

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

FOLEY: Good morning. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the fifth day of the One Hundred Seventh Legislature, First Special Session. Our chaplain for today is Senator McCollister. Please rise.

McCOLLISTER: Good morning, colleagues. Please join me in prayer. Lord, make me an instrument of your peace. Where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; where there is sadness, joy. O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much to seek as to console, to be understood as to understand, to be loved as to love, for it is in giving that we receive and it is in pardoning that we are pardoned and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life. Amen.

FOLEY: Thank you, Senator McCollister. I recognize Senator Kolterman for the Pledge of Allegiance.

KOLTERMAN: Please join me in the pledge. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

FOLEY: Thank you, Senator Kolterman. I call to order the fifth day of the One Hundred Seventh Legislature, First Special Session. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: I have a quorum present, Mr. President.

FOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Are there any corrections for the Journal?

CLERK: I have no corrections.

FOLEY: Thank you, sir. Are there any messages, reports, or announcements?

CLERK: Mr. President, confirmation reports from Natural Resources Committee. I have the report of registered lobbyists, as required by state law, to be inserted in the Journal. And, Mr. President, agency reports acknowledgment. That's all that I have.

FOLEY: Thank you, sir. Members, we'll now proceed to the agenda. Mr. Clerk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

CLERK: Mr. President, LB1 was reported to the floor from the Redistricting Committee this morning. LB1 is a bill introduced by the Redistricting Committee. It's a bill for an act relating to redistricting. It sets the district boundaries of the representatives of Congress of the United States by the adoption of maps by reference; introduced on September 13, reported to the floor this morning. At this time, I have no amendments to the bill.

FOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Linehan, you're recognized to open.

LINEHAN: Good morning, Mr. President and colleagues. I am going to get to the map in a second, but I want to say a few things first.

FOLEY: Members, please come to order.

LINEHAN: In case anyone missed it, yesterday was my birthday. It was also John Lowe's. I don't think-- I don't think anybody missed that. But they might have missed John Lowe's because he didn't admit to having a birthday until sometime after the first three or four hours of testimony. I've been involved in politics and public service for over 30 years. The events of the last seven days have brought into stark relief how much has changed. In 1995, when I was Chuck Hagel's campaign manager and the first woman to ever run a statewide Republican campaign, the World-Herald was a statewide paper. The bulldog edition was published at 8:00 p.m. so it could be delivered to Scottsbluff early the following day. Its editorial page was serious, informed, thoughtful, though I didn't always agree with them. The editorial page was also connected to news reporting, not baseless rumors. Our pollsters at the time were amazed how well-informed Nebraskans were. We were, according to national pollsters, the best-informed state in the nation, and much of that had to do with our public-- our papers, including stories by Don Walton, who is here with us this morning. I have known Don Walton for a very long time. Consequently, yesterday, I was shocked at the misinformation that shaped far too many of our fellow citizens' opinions. I don't follow Twitter. I don't tweet negative comments about my colleagues while sitting next to them at a public hearing. I don't game out political messaging campaigns based on misinformation. I'm actually dismayed by it. But my bigger disappointment this week has been the disconnect between rural and urban Nebraska. In the 1990s, no one referred to communities outside of Douglas County and Omaha as the rest of it, especially the Omaha media. There was a sense that we were all connected, especially the Omaha, Sarpy, and Offutt area. The partnerships across those borders were rich and effective. It is sadly evident this weekend that tribalism has gained an unhealthy foothold

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

in our state. We, the Legislature, more than any other body, needs to remember that we represent the whole state. That's why we're called senators. The businesses headquartered in Omaha do not just do business in Omaha. First National Bank has branches in Columbus, in Norfolk, and Beatrice. Union Pacific's tracks span our whole entire state. And the University of Nebraska Med Center does not just educate Omahans. Tweets that misinform feed that tribalism. Yesterday in Omaha, many testifiers commented on a map they saw last Thursday. Maps for LB1 and LB2 were not made public until Friday evening. I had no idea what map they were referring to. It was only later that my staff told me they were referring to a map that was tweeted, not an official map but one that was discussed in committee. What does LB1 actually do? LB1 creates three congressional different-- districts. It does split Douglas County along very recognizable boundaries. Nobody argued yesterday that 680 and Dodge Street are not recognizable boundaries. The districts, we didn't follow county lines. All of you who also have had birthdays over 60 will understand I can't quite read this because I lost my good glasses this morning. We do split Boyd County, but we tried to put communities of interest together. I know it's not perfect. That's why we have debate on the floor. But there's another thing it does not do. It's not gerrymandering. How is splitting Douglas County around a very recognizable boundary gerrymandering? Political gerrymandering, I've heard all week. When taking Douglas County and reaching down into Sarpy County grabs 69,000 people: not gerrymandering. Our legislative districts will contain roughly 40,000 people. None of us believe that 40,000 constituents, our 40,000 constituents, are less important than 140,000 somewhere else. Sarpy County is no less recognizable than Douglas County or Lancaster County or Cherry County. Finally, LB1 does not destroy the blue dot. This week, in Grand Island, in front-- testifying in front of the committee, the Democrat state chair admitted as much. The election last fall laid down on this congressional map, President Joe Biden still wins. Nonetheless, on Thursday night in Omaha, there was a rally held-- I was not there, but I heard a lot about it yesterday-- telling people that it did destroy the blue dot and they needed to come yesterday and say they didn't want the blue dot destroyed. I know we're going to have a very intense debate today and we need to have one, and then the committee is going to have to go back to work and find out something we can all agree on. But I would like to talk about facts and not things that just aren't true. Thank you, Mr. President.

