

CHAIRMEN: Senator Williams

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SENATORS: Fasano, Looney, McKinney

REPRESENTATIVES: Cafero, Donovan, Nafis, O'Neill

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

Can I have your attention, please. We'd like to call the meeting to order. Thank you.

It is my privilege to call this public hearing of the State of Connecticut's Reapportionment Committee to order.

My name is State Representative Larry Cafero, and I am also the House Republican Leader. My district is located, the 142nd District solely within the town of Norwalk. And as a lifelong Norwalker, it is also my distinct honor to welcome my fellow committee members to our great city.

I have the honor of serving as cochairman of the bipartisan committee along with my colleague State Senator Don Williams of the town of Brooklyn. Senator Williams is on his way. He had a little traffic delay and should be here momentarily.

And at this time, I would like to ask the committee members to introduce themselves and the areas of the state they represent. And I will start to my left and your right with Representative Arthur O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL: Yes. My name is Arthur O'Neill. I'm a State Representative living in the town of Southbury and I also represent the towns of Roxbury, Bridgewater and Washington.

REP. NAFIS: Hi. I'm State Representative Sandy Nafis and I represent the town of Newington.

REP. DONOVAN: Hi. I'm State Representative Chris Donovan. I'm the Speaker of the House and I represent the town of Meriden.

SENATOR LOONEY: Hi. I'm State Senator Martin Looney from New Haven, represent New Haven and Hamden, the 11th Senate district and I'm the Majority Leader of the State Senate.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: Hi. Good evening, everyone. John McKinney, State Senator. I represent Fairfield, Easton, Weston and Newtown.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you. One of our members, State Senator Len Fasano was unable to be with us tonight, but please rest assured that all the comments that were given in writing are submitted to all committee members. And of course these proceedings, as I'll indicate later, are televised by CT-N, the Connecticut Network.

Again, welcome to all of our colleagues and fellow citizens who've turned out to participate in or to simply witness this important process. Our state and federal constitutions require that we review, reapportion and adjust our state assembly every ten years immediately following the federal census. We also do our State Assembly, our state senate and our congressional districts in order to ensure that all people are equally represented, both in Hartford and in Washington.

While we, the committee, are charged with the task of developing plans that are acceptable on a bipartisan basis, we're well aware that we do not have all the answers. That is why we hold these public hearings throughout the state. This happens to be our third public hearing. Our first one was held in the city of Waterbury. Our second one in the city of Norwich. Tonight, of course, we're here in Norwalk. Tomorrow evening will be in New Haven and Wednesday I believe we have two hearings at 2 and 7 in Hartford, Connecticut.

We want to have as much input as possible from our constituents so thank you again for taking the time to participate on this rather warm summer night.

I'll mention that while we do not have a set time limit for your comments we ask you to be respectful of your fellow citizens and help keep your remarks so that all may be able to give full and fair testimony. There also may be questions from the committee following some of your remarks, so don't be surprised if we ask you to remain at the podium and answer some of our questions.

If you've not yet signed up to speak please see our clerk, Deb Blanchard to do so right here in the front row here. Also I know they're some of you that might have come without the intention of speaking, but are moved to do so during the proceedings. Again, please feel free to get up at any time and give your name to Deb, and she'll be glad to add you to the list.

Before we begin, the committee would also like to extend our thanks to CT-N, as I mentioned before, for broadcasting these hearings so

that our friends at home could participate in the process. Additionally, we want to make sure that we are conducting this process as transparently as possible, and to that end, we've established a public redistricting terminal in the legislative library at the Legislative Office Building in Hartford. That terminal has the same software and public data that each of our caucuses have and appointments can be made by calling the library directly. It would allow you to literally go there and work on or create your own redistricting map to submit to this committee.

Further, the committee has established a comprehensive website that we encourage all interested citizens to view. A link to that site is available from the Connecticut General Assembly homepage. You'll see a reapportionment link. You can click on. And it has some very useful data that would help you understand the process, and more importantly participate in it by submitting to us your comments.

We also have some handouts that are available tonight that address many frequently asked questions, so please avail yourself of the information that is out there. We have actually two. One is frequently asked questions, as I indicated, and the other is a handout that is a table that shows the population changes in Connecticut based on the last census and its towns as determined by the census, both in 2000 and in 2010. It expresses the changes in both numeric and percentage format.

And before we begin, I'd like to officially welcome my cochair, State Senator Don Williams. Don, would you like to say hello to

everyone?

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Larry. Yes.

Good evening. Thank you very much for being here. Your presence is very important. This process is very important.

As Chairman Cafero mentioned, we're in the fact-finding stage right now. We're on our listening tour, if you will. We want to get as much input from the public as possible and that's what this is all about here tonight. So thank you for being here.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you so much.

And again, if there's anybody who cares to sign up who has not yet, please see Deb Blanchard, our clerk here in the front and she'll be glad to sign you up and add your name to the list.

Again, if there's some questions you have about the handouts, don't hesitate to ask.

And with that, we will begin. Our first speaker on the sign up list is Rick Cruz from Bridgeport, Connecticut.

RICHARD A. CRUZ: Good evening, honorable members of the Reapportionment Committee. My name is Rick Cruz. I am a commissioner with the Latino Puerto Rican Affairs Commission for the State of Connecticut. A portion of my testimony tonight was given to this committee back in Waterbury. I just wanted to make it for the record here at this meeting today.

I am here today to give you our feedback and recommendations with respect to the task of redrawing both the congressional and state

district lines in the State of Connecticut as mandated by the federal and state laws.

Connecticut, as you already know, has 3.5 million people according to Federal Census Bureau's latest information released earlier this year. 480 -- close to 480,000 are of Hispanic or Latino descent, or roughly 13.4 percent of the overall population, which signifies an incredible growth of 49.6 percent since the last data was released ten years earlier. The Latino population of our state is growing 12 times faster than the general population. For comparative purposes, the Anglo-Saxon population of the state of Connecticut actually decreased by .3 percent during the same period. And the African-American population increased 16.9 percent.

The Latino population is also the fastest racial and ethnic share of eligible voters. There are 318,000 Latinos 18 years of age or older, which is a 55.8 percent increase since 2000. Equally important is the fact that Latino-eligible voters in Connecticut are more likely to be native-born citizens than Latino-eligible voters nationwide.

According to a fact sheet released by the Pew Hispanic Center, Latino eligible voters are less likely than white-eligible voters in Connecticut to own a home and have lower levels of education attainment than do black and white eligible voters. This is alarming to LPRAC because it is also widely known in political circles that our state for many years, that Latino students have the largest economic and racial/ethnic academic achievement gap in the country and nothing significant has been done by Connecticut lawmakers to create the systemic changes in

the state statutes required to alleviate such problems.

Meanwhile, the general unemployment rate in Connecticut is hovering at 9 percent, but the unemployment rate averaged 17.07 percent among Latinos in Connecticut. As a matter of fact, a recently released report entitled, the Hispanic labor force and recovery, prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor, found that Connecticut has the third-highest unemployment rate in the nation for Latinos and it has found that Latinos make only 70 cents for every dollar earned by whites. This data listed here with -- alongside with the fact that the share of Connecticut's workforce consisting of whites, particularly those under the age of 45 is declining rapidly while the share makeup of other racial/ethnic groups is projected to reach 29 percent by 2020.

This is the main reason why LPRAC alerted Connecticut lawmakers in 2009 to be aware of the social and economic costs resulting from these demographic shifts and disparities in education. LPRAC is convinced that Connecticut's economic future rests on its ability to raise the level of education of all its residents, particularly it's Latino and African-American population. The redistricting process for LPRAC therefore is of paramount importance because of the way these district lines are redrawn by the Reapportionment Committee can make it much easier for more difficult -- to elect representatives to the Connecticut General Assembly that are responsive to these previous mentioned community needs.

The Latino Puerto Rican Affairs Commission and the Institute of Puerto Rican Latino Studies at the University of Connecticut held a

reapportionment summit on May 25th of this year at the Legislative Office Building to help our agency develop recommendations to share with this committee, the Reapportionment Committee, and to learn more specifically about the redistricting process via presentations and discussions from Latino recognized experts on the field.

A summary of the findings of this event were prepared for LPRAC by Dr. Charles Venator-Santiago from PRLS and we are submitting a copy of the summary for the proceedings with this testimony of this record.

However, the preliminary scan of the data suggests for this summit that one, reducing the number of districts, reapportionment in the State of Connecticut would harm Latinos by diluting their ability to influence the outcome of elections.

Two, there are higher proportions of Latino citizens potential voters residing in central Connecticut while there are higher proportions of noncitizen, nonvoting Latin American residents in the southern most towns and cities.

Three, the redistricting process could create two Senate seats. With a majority Latino population of 50 plus. The available data suggests that the 1st, Hartford, and the 23rd, Bridgeport districts, could be redistricted in order to create new Senate districts seats with a proportion of more than 50 percent of Latino residents.

At least four existing districts, namely the 75th of Waterbury, the 125th of Bridgeport, the 3rd in Hartford and the 147th in Stamford

could be redistricted to increase the proportions of Latino residents above 50 percent of the population of these districts.

