

CHAIRMEN: Representative Cafero

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SENATORS: Fasano, Looney, McKinney,
Williams,

REPRESENTATIVES: Donovan, Nafis, O'Neill

REP. CAFERO: Good evening, everybody. It's my privilege to call this public hearing of the State of Connecticut's Reapportionment Committee to order.

And welcome all of you to this magnificent Waterbury Town Hall. Many were commenting it's one of the most beautiful municipal buildings I think we've ever seen. It's certainly gorgeous.

My name is State Representative Larry Cafero. I represent the 142nd District in Norwalk and I also serve as the House Republican Leader. I have the honor of serving as cochairman of this bipartisan committee along with my colleague Senate President Pro Temp Donald Williams from the town of Brooklyn, Connecticut.

And joining us are the remaining members of the committee. To my right, the Speaker of the House, Chris Donovan. And to Senator Williams' left the Majority Leader of the Senate Senator Martin Looney. We also have Representative Sandy Nafis. We have the Senate Minority Leader Senator John McKinney. Next to him is Senator Len Fasano, Deputy Minority Leader of the Senate, and deputy at-large of the House Senator -- excuse me, Representative Arthur O'Neill. Welcome to all

our colleagues and fellow citizens who have turned out to participate in or simply to witness this important process.

Our state and federal constitutions require that every ten years immediately following the federal census we review, reapportion and adjust our State Assembly, State Senate and 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 are well aware that we don't have all the answers. That is why we hold these public hearings throughout the state. This is the first of five public hearings. We will have one in each of the congressional districts, each of the five congressional districts.

We want to have as much input as possible from our constituents, so thank you for taking the time to participate and come on out on this beautiful summer evening.

I will mention that, though we will not have a time limit set for your comments, we would ask that all of you be respectful of your fellow citizens and keep your remarks as brief as possible 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. If you have not yet signed up to speak please see our Clerk Deb Blanchard to do so.

Also I would like to inform you that we have some handouts that are sort of frequently asked questions about the reapportionment process and also some data. Please feel free

to grab. They're available at the table to my left.

And before we begin, I would like to on behalf of the committee extend our thanks to CT-N, Connecticut Network for broadcasting these hearings so that our friends at home could participate in the process.

And with that we will begin. And I will go to the sign-in sheet. And we have -- and forgive me if I mispronounce -- I think it's Isaias Diaz. Yes, of Waterbury. I'm sorry. Sure. I should know that.

Mr. Diaz, welcome.

ISAIAS T. DIAZ: Thank you.

First and foremost, I'd like to welcome you to the beautiful city of Waterbury. And while we don't have a timetable, I have about a page and a half of data that we compiled, so I'll try to be somewhat cursory, if you would allow me the indulgence.

I just want to say, good evening, first of all, to our Cochairs Williams and Cafero as well as the honorable members of the Reapportionment Committee. My name is Isaias Diaz. I'm the chairman of the State of Connecticut Latino and Puerto Rican Affairs Commission and I also hail here from the city of Waterbury.

I'm here today to give you our feedback and recommendations with respect to your task of redrawing both the congressional and state district lines in the State of Connecticut as mandated by the federal and state laws. I'll just provide you a little bit of background information as to why I'm here today and then

I'll get into some of the data that we've compiled through our summit of professionals.

Connecticut, as you already know, has approximately 3.5 million people according to the Federal Census Bureau's latest information that was released earlier this year. 479,087 are of Hispanic or Latino descent. Roughly 13.4 percent of the overall population, which signifies an incredible growth of 49.6 percent, whereas the Latino population only increased 16.9 percent and the Anglo-Saxon population actually decreased 3 percent.

The Latino population is also the fastest growing racial and ethnic share of eligible voters. There are 318,947 Latinos that are of the ages of 18 years or older, which is 55.8 -- which is a 55.8 percent increase since 2000. And equally important is the fact that eligible voters in Connecticut are more likely to be native born, obviously because the majority of Latinos in this state are of Puerto Rican descent, including myself, minus the pale complexion of course.

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, they have lower levels of education attainment than the black and white eligible voters. And this is alarming to individuals like myself and the Latino and Puerto Rican Affairs Commission because it is also widely known in political circles in 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 systematic changes in state statutes required to alleviate this problem. And a lot of the time it's because we just don't have enough people there from our community at the state level.

Meanwhile, the general unemployment rate in Connecticut is hovering at approximately 9 percent, but the unemployment rate averaged 17.7 percent amongst Latinos in Connecticut. As a matter of fact, a recently released report entitled, *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 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 made up of other racial and ethnic groups is projected to reach approximately 29 percent by 2012. And this is one of the main reasons why the LPRAC alerted Connecticut lawmakers in 2009 to be aware of the social and economic cost 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, a collective effort as one group, particularly it's Latino and African-American populations. And the redistricting process for LPRAC therefore is of paramount importance because the way these district lines are redrawn by the Reapportionment Committee can make it much easier or much more difficult to elect

representatives to the Connecticut General Assembly that are responsive to these previously mentioned community needs.

So I just want to summarize our recommendations. I included them in your packet. And out of courtesy for the other speakers I'll go quickly, but I do want to state these for the record.

LPRAC and the Institute of Puerto Rican and Latino Studies at the University of Connecticut held a reapportionment summit on May 25, 2011, at the Legislative Office Building to help our agency develop recommendations to share with the reapportionment committee. Now this summit consisted of professionals, not just from Connecticut, but abroad that specialized in the area of redistricting and empowerment for specific communities, in this case, the Latino community.

A summary of the findings of this event were prepared for LPRAC by Dr. Charles Venator Santiago of PRLS and we are submitting a copy of the summary of the proceedings within the testimony for the record. If you see it fixed to your packet, it should be attached as Attachment A.

However a preliminary scan of the data that was suggested at this summit indicates the following. Number one, reducing the number of districts in the State of Connecticut would harm Latinos by diluting their ability to influence the outcome of elections. If you do not have representation, you do not have a voice. If you do not have a voice there's no way to remedy the situation in these communities.

Number two, there are higher proportions of Latino citizens or potential voters residing in central Connecticut, while there are higher proportions noncitizen or nonvoting Latin American residents in the southern most towns and cities, such as Danbury which, when compared to Waterbury, is much different because Waterbury has a large Puerto Rican population.

Number three, the redistricting process could create two Senate seats with a majority Latino population of 50 percent or more. And the available data suggests that the 1st would be Hartford. And the 23rd -- the 1st District, Hartford, and the 23rd District of Bridgeport, they could be redistricted in order to create two Senatorial districts with Latino dominant populations of 50 percent or more.

