

CHAIRMEN: Senator Williams

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SENATORS: Fasano, Looney

REPRESENTATIVES: Cafero, Donovan, Nafis,
O'Neill

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Good evening. I'd like to welcome folks to our second public hearing. We are the State of Connecticut Reapportionment Committee.

And just to give you a brief bit of background, every ten years, as we all know, we have a national U.S. Census to update population state by state, town by town across our country. In the State of Connecticut, when that happens after all the information is in, we every ten years take a look at our respective legislative and congressional districts for the State of Connecticut.

So that would be the districts for State Representative, State Senate and our five congressional districts. And compare those districts that were fashioned ten years ago with the changes in population that have taken place in those ten years. We are required by state law and federal law to make sure that the districts are represented fairly in terms of population.

Now in the last ten years the population in the State of Connecticut grew approximately 4 percent. We have 3.57 million folks living in the State of Connecticut. And in some towns, the population growth was greater. In

some towns it was less. And so it's our job as the Reapportionment Committee to, every ten years, readjust districts in conformance to changes in population.

Now we are here today to get your input. I can tell you at the outset we have not begun the process of changing lines, looking at maps to configure this or that or the other. What our job is right now is to go throughout the state, and this is the second of five public hearings, to hear from you, to hear from the public to get your input. You could give us your input in a variety of ways, through written testimony, through oral testimony at public hearings like this. You can also access what is going on today and in the future with the Reapportionment Committee at our website.

And I'll tell you there are two handouts that are available at the sign-up table that you can either get now, or if you haven't picked them up, when the hearing is concluded. One is a listing of the population changes in the state of Connecticut comparing the year 2000 to 2010 according to the census. It will give you a rundown of every town in the state of Connecticut and their population changes. So that's useful for you if you have particular suggestions or concerns as to the town you live in.

And the other handout is frequently asked questions. And it's just what you think it might be, providing a lot of different detailed answers to basic questions about the reapportionment process.

So with that, I want to quickly introduce the panel. I am Don Williams, State Senator of the 29th District up in Northeastern

Connecticut. I am the cochair of the Reapportionment Committee.

I am joined this evening by the rest of the committee including my cochair, Republican Minority Leader in the House Larry Cafero from Norwalk. Thank you, Larry, for being here.

And I'll ask the rest of the folks to introduce themselves starting with Art O'Neill, State Representative. You just want to tell folks what areas you represent, Art?

REP. O'NEILL: Yeah. I'm a State Representative from the town of Southbury. I also represent Roxbury, Bridgewater and Washington, which for those from Eastern Connecticut, is midway between Waterbury and Danbury.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: And Representative Sandy Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: Hi. Sandy Nafis. I represent the town of Newington in the Legislature.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Speaker of the House, Chris Donovan.

REP. DONOVAN: Good evening. My name is Chris Donovan. I'm Speaker of the House. I represent Meriden.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: My cochair Larry Cafero, would you like to extend greetings, Larry?

REP. CAFERO: Sure. Welcome, everyone. And thanks for being here. I represent the town of Norwalk.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Majority Leader in the State Senate, Senator Marty Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY: Hi. Marty Looney. I am the

Majority Leader of the State Senate and I represent the 11th Senatorial District that is parts of New Haven and Hamden.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: And the Minority Deputy Leader for the State Senate Senator Len Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO: Thank you.

Len Fasano, 34th District which is Wallingford, North Haven and East Haven.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: And with that, we'll get right down to business. Larry Tracey is the first person from Enfield. I would ask Mr. Tracey to come forward to the microphone for testimony.

And we have a number of folks signed up this evening. You know, up at the Capitol when we have public hearings we have three-minute time limits. We're not going to say that you've got a three-minute time limit tonight, but we will ask folks to try and be succinct in respect of the other folks who want to testify this evening.

Mr. Tracey, good evening.

LARRY TRACEY: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

I am the recently retired executive director of the North Central Connecticut Chamber of Commerce. I was the executive director for ten years and prior to my serving in that capacity I was a member of the Chamber for 22 years prior to that. So I've got a little bit of experience in chambers of commerce.

That being said, my concern here is, in the 2nd District, the potential consideration for the loss of annexing the North Central

Connecticut -- part of the North Central Connecticut Chamber of Commerce.