For additional LPRAC recommendations, as submitted to the Reapportionment Committee; you have an attachment there.

In conclusion, the allotment for Latino districts in the end result of the redistricting process is pivotal to effectuate government efficiency and at the same time address the issues affecting the state's largest growing population. To create opportunities for positive contributing members of a community to attain leadership roles can only serve to alleviate the burden from the government when addressing issues affecting said communities.

It is because of this -- of the aforementioned, I strongly urge the Redistricting Committee to create Latino districts where appropriate.

Thank you very much.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much, sir.

Are there any questions by committee members?

Representative O'Neill.

REP. O'NEILL: In all of the data you gave us, you talked about the rise of the population that's Latino that's over the age of 18. But you also indicated that there's a differential between people living in Central Connecticut who are likely to be citizens and people who are in Western and Southern Connecticut that are likely to -- or less likely to be

citizens.

And as you were reading I was trying to follow along with the data and I remember we had a similar presentation before. Is there a breakout of the difference in terms of the population? I mean, other than just saying there's more citizen Latino population in the central part.

For example, has the growth rate in southwestern Connecticut in the Latino population -- been among noncitizens? Does the data indicate what that pattern has been?

RICHARD A. CRUZ: If I may, I'd like our executive director of our commission -- maybe address that question more appropriate for you, Werner Oyanadel.

REP. O'NEILL: Well, that's up to the chairman to decide if that's okay.

REP. CAFERO: Yes. That's fine. Go ahead.

RICHARD A. CRUZ: Thank you.

WERNER OYANADEL: Representative O'Neill, my name is Werner Oyanadel. I am the acting executive director for the Latino and Puerto Rican Affairs Commission.

The data that you are mentioning was discussed at our redistricting summit that we held, but most of the specific data that is going to be collected on the patterns, you know, we are awaiting that to be released by the U.S. Census Bureau. As soon as that data is released, I would be happy to submit our analysis of that to the Reapportionment Committee.

REP. O'NEILL: Okay. Because -- and the reason for the question -- and just because you're suggesting, for example, one of the districts in Stamford, to pick an example, could be redistricted, but if the population is as so to create a Latino majority population, but if it doesn't include citizens then they can't vote. And so the -- you could create a district that was predominantly Latino, but it wouldn't really make much of a difference if most of the voters were not Latino that were still living in the district. And so we don't have that data as of yet, it sounds like.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

Mr. Cruz, before you go, in your comments you indicated the census shows that increase in population in the Hispanic community and a decrease in the population. You used the word "Anglo-Saxon." Did you mean Caucasian?

RICHARD A. CRUZ: Yes, sir.

REP. CAFERO: Okay. Because I think I'm Caucasian, but no one has ever called me Anglo-Saxon.

RICHARD A. CRUZ: I apologize. I apologize.

REP. CAFERO: Don't ask me why. It just never happened.

Thank you so much.

RICHARD A. CRUZ: Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Our next speaker is -- actually there's a tandem here, I guess. Ed, forgive me. If -- it's handwritten so I'm having -- Ed Krumick, Krummick?

EDWARD KRUMEICH: Close enough. Krumeich.

REP. CAFERO: Okay. And Joe Kantorski.

JOSEPH KANTORSKI: Very good.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

Gentleman.

EDWARD KRUMEICH: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Ed Krumeich. This is Joe Kantorski, and we are from Greenwich.

We had previously submitted to you several submissions relating to the redistricting of the House districts in Greenwich. That's the 149th, the 150th and the 151st. You should have a copy of the original submission, which is June 24th. And that provided alternatives for redistricting Greenwich and it provided a lot of background data about the town. Because of course, we don't expect that you have detailed knowledge about our town, particularly since there's so much misunderstanding about our town.

But let me describe it to you as backed up by the data which we submitted to you. We have a shore area that's very affluent, zoned one or two acres. We have a central area which is the top one-third, which is very densely populated commercial multifamily housing, what we would consider relatively densely populated. And then two thirds, the top two-thirds of our town are zoned for four acres and two acres, so as you can imagine it's a very affluent section.

Now, we're here today -- this by the way is founder's day in Greenwich, so it's very

opportune. It's our 371st birthday as a town and we're here today to undo some damage that had been done in the past after the 1980, 1990 censuses.

Frankly, Greenwich was pretty badly gerrymandered. Our neighborhoods were split up. The villages, which comprise our town, were cut in two, in some places in three pieces. That's the past. What we've submitted to you -- and this is asking you to take a look at the July 14th. We gave you another booklet on July 14, 2001. This is the booklet that we actually were able to prepare and the plan we're proposing to you, that was done on the public terminal in the assembly library. And I thank you for providing that.

And what we were able to do is take the previous submissions to you and put together a plan that redistricts Greenwich on three zones: a shore zone, a central zone and a northern zone or a backcountry zone. And we're able on the shore zone, the 150th, and the middle zone, the 151st, to exactly meet your standards. One is .0 percent deviation. One is .1 percent deviation. And I would point out to you that both those districts are entirely in Greenwich which meets your criterion when possible to have a district entirely in Greenwich. It was impossible, of course, to have the 149th entirely in Greenwich, but the 149th today is not entirely in Greenwich. But we've come to you with this plan.

Now, this plan is based on -- and you'll -- I've submitted to you -- and Joe has -- Joe has put this thing together. I'm just responsible for the writing part. But we've submitted to you data that will show you why -- the sense of these three districts.

And they're based on two sources.

One is, we have a 230 member RTM, Representative Town Meeting in Greenwich and our RTM is split up into 12 districts. We have followed the district lines in most every case, which means we have used a recognized boundary for a specific area that has some meaning to our town. We have also followed the zoning maps. In other words, we have put similarly situated neighborhoods in terms of zoning in the same proposed district. And if you want to see how closely we've come to that, I would call your attention to this Exhibit T, and the supplement that we just delivered our Bastille Day supplement, July 14th. And this is a GIS map that's produced by the Town of Greenwich to show the actual parcels that have been built out in accordance with zoning.

And you'll see where the densely populated zone is. And we've been able to construct, as I say, two proposed districts that exactly meet your requirements using that bottom one-third, which is the densely-zoned portion of Greenwich. And that makes 149 what it is today, which is essentially a backcountry district. And we've done that by taking two densely populated neighborhoods, Glenville and Pemberwick, which you'll see if you take a look at this map --

JOSEPH KANTORSKI: It's the last page in the supplement.

EDWARD KRUMEICH: Last page, Exhibit T. We've taken those and we combined those with the other neighborhoods in the central district that stretch from border to border that are similar neighborhoods.

Now, you don't have to take my word for that. I've also provided you today with a copy of the Greenwich Time editorial. And the Greenwich Time has recommended this proposal, saying that our current districts don't make any sense. And that what we're proposing makes sense because it puts together the neighborhoods of Greenwich and it makes sense. It's meaningful.

We've also been able, by combining the densely populated areas of town, to create two districts that have a substantial minority population. The central district has 11 percent minority population. The shore district has 16.1 percent. And that again also reflects the fact that in our densely populated neighborhoods in Greenwich we have eight housing developments, which in the previous plan, for whatever reason, had been divided and combined with more affluent neighborhoods in which they had very little in common. We've been able to create -- or propose to you two districts: one, 16.1 percent minority; one, 11 percent minority. And this again is in the July 14th presentation which was developed on the -- using the public computer.

Now -- and I thank you for providing the public computer, but of course computers are only as good -- and computer programs are only as good as their operators. And I'm here to tell you today I've provided you with yet another plan and this is to correct a mapping error.

When I was up in -- sitting there with some assistance working on your public computer, and when I was putting together the zoning maps that we've submitted to you I did make an error, which I hope your staff can correct,

but you should all have a document that says, correction to map error. And let me just explain to you what this is.

In order to meet the projections and the census projections that you've asked us to meet, we moved one neighborhood. We did this always by neighborhoods. We moved one neighborhood, a neighborhood called Milbrook, which is a private gated community. And we moved it from the 150th to the 151st and that made everything fit in terms of census projections.

Unfortunately when we were clicking the map I made a mistake and I took a section of Milbrook that I should have added to 150. And I took a section of central Greenwich that I should have -- sorry -- that I should have added 151 and a portion of central Greenwich that I should have added the 150. And I got them mixed up and in the wrong districts. And this happens to be very important because this is one of the more dramatic differences in neighborhoods in our town.

As I said, Milbrook is a private gated community. This area that should have been in 150 is the site of two of our housing developments. And so again, it's an example of a densely populated minority area that should go with the rest of central Greenwich and the Milbrook neighborhood should go intact to the central district.

Now the only -- as I said, the newspaper, the Greenwich Time has recommended this plan as making sense for the neighbor -- on a neighborhood basis. The only criticism, frankly, that I have heard of this plan is that I'm a former Democratic candidate for the House and I'm proposing it. Well, I've got to

tell you, it is true. I'm a former Democratic candidate. Fred Camillo, who's in the audience handily defeated me in the last election, and I'm here to tell you I'm not a candidate. I'm not submitting this as a candidate. I don't intend this to be a candidate.