And next is at least four of the existing districts, namely the 75th District in Waterbury, the 128th District in Bridgeport, the 3rd District in Hartford and 147th in Stamford could be redistricted to increase the proportions of Latinos above 50 percent of the population in these districts that are already so close to getting, making that mark anyway.

Lastly, I'd like to refer you to Attachment B for our additional recommendations submitted to the Reapportionment Committee cochairs on June 14, 2011.

And in conclusion I would just like to say that the allotment for Latino districts and the end result in 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 our community

to attain leadership roles can only serve to alleviate the burden from the government while addressing issues affecting said communities.

It is because of the aforementioned that I strongly urge the Redistricting Committee to create Latino districts aware program.

Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you, Mr. Diaz.

Any committee members have questions for Mr. Diaz? Okay.

Thank you very much for your testimony. Our next speaker is Ray Squier from Cheshire. Mr. Squier.

RAYMOND SQUIER: Raymond Squier. Cheshire, Connecticut.

You may be wondering why I brought you all together. There's good news and bad news. The good news is you're better looking live than you are on television. And yet, I have seen you so often on television I feel I know you. In spite of that I'll continue.

Two things bother me. One is the overrepresentation we have up in Hartford. I'm not saying that the gentlemen are undeserving of those honors, but Connecticut is 1 percent of the population of the United States. In Washington we're represented by seven people, two Senators and five House members. In Hartford we are represented by -- you know the number.

Have you ever heard of the phrase, too many cooks spoil the broth? That's the feeling I have about the representation, or should I

say, the overrepresentation up in Hartford. I know you mean well, but frankly, ladies and gentlemen, there are just too many people up there. If I had my way I'd reduce the House by two thirds. I'd reduce the Senate by another two thirds.

I also want to mention something else that has some bearing on legislation that has passed. First in the Supreme Court and up in Hartford. I do not believe in a majority vote. I believe in a super majority vote. I believe that if a bill is to be passed it should be passed by two thirds of the voting members.

It worries me that in the Supreme Court -- which is not of your jurisdiction, thank God -- the votes are coming down on a four-to-five split. That means one person is voting for what 300 million people in the United States will observe as the law. I would have more confidence of six of the nine voted either for or against the legislation. And that also applies up in Hartford as well.

I don't like seeing a -- one person on a nine-panel board, for example. Four Republicans would vote for something. Four Democrats would votes against it and the tiebreaker would usually be the member of the predominant party. More better, as we say in grammar school, if six of those members agreed to a piece of legislation, or six members, two thirds agreed not to pass that legislation, I feel that twice as many people voting for or against something is a lot more Democratic than one person voting for the entire country.

I have nothing more to say. I thank you for the courtesy of your time.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you, Mr. Squier.

Questions or comments? Okay. Seeing none, we'll go to our next speaker, Kim Hynes from Woodbridge.

KIM HYNES: Good evening, Senator Williams, Representative Cafero and members of the Reapportionment Committee. Thank you for allowing me to testify this evening.

My name is Kim Hynes and I'm senior organizer for Common Cause in Connecticut. We are a nonpartisan, nonprofit citizen lobbying firm that works to improve the way Connecticut's government operates. Common Cause has more than 400,000 members around the country and 35 state chapters. Here in Connecticut we have about 7200 members and activists.

I am here today to urge members of the Reapportionment Committee to ensure that the process of redistricting in Connecticut be as open, transparent and acceptable -- accessible as possible.

Secrecy in government is inherently contradictory to democracy. A country that is not accountable to its people risks losing its basic legitimacy. Open government, transparent processes and a fully informed citizenry helps ensure that this never happens. A redistricting process that leads to well-defined and well-represented communities will promote a self-determinative democracy in which individuals and groups create solutions to the greatest problems facing our cities, towns, counties and state.

How political boundaries are drawn impacts who has a voice and the strength of that voice in the political process. One critical issue for redistricting in Connecticut is Connecticut's

large prison population and how incarcerated individuals are counted by the Census Bureau for the purpose of redistricting.

Currently incarcerated people are counted as residents of the prisons in which they reside rather than in their home communities. During the last census in 2000, the U.S. counted almost 20,000 people in Connecticut in state or federal prison cells in our state. Taken as a group, that population, which I believe now is about 17,000, is nearly large enough to constitute its own district.

However people in prison come from all over state, not the towns in which they are incarcerated. Using prison populations to inflate the voting power of a handful of towns in Connecticut distorts democracy for all of Connecticut's cities and towns.

In fact, counting prisoners in towns in which they are incarcerated is a violation of Connecticut State Law. Connecticut State Statute 9-14 says, no person shall be deemed to have lost his residence in any town by reasons of his absence there from in any institution maintained by the State.

Evidence of the statute can actually be seen in certain voting laws in Connecticut. Those prisoners who are allowed to vote, if they have committed misdemeanors or they are awaiting trial, have to vote by absentee ballot in the towns in which they're from rather than in the towns in which they are imprisoned.

This clearly is at odds with the practice of counting prisoners as residents of towns in which they are housed as prisoners for the purpose of redistricting. Common Cause urges

the Reapportionment Committee to follow the lead of states like Maryland, Delaware and New York and correct the federal census data count to count incarcerated people at home for redistricting purposes. By doing this the committee can assure that every District in Connecticut fairly represent the population therein and that each voter has the chance, same chance to be heard.

In addition I just wanted to mention that Common Cause would love to give recommendations on redistricting. And it would be great if we could have access to the maps that you guys are going to draw before everything is done rather than the maps from ten years ago.

So thanks so much.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Any questions or comments by committee members?

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Just very briefly, you certainly will have access to that information and we have not begun the process of redrawing maps.

KIM HYNES: That's why we're here.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: That's why we're having these public hearings to get the input from folks. And that will be available at the Capitol and we believe online as well.

KIM HYNES: Okay. That's terrific. Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Americo Santiago from Bridgeport.

AMERICO SANTIAGO: Muy buenas tardas.

Good afternoon or good evening.

REP. DONOVAN: Happy Birthday.

AMERICO SANTIAGO: Thank you. Jeez, you had to do that. Right?

Good evening. My name is Americo Santiago. And Cochairs Looney, Senator Looney, Senator Williams, Representative Cafero, Speaker, Representative, the rest of the members, thank you for being here and for allowing us this opportunity to come before you and speak on this important issue of redistricting.