NCCC represents the towns of Suffield, Somers, Enfield and East Windsor. Collectively we represent approximately 83,000 residents in those four towns. All four towns have grown in population.

What's made the concern that I have is that there's currently a -- Congressman Courtney currently has an office in Enfield. And the reason that for I'm sure -- or part of the reason for that is because of the growth in population. 82,000 constituents in that four-town area is a large number of constituents.

And even prior to Joe being there, our previous Representative -- both of them have been very, very -- were very, very visible and very, very busy in the community, knocking on doors. We've got a lot of commercial establishments there. Enfield alone has Hallmark Cards, has LEGO. Eppendorf is a foreign company, a German company that's expanding and creating 117 different jobs.

My point being is, to all of this is, that it's imperative I think that we not annex that part of the state, all right, with that many people and those types of businesses and take it away from the 2nd District and put it into the district that Mr. Larson, Congressman Larson currently has.

I'm not -- I've checked with many, many of our members and asked them their input and 90 percent of them feel the same way I do. We have a congressional office in Enfield, a satellite office. We'd like to keep that there. I don't know that if it's changed. If

we annex that, that that's going to continue, but I certainly would like it to continue as would those people that I represent.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Tracey.

Any questions for Mr. Tracey?

Speaker Donovan.

REP. DONOVAN: Good evening. I just wanted to get a list of all those towns. Enfield --

LARRY TRACEY: Enfield, Somers, Suffield and East Windsor are the four towns represented by the North Central Connecticut Chamber of Commerce.

REP. DONOVAN: All right. Thank you very much.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Any other questions?

Thank you very much.

LARRY TRACEY: Thank you.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Next, Jerri MacMillian.

JERRI MacMILLIAN: (Inaudible.) But anyway. So, sorry.

I'm Jerri MacMillian. I'm from Essex. It's interesting to note that the federal constitution's bicameral approach to legislation came about because of the Connecticut Compromise, also referenced as the Great Compromise.

William Samuel Johnson of Connecticut explained that the two houses of membership and the Upper House, the Senate, and the -- would be similar to the New Jersey plan and

allocated to representation and in favor of the more populous states, membership in the Lower House was to be allocated in proportion to the State population as in the Virginia plan.

A census of all inhabitants of the United States, as you mentioned, is to be taken every ten years. And this approach, this bicameral approach, the difference in composition in the different houses is -- accommodates the more populous states' desire for proportional representation as opposed to the littler states' desire for equal representation.

Now the U.S. House of Representatives, as everybody knows, guarantees one house seat per each state. And the U.S. House of Representatives currently uses the equal proportionate method to allocate the remaining seats.

Now today as a result of the Great Compromise -- and I can say this because I'm from Wyoming -- Wyoming has one Representative and they have about 4 people -- no, we have about 400,000 people. But California has 37 million people and they only send 53 Representatives, while Wyoming still gets to send one. But both states have two Senators. So that's the equality of representation as opposed to the proportional representation.

Now Section 5 of the Connecticut Constitution sets out the requirements that the composition of the General Assembly be consistent with federal constitutional standards. Now remember that the Connecticut Compromise was drawn because small states were afraid of being steamrolled by the more populous states and a concern that persists today.

And the fear and reality of that concern should be acknowledged in the efforts to establish the House and Senate districts in the General Assembly in Connecticut as well. Now following the wisdom of the Connecticut Compromise -- which I think is just the coolest thing that it happens to be the Connecticut Compromise -- it would stand to reason that among people forming a state government every town ought to have equal representation in government and that the citizens have proportional representation, as in the House, in a common government, however unequal the size.

And when you look at a map of Connecticut -- and that map only is telling us the congressional districts -- but the maps behind those would show you the mosaic, if you will, of the Senatorial and the House districts as they are comprised right now.

When you look at a map of Connecticut you start to understand the wisdom of balancing population and geography in representation elections. The danger that this map lays bare is that the great geo-diversity -- and actually I was speaking with this gentleman earlier and one of his concerns before the speaker who was just here was that Enfield will be sort of swallowed up because it's not as big of a city as the ones in the 1st district. Well, you can understand the same kind of fears are when a little town gets sort of swallowed up and lost in the balance when you have just representation based on population.

