process just a little longer in the public interest.

Thank you.

MR. J. FARMER: Thank you, Commissioner Thigpen.

Any other comments on the map? Mr. Speaker, would you like to make a motion?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Dean, thank you very much.

My question is: What's the hurry? Our deadline is not today; our deadline is 24 days from today. And since that's the case, I would move that we defer a consideration and adoption of this map today until we can schedule public hearings so that the citizens of New Jersey have the opportunity to be heard.

MR. J. FARMER: Do I hear a second?

MR. BAKER: I'll second that -- Baker.

MR. J. FARMER: Discussion? (no response)

Mr. Secretary, do you want to call the roll?

MR. PARISI: Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Michael Baker.

MR. BAKER: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Caroline Casagrande.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CASAGRANDE: No.

MR. PARISI: Nilsa Cruz-Perez.

MS. CRUZ-PEREZ: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Michael Duhaime.

MR. DUHAIME: No.

MR. PARISI: Sherine El-Abd.

MS. EL-ABD: No.

MR. PARISI: Edward Farmer.

MR. E. FARMER: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Aubrey Fenton.

MR. FENTON: No.

MR. PARISI: Jeannine Frisby LaRue.

MS. LaRUE: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Eric Jaso.

MR. JASO: No.

MR. PARISI: Speaker Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Susan Sheppard.

MS. SHEPPARD: No.

MR. PARISI: Phil Thigpen.

MR. THIGPEN: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Dean Farmer.

MR. J. FARMER: No.

MR. PARISI: Motion fails.

MR. J. FARMER: Do I hear a motion on the map?

MR. DUHAIME: I forward this map to be adopted by this
Commission.

MS. SHEPPARD: And I proudly second it.

MR. J. FARMER: Mr. Secretary, want to call the roll?

MR. PARISI: Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

On the motion to adopt the map which has been presented to
the Commission today -- Michael Baker.

MR. BAKER: No, for the reasons stated earlier.

MR. PARISI: It's a "no" -- is that correct?

MR. BAKER: That's a "no."

MR. PARISI: Caroline Casagrande.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CASAGRANDE: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Nilsa Cruz-Perez.

MS. CRUZ-PEREZ: No.

MR. PARISI: Michael Duhaime.

MR. DUHAIME: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Sherine El-Abd.

MS. EL-ABD: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Edward Farmer.

MR. E. FARMER: No.

MR. PARISI: Aubrey Fenton.

MR. FENTON: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Jeannine Frisby LaRue.

MS. LaRUE: No.

MR. PARISI: Eric Jaso.

MR. JASO: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Joseph Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: No.

MR. PARISI: Susan Sheppard.

MS. SHEPPARD: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Phil Thigpen.

MR. THIGPEN: No.

MR. PARISI: Chairman John Farmer.

MR. J. FARMER: Yes.

MR. PARISI: Motion carries.

MR. J. FARMER: We have no other further business; I declare this meeting adjourned and this Redistricting Commission dissolved.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)