Most of you know me. I have been around working on this process for the past 20 plus years, worked during the 1990, 2000 and now. So I'm here to voice my concerns regarding the Connecticut redistricting process.

First we are kind of disappointed that the committee doesn't have an African-American or a Latino person as a member of the committee. As committee members you have the right to select people, but I guess it was decided that you wanted to continue the process as you did ten, 20 years ago.

Also, we are concerned that some members of the committee doesn't see fit that we should be meeting to talk to you about this process and has said in private that we will do this after we have the public hearings. I hope you give us the opportunity to meet with you and to allow us to express our concern so we can put our 2 cents in making sure that the process is fair, is transparent and is inclusive.

But now let me just go back and say, thank you, also because 20 years ago you allowed Senator Coleman and myself to be like Representative Andres Ayala to be part of the voice that met with you and talked to you, to the committee about what was our concern and our interests.

I also want to say, thank you to the House for allowing us to work with you and create districts in the Latino community that were the foundation to elect people of our choice or continue to elect representatives that, even though they are not Latino, they continue to represent our interests.

For example, in Meriden and in New Britain, that for many years those two districts were almost majority Latino, yet we didn't have a Latino Representative, but there were people who were concerned about our community. So thank you for that.

And that built the foundation of what today we have the opportunity to elect more Latinos, but it's not the same when it comes to the Senate. Let me be very clear that the Senate has not been as fair as the House and the reason, I think it's because in the House we have people who were elected who were of Latino ethnic background which were able to voice their concern to the other House members. The Senate, we don't have a State Senator so there is no one speaking on our behalf.

And you know that the Senate is very powerful. Senators are chairs of the committees and they can influence one way or the other the way many votes go. I don't know what's going to happen in the future, but I know I remember in

the past one or two Senators could have changed the vote on the budget or many other important issues.

So that's why for the Latino community in the State of Connecticut, when you heard Cochairperson Isaias said that we are the fastest growing number in the state Connecticut, over 400,000. We are very concerned that the Senate has split the Latino community into two communities, two different districts most of the time.

I want to give you an example. The districts in New Haven, 10th and 11th Districts, the community is split right in half. We would love for the 11th District to take some of those Latinos and make it more Latino, while respecting the integrity and the district, the 10th District, which is an African-American district. Same thing in Bridgeport. The community is split. We would like for our community to be in just one district. The same thing in Waterbury where our community is split into two communities and also in Hartford.

Now in Hartford we have a unique case where in Hartford we could have a Latino majority district over 53 percent. And I have the proof right here. 53 percent Latino without doing -- in your own words -- doing any damage to the incumbents. Where you can have a district, the 1st Senatorial District where you can take a piece of West Hartford, a piece of East Hartford without doing anything to those incumbents from those three districts.

The history of our community has been that in Hartford we are a very concentrated community and professionals have moved to East Hartford and West Hartford. Historically the Latino

community in Hartford has not moved to Wethersfield. If you look at numbers 20, 10 years ago it has not changed much, but yet when you look at East Hartford and West Hartford, the Latino community has grown and that's why I will recommend to you that you take this into serious consideration.

If you draw districts that encompass what we are suggesting you are doing the Latino community the best favor that you can do, by allowing us to have a district where we can choose the person who gets elected. And that doesn't mean that the incumbent who's there has to move out. The incumbent can continue to run, be there and people probably will reelect him. That doesn't mean that we want to replace someone. What we want is the opportunity to have a district where in the future a person of our choice can be elected. And that's the bottom line.

So we will be submitting testimony. We will be submitting a plan for the State, Lower House and also for the Senate on the 18th when you go to Norwalk. We also -- we will have people coming, professionals to testify and to voice their concern. Hopefully if the Senate does this we will be happy. If it don't, then who knows? Maybe we'll end up in court.

Thank you very much.

REP. CAFERO: Mr. Santiago, before you go I just want to make a comment and see if the committee members have a comment to make. I want to assure you that there are members of this committee that would not care to have the incumbent reelected. So that is not necessarily universal opinion.

AMERICO SANTIAGO: I respect your opinion,

Representative.

REP. CAFERO: Especially given a two-party system. So this isn't all about protecting who's in there now. It's all about doing what's right and what's fair.

AMERICO SANTIAGO: Okay. Thank you. I respect your opinion.

SENATOR WILLIAMS: Although I have to add that that might not work out in exactly the way that you have planned, so in terms of my cochair's interesting suggestion there.

AMERICO SANTIAGO: Right. Okay. Well, that's a --

SENATOR WILLIAMS: For the viewing audience we have to be joking, but --

AMERICO SANTIAGO: I know. I know.

That's an internal decision that the committee has to make. All we are saying is, please be fair, be inclusive and understand that we are a growing community. And where we are moving is not to Wethersfield. It's to East Hartford and West Hartford and people know that. You can see the history. You can do an analysis. People will tell you.

Thank you very much.

REP. DONOVAN: I'd also like to add, and you, I think you mentioned it. Again, I wish him a happy birthday, because Americo Santiago, born on the 4th of July.

AMERICO SANTIAGO: Thank you.

REP. DONOVAN: So a belated happy birthday.

But also you mention -- and the House Democrats we have, is helping us.

AMERICO SANTIAGO: Right.

REP. DONOVAN: As we look at the districts we have Representative Andres Ayala from Bridgeport -- is helping us.

AMERICO SANTIAGO: Yes.

REP. DONOVAN: And also representative Toni Walker from New Haven who's helping us as well. So we can have -- make sure that we -- we're inclusive and we have everyone's opinion as we move forward.

AMERICO SANTIAGO: Yes, Mr. Speaker. And you know that we have a good working relationship. I know both sides, the Republicans and Democrats have worked very well with us in the past. We hope to continue doing that. We're just encouraging the Senate to be a little bit more flexible.

Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Okay. Our next speaker is Alma Maya from the city of Bridgeport.

ALMA MAYA: Good evening. I'm here as part of the Connecticut Latino Redistricting Committee. I'm also the elected town clerk in the City of Bridgeport. I just wanted to add that in just to clarify.

I remember when our community only had one State Representative in Hartford. And we worked very hard in the 1990s, which was the first time that Latinos had gotten together en masse to work on redistricting. So I know how important redistricting is. And let you know

also that we believe it's an ongoing process.