If we are to follow the Constitution of the State of Connecticut in redistricting it would seem that the process to follow is fairly straightforward, consistent with the federal

constitutional standards, and would be consistent with the Connecticut compromise. The way the current districts have been divided appears to be the same side of one coin, allocation by population alone, as opposed to halves of a unique whole.

I understand and I saw that it was in the materials that were passed out that the Supreme Court has actually ruled on this and decided in Gray Versus Sanders and then again in Reynolds Versus Sims that the representation had to be based on one person, one vote.

I hope it is understood clearly by everyone in this room, that the Supreme Court has made errors in the past and that sometimes it requires a readjudication of the issue. It would seem that in coming to that conclusion the Supreme Court completely overlooked the wisdom of the Connecticut Compromise. And it also overlooks in our Constitution the requirement that we follow the standard set out in the federal Constitution.

So what I'm saying is that I'm not here at all to address the congressional districts that are going to send people down to Washington. I think we have a big problem here in Connecticut in that it comes down to basically five major cities having enough of a voice in this state that all the rest of the state might just as well fold their tent and go home. And so I would ask that you please address redistricting along the lines required by the Connecticut Constitution.

Thank you.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Are there questions or comments from the panel?

SENATOR LOONEY: Just one, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY: Yes. Thank you.

Since -- not really a question, but if you look at the state of Connecticut as opposed to many other states, we don't have any large cities really compared to what other states have.

In terms of our largest city, Bridgeport only has only 4 percent of the state's population. So we're very dissimilar to states like New York, where New York City has 40 percent of the state's population. And even Massachusetts, which has -- where Boston has about 10 percent of that state's population.

So we are of a state ranging from moderate to small size communities. We don't really have any large ones. So that the -- there are no really large urban delegations in the General Assembly because our state doesn't really have any truly large cities, at least on the scale that you see in other states where a single city or a couple of cities have a very large percentage of the state's population.

As you probably are aware, one of the issues that the court dealt with in the sixties in dealing with Reynolds Versus Sims and the apportionment decisions is that the states tried to argue that only one house of the state legislature should be required to be reapportioned on population similar to Congress.

And that municipal boundaries should be recognized in the way that state boundaries are recognized. So that, trying to argue by analogy that state Senates should not necessarily be based on population, analogous to the U.S. Senate. And the U.S. Supreme Court rejected that argument on the grounds that municipalities don't have the same standing as states do in terms of claiming unique status under federalism.

JERRI MacMILLIAN: I can understand that, that comment. However I'm from Essex and I'm here to tell you there's a huge population difference between Essex and Hartford or Bridgeport or any of the other five. Yeah.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Turner. Next -- I mean, Ms. MacMillian.

Our next person testifying is Mary Anne Turner.

MARY ANN TURNER: Good evening. I'm Mary Anne Turner of 7 Meadow Road in Enfield. In my spare time I'm also the Republican chairman there. I thought I'd come down for a visit.

I came tonight to talk about keeping Enfield in the 1st District and it has a pretty valid reasons why we should stay there. First off, you did receive a letter from our town council asking you to keep us there. And they used some valid reasons, as was mentioned by Larry Tracey, that we've gotten very good representation from our congressman, when it was Congressman Simmons and then again now with Congressman Courtney. They've been very helpful to Enfield. They are very pointed there. There is an office in our community which really makes a difference for us.

Enfield may be looked at as being more of a city sometimes, but we are just a town. That's how we act. That's where we are. That's how we communicate with the communities around us. The people work well with the respective communities like Ellington, Somers, and Tolland. And we -- I personally, when I say, we, I'm speaking for me -- but feel that that's where we belong and where we should stay. We do not act nor look like Hartford. And truthfully, I don't want to be treated like Hartford.

One of the biggest things is -- as our government is run by volunteers, not one person is paid a dime to do it. And many of them, like Scott Kaupin who's been mayor for the last two terms, has done it for almost 20 years. And that's a pretty good amount of time to have given up his volunteer time to the Town of Enfield, which then goes to show you why -- how valid it is for us to stay in the 1st.