I intend this to right a wrong and to end the gerrymandering of Greenwich. And frankly, founder's day 371 years after our founding is a good day to begin the process of ending the gerrymandering of Greenwich.

Thank you very much.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

But before you go, I have a question and I don't know if the other committee members do. And I think it's important and we certainly know this from our history, being in the General Assembly and having lived through maybe a couple -- depending on how long we've been here -- of these redistricting.

There's so many towns that unfortunately -- and it's always our goal in state representative redistricting efforts to, as best you can, keep a town, keep a district, if you will, solely within one town. And there are many many towns, some small or whatever, that are actually in two, sometimes three different districts that include other towns, neighboring towns.

Greenwich currently has three state representative districts, two that are entirely within Greenwich, one that is mostly within Greenwich. And that is the same plan that you're submitting now.

So as far as that fact being changed, that would not be changed by what you submitted. My question is, I guess, what I'm hearing from you is, yes, though, you're not -- you are proposing, I guess, that Districts 150 and 151 remain wholly within Greenwich and District 149 remain mostly within Greenwich. But the lines that divide and separate those two be altered to include some more natural associations of neighborhoods, et cetera. Is that accurate?

EDWARD KRUMEICH: Well, that's correct. That's correct, Representative Cafero.

There's -- I was pleased that we were able to fit two of our districts in Greenwich and these are the two that are right in Greenwich now. I did not want to, as a Greenwich resident, get involved with trying to redistrict Stamford.

Now 149, according to the statistics that I have, 149, 41 percent of that in order to meet your guidelines will have to be outside of Greenwich. I don't know what the percentage is now, but I didn't -- it didn't seem to be my place to recommend to you how to deal with a Stamford redistricting.

But what we did was we tried to help you out. We're in the corner of the state. Obviously, our districts are surrounded. Our town is surrounded on three sides by New York State so there's only one place to go and that's go east, to Stamford, maybe to New Canaan, but that's really not a call that we wanted to recommend to you. We thought you'd have to do that anyway. That's really part of one of your redistricting challenges for the state. But we wanted to present you with two districts that made sense, that were compact,

similarly situated voters. And frankly, both of which have a very healthy percentage of minority population, which I think is also a good thing.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Any other questions?

Yes. Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you for all your time that you've put into this. I appreciate the fact that you're using the terminal, which is good to know that it's working.

As I look at the map that you have, is it fair to say that you're basically shoreline central and northern part of Greenwich, you sort of split it?

EDWARD KRUMEICH: That's correct.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: And so I guess the question would be -- that makes a lot of sense. Isn't it equally logical to look at eastern, central and western and divide the town up that way?

EDWARD KRUMEICH: Divide it into three ways and then you'd have to -- well, then you'd really have an interesting situation. I frankly don't think you can do that and come up with a fair mixture.

I think that there you'd get into -- first off, I think if you're balancing, you wouldn't get the minority representation that you're looking for, I doubt, because of the way that the concentrations are.

I have not looked into redistricting Greenwich along those lines. I think that then you would have to think about the border district of Greenwich; actually would include a number of Stamford neighborhoods in order to meet your targets.

You know, for example, if you're going to do something like that there's a shore area right next to Old Greenwich that, you know, is part of the Old Greenwich community, but I will tell you that it's also very heavily Democratic. If I was looking for a Democratic district I would have asked you to do that.

But I tried to do a fair district along the lines of the way a person, any person from Greenwich would think. And frankly, the way we would think is that the town breaks down naturally among a shore district, a central district and then the backcountry district.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: Right. And I'm not disputing that. And I don't care whether you're trying to create Republican or Democrat districts, but --

EDWARD KRUMEICH: I wasn't.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: You can look at different -- I mean, towns have different communities and I'm pretty familiar with Greenwich. And my memory, and I haven't known someone in the middle school in some time, but my memory is that the middle schools are eastern, central and western middle school in Greenwich.

EDWARD KRUMEICH: That's correct. That's correct.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: So one of the ways the Town identifies itself for purposes of its middle school population is to go east, central and

west.

So I understand that you may want Cos Cob and Riverside together because they might be similar communities, but maybe the Town looks at in terms of different communities.

I know in my town of Fairfield we look at communities differently as well. You have your little community where you live, but you also have your greater school community that you might have in terms of your middle schools and high schools.

EDWARD KRUMEICH: Senator McKinney, that's correct, that our middle schools are split up that way. I can't even begin to tell you how complicated school redistricting is. If you think redistricting the State of Connecticut is difficult, try redistricting a Greenwich school.

There are many different factors that go into that, not the least of which is capacity in the buildings. And I can speak from some knowledge about this since I was a board of finance, the BET in Greenwich for 14 years, just came off it. And I don't believe that the way the schools are set up during the middle schools would be a reliable way of doing this.

Now what is a reliable way of doing this is to follow the RTM districts and that's why I use the RTM districts rather than the school districts, because the RTM districts are trying to achieve the exact same thing you're trying to achieve. In other words, get people represented that are in a compact district, that are in a similar sort of neighborhood and that's why we use the RTM districts.

And I'll say one other thing, that I met with both the Republican and the Democratic registrar of voters in Greenwich and frankly, I got very positive feedback on this plan for one reason: My plan reduces the split districts that resulted from gerrymandering which drives them crazy.

You know, we have now because of the way we've been gerrymandered, you have -- you can go into a polling place and there could be two or three legislative districts in the same polling place, which as you can imagine, is very confusing. This plan, by following the RTM districts, by following the zoning map and the build-out in accordance with zoning, I think is a coherent way to approach this.

REP. CAFERO: Any questions by other members of the committee?

Thank you, gentlemen. Appreciate it.

Our next speaker is Pat -- no. Excuse me. Elsa Peterson -- forgive me-- Obuckowski?

ELSA PETERSON OBUCHOWSKI: Obuchowski.

REP. CAFERO: -- Obuchowski of Norwalk.

ELSA PETERSON OBUCHOWSKI: Good evening. Thank you for this opportunity.

I would just like to say that, as a citizen without a lot of experience in this, when I read what it says about what other factors. And it says, the courts have not clearly identified the principles, but they may include respecting communities of interest, drawing contiguous and reasonably compact districts -- which we've just been talking about -- protecting incumbents and maintaining

partisan fairness.

It's a little bit unclear really what your mandate is. It kind of sounds like respecting communities of interest could mean almost anything that somebody wants it to mean. It could mean, well, we want the wealthy people along the shore and the wealthy people in the back country to have their own districts so that they don't have to mingle with the middle-income people in the I-95 corridor and the Route 1 corridor, or it could mean something entirely different.

So I'm just wondering how we can make this more transparent and really have fairness. Where it says, drawing contiguous and reasonably compact districts, it seems like that should be the overriding goal and not have all these weird shaped districts, but have things with a limited number of sides. And not go by, well, this community naturally hangs together because they're all minority or they're all wealthy or whatever. That's my comment.

Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Any comments by members of the committee?
Thank you. Seeing none, we'll go to our next speaker who is Pat Donovan of the League of Women Voters of Connecticut.

Pat.

CHERYL DUNSON: With your permission, my colleague Pat Donovan, who lives in Litchfield, must have encountered some difficulty in arriving.

So my name is Cheryl Dunson and I'm president

of the League of Women Voters of Connecticut, so I hope it would be okay if I presented the comments for our organization.

REP. CAFERO: There is no objection by the committee. Please go ahead.

CHERYL DUNSON: Thank you.

The League of Women Voters is, as I hope everyone knows, is a statewide organization. We're a nonpartisan political organization of 2,000 members across the state. And we want to commend the Reapportionment Committee for its significant public outreach in the spirit of cooperation that it has demonstrated.

We urge that you continue that in making sure that all the meetings that you have, not only in terms of the public input, but the subsequent meetings continue to be well subsidized, publicized. That you continue to post the testimony and any transcripts on that excellent portal that you have on the CGA homepage. And that the committee will post any proposed redistricting maps.

We recognize that redistricting is not a straightforward process. There's more involved in a shift or in the size of the population. Obviously you are being governed by the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. And sometimes these can conflict with partisan objectives. So we feel it's very important that we ensure one person, one vote in whatever districts that are proposed.

We are not going to be commenting on any particular plan. We're not going to be proposing a plan. Essentially what we would like to do is reinforce the process which

seems to be underway and we hope will continue, a process that's representative, accountable, transparent and responsive.

We believe that the districts, as has been mentioned before, should have equal population, represent minority representation, be contiguous and compact and represent and follow political and geographic boundaries. But there are still a lot of different ways to skin that cat, so we just wanted to reinforce that.

We do, to one specific end, want to bring up a point which I believe was raised in a previous hearing. And that has to do with our support for a measure to count the incarcerated population within their hometowns and not within the facility in which they are incarcerated. As you know, anyone who is incarcerated at the moment who might be awaiting trial, if it just happens to be around the time of election day, they are able to apply for an absentee ballot and that ballot is applied for in their hometown. It's not provided by the prison facility. So we do urge you please make that change in the upcoming reapportionment.

So once again just to sum up, we applaud your commitment to public outreach and transparency. We would like to see it continue. We look forward to your maps and proposals and we hope that among them we'll see -- we'll be looking for them in terms of equal population, minority representation, contiguous and compact and respecting political and geographic boundaries.

Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

I have a question, if I may, or I guess to seek your opinion. You indicated that it is the position of the League of Women Voters of Connecticut to count incarcerated individuals in the town from which they reside. And that's always a curious question.

I know being an attorney in my other life and having, in my early days, done some criminal work, we often find ourselves with a prison population that, if we were able to determine where they lived prior to being incarcerated, in some cases, many cases actually, they lived in that town a very short period of time. Maybe they were transient and lived in frankly, a motel within a town before they were arrested for committing their crimes and, say, sentenced to 15 or 20 years. Do you still believe in cases such as that?

That for instance, hypothetically if a person, you know, was in New York and then drove into Connecticut, staked out his -- planned his next heist, if you will, and stayed in a motel at the Westporter Inn and then got caught, arrested and incarcerated, sentenced to 20 years in jail. Should he be considered a citizen in the town of Norwalk according to what you think?

CHERYL DUNSON: I think it's certainly a thorny issue that you're raising. There's no doubt about that. I think probably one of the things we have to think about is just the overall policy that, yes, there could always be individual exceptions. I mean, there could be that example that you're thinking of.

But the broader -- when you're talking about a 20,000-plus prison population, which is about the size of a district in Connecticut, we

would still urge you to think about how we could accommodate the change that we're recommending.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

Any other questions or comments?

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: Just a follow-up. If we were to -- and I think there are many examples of -- I can think of one. It's not a hypothetical -- where someone is convicted of a crime, they go to jail. Wife and family have to sell the house and move in with their parents in a different town. So people actually -- if they're in jail for 7 to 10 to 15 years don't maintain that residence.

But if we use the logic that someone in my hometown of Fairfield goes to a correctional facility in Enfield, they should be counted in Fairfield -- if someone from my hometown of Fairfield goes to Storrs, Connecticut for four years to attend college, why shouldn't they be counted in Fairfield as well?

CHERYL DUNSON: Good point.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Any other questions from members?

Okay. Seeing none, our next speaker is David Stevenson of the town of Danbury. Democracy for America is the organization being represented. David Stephenson. Is David here?

If not, we will move on to, I believe it's Kate Toper, Norwalk.

KATE TEPPER: Kate Tepper.

REP. CAFERO: Tepper.

KATE TEPPER: Actually my question was (inaudible) asked. So (inaudible) to the next person.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. It's very kind of you.

Our next speaker on the list is Matthew Waggner, I believe, of Fairfield. Did I say that right? Good. Matthew.

MATTHEW WAGGNER: Hello, Senator Williams, Representative Cafero, Senator McKinney. Thank you for being here today. I'm the -- one of the registrars of voters in Fairfield. And while I have my personal preferences about how you might reconfigure districts within the state, I actually came to speak to you today to suggest a criteria which may or may not be a part of your deliberations that might have the possibility of improving the voting experience for voters in the number of our larger towns and cities.

Here in the 4th District, we have a number of towns whose flexibility in conducting their municipal redistricting is more constrained than maybe your experience in your towns. Norwalk -- Representative Cafero is aware -- has a number of -- the local district lines are set into the charter and they actually don't redistrict following the state redistricting process. Their local districts are set in stone due to the taxing districts that they have and they require different ballots in different polling places.

Greenwich, like Norwalk, also has fixed

municipal districts and you heard a little bit about that before. They reapportioned the number of members from each district to their RTM rather than redrawing their lines.

And Bridgeport, the third town in the 4th District has a process where their ten municipal districts are reapportioned prior to this State's process. This process was finished in Bridgeport shortly after the 2010 census data was released. Now, Bridgeport has been the subject of a certain amount of bad press for long lines and confusion at their polling places, but it may not be obvious to you that a great share of these problems result from the fact that roughly a quarter of the voters in the city are required, due to mismatched district lines, to vote in a different polling place from year to year. So in one year you'll vote at this school in your neighborhood. The next year you'll vote somewhere across town. Norwalk has 3 of 8 voters, nearly 40 percent of the city changing their polling places every year.

Compounded with the challenges associated with voters that change addresses more frequently due to renting, these shifting polling places force even those voters who are engaged to travel from location to location on election day, often waiting in several lengthy lines before being allowed to vote.

Greenwich has developed a solution to this problem, but unfortunately, it comes with a high cost. Their 12 polling places ballooned to 21 in state election years, which nearly doubles their cost of machine programming, staffing, equipment maintenance. They have, for their 12 polling places, I think it's nearly 60 machines that they're required to have. Many towns, like my town of Fairfield

among them, face massively increased costs in the 2012 election when municipal and state district lines become misaligned.

With that in mind, I'd like to ask you to consider as you prepare your redistricting plans options which incorporate existing municipal district boundaries for those towns that lack the flexibility to adjust their own lines in the service of their voters. I understand that these options may not ultimately be feasible within the numerical constraints that you face, but registrars try to take care to provide as consistent an experience from district to district and from year to year to best serve our voters and to prevent foreseeable expenditures in order to serve our town budgets. By (inaudible) to existing municipal lines, especially in towns like Bridgeport, Greenwich and Norwalk, here in the 4th, you do a great deal to improve the functioning of the elections in our communities.

Also I'd like to second the proposal from the League of Women Voters concerning the counting of prison residents. In fact, you may not be aware of this, the registrar of voters office has received on the conviction of felons a list of the name, the special crime that was committed and the declared residence address of whoever was incarcerated. Sometimes these people are voters. Sometimes they're not, but we are aware and are able to track sort of the last known residence of people. So it's within our powers to do and manage from an election perspective.

And just to a comment before about schools, we actually do allow students who go to college to continue to vote in their home communities. So that's something we already do.

Thanks.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: Thanks.

I didn't ask any questions in Waterbury so I'm getting them all out tonight. First, Matt, thank you for coming. And I think you mentioned that you are one of our registrars of voters and thank you for the really great job that you do.

MATTHEW WAGGNER: Thank you.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: The question I asked about -- to the woman from the League of Women Voters -- and I apologize for sort of surprising her with the question. But just -- and I obviously understand, if you're a student at a college you can choose to vote from your hometown or from where you go to college.

But if you have 10,000-plus people from different towns in Connecticut that all go to Mansfield, Connecticut or Storrs, Connecticut where UConn is and they are counted there, that gives that town extra weight just as someone were to argue that someone in a prison in Enfield gives that town extra weight, yet that person is only there for four years. And it very rarely is their hometown beyond those four years.

So I just -- I think there's a logical argument for the prisoners, but that logical argument shouldn't stop at the prisoner. It should also work with the college student.

And the reason -- the last point -- and I would love to hear your comments about it, because I think it's a good debate -- there's an argument that while the college student has services and other needs provided for by the town where they go to school -- and obviously, you're familiar with the sort of town gown fights we have in Fairfield with Fairfield University students and the like -- yet, as someone who represents a town that has a prison within it, the Garner Correctional facility in Newtown, I can certainly tell you that the Town of Newtown has a lot of effort that goes into that prison facility there as well.

So when I think that all those people at the prison at Garner would be taken out of the Newtown population because they don't, you know, burden the town, that's the argument that's given. I tend to have firsthand knowledge as to how that's not an accurate factual argument. So that's just a curiosity. Go ahead.

MATTHEW WAGGNER: You know, I guess, if I may, you have -- Fairfield sort of has examples that you're familiar with. Fairfield University students, are they to be counted on North Benson Road or on the beach? You know, and that's -- where they're counted is not something that we necessarily know whether they're in the correct place when they're counted.

Sacred Heart University, which is on the border of Fairfield and Bridgeport, are the correct students being counted on the campus or on the condominiums across the street? You know, there are a number of problems where when you try to figure out, okay. Statistically lets figure out where everyone

is, and I think really this debate is -- it's not one that I or the League of Women Voters or whoever may have cared to have raise it is having with you. It's sort of a federal question of where the census --

If the Census Bureau assigned all of these people to their original locations, you would largely never know the population for reapportionment. So it's sort of a debate that it's in your power to adjust it, but it's really a national question that's being raised.

The other thing is that for anyone who's familiar with (inaudible) and how they function, this question of your bona fide residence is really flexible. It's anyone who's tried to pursue a voter who may not -- supposed to be on their rolls will find that actually your bona fide residence legally is -- can be considered where you intend to return, where you have continuing family connections.

And that actually your residence is not considered to be discontinued until you have taken steps to sever it. You know, abandonment becomes a standard rather than physical presence. So that's, you know, that's well trodden case law that I'm not really that well versed in, but it's something you may want to consider, I guess.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Any other questions from the committee?

Thank you, sir.

MATTHEW WAGGNER: Thanks for your time.

REP. CAFERO: Our next speaker is Garland Walton of the town of Fairfield.

Excuse me, Ms. Walton.

Before you begin, if anyone has arrived late or has changed their mind about speaking, again please feel free to see our clerk here in the front row, here against the table and we will be glad to add your name to the speakers list.

GARLAND WALTON: Good evening. My name is Garland Walton. I have been a Connecticut resident since 1995. Prior to that, I worked for the Illinois State Senate for five years.