It's not a process that happened in 1990 and it stopped, and we did it again in 2000 and we got a little bit more. And now what we're looking for is we want to have our first Latino Senator. And we know that if we can get at least one maybe in ten years we can have another one because we continue -- we want to continue to work on doing this.

Now remember back in the 1990s we did not have these kind of public hearings. We had no meetings and we ended up in court in the 1990s. We would hope that this time we don't have to do that, because I think that now the State and our community understand the process a little bit more and know that this can be done in a joint way in cooperation. And I hope that that's what will continue to happen.

So I thank you for the opportunity and I look forward to the election of our first Latino Senator.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much. Comments?

Okay. Seeing none, our next speaker is Peter Wagner from Easthampton, Massachusetts.

PETER WAGNER: Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to come here and testify. I'm -- my name is Peter Wagner. I'm executive director of the prison policy initiative. And our largest project concerns prison-based gerrymandering.

As you've heard before, the U.S. Census counts people in prison as if they were legal residents of the location of the correction facility, even though under state law they remain legal residents of their home -- of

their homes.

When states use census counts to draw legislative districts they end up enhancing the weight of a vote that's cast in the districts that have the prisons at the expense of all districts elsewhere. And there was a bill that was before the Legislature last session, which did not pass, but I'd like to talk specifically about the two technical ways that this committee can greatly reduce the impact of prison-based gerrymandering of the Census Bureau's person counts on the legislative districts that you draw.

And I go through a -- my written testimony, I've got six pages of really technical stuff, but in very kind of broad strokes, the first option is that there's not enough time to collect home addresses, geocode them and prepare an entire adjusted data set. But it is possible to use the State's State Department of Corrections data on town of residence for incarcerated people and allocate them evenly within each city and town in the state. That's something that is actually relatively straightforward to do.

And on the flip side, for the first time ever the Census Bureau was providing you with the data about which census blocks contain correctional facilities and how much of that population is actually incarcerated. And in the third page of my testimony I go through and I've actually annotated which blocks, which tracks contain correctional facilities and exactly which populations are incarcerated.

The second option is the one that I'd like to spend a little bit more time on. It's possible for this committee to greatly limit

the impact of these prison populations being counted in the wrong spot without running afoul -- without having to exceed the 5 percent population deviation rule under White V. Regester, where if you can keep your district population deviations within 5 percent, you're presumed to have a -- those districts are presumed to be valid.

And what you can do is use those population deviations to your advantage, deliberately overpopulate the prison districts so that the real population, the population of the district with the prison population removed would be on the low end of the scale. So you draw the districts a little bit heavy. And then in reality their population then becomes a little bit light, but still within the allowable range.

And in doing this research and coming up with this proposal we wanted to make sure that this was actually technically possible in Connecticut, because you have a number of very large prison clusters. And it turns out that as long as you make sure that there's no district that is more than 9.4 percent prisons, it's possible to do this. So there's a prison cluster in Enfield, if that prison cluster is split between what's currently the 58th and 59th District that population deviation can be drawn in a way that it appears to be heavy within the allowable range, but it's true population would then be on the light side.

And then similarly the District 52 in Somers can be drawn in such a way that it is one of the most overpopulated districts in the state, would be presumptively valid, but then in reality, was one of the more underpopulated districts but still within the allowable

range.

And methodologically as you go forward, I'd strongly urge you to link the department of the Census Bureau's correctional database or the shorter version that I created to your redistricting data. So as you draw districts you can keep running totals of how many of this population that I'm looking at in this draft district is incarcerated.

So you can create summary reports just like you do for total population for race and ethnicity and voting age population, you also can do that for the correctional population so that you'll know for sure, is this population incarcerated or is it not? So Connecticut can avoid the situation that it did in the last decade where it drew on district that was 15 percent prisoners. So every 85 people in that district were represented as if they were a hundred people anywhere else in the state.

This is something that you did. This was an accident, but it's not -- and it was actually ten years ago. It's very difficult to be very sure that you were doing that. Now we have the data from the Census Bureau, so that could be very easy for you to do.

And finally I just wanted to just draw your attention to something that, there's actually some precedent in Connecticut for adjusting the census in regards to how prison populations are counted when drawing districts. The City of Enfield, when they're drawing districts for their town council, they removed the prison population prior to drawing those districts. Because to do otherwise they would draw a district that was about a third prisoners.

So rather than allow the people who live next to the prison to dominate the town council in Enfield, Enfield did the common sense thing that more than a hundred counties and cities across the country do and that several states are doing this decade. And they adjusted the census to try to more accurately represent where people in their town reside.

The state of Connecticut, I argue, should adopt the same principles and do it's best to count incarcerated people where they should be counted. And failing that, at least avoid inflating the weight of a vote cast in a district that happens to contain a prison.

Thank you very much for your time.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

Any questions?

REP. DONOVAN: I just have a question.

REP. CAFERO: Yes, Speaker.

REP. DONOVAN: So on your -- excuse me, and thank you for your -- the information here. So I'm just trying to figure out the second option number two.

PETER WAGNER: Sure.

REP. DONOVAN: It's a little complicated to me. Maybe we can figure it out.

So just take Enfield, for instance. You're looking at Enfield and over populating it in such a way so that it would meet the 5 percent rule. But would you move the population to bordering towns and somehow -- I'm just trying to figure out how to bordering towns come into

play.

PETER WAGNER: Actually in the case of Enfield, my understanding is that the 58th and 59th District could be drawn so that they're both within Enfield, but you just draw the districts near the prisons so that the prison -- half the prisons are in one district. Half are the others, but there's actually no need for either of the Enfield districts to cross the town boundaries.

REP. DONOVAN: I see what you're saying.

PETER WAGNER: And now these proposals that we've --

REP. DONOVAN: So it doesn't deal with the issue of where the person lives. It's just to deemphasize the impact of the prison population on that particular district.

PETER WAGNER: That is correct. And that's actually -- the way the math works out that's the biggest part of the prison-based gerrymandering problem and that's the one that you can address on that end.

REP. DONOVAN: I understand. Okay. Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Now you heard a previous speaker talk about counting prisoners in their hometown. That would totally discount what you're talking about here. Would it not?

PETER WAGNER: Option two, the second option that I proposed does not do that at all.

REP. CAFERO: I see.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: And I think option one didn't do that either because of the timing of finding

everyone's -- where their residence is.
Correct? Option one was sort of an equal
distribution. Was that what -- could you
refresh me on option one?

PETER WAGNER: Sure. And if I can, I think the way
to distinguish it would be that the bill that
was pending last year was about figuring out
exactly where people live down to the census
block level.