One of the things that really -- that's kind of funny about our folks is the only thing they really get is maybe a free dinner for all the meetings they have to attend. There are no stipend dollars like it's taken in Hartford.

But one of the things I also know is being kicked around a little bit is about the prison population. Now I don't want to be on the map because Enfield happens to have a prison behind its, you know, little district, but we do. And right now those numbers are counted in our total.

And I hear -- and I have nothing more to base that on -- that the prisoners may now be counted by where they last resided. And that

could then pollute your population numbers regarding what inner city they may have been in. I strongly urge you not to do that.

Enfield has to take responsibility along with Somers for these prisoners. That includes the sewage that comes from that place. It flows right into Enfield. Now that may sound silly on why I'm saying we should stay in the 1st, but it goes to show you why it's so important that we don't act or move into -- I mean, we stay in the 2nd and we don't move to the 1st. We're not like them. We don't act like them and ask you this evening not to make us think we should be like them.

So again, I thank you for your time. And please come to Enfield.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Any questions?

Speaker Donovan.

REP. DONOVAN: Thank you, Ms. Turner.

We were at the reapportionment meeting in Waterbury yesterday and there was someone who suggested -- who informed us that the City of Enfield, in looking at its own districts, on a local level does not count the prison population. So I was wondering if --

MARY ANN TURNER: And sir, you're -- I'm only telling you something I heard and I have nothing to base it on except hearsay. So I can't tell you what that person had to say.

But we -- I'll tell you the truth. When we say we have 45,000 people, and maybe Mr. Tracey can answer this for me since he was

the chairman -- chamber member for so long -- is that we counted as 45,000 people, 3,000 sit in prison. Okay. So they are counted in some way, shape or form.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

Next we have -- and I apologize if I mispronounced the last name -- Dorothy Mrowka.

Did I get that right?

DOROTHY MROWKA: You got that right.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Very good.

DOROTHY MROWKA: I'll make mine short and sweet.

I'd like to see the 2nd Congressional District stay intact the way it is. If we have to lose some, maybe a small town off the side, but I really hate to see it start getting messed up, you know, pulling something from the middle and then moving everything around.

And I can recall back in the fifties when each town did have their own State Representative. My dad was one of those State Representatives from the town of Salem and everyone had their own state rep. And then in the sixties they came through with this reapportionment and that's when everybody got mixed together.

Thank you.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Any questions? Thanks very much.

Next is Elizabeth Duarte.

ELIZABETH DUARTE: Hi. Thank you.

I just very briefly also want to say that I don't like change. Many people in my area -- I live in Southeastern Connecticut. Many of us don't like change, but unfortunately I know with the numbers there may have to be some change. The 2nd Congressional District works well the way it is. I too would like to see it stay intact.

If unfortunately we would have to lose a town, I would hope that it wasn't -- it wouldn't be split up in any way and that we would have to, not to pick on anybody, but have someone on a small town on one of the fringe boundary areas.

I do also want to say I know that you try very hard not to split up towns, but I do want to say that I live in the city of Groton And it works well to be split. That we have great representation there and the division in between the town and the city represents what the division really is. Right. So thank you.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Are there any questions? Thanks very much.

REP. DONOVAN: I'd just like to make a comment.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Speaker Donovan.

REP. DONOVAN: That for those who know the area of the city is the small group and the town is the big group, as opposed to other -- the other way around.

A VOICE: (Inaudible.)

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Next we have Paul Duarte.

PAUL DUARTE: Hi. I'd also like to -- Paul Duarte;

Groton, Connecticut -- to comment on maintaining the 2nd CD as much as possible, to leave it intact.

The 2nd CD is fairly unique and it's pretty much, you know, off to the side. It's split by, I guess what most people refer to it as, the golden banana, that really just kind of comes down to the center of the state. It's very rural. I know and understand that the northwestern corner of the state is also that rural, but having the hills and things like that, I mean, there's a lot of farms.

And there's been a lot of continuity that has been developed over the years with those particular interests. And to make, you know, large-scale changes to the district I think would be detrimental to those particular interests, especially in the farming communities.