In the early 1990s, I was the lead staffer for the Senate Democratic Caucus for the Illinois Legislature's state and congressional redistricting process. Our state's process was similar to, at that time, around 99 percent of our country's other states. So I have seen and sadly participated in the behind-the-scenes work which occurs during the redistricting process that many states have experienced, though I am very unfamiliar with what our state, my adopted state, is going through now.

I am not thrilled to say it, but all of the work done focused on helping elected officials, not citizens. I not once had a conversation about drawing lines which would ensure better representation for the people of, say, the 23rd District instead of the senator representing that district. Instead I helped exclude from a district a challenger who might be a threat to a sitting senator. I included or excluded public housing, parks, factories or other things legislators wanted or didn't want in their districts. I excluded

blocks or census tracts which had a higher than acceptable percentage of Republican voters. No attention was given to matters of compactness, competitiveness, representational fairness and united communities of interest. As you might guess, there was absolutely no transparency.

In most states, redistricting is an expensive and undemocratic process. As we were going through that process in Illinois, we learned that Iowa's district lines were computer drawn, saving that state and thus taxpayers considerable time and money.

Having legislators and legislative staffers focused on this process means they're not focused on fixing the significant issues facing our state.

Again, I don't know how we're approaching the process, but it would not surprise me to hear that we have many staffers who are dedicated solely to this task, pulling them out of critical policy positions. It also means that taxpayers are paying for a process that is largely political.

Am I your most popular speaker yet? Right? Okay.

So it's my belief that this is really an unacceptable use of taxpayer funds, and I say this as someone who I am embarrassed to say, the first time I've said it publicly, I spent most of my early-twenties getting paid by Illinois taxpayers to do campaign work on the state payroll most days of the year.

You don't want to hear this. I understand that. I get it. And even if I could find a small government champion for this idea it

likely wouldn't go anywhere because legislators have to vote on the map regardless of who or what draws the lines, but we're all, each of us taxpayers.

And I know there's a more fair way to draw lines and spend taxpayer dollars so I hope that you'll consider this idea and I hope that I have described a process that happened in Illinois that's nothing like that what happens in Connecticut.

Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

If I may, and then I'll open it up to the committee, I don't doubt that you experienced what you experienced, and I'm certainly not naive enough to think that that doesn't happen here, but I've got to tell you something. We're pretty proud of our process in that unlike some states we have a completely equal bipartisan committee, four Democrats, four Republicans, two from the House, two from the Senate. It's sort of a checks and balances if you will.

Nobody could leave the state and not participate or no one has the power to draw lines over another because they're in the majority party or whatever. Is it perfect? Probably not. Is there a lot of the political thought processes going on, as you mentioned, sure there is. But for the most part we try our best and the system is designed to avoid and keep that kind of stuff to a minimum and to keep public input at a maximum and to be as transparent as possible. But I thank you for your comments and I would --

Senator Williams.

GARLAND WALTON: Actually, we did have the bipartisan thing, too. But each caucus was kind of working on its own and the bipartisanship kind of happened at the end anyway. I just, you know, I know you don't want to hear it, but I think that publicly we should, you know, that -- and I hope it's not happening. We didn't have any of the transparency measures that you're talking about put in place and it's really nice to hear. It would have been nice to have a terminal where people could draw their lines.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Ms. Walton, thank you very much for coming and giving your testimony. And given all your experience, I'm sure you could be a sought-after consultant in other states that are going through this right now.

GARLAND WALTON: No thanks.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: But we in Connecticut, as Representative Cafero said, we do have our own process. I would like to think it's a different process. And for many cycles now it has been absolutely bipartisan. It's not, you know, where one party that has a majority can say, it's my way or the highway, and you know, redistrict along the lines that you are suggesting where it's all for partisan advantage and one party walks off with new districts all to its own advantage. We've all read about those stories.

So we're going to try and be as fair as we possibly can and that's really what all these public hearings are about. And the website, the public terminals at the capital, et cetera. So that folks can have input. That this can be as transparent as possible.

And it can be a process where you can come and talk about your experience in Illinois, which I'm sure is a great state, but it sounds like they approach redistricting a little differently.

But thank you very much for coming here tonight.

GARLAND WALTON: Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Alice Hutchinson from the town of Bethel.

Before Ms. Hutchinson gets the podium, is David Stevenson back in the room by any chance? I had called his name and he was not present. All right.

ALICE HUTCHINSON: First I'd like to thank you for holding these meetings because it's really -- it's over the years of redistricting I haven't had any group of people that I could bend an ear about something that I have pleaded for many years, and that is to put Bethel back together.

As you know from your own statistics, we're a town of about 18,500 people. We are in Fairfield County. We are in the 5th Congressional District.

We have two senators, the 24th and the 26th. The 24th is all Housatonic Valley Council of Elected Officials. The members are Sherman, New Fairfield, Danbury, and the northern part of Bethel. And in the 26th, it's Westport, Wilton, Redding, Ridgefield, part of New Canaan, part of Weston and part of Bethel. So we've been split that way for a very long time

and one of the things that I would advocate is to allow Bethel to migrate north to the 24th for many reasons.

As I mentioned, we are part of the Housatonic Valley Council of Elected Officials and many of the towns in the 24th are SWERPA and their attention has moved south. Most -- all of them, I believe, are in the 4th Congressional District. A lot of the emphasis and the demographic is different. That's just one suggestion.

The other split that we have is we are also -- we have two representatives. So we also have in a small town of 18,500 people the 002, which is Danbury, Redding and Bethel. And we have the 107th, which is all of Brookfield and half of Bethel. And so if you can't find your way to put us back within our northernmost neighbors, maybe you could put Bethel back together and give us half of Brookfield.

I mean, I don't really -- I'm not here to draw the lines. I haven't come with a petition. It's just there's been a generation out there where somebody from other towns has represented us.

We've had, I believe, two people from Bethel in the Legislature in the last 40 years maybe. And I just -- we have pleaded for years to anyone who would listen to allow at least one of the two sections, either the Legislature or the Senate to become one because we have five voting districts in our little town and it's all because of how these particular districts break out.

Our affinity is much closer to Danbury. Although we haven't been part of Danbury since 1855 we are much more closely affiliated with

its transportation routes. We're part of the 84 corridor. That's pretty much it.

I mean, I just -- I have pleaded this case for many, many years and I'm glad I finally have a group of people I can make the case at the same time in front of witnesses. Do any of you have any questions of me? It's a very simple request, is please put us back together.

REP. CAFERO: Committee members? Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: Maybe not a question -- Hi Alice -- as much as just a food for thought. And I say this sitting next to Senator Looney the Majority Leader, who represents New Haven which is our state's third or fourth largest -- second-largest city?

SENATOR LOONEY: Second.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: Second-largest city. There are two state senators from New Haven. I understand all towns want to be together. I represent the small town of Weston that has two state senators. There are only 36 state senators. When something is needed in Weston, having two people go to the Senate President or two people go to the Governor sometimes is a lot more than one.

So it's not -- I understand towns want to all be together, but I'm sure you could maybe ask Senator Looney, how does he feel that New Haven, the second-largest city has the same number of state senators as Weston, one of the smaller towns? And it can matter sometimes.

ALICE HUTCHINSON: You do raise an interesting point. So if you're not going to give us the Senate, give us the House. I mean, we'll take

one or the other, man. I don't care.

It really -- we'd like to have someone who can represent the whole of Bethel, one or the other. I think there aren't many municipalities our size that are split in both houses. Give us one or the other, is really an acceptable alternative. I just wanted to plead the case for the Senate being an easy one from our standpoint, not -- I mean, you do raise a great point about having two people, although I have not seen that happen. And in our particular case, having been a former -- I'm a former first selectman, I have not seen, at that time, both Senators go to ask to advocate for the same thing. Usually one takes it or the other depending on what part of town might be affected, et cetera, et cetera.

I just think you raise a legitimate point, but then we'll take the other one.

Any other questions?

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Any other questions?

ALICE HUTCHINSON: Thank you for your time.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

ALICE HUTCHINSON: I really appreciate it.

REP. CAFERO: Appreciate it.

Our next speaker is State Representative Terrie Wood from the town of Darien, also representing Norwalk.

REP. WOOD: Thank you very much for allowing all of

us to testify and to be here. And thank you to you all who had to drive the opposite direction from what we usually drive.

Very briefly, Darien, the state representative seat is one seat, all of Darien. And it includes a part of Norwalk called Rowayton. That has worked very well for a number of years for Darien. The Senate district however is split between -- we have two Senators representing Darien and that's -- I am here at the request of a number of constituents to speak on behalf of having one Senator represent Darien.

I'm not going to suggest lines. I'm not into that. You all are, but just please give some credence and some support to giving Darien one State Senator and one voice in that way representing that chamber.

Thank you very much.

Any questions?

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Any questions?

Thank you very much, Terrie.

REP. WOOD: All right. Thank you all again.

REP. CAFERO: Our next speaker is Deborah McFadden of the town of Wilton.

DEBORAH MCFADDEN: My name is Deborah McFadden. I'm an elected official in Wilton and I'm an elected party official in Wilton and I'm here as a citizen. I'm not representing any organization. I live in the 4th Congressional District. In Wilton I happen to live in the

State Rep 125th and I live in the Senate 26th.