What is -- what option one would be, to coin a
phrase, would be a best estimate. And because
Connecticut is kind of unique, that you have
publicly accessible data about the town or
city of residence for your entire state prison
population three weeks before the census was
taken.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: And with respect to option two,
we have, when we're drawing the districts,
each one doesn't have to have the exact number
of voters. We have a range of about
5 percent. So it's about a 10 percent range
between the smallest and largest.

And I guess what you're suggesting is where
there are prisons, those, whether they are
State Rep or State Senate districts, should be
at the larger end and that effectively puts
more people who aren't part of the prison
population in that district and makes it more
of a fair representation. Is that option two?

PETER WAGNER: That's correct.

SENATOR MCKINNEY: Okay. Thank you.

PETER WAGNER: Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Any other comments? Okay. Thank you
very much.

PETER WAGNER: Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Our next speaker is Remi Acosta from the town of Waterbury.

REMI ACOSTA: Good evening. My name is Remi Acosta. Thank you for allowing me to speak in front of you today.

I've been a Waterbury resident for about 48 years. I'm a part of a group of Hispanics at a state and municipal level interested in equal representation for Hispanics at different governmental levels.

As reflected in the 2010 Census, the Hispanic population in the city of Waterbury has increased about 47 percent. Presently we have approximately 110,000 people in our beloved city. This means that approximately 31 percent of the population in Waterbury is Hispanic. All we ask is that we are afforded the opportunity, that the Hispanics are given the opportunity to choose candidates that will have the best interest in their community and the city at large. As mentioned by Mr. Santiago, we have a fair and equitable redistricting suggestion that we would like to present to you in the near future.

Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Any comments or questions?

Thank you, Mr. Acosta.

Our next speaker is Alberto Negrón.

ALBERTO NEGRÓN: Good evening. My name is Alberto

Negron and I reside at 27 Red Maple Lane in Waterbury. I thank the Apportionment Committee for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight on this most important process.

There are few other activities that have such a profound effect on the political landscape as redistricting. From diffusing representation to strengthening voices among those with shared interest, the apportionment process is something we should pay close attention to and never take lightly.

To that end I was looking at the -- Connecticut's 5th Congressional District and I noticed that it has the second most Latinos of the congressional districts after the 4th. So I would urge the committee to make an effort to keep as much of the cities -- or the larger municipalities within the district intact because Latinos tend to live -- or concentrate in urban areas and that congressional district is -- one second here -- 85 percent urban. So these municipalities have a sizable and growing Latino populations with common interests and issues of concern that would be best served if kept together.

As someone who has previously and presently serves in municipal government -- I served in Bridgeport 17 years ago and now in Waterbury -- I know how difficult it is for communities to organize behind any particular issue. And I know that if we keep the communities intact, that's the best avenue that people have to, you know, petition government for representation.

So it's far better for communities with shared issues to organize and petition government if they are able to work together and it is therefore important to do all we can do to

facilitate any elected officials' focus on issues that rank the most important in their given districts. Keeping the municipalities mentioned together will serve that end.

Thanks again for the opportunity to speak.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Any questions or comments?

Okay. Our next speaker is Ronnie Vazquoz from the town of Waterbury.

RONNIE VAZQUOZ: Good afternoon everyone. I'm Ronnie Vazquoz from the city of Waterbury. I'm not going to go into much detail and I don't have a written statement at this time. And most of the speakers that you heard already have given you the testimony, the input of what we're looking for.

I can only speak on my behalf and on -- as a long-life resident for the city of Waterbury for the last 30 years, I can say on behalf of the Hispanic community we have grown considerably. If you look at the census data you'll see the growth that's there. And one of the important things that we are looking for is that this particular board is fair, is equitable and looks at the census data according to that particular growth.

Like I said before, we don't have right now at this moment a particular plan of action to submit to the board, but we are currently working on that and we will be submitting that in the near future. So again, we just want to make sure that this process is fair and it's equitable.

Thank you.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Comments?

Okay. Seeing none, before I call our next speaker if anyone in the audience did not intend to speak, but is now moved to do so or came in afterwards, please feel free to, again, sign up at the table to my left. And we'll be glad to call you in.

Our next speaker is Chris O'Brien from the town of Wolcott.

CHIS O'BRIEN: Good evening, everybody. Thanks for coming down to Waterbury for us.

I decided to speak as a former State Senate Candidate here in Waterbury and Wolcott, in Southington and Cheshire in the 16th District 5 years ago. I'm also -- always been interested in maps. That's what you're going to be pouring over in the next few months. And also a casual observer of psychology, which I'm sure many of you in one way or another has an interest in as well.

I'm sure when we watch movies we see psychiatrists pull out an inkblot and they show their patient, well, what does this look like? And after someone suggested in the media looking at reapportionment -- and the next thing that comes up is gerrymandering, which of course, everybody loves a scandal. And what's better than a scandal is the one that you can see on a map.

So I don't know what -- I'm not a psychologist. I don't know if something looks like an egg or a tree or an animal or something, if it's a good thing or a bad

thing, but I'm sure at the end of the year you'll all be passing around what does this look like? And does it look anything other than a square, rectangle or semicircle?

But I decided to come here to talk to you that -- my experience a few years ago, walking up in the north end of Waterbury, campaigning door-to-door like many of you have done. And the border of the 72nd 73rd District, I think that as districts get larger, even as they are small people want to identify with their state legislator and they want to identify with their congressperson.

And I've thought sometimes, why are some of these towns divided in some -- why are the maps drawn a certain way that seem to bisect neighborhoods or bisect whole communities? Sometimes I thought, well, Waterbury has two Congressmen. That should give us more power in Waterbury, more influence in Washington.

Well, over the ten years -- maybe because the south end of Waterbury wasn't always part of the 3rd district and maybe because it's newer, I don't think people really identified with Rosa DeLauro. She certainly has made an effort to come here. She has certainly given water -- brought some money and influence back to the city, but I'm not sure if the populace -- because maybe the distance, the way to get to New Haven, what have you; I don't think they really identify so well.

So I hope that you'll look at transportation networks and community and ethnic boundaries as how you draw your borders for your -- going forward. I-84 and Route 8 are right at the center of Waterbury. Maybe you'll orient Waterbury and the surrounding towns along

those borders too.

I know you have to conform with the population and you'll probably start counting up from Greenwich and Stamford and New Caanan, Darien and see where the 4th District is. And doing the same thing coming from the east to the 2nd District. And then we have the jigsaw puzzle in the middle.