So I mean, I understand that there is -- that you do have to make changes, that the district has to lose, I guess, approximately 15,000 people. And if that is the case, then I would prefer them to come out of one of the bordering towns and not to aggregate a group of towns together to make that up or to push --

I'm also very interested in keeping Enfield in the district as being, you know, one of the larger industrial areas to the north where, you know, of course we have that in Groton to the south and those are probably two of the biggest towns in the entire district.

And it's, I mean, I think it's been represented well and I'm just hoping that you can see your way clear to just maintaining that as much as possible. We're also very

interested in keeping Enfield, again in the district.

Thank you.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Are there any questions?

Thank you, Mr. Duarte. Thanks very much.

Next is John Levgie.

JOHN LeVGIE: That's pretty close.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Pretty close.

JOHN LeVGIE: Yes. Hello. Thank you for coming.

Also Representative Cafero, welcome back to Norwich City Hall. You were down here for Representative Nystrom's swearing in. Welcome back.

Just a couple of things. Number one, I think all the communities should be kept in the same districts as much as possible. That goes congressional, State House of Representatives and State Senate.

I notice, looking at the map quickly, there were five communities split up in Congressional districts. Two of them are in the 2nd district. Glastonbury and Durham. I think they should either stay in the 2nd District, the whole community or go into another district.

As far as the State House of Representatives, I went through this chart that was put out by the staff over here. I think -- I think the Legislature should be reduced to the lowest number allowed in the Constitution, 30 in the Senate and 125 in the House of

Representatives. By doing that there are 33 communities including Norwich. Which by the way, if you go back and read your thing, you left Norwich off. Thirty-three communities including Norwich would be entitled to one State Representative without sharing it with another community.

There would be four cities in the state which would be allowed to have one complete Senate district and maybe a piece of it going into another community. With 30 State Senators, each State Senator would be representing 119,136 people. Each of the 125 representatives would be sharing -- would be representing 28,592 people.

I think this would be a more efficient operation. If you don't like the way it works out, you can always change it later or maybe go to a constitutional amendment and make it even better.

Thank you.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

Are there questions? Any questions?

Thank you for your testimony.

Next, Norman Primus.

NORMAN PRIMUS: Good evening. My name is Norman Primus and I'll tell you a little story.

In 1974 when I lived in New Jersey I was a member of Common Cause and a chairman of our redistricting task force committee. It took me six years to create a balanced, neutral process of districting.

In 1986, a group of citizens where I now live wanted to elect the members of a south end school board. The State Board of Education sought someone to assist and I volunteered. I prepared several kits with all of the data necessary and explained how to proceed. The state board attorney -- that's the board of education attorney -- narrowed the maps submitted, down to three plans and finally the state board selected one they felt most qualified.

In 1991 I got lucky. A districting lawsuit was filed in Terre Haute, Indiana, and I served as the witness for the plaintiff. My attorney spent an hour and 45 minutes questioning me. And when the census -- the defense attorney asked his first question, I could not believe my ears. He knew nothing about redistricting. I spent 20 minutes explaining the process of redistricting. He attacked me and demanded I agree with him, which I refused. And finally the court said, we had enough, and the decision was for the plaintiff.

Two weeks later I received a phone call from Terre Haute City -- a city employee, asked me if I would be interested in districting the city. My plaintiff attorney released me so that I could district the city. I did it and all the parties concerned, Republicans, Democrats, whatever else, they all were very pleased.

In 1998 I moved to New London, Connecticut and in 2001 I involved myself in the districting process of Connecticut's three districting bodies. I find that the process that was being used by the last districting commission -- that's 2010 -- to be costly in both money and time.

It is my opinion that the Census Bureau has hundreds of computers, and upon the census' completion of each and every state, the Census Bureau could quickly generate district maps, districting maps of each and every voting district in the United States. I believe this would save all of our states hundreds of thousands of dollars and hours.

In 2001 the districting commission used a data service company and a law firm costing \$230,320.99 and \$80,000, respectively for the two providers. In addition, all of our elected Senators and Representatives spent many, many, many hours of moving districting lines. I think that our Governor would appreciate saving the sum of \$310,320.99 or more to help meet our budget in this time of economic difficulties.

In conclusion, I will ask my two United States Senators, my Congressional Representative, my State Senator and my State Representatives to reject all districting plans set down before them by our current districting commission. If my elected representatives accept gerrymandered districts I shall not vote for them.