I don't have prepared remarks. I didn't write anything in advance. I came to hear what everybody else had to say and then throw in my 2 cents. And I agree with a lot of the speakers who have spoken already. I loved what the woman from the League of Women Voters said. I loved Matt Waggner's comments from Fairfield. I really think that the towns when possible need to stick together. I know you're hearing that from a variety of different people. I know that's not always possible. Wilton has two different state rep districts. We're fortunate in that we're in at least one senate district.

If you look at the map of one of the districts, I don't happen to live in it, but in Wilton, there's the 143rd. And you'll notice it's one of the districts that has a tail. It has a little teeny tiny strip that runs right down there. How anybody gerrymandered that district, I have no idea, but it's not cohesive in any way. You've cut through many neighborhoods.

It would be really nice -- I realize that Wilton will probably have to have two districts, but if you're going to be doing things -- and I guess I'm speaking more on behalf of the people who live in Norwalk who live in that portion of that district. It's crazy what you did ten years ago with having that tail go down there like that, just cutting through neighborhoods like crazy.

So if they can be more compact, more cohesive, I think it's better for the residents who are represented by those, whoever is elected from that district because there's a sense of community, because it's very hard for whoever

holds that seat to have a sense of cohesion. The other thing -- let's see. Besides the fact that it would be fabulous if Wilton could be a little bit more together, but I know that you're going to split us in some way probably.

The other thing is the whole issue of the prisoners. I realize not all prisoners are eligible to vote. And so I don't know how that works out. I don't know anything about election law and what prisoners are able to, but I do believe that where possible, the prisoners ought to vote where they were originally from and not where they were incarcerated. I do think that that skews things a little bit.

I did hear you ask questions about what happens with universities. That gets really complicated because that's, I think, a different issue, but the prisons specifically, wherever possible, they not vote where they are incarcerated. I realize there are exceptions.

I want to bring up a new issue and that is Connecticut used to have six congressional districts. And since I've been living here we've lost one. And we are not amongst the states who have a population growth that's exploding like the southwest and some other places who are gaining some of those seats.

I want to know how close are we to the line either way. Are we -- if we continue with our tiny growth that we have, are we in jeopardy of losing another seat in, say, another decade or two? Or -- I see a nodding head. That is possible? Okay. All right. So what I'm hearing is if we want to retain our seat we need to either have better economic development so people move in or up our

fertility rates to -- okay.

All right. Moving right along. I do really appreciate the process of inviting citizens to participate in the process. I've lived in other states where that's not so. Just something gets released and that's it, you know.

And as part of the process I'm curious about the timeline. And it's probably posted someplace and I just don't know what it is, but once you're done with your hearing schedule and you go back and you have pow-wows with each other and you come up with a draft plan, do we get a second round of hearings to look at what you did to make public comment a second time?

REP. CAFERO: I'll try to answer that if I can. And I can certainly take help from my committee members, because other than Representative O'Neill, participation in this process is pretty new to all of us I believe. I don't know if I speak for you, Senator Looney, but none of us participated ten years ago, so we're sort of learning along with you.

But as far as the Constitution and our statutes, the General Assembly must complete its task by September 15, 2011. And the goal is for this committee to have public meetings -- first of all, these are public hearings -- to have public meetings taking the input from the public and all of the plans that may be submitted by the public and come up with a plan or try to negotiate, if you will, a plan -- if we are unable to submit to the General Assembly -- for it to take action by September 15th of this year.

If we are unable to do that, it is my

understanding -- well, here it is. It's part of the frequently asked questions. The four top legislative leaders designate eight members, two each. We did that already. The Governor appoints a designated -- the designated members. The eight appointees choose a ninth member. The commission must prepare a plan by November 30, 2011.

If this group cannot agree the Constitution empowers the State Supreme Court to make them do their job or the courts may draw the maps themselves.

DEBORAH McFADDEN: Okay. I understand that if you come to a deadlock. I'm assuming that you're bright, capable people who are going to get along with each other and you're going to come up with a plan.

And so my question is, when you do draft that plan will there potentially be another round of hearings where you're going to have maps on the wall of the proposed plan; we get to look at it and say, gee, we love this or, gee, we hate this. Will that happen?

REP. CAFERO: Not in the way you -- not like this. No.

DEBORAH McFADDEN: Okay.

REP. CAFERO: And not because we said, no, we're not going to have it. It's just not the way it's called for. What happens however is that whatever plan we fortunately or hopefully are able to come up with and in agreement on, will be well publicized before the General Assembly officially takes action on it.

So if there was a human cry from the public I'm sure we as the commission would react

thereto, but it certainly would be well publicized to the public prior to the official General Assembly vote, which would be a natural result of us agreeing.

DEBORAH McFADDEN: Okay. I got it. I got it.

Thank you so much. I really appreciate the fact that you have opened this up to the public to give the thought. And it's wonderful to see towns like Greenwich who did fabulous research for you and basically handed you something that was well prepared and thought out.

And if we continue down this, maybe in ten more years, more towns can kind of work together and come to you to make this more of a statewide community process. And I appreciate the participation.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

I just want to make one correction you eluded to and I don't know if it was an oversight. You were talking about the -- where we count the people who are incarcerated. They are counted for population purposes. They don't vote. They lose their right to vote while incarcerated. So it's not a question of where they vote because they're unable to vote. It's a question as to where their bodies are counted for purposes of drawing a district.

DEBORAH McFADDEN: I understand a convicted felon cannot vote, but you can be incarcerated for either a misdemeanor or you can be incarcerated while pending trial and still not have lost your privileges, is my understanding.

REP. CAFERO: True, but that is a very, very small

population compared to the general prison population.

DEBORAH McFADDEN: Okay. Yeah. No. No. I understand that most prisoners don't vote, but some do. A few.

So thanks.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

Okay. Our next speaker is Maryann Ramos from the town of Greenwich.

MARYANN RAMOS: Thank you for holding -- excuse me. Thank you for holding this session. I think it's a very good way to see representatives.

I'm Mary Anne Ramos and I live in Greenwich and some 23 years ago I ran for 149th District. And I just want to underscore what Ed Krumeich and Joe Kantorski put together, and that is that certainly that district of Pemberwick and Glenville, where I live, is separated and yet we have community meetings and days of, you know, picnics and -- because we are contiguous, but we don't vote in the same areas. So it has been separated.

And I definitely agree with the shoreline, the central and the Pemberwick/Glenville separations.

So thank you very much again.

Do you have any questions?

REP. CAFERO: (Inaudible.) Okay.

A VOICE: I think we just skipped over Mr. --

REP. CAFERO: Did we? I've got to call her.

A VOICE: (Inaudible) so we just need to go to him.

REP. CAFERO: Okay. I'm sorry. I guess we inadvertently skipped over someone.

Mr. John Hartwell, the town of Westport.

JOHN HARTWELL: Good evening. Thank you.

I actually brought some prepared remarks, but much of the ground that I wanted to cover has been covered, so I would just like to reiterate that I would support anything that creates more competitive districts where incumbent protection is not the number one priority of what's being done. And you've said this evening that it's a bipartisan effort.

I think what happens in this situation is that you get locked in, because neither side in fact can work its will on the other one and therefore the fallback position is, well, we'll protect what we've got and work around the margins and that I don't think is good for democracy.

The best thing for us as a society is where the ideas and the people who are representing them are tested again and again and again at the polls. And too many of our districts, I believe, are single-party districts basically, where when you get the nomination from your party either in a caucus or, God forbid, in a primary, you're in for a long time and I don't think that's a good way to do things. So definitely would urge you to backpedal on incumbent protection and work strongly for competitive districts.

I also would strongly support the idea of

holding districts together that represent natural constituencies. And we've talked a lot about that this evening. In Fairfield County there are a number of towns which are broken up in a myriad of ways. For example, New Canaan for example, a town of about 20,000 people has two different state representatives and two different state senators and three voting districts.

And because of the differing overlaps, each one of those districts has a different combination of state senator and state rep. So if you live in New Canaan and you're not really following things all that closely, as most people don't, unfortunately, how are you going to know who it is that represents you?

So I believe this is a real problem. You look at Weston for example, and Senator McKinney referenced that earlier. Most of it belongs to his district. A tiny slice of it belongs to the 26th.

And once again, there's a lack there of, you know, of sort of an organic feel as to who is representing that town. And it's very possible that having two state senators there would be of some benefit, but I would suspect that the -- Senator Boucher who was here earlier who is the other Senator there, doesn't spend a lot of time thinking about Weston because that's a very, very small part of her district.

And in addition -- and this is a new point that no one else has thought about tonight -- I believe that the citizens election, the clean election bill, the citizens election program that's the public funding of elections actually gives incentive to break up towns into more districts rather than to keep them

together. Now why is that the case?

Well, all of you sitting up there know that in order to qualify for public funding there are two basic criteria. One is the amount of money that you raise and that can come from basically anywhere and the second is by achieving a certain number of donations from people who live in the towns of your district.