So I -- looking at that area, I know ten years ago we were looking at that map and Nancy Johnson wanted the district and you had to put Jim Maloney in the same one and it was quite a battle, an epic battle, a fairly even district, but I would suggest perhaps moving people that orient themselves towards Hartford. They work in Hartford. They converse with people from Hartford and they come from the Farmington Valley. Perhaps put them into where they would more likely share their ideas with other people in Hartford region and the same district. Move them from the Farmington Valley into the 1st first Congressional District.

When you go to a meeting and you say, you know, call your congressman. It's -- sometimes people feel like there's an extra barrier to call two rather than one. So on paper it might sound like a good idea to give two -- more power to a single town than less.

When I -- I'm sorry. Going back to when I was campaigning years ago in the 72nd and 73rd, I'd walk up North Main Street, Monte Road and Chestnut Road in the Bucks Hill neighborhood. And people would ask me, where do I vote? And who is my state legislator now? And who's running against them? And I'd have to pull out my map. What side of the street am I on?

Where am I on?

And because that whole area is certainly carved out -- I don't know what it looks like I'm on an inkblot test, but it is certainly carved out. I'm not sure if it's for a reason. Both legislators are Democrat. Representative Berger has faced primary challenges in the past, but Representative Butler I don't think has so much. It's a very uncompetitive -- oh, I stand corrected. You'll know better than I will, Representative.

A VOICE: (Inaudible.)

CHIS O'BRIEN: Well, then you'll know better than I do. I'm sorry.

But from my point of view perhaps that's not as competitive a district historically, but maybe it is. But at least for the people that they represent they get confused on who is representing them and where they vote and if can you redraw those lines -- I understand power will influence this to some degree, but there will be representative leaning -- or Republican leaning and Democratic leaning districts, but we're here for the people.

If I could just call your attention to another couple districts, the 133rd in Fairfield that matches the ink blot test that's kind of strangely carved out through Fairfield right down the middle and then again in Westport.

The Senate districts I think are very interesting. If you look at a map of Senate districts throughout the State, you see Senator McKinney here and Senator Williams. Your districts look -- I honestly think they look funny, but I think that there, the intent

to keep towns together in those districts was probably a good one.

That when you -- in Newtown you know you'll have one Senator. You know who they are. Senator Williams, same thing. Your towns probably know exactly who you are. I don't know if it's difficult to drive from one end to the other, but I think that's a good intention.

And then that goes on back to my point before along, you know, communication, transportation, economic boundaries. Try to keep those together.

Thank you very much.

REP. CAFERO: Any questions or comments?

Okay. Seeing none, our next speaker is Alexa Looker.

A VOICE: (Inaudible.)

REP. CAFERO: I'm sorry.

A VOICE: Aleta. A-l-e-t-a. Aleta.

REP. CAFERO: Aleta. I'm sorry. Aleta.

ALETA LOOKER: Thank you for having this hearing.

I don't recall it being quite as formal ten years ago. And it's good to see you all and to see who you are. And know that maybe I can possibly reach you again at some point. I am Aleta Looker. I come from Cheshire. I am one of the registrars there.

We have -- and I regret that I didn't write testimony, but if you want me to write something I will at some point.

REP. CAFERO: We just ask you to try to speak into the microphones so we can pick you up for the recording. Thank you.

ALETA LOOKER: I am a registrar. My fellow registrar on the other side of the aisle and I and the town clerk in Cheshire have some issues that we'd like to have brought before you.

Right now -- oh, I also should mention that I am on the board of directors for the Registrars Association for the State of Connecticut, so my connections are not only within the town, but rather widespread.

We are very concerned as the costs of running elections continue to mount and that we have in our community of Cheshire, five little clusters, that is five things that were dropped on us. Five -- we have two senatorial districts. Ten years ago we had one. We have three assembly districts and they are extremely weirdly carved out. As someone spoke of it as being a jigsaw puzzle. That's indeed what it is.

And remind -- let me remind you that each of these areas requires a different ballot. Each of these ballots costs in the neighborhood of 50 cents apiece or more. And we're supposed to, if we don't make the proper -- because of the law that was passed this year, the integrity bill -- if we don't make the proper report to the Secretary of the State, she will take it upon herself to require that we order 100 percent coverage with ballots. This could be extremely expensive. I intend to send that report PDQ.

But that being said, the cost is just one

issue. I know that there were reasons for the subdivision of the State over this past time. Of course, one of the major problems was that we went from six congressional districts to five and it meant a lot of wiggling around with the way the outlines of those five districts were. And of course that isn't your prerogative. Is it? You don't choose. Or do you?

Do you make the decision about how the five district outlines are for the congress?

A VOICE: Yes.

REP. CAFERO: Yes.

ALETA LOOKER: You do. Well, I'm not going to tell you what to do, but I'm simply suggesting that there are perhaps some more imaginative ways of doing it this time around.

I would suggest also -- and I heard this mentioned by somebody else -- that the town outlines be recognized and used a little bit more positively. I don't like the fact that just a little bit of the Senatorial, 16th Senatorial District is dipping into Cheshire. You could push it out again. We could have one Senatorial district quite happily. It would save us a lot of headaches. On a wider scale, here in Waterbury you've got -- a part of the city is in the 3rd Congressional District, but most of it is in the 5th.

In Durham, that poor little town has part of it in the 2nd District and part of it in the 3rd -- I mean, in the 5th. Excuse me. But I mean, there should be no real good reason for this that I can see. Yes, I understand about population census districts and so forth, but use it intelligently.

We also have a prison in Cheshire and it has changed the look of our polling places a considerable amount. It's really strange that when we have town people, people running for office in town, they weigh in the prison population in two of our four sub districts.

Do any of the prisoners vote? Uh-uh. But they have influenced the size of that particular district because we have to follow, not only the senatorial lines, but the represented -- the assembly district lines in order to make this work. Otherwise, we'd be fractured into many more voting districts than we already have.

I want to make a remark that's maybe out of order, but I hope not. Right now in our town and I think in many more we're having a difficult time finding people to run for municipal office. Part of it is ignorance about where they even belong, but a lot of it is apathy.

I am really excited to hear the Latino members of our state being so interested in being involved in the political process. Hurrah.

Thank you for your time.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you very much.

Comments or questions?

Seeing none, our next speaker is Vincent Flynn from Cheshire.