I shall vote for candidates who will in the future eliminate gerrymandering and I ask that we the people do it.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Primus.

Are there questions or comments?

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

Just curious, and maybe I missed something. You said in your close that you would urge all of your elected representatives to reject any plan that this commission comes up with. Is that correct?

NORMAN PRIMUS: (Inaudible.)

REP. CAFERO: I think I heard you say that you would urge your elected officials to reject any plan that this commission or committee comes up with. Is that correct?

NORMAN PRIMUS: That's correct. I don't think the State should do its own redistricting. It should be done by the Census Bureau in Washington for all states and all cities and all counties and so forth.

REP. CAFERO: And you believe that because you feel that would be politically neutral, if you will.

NORMAN PRIMUS: I'm sorry, sir. I --

REP. CAFERO: I think -- are you saying, you believe in that because you believe that would take politics out of it?

NORMAN PRIMUS: Correct. Absolutely. Totally.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you so much.

NORMAN PRIMUS: Thank you very much.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Any other questions or comments?

Thank you, Mr. Primus.

Next, Scott Bates from Stonington.

SCOTT BATES: Good evening, I'm Scott Bates from the town of Stonington. Thank you for coming here tonight to Eastern Connecticut.

Just a few thoughts so I won't be redundant. First of all, I think it's eminently important that elected Representatives make these maps. The Constitution says it so and you represent the people and so you're accountable to all of us. And so I think you're the right body to be making these decisions, not the Census Bureau for example.

But in getting to this issue in particular of congressional representation in the state of Connecticut, it is clear that Hartford Metro area, which is something like 5,800 thousand people, has a community of interest. People go to work there. They have social arrangements there. That's the 1st District.

The 3rd District is the New Haven Metro area. The 4th District is the Bridgeport Stamford corridor. The 5th District is kind of everything else up there. And the 2nd District, which is us, does have a distinct community of interest that is not aligned with Hartford or New Haven.

So in your deliberations I'd encourage you to remember this very distinct community of Eastern Connecticut, that the towns that you see from Norwich to Stonington to Enfield are very similar in many ways. We are relatively small towns. We have rural interests. We have some cities, but they're not anything near the scale of a Metro Hartford, or a Metro New Haven.

And so I'd just encourage you to keep intact as much as possible the existing 2nd because

that represents the voice of the people of Eastern Connecticut which needs to be heard in an increasingly urbanized state. As Mr. Duarte said, the golden banana. We're often not heard in Hartford and Eastern Connecticut and we want to be heard in Washington as we have distinct communities of interest that need to be listened to.

So thank you very much.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Any questions?

Thank you, Mr. Bates.

And finally, and before I announce the final speaker, if there is anyone else who did not testify who wishes to do so, you can sign -- you can still sign up at the table and speak.

But otherwise, our final Speaker this evening is Theresa Madonna.

THERESA MADONNA: Good evening and thank you.

I'm Theresa Madonna from Griswold, Connecticut and I'm concerned about town integrity. And while I realized that splitting towns has been determined to be legal, I believe -- I don't believe it's practical and I don't believe it's practical for the following reason. For example, in the House of Representatives, in our small district, in our small region which is Representative District 45, I believe Plainfield is split and has a Representative representing half of Plainfield and then another Representative representing the other half of Plainfield.

I think it's impractical to expect that a small town like that would have two different people representing their interest in the

House of Representatives. So while town integrity is deemed to be legal, I would encourage you even at the represent -- in the House of Representatives, that you try to maintain the entire population of the town being represented by one person.

I think it's much more practical and I recognize that as you do redistricting at the congressional level that that becomes sort of impossible to do. But at the small populations that are being considered for the House of Representatives, I ask for you to leave towns intact if you can.

Thank you.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

Any questions? Thanks.

Any other folks wish to testify this evening?

Then I want to thank you for taking a nice summer evening like this, coming out to this beautiful city hall. It was a pleasure for us to be here in Norwich in Eastern Connecticut. So thanks again.

And remember that you can continue to keep apprized of the work of this committee and redistricting across the state by the information that's available at the signup desk, the website that we have and other resources at the State Capitol.

So again, thank you for coming this evening and this concludes our public hearing. Thanks.