But in the case -- let's go back again to Weston there, where the slice of the 26th is in -- has a bit of Weston. That means that the person who's running for the state senate seat in Weston, as I was doing two years ago and four years ago, can fundraise from anywhere in that town.

Now my experience and the experience of many people that I talk to who are running for office was that, in fact, making that hurdle, the number of donations from people who live in the towns in your district was actually more difficult for many people than raising the total dollars required. And if that's the case across the state, there is an incentive then to split towns up and to give a piece here and a piece there, allowing people an easier way to fundraise, but that's definitely not what should be done in terms of representative -- representing organic groups of people.

So I would again urge you, in fact, to take a look at that provision and the clean elections statute and to make that provision in the clean elections statute raising money from the people who are in your district and not simply from the towns in your district, something that has not been covered at all tonight.

I also had strongly talked about the prisoner

issue. It's come up again and again. And Senator McKinney, you again have raised the issue about, well, what about schools? And I would point out to you that people who go to school are there by choice. They are not there because they're compelled to be. And we allow people who go to school to decide where it is that they want to be.

And you say, well, most of them don't stay there afterwards. Well, that's true. Most of them don't, but some of them do. And the intentionality of where you live and where you want to participate as an active citizen is, I think, a very important requirement here. And a person who is incarcerated and sent to jail doesn't have that choice.

And most of them will return to the community from which they came. And by putting their representation in a town where they are incarcerated, rather than where they're coming from, you're actually disenfranchising their family and their friends because you're taking that what would be political representation away from them and putting it in a place where none of them has any real connection. So yes, you can make -- I think they're completely different points of view here and the intentionality is something we should be paying attention to.

I'd also like to raise something that's not in my prepared testimony, but which I think would urge you to think about thinking outside the box here. Now, when I read your materials, one of the things that jumped off the page at me was that the number of state senators and the number of state representatives is not, in fact, fixed. That there is a very large range that you can choose.

And so going back to the thought again of having an organic sense of a community, one of the things that's, to me, missing in the political process is having a natural flow of people coming out of local offices into state rep offices and into state Senate. And what I would like you to think about is setting a number of state senators, 36 is fine, and then setting a number of state representatives so that each state Senate district has an equal number of state representatives within it, let's say four, because that's pretty close to what we have today, which would mean scaling back the House by a few seats.

And starting off your redistricting process with that state Senate seat and drawing that boundary and saying, this is what it is. We've got 36 of them. And now we are going to subdivide that into, let's say, four state reps. And that way, you again, you have an organic process that starts at a lower level and moves up and everybody knows where they fit.

Again, going back to my state Senate district, the 26th is a hodgepodge. Bethel is part of my state Senate district. And as Alice Hutchinson pointed out, Bethel is split up four different ways. Redding is the same way. I've got all of Redding, but Redding shares a state House district with Easton, while it's sharing a state rep district with Bethel. It's really a patchwork out there and it doesn't need to be and it is not promoting democracy in the sense of community.

So those are the points that I wanted to make this evening and I'll leave my testimony with you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you, Mr. Hartwell. Just one

comment before I ask the committee if they have -- and I know you did not mean this in a negative way, I presume. You indicated that you think maybe Senator Boucher doesn't worry about Weston. Having served with her for all these years, trust me, she worries very much about the town of Weston.

JOHN HARTWELL: My point was that I think that if -- she has seven towns, as she does, and only a little bit of it is Weston and the rest of it are everywhere else, she probably would spend less time there and less thought. That's all I'm saying.

REP. CAFERO: You know, as my mother used to say -- thinkers of your hands. You can't give priority to anyone.

JOHN HARTWELL: Not at all to malign Senator Boucher who is -- we've met before.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you. Any other comments?

JOHN HARTWELL: I understand that entirely. And when you passed that bill in 2005, you were in uncharted waters and you took an approach which made it easier for people who are in a system already to switch over from what had been in the past to a completely new system.

And as I said before, I'm a strong believer in the citizens elections program. I've used it twice myself, and I think that it has -- it's a tremendous opportunity for people to get involved.

We've got -- how many people in the state house seat?

SENATOR LOONEY: 151.

JOHN HARTWELL: Yeah. But how many people?
20,000?

SENATOR LOONEY: 23,000.

JOHN HARTWELL: 23,000 people, and the requirements of the state rep seat is that you raise 150 contributions of \$5 or more in order to meet that qualification. Now, when I first looked at that my feeling was that you put that in place in order to make sure that a candidate actually did have local support for the candidacy, that they weren't just coming in, raising some money from fat cats and then reaping the benefit of large amounts of money to run their campaigns. \$25,000 for a state House rep, \$100,000 for a state Senate seat is a large amount of money and it's needed in order to run. But clearly to me, the idea of putting in that requirement of getting at least 150 contributions at the state House level and 300 at the State Senate level was there to force you to have a local constituency base.

And to me, 150 out of 23,000 at \$5 a pop is not a big deal. Shouldn't be a big deal for someone who truly has local support. So again, I would urge you -- we've had two election cycles with this now, I would urge you take a look at that and maybe make a change.

REP. CAFERO: Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: I might agree with that, but you didn't say this, but I just didn't want the public to be left with the implication that the previous redistricting committee in 2000 did not split towns because of some interest in the clean election law because it

didn't exist then.

JOHN HARTWELL: No, of course not.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: And you didn't say that, but I didn't want anybody to think that that's why some of the towns were split. It is a potential --

JOHN HARTWELL: No. No. No. I'm just saying going forward --

SENATOR MCKINNEY: No, you're right. I agree.

JOHN HARTWELL: Going forward, there is now an incentive that is, I think, an unattended consequence of a very good law that would say, okay, well, let's just do a little more splitting up here. Make it a little easier for people to run and I don't think we shouldn't be using that and, in fact, you should correct this. That's my -- that's my feeling.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much, sir.

JOHN HARTWELL: Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: The next speaker is Cynthia Jenkins of Windsor. I'm sorry. I guess my mic wasn't on. Cynthia Jenkins of Windsor is our next speaking.

CYNTHIA JENNINGS: Jennings.

REP. CAFERO: Jennings. I'm sorry.

CYNTHIA JENNINGS: Good evening. My name is Cynthia Jennings and I am a civil rights attorney. I am also the chairperson of the Connecticut Coalition for the Protection of Civil Rights. I represent a statewide

coalition that -- with the goal of protecting the civil rights of those individuals in the State of Connecticut. That includes the civil rights of white citizens of the State of Connecticut. I'm a former executive director of the Connecticut Legislative Black and Latino Caucus. I served on the Hartford and Bridgeport Democratic town committees. I'm the cofounder of the largest cross racial cross-cultural organization in the State of Connecticut called the Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice. I'm one of 26 people who was appointed to serve on the -- on a national board to advise the U.S. EPA director on the issue of environmental justice.

I served as assistant to the commissioner of education for the State of Connecticut. I served as assistant to the commissioner of the chief court administrator of the State of Connecticut. I have worked in every single part of government, every single branch of government, executive, legislative and judicial. I have worked and served in more than 28 political campaigns and I served in once -- the one statewide staff person for census 2000. I was responsible for establishing relationships and partnerships between government, faith-based organizations, community development organizations, educational institutions, colleges, universities, business and industry.

I just want to say that reconstruction was done with the intent of disempowering people politically based on race. I urge you, as a committee, to take into consideration the state's economy and the relationship between the economy and the political disempowerment of large numbers of people based on race. Drawing lines that will provide better

representation of politically disempowered people could go a long way to improving the economy and the economic status of the State of Connecticut.

You can reduce the incarceration rates. You can reduce the educational disparity. You can provide people with the wherewithal to make their own decisions based on their own representation in their own communities. When you talk about gerrymandering or redistricting, which sometimes is one in the same, you're also talking about the ability to make decisions that can disempower political entities based on race throughout the State of Connecticut. And we have lived with this for years. How the lines are drawn has a direct influence on the very foundation that our society is based on and that is one man or one woman and one-vote. When you politically disempower or you weaken the basis of our -- our society, then what you're doing is making sure that people who could take care of themselves, given the opportunity that everyone should have in this country, are not able to do so. And you're also putting a huge tax burden on the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut.

If you could reduce the incarceration rate by providing an equal opportunity to all, then you would reduce -- you could fill the hole in the Governor's budget. We have -- someone cited earlier -- 20,000-plus inmates in Connecticut prisons. These inmates are educationally disadvantaged. They have issues that need to be addressed, including health, education, employment and they are in a politically-disempowered community. When you're talking about counting prisoners that do not live in communities where they are housed involuntarily, then you're talking

about disempowering the families that they came from and the communities that hosted them and that will host them when they get out again. It is a disservice to an inmate and to the community that they come from to count them in a community where they are involuntarily housed.

The question is, can Connecticut taxpayers afford the consequences of districts that politically disempowered people based on race? And the answer is no. We are in an economic decline right now because the ship that we are on is sinking and we have to fix the hole in the boat. And fortunately, those individuals that are in front of us today are in a position to change what's happened historically in Connecticut, to empower communities based on the numbers and not race, and to make sure that everybody has -- falls under the equal protection amendment and that everyone is allowed the opportunity to contribute to society and not spend a life in prison. If we took 12,000 of those individuals that are nonviolent inmates, and put them back into our communities, that's the \$1.5 million budget deficit that our Governor is struggling with. And irrespective of whether it's Republican or Democrat, Connecticut taxpayers pay the price.