VINCENT FLYNN: Good evening. I just want to commend this panel. You guys have quite a job ahead of you because it's a monumental task to deal with all of the statistics and the census

and try and conjure up districts that are going to work for the people and provide everybody a fair chance to be represented in the state. So I do want to commend you for your effort here.

I just want to speak to some of the things that some prior speakers have mentioned and also weigh in on a couple of my own points. I do live in Cheshire. We do have a correctional facility in town. I think it would be really unfair, given the myriad of burdens that the correctional facilities pose to the town, if we were penalized in reapportionment as a result of the presence of the prison --

And I would also mention something Ms. Looker mentioned, that the town of Cheshire right now is divided into three State Rep districts, none of which are fully within the town. The town of Cheshire I believe is somewhere around 29,000 residents. The appropriate population for a State Rep district in 2010 is -- correct me if I'm wrong -- somewhere between 22,500 and 23,500. So it would be possible to draw a district entirely within the town of Cheshire and still have about 6,000 residents left over.

So we are presently split for State Rep districts three ways, State Senate districts two ways and we're not a particularly large town. And I think that also gets to one of the other concerns I have in the overall redistricting process and I'm very familiar with Baker Versus Carr and the various court decisions mandating one man, one vote.

However what we've seen, I think in particularly our smaller communities, is they've been sliced and diced like they've

gone through a Cuisinart. And it's really -- if we're going to have to make cuts in these districts to conform to one man, one vote, I think that it's really unfair to the smaller and middle sized communities, that they are the ones that are on the cutting block.

They already have less voice in state government than the larger communities that have large delegations in Hartford. If our voice is splintered into three or four State Rep districts in Cheshire, mostly historically held by out-of-towners, I mean, it creates a sense where we really -- we have, right now we have a State Representative who lives in Cheshire today, but we have no certainty if the town continues in its current alignment that we could go back to the days in which there was no representative from Cheshire in either House Of the State Representatives or the State Senate and I think that's something that applies on all levels.

And one of the things in looking at the not so picturesque map you have over there is, I think it's painfully obvious that that was done to accommodate two individual's desires and not necessarily the desires of residents in Northwestern and Central Connecticut.

The map in general has numerous town splits. I played with a -- is a website, Dave's redistricting. It's on -- you can go find it. And you can split the state of Connecticut and get zero deviations. Well, they only do it by precincts, so you're down to about a thousand or 800 splitting four towns.

There's no need to go to more splits. If you're doing more splits you're doing it because you want to do them, not because they have to be done. And I think one of the

things in that realm is that in looking at the map, I don't know why Torrington was split except for a gentleman's agreement. Durham was split. Again, that's a very small town which had its voice in Congress dissipated. So I would really commend that this panel not follow that path when it creates the new congressional districts.

And also speaking to something else people have mentioned here about communities of interest. The 5th as it's currently configured runs all the way from Danbury to New Britain and then up into the northwest corner. I think it's readily apparent in recent years that New Britain is really an integral part of the Hartford metropolitan area. And in fact the Governor is planning to spend something like \$600 million to further integrate it with the busway. And if you look at it right now, it constitutes a salient in the district which juts out from the remainder of the congressional district.

It's -- and if you look at the DECD labor market stats, the vast amount of commuting into New Britain and out of New Britain are to communities in the 1st Congressional District. So the ties that New Britain has to the remainder of the district, particularly as you go west of Waterbury are quite negligible.

There was one time when we were six districts. It was clearly the largest town in the former 6th District. The population has declined. We've lost a district and I think it's become more further integrated with Hartford. And this has just happened as time has gone on and I think we should recognize that in the map.

On the other hand, today I was driving around. I was driving to Route 322. I took a left in

front of the McDonald's. That was in Southington. I got into Southington about 200 yards before. I go down 322. I pass through Cheshire. I pass out of Cheshire. I pass back into Southington.

Southington and Cheshire, they're in the same cable TV system. They share a probate court district. They're both in the 16th State Senate District. They play a Thanksgiving Day game in football now every year. I really think that it probably would be prudent if you're going to move towns around between the 1st and the 5th, that Southington and Cheshire, with all the, you know, multiple ties that they have, belong in the same congressional district.

And I can probably speak to other towns, but you know, that's the one where this morning I was driving down Route 322 to get onto I-84, so I know how often I went to -- in and out of the 1st District, the 5th District, back to the 1st District. And if you look at the map, I don't know if that's really the way we should be doing it.

Anyway, I don't have any written submissions, but I would suggest however that the professional staff look at Dave's Redistricting. It's on the Internet. You can find it. You can find it through D Kos; you have it linked through there.

Frankly I would like if our professional staff could get a website here for the amateurs out there that has all the nuts and bolts. That, like, they told me to go look at the tiger files from the census. I couldn't open them up. So I do the best I can with what I have, but I think there's more that's out there and I think the more we get public involvement,

district lines submitted from the public, the more there's going to be a transparency. There's more confidence that the result we get is what the State of Connecticut really wants for the next decade.

And thank you very much.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

Comments or questions?

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY: Yes. Thank you, sir. Not really a question, but just a comment.

You mentioned some of the larger delegations in the state. Connecticut really doesn't have any large delegations because we are, unlike our neighboring states, if you look at -- no single municipality in Connecticut has more than 4 percent of the State's population.

Bridgeport with -- barely reaches the 4 percent figure. So if you look at New Haven, Hartford and Bridgeport together, those three municipalities have less than 12 percent of the stat's population as opposed to New York City is almost 40 percent of the population of New York State. And even Boston has about 10 percent of the population of Massachusetts.

So we're not a State Legislature that has any really large delegations, if you compare it by looking by other states and our population is very much fragmented into 169 moderate sized municipalities.

VINCENT FLYNN: Well, perhaps I just -- I once actually worked in this building about 20

years ago. And I can tell you right now that there's a tremendous gulf in how someone in a town the size of Cheshire perceives their influence in state government and the perceived influence that politicians in Waterbury have.

I just, and you know, I do understand that New Haven does not have the impetus in Hartford that New York City has, but I mean, you know, I do think people in New Haven sleep. We know that doesn't happen in New York City. So --

REP. CAFERO: Okay. Our next speaker is State Representative Larry Butler, the city of Waterbury.

And once again, if anybody has arrived late or has a change of heart and would like to speak, please see -- sign in at the table to my left.

Senator Butler.

REP. BUTLER: Good evening, lady and gentlemen of the Reapportionment Committee. Welcome to Waterbury. My hometown that I love so dearly.

I have to say that ten years ago I came to speak in front of a similar panel and the hot-button issue was the 5th and 6th Congressional Districts. And has been alluded to earlier, it really had to be formed considering two incumbent congresspeople.

So when you look at the map and the fact that it actually goes from New Britain, where I believe Nancy Johnson was from, and all the way to Danbury where Congressman Jim Maloney was, I guess that's the result of what the big challenge that you had to face. Somebody had to draw lines and actually it's changed hands a couple of times. So I guess it's, you know,

pretty fair, but that's something you're going to have to look at.

My concern is something that a couple other people mentioned earlier, the various incursions into different towns where you get a sliver like Waterbury. We have a sliver in the 3rd Congressional District. Now I don't know how Rosa -- Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro is really working out for the people in the town plot area here in the city, but we happen to love our Congressmen who is moving on in the 5th Congressional District.

But for such a small sliver to be in Waterbury, I would ask that you really look at those borders. And if you can, just stop the district there. For the little sliver of that congressional district that's in Waterbury, I'm sure you can find that someplace else. There were some other towns mentioned, like, Durham, or something. If that was split, the split in Waterbury could offset the split in Durham. You could have these districts, you know, within the boundaries of towns.

I'd like to move on next to the State Senate level where we have in Waterbury a sliver of the 16th Senatorial District. Now ten years ago we in Waterbury had a significant portion of the 16th Senatorial District. So I'm looking at that district I would hope that either one, you take the sliver and move it out to the boundary and have the complete city be in the 15th Senatorial District.

Or if you're going to fill that, the 16th Senatorial District should have a place in Waterbury to give us a little bit more of an emphasis in the district because right now we only have a sliver and actually most of it is in Wolcott and Southington and I guess there's

a sliver in Cheshire. But really I'd rather either see more of a significant presence in Waterbury or actually having the 15th Senatorial take over the whole city.

I just think it's more practical and I think it really lends itself to the point that was made earlier really wherever possible. If you could stop districts at the city/town, you know, a city line, town line, I think that helps everybody all the way around.

State Representative districts, I like talking about that. My district actually -- my district, which was mentioned earlier, and the 73rd District, actually kind of mimics a puzzle piece. And ironically I came in here tonight and I looked at the state map. And I'm looking at the 5th congressional district and the first congressional district. And boy, that looks an awful lot like the 72nd and 73rd District. Just looking at it. If you look at it, it really mimics that.

And where I live happens to be right up in the notch. I guess that's right around Enfield where the Connecticut notch is. And so you can see how my district flows around. And if at all possible, I think that my neighborhood that I live in is really -- a great portion of it is in the blue section that's right below that notch. So I would hope that if you get down to the neighborhood area, because Waterbury is a distinct city of neighborhoods. And I'm very involved in my neighborhood community club. And it's split between Senatorial Districts 15th and 16th. It's split between State Representative Districts, the 72nd and 73rd.

So that would help to put that all in one district and it would look a lot less like

a puzzle piece. So I know there's all kinds of tweaking that's involved in there, but that's just one such instance which was brought up today about when -- from the gentleman from Wolcott about the people in that area who walk that district. I'm telling you, you could walk up one street, North Main Street and you can go in and out of the 72nd and 73rd District probably four times if you walk, you know, two miles. I think that could be done better.

So in terms of the prisoners that were mentioned here today, I've thought about that issue and I, from the top of my head, thought about the people who actually, you know, should be considered from where they come from, would be the most logical choice. It's plain and simple.

You don't need a lot of formulas, even though I've got a handout from Mr. Wagner. And it seems interesting. You know, a formula that seems that it's going to take some digesting to see if whether or not it's practical. But the simple way of handling that would be where they come from, pure and simple.

So hopefully you will take that under consideration and do something to address that issue. You have multiple options. I'd just like to see something done to address the issue.

And finally, I'd like to talk about the minority representation and it was brought up earlier about the fact that there's no blacks or Hispanics on this panel, but I heard the answer to that. And the answer to that was Representative Ayala from Bridgeport and Representative Toni Walker from New Haven would be working in concert with you,

consulting with you. And I have the utmost respect for both of those individuals. So if they are actually working with you, that really makes me feel a lot better. So -- and I applaud you for actually doing that in advance.

Hopefully you had anticipated that being the issue. And for me, I can tell you that I think those were two great people to bring onto the process and I feel confident with their input and your wisdom that we'll arrive at a very fair district apportionment in the State of Connecticut.

So thank you for this opportunity to speak tonight and I look forward to the results.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you.

REP. BUTLER: Oh, and finally I have to really comment on one last thing. Senator Looney, you had touched on it terms of the makeup of the cities and the actual percentages. And it was mentioned here that, you know, certain small towns don't really feel like they have a chance.

Well, I tell you, up at the Capitol the small towns, while by themselves they may not feel like they have a lot clout, collectively let me tell you, they have significant representation. So clearly I don't think any small town should feel that their concerns won't be reflected in representation at the capital. So I just want to say that for the record.

REP. CAFERO: Thank you. Thank you.

Just a couple of comments before I ask if there's any other speakers. First of all, I

thank Representative Butler for his comments. And I know the Speaker has indicated that he has asked the assistance of two of his State Representatives within his caucus of the minority community to assist he and his caucus in their efforts in this process.

I think I speak for everyone, whether it is of an elected representative or not, I think we are all not just acting amongst ourselves here. We have solicited and asked for assistance from many, many people throughout the State of Connecticut in a varying communities, certainly in the minority communities, to assist us individually as caucuses as we go through this process. So I want everyone to be assured of that.

The second comment I want to make comes from somebody that made a comment, just so you know. If you go to the Connecticut General Assembly website, on the front page, there is a link to the reapportionment committee and in particular, the redistricting project. And there's a ton of very useful information that would assist somebody in doing or drawing their own maps, et cetera.

Also we do have a public access terminal for someone to do just that at the Legislative Office Building in the legislative library, which is on the fifth floor of the Legislative Office Building, which is connected to the State capitol. It has state-of-the-art equipment and software and would, I think, really be very helpful for someone who's interested in submitting and drawing and experimenting with drafting their own district maps.

So with that, I'd like to ask if there's anyone else in the audience that did not get a

chance to speak that would like one. And if not, on behalf of my committee members, I'd like to thank you all for coming. Thank you so much for your input.

And we will have four other committee meetings. The next one is tomorrow evening at seven o'clock in the city of Norwich, Connecticut.

Thank you.