So I urge you when you go through and make your decisions about how these lines are drawn, to think back to reconstruction and the original situation where African-Americans -- and there were at the time less -- far fewer Latinos, but we are talking about African-Americans, Latinos and white citizens all receiving an equal opportunity in Connecticut, and therefore, providing our children with a better education, being able to provide economic empowerment to people who

live in communities and also to not violate the one man or woman one-vote rule. So I urge you to do the right thing and I urge you to take a look at the lines and to continue to involve people in the process. Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you. Any questions from committee members?

Thank you very much.

CYNTHIA JENNINGS: Any questions?

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is David Martin from Stamford.

DAVID MARTIN: Thank you. I'm David Martin from Stamford. I was the former chair of the city council in Stamford. I am currently cochair of our local redistricting commission. And to the point raised earlier about sometimes it gets political, we are hopefully near the end of our work about redistricting our 20 local districts and we had not ever used, requested or had available to us -- although we could have made it available -- the political representation of the census blocks and tracts, and it just wasn't used as a principle among the group. That isn't to say that there wasn't a one or two representatives who wanted to know that, but we didn't provide it and we didn't ask for it. We didn't have it.

So I wanted to speak about two things. The first, which hasn't been spoken about, and I think it's fairly obvious is the congressional districts. And we talked a bit earlier about the need to have communities of interest who would stay together. And those of us here in

the Fourth Congressional District, I would only point out the obvious which is that this district already tends to represent a community of interest, in the sense that it follows largely at the Merritt Parkway and I-95 and the Metro-North as transportation corridors. It is on the Long Island Sound and as a community of interest that way, and from an economic development standpoint this whole area tends to have a similar community of interest.

And although I am sure they're going to have to be some modifications to the districts, I would tell you that at least the Fourth Congressional District looks like it makes sense from a community of interest. And although I can't imagine it, I have heard some people talk about well, there could be a major restructuring of that district. That just wouldn't make any sense.

Now, how you're going to deal with that dagger from the fifth into the heart of the first I don't know. That looks kind of crazy and I think that occurred when we collapsed from six into five. But, gee that's -- I don't know those community of interests, but I do know this one down here, and I would hope that you would hold the Fourth District together largely -- as it has been constructed in the past.

I would speak to another issue, as I happen to be a resident in Stamford, of the 149th District, which for all intents and purposes, despite the great statements earlier from our people from Greenwich, the people in Stamford really don't consider the representation from Greenwich to be focused on Stamford at all, and Ms. Floren I think comes to the meetings, and I think that she does a

good job, as I think any representative would, so I have no complaints about her representation per se, but as a relatively small piece of a larger district, we do not believe -- and I am fairly certain -- that we do not have the same representation that would often occur with others.

Now, I say to that when we think about these communities of interest, and someone was, in fact, saying, well, what we going to do? Just make these things up? There are a couple of definitions that are nonpolitically-based that I think we could pay attention to. One is DMAs, which is designated marketing areas which is made by marketers to determine what area seem to work together well from a marketing standpoint. And that would, in fact, play well to the Fourth Congressional District.

But another one is the post office who is not interested at least a two or three digit level about what the political interests are, sometimes they get down to individual post offices. But for instance in Stamford and Greenwich, part of Stamford is actually put into the Greenwich zip code, the 068. And so for you and your wisdom to combine that part of Stamford in with the 149th, while I don't desire it, I think it's understandable, but when it crosses over to the 069 zip code, the connection between me on Long Ridge Road and my vertical alignment with the rest of Stamford and my interest in the 149th, you know, I don't know anyone who uses any of the shops, has any other school interest, has any of the same zoning requirements. It is as much a different world as one could imagine. And what I suggest to you is that by being made a part of that Greenwich district that problem then carries forward into New Canaan,

which is saying, well, gee, we have a half a representative with Stamford and half a representative with somebody else.

So while I do not advocate, you know, making districts a little bit larger, a little bit smaller, I suggest to you that you look for some small compromises where towns that are currently represented by sliver seats can become a majority or at least a major part and I would hope that that could be done in the northern part of Stamford, although the challenge of working those numbers I leave to you and your staff.

And that concludes my comments. Are there any questions?

REP. CAFERO: Thank you. Are there any questions from the committee? Thank you, sir.

DAVID MARTIN: Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Our next speaker is Brian Robbins of the town of Wilton.

BRIAN ROBBINS: Good evening. I would like to first thank you all for having this meeting. It's a very good opportunity to speak and get our opinions about. I studied a little bit about electoral systems, having had done it in a little small school I go to in Wisconsin -- so I'm not here most of the year so I'm not quite sure what district I am -- but my question is this, a lot of people mentioned competitiveness a couple of times here now within this meeting and I was wondering have you looked at the Ohio system and what they use to redistrict?

REP. CAFERO: It certainly is available for us to

look at. We haven't debated --

BRIAN ROBBINS: No. I'm just wondering in the past have you at all.

REP. CAFERO: I can't speak for past commissions. This is my first --

BRIAN ROBBINS: No, I mean you as a committee yourselves, have you looked at how it's structured?

REP. CAFERO: Did anyone look at the Ohio system? I don't think so.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is our fact-finding mission right now that we're on.

BRIAN ROBBINS: To quickly sum it up -- to quickly sum it up, it's computer-based. It uses a lot from the Iowa system, which is computer-based, but the citizens map it out and then computer scores it based on competitiveness, compactness and continuousness. So pretty much what it does is it pretty much figures it out, and then from there, a committee -- or depending on which state you are because a couple of states have adopted it -- decide on which one if there's a tie of this score that computer gives is best. So pretty much can actually potentially increase competitiveness throughout the state overall.

REP. CAFERO: Something to think about. Thank you. Any questions?

SENATOR WILLIAMS: I was born in Cincinnati, Ohio so I have to look into that. Thank you very much.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you. Our next speaker is Fred Camillo, State Representative of the 151th --

51st District -- 151th -- 151st District, the town of Greenwich. That is the last signed-up speaker. Is there anyone else that cares to speak that has not signed up? If so, please see our Clerk here in the front.

Thank you. Fred.

REP. CAMILLO: Representative of the 151st District is numerically the last, I guess it's fitting that I'm last tonight.

Senator McKinney, Senator Looney, Senator Williams, Representative Cafero, Representative Donovan, Mr. Speaker, Representative Nafis and Representative O'Neill. Good to see you again. Seeing that my district was one of the focuses of the Greenwich Democrats' plan, I do want to say to my former opponent and friend and fellow Yankee fans that I think was very well thought out. It's certainly worthy of debate. You know, Ed and I have gone back a couple of e-mails on this between our baseball conversations, and it was true as I said, that some of the districts that they are looking to put back in the 151st is where the Camillo family is from so I mean I'm not afraid of those districts. I love the western side of town. I have strong ties there.

But I do want to say to my constituents in the 151st that that's where I grew up. I love the people there. I think they are very familiar with their state representatives both myself and my predecessors. Probably in the last 30 days have become a community of interest. You know, I feel compelled to say that I support the district the way it is.

Interestingly I've not had one call in favor of this, and I'm out there every day and they

tell me whether they like things are not. And probably seven or eight people have read this in the paper including a few Democrats, all in my district, not one person has said that they want the district moved. Again, I haven't heard anything. Certainly if there was an outcry, as their Representative, I would listen to that, but I have not so I just wanted to get out there that, you know, I like my district and certainly I would support it being as close to it -- the way it is now as possible, but certainly would abide by whatever is decided. Thanks and thanks for all your hard work up there.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you. Any questions of Representative Camillo? Thank you for that.

Before I ask if anyone else has decided to speak, I want to just take time. We've heard from two state representatives, State Representative Terrie Wood who resides in Darien, and also represents the town of Norwalk, State Representative Camillo who represents the town of Greenwich. We also have with us today, Senator Toni Boucher, of the town of Wilton representing various other communities including the town of Weston; Senator Mike McLaughlin, the city of Danbury; State Representative Toni Walker of the city of New Haven. State Representative Chris Perone of the city of Norwalk; State Representative Gail Lavielle of the town of Wilton, also representing Norwalk. You just met Fred Camillo. We of the State Representative Jonathan Steinberg of the town of Westport and State Representative Andres Ayala from Bridgeport -- where is he -- there he is. Representative Ayala.

So with that, is there anyone else who has not spoken would care to speak?

Senator Boucher, I didn't see your hand there.
Come up.

SENATOR BOUCHER: Very briefly, thank you so much for being here and I just wanted to make a statement on behalf of all representatives both Democrat and Republican, both House members and Senate members, whether they represent a hundred thousand individuals in a community or two, that they take their job very seriously and represent everyone, all of their constituents to the best of their ability. Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.
Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes our public hearing. I thank you so much for coming. We will be having a continuation of our public hearings tomorrow evening at seven o'clock at the New Haven City Hall and on Wednesday in the city of Hartford at the Legislative Office Building at 2 P.M. and 7 p.m. I can thank you so much. Bye now.