FOLEY: Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. Pr-- Mr.-- [RECORDER MALFUNCTION] Test, test, test.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

FOLEY: Mr. Clerk, you're recognized.

CLERK: Mr. President, at this time, Senator Blood would move to amend with AM15.

FOLEY: Senator Blood, you're recognized.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators, friends all, I stand actually in support of LB1, and-- and I do echo much of what Senator Linehan had to say-- I'll stand back from the mike, maybe that'll help-- had to say. But I do feel it necessary to-- to bring forward an amendment, and let me walk you through why. As you know, Sarpy County is the fastest-growing county in Nebraska. We have the largest employer in Nebraska in Sarpy County, and we have no signs of slowing down. In fact, we have had eight solid years of momentum, for those of you who are unaware of what's going on, on our end of the state. But today, driving here, I remembered that today was Constitution Day. And that's why I like the drive. I have lots of time to think and why certain days are important. And I remembered that our founding fathers were really fearful of the rise of factions that advance political agendas, much of what you just heard. Our government was designed with checks and balances to prevent any one group from being too influential. And that's why the way we do redistricting is so important, not us versus them, Republicans versus Democrats, we're trying to make it-- at least some of us are trying to make it about the people. So rolling forward to redistricting, I found it disturbing that many came forward, as they have the right to do, not knowing about what they really liked about the maps or didn't like about the maps. They came based on emails that they had received, some being told to be angry, some being given misinformation, some not being given mis-- misinformation. But when they came, they were just robots talking about what they were told to say. And if you watch some of the hearings, you know exactly what I'm talking about. We'd say, can you point out, please, what you do or do not like about that map, the one that you say you do or do not support or you do-- or do support? And the vast majority of people couldn't tell us and that's just disturbing. That's why I'm glad so many people have called and sent emails and given their personal stories and told us why they do or do not like certain maps. But with this said, we heard a story about how if we don't keep Sarpy County whole, it's going to affect the sewer project, which, I'm sorry, is untrue. The-- Sarpy County is currently not whole and in 2017, the Bellevue sewer project became part of the Sarpy County and Sarpy city's wastewater agency pro-- project, and that was formed in 2017 to address that particular issue. And so I just don't want you to be fooled into thinking that this is something

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

that's going to go away, because this is a unified effort that started years ago. In fact, in September of this year, they started taking bids. And so I can get into all the particulars and talk about the ridgeline and talked about where things are located and why this is an important project. It's an important project. It's not a project that's going to go away because we don't make Sarpy County whole. But with that said, and what I never heard on record and I kept trying to ask people about it, is that Sarpy County really does need to be whole as a county, and that's because we are the fastest-growing county. And if we become whole, that gives Douglas County the ability to become whole as well. There is no reason that we can't move Sarpy County as a whole into Congressional District 1 and Douglas County as a whole into Congressional District 2. Now I know there's a lot of different things that we can be doing, and I know that Senator Linehan is going to be working on that, as other committee members. But I just want you to know that there are other options than what we're seeing on LB1. And LB1 is the starting point for discussion, and today I wanted to start the discussion about how we keep Sarpy County whole. But I want to do it with facts, not scare tactics, and with the truth, not half-truths. So the truth is we're not going to lose our ability to fix the sewers in Bellevue if we don't keep Sarpy County as a whole. If that wasn't the case, we would never have been able to form the organization that we have now, which is moving Sarpy County forward. And what you need to know about Sarpy County-- and we're different than a lot of-- a lot of other counties outside of Douglas. So I know when you go into Hall County, your communities don't abut each other. When you go into Buffalo County, your communities don't abut each other. But in Sarpy County, you can literally cross the street in multiple directions and be in another community. If I go to Harrison and I cross the street, I'm in Omaha. If I go to northwest Bellevue and cross the street in that direction, I'm in La Vista; that direction, I'm in Papillion. A lot of people who live in western Nebraska, who say we don't understand western Nebraska, should come and take a look at what's going on in Sarpy because it's very different than the other counties. And that's one of the reasons we need to keep it whole, not because we're going to lose our ability to-- to protect the Bellevue sewer project that's already on the books, that's already taken care of, but because we really are a different creature than the vast majority of counties in here. Now I'm also not saying it's OK to cut any county in half, just so words aren't-- aren't taken out of my mouth and-- and put in as-- as I'm trying to take something away from somebody else. But what I am saying is that there is much to be done as a nonpartisan body to work together and get this right. And if you're sitting there going, it's LB1, do or die, I'm going to support it no matter what, then we're not doing the people's work, we're not doing justice to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

Nebraskans. If you don't think redistricting is important enough for us to revisit it and talk about how we can change things for the better for all Nebraskans, then I don't understand why you're in the Unicameral, because, yes, your people elect you, but you represent all of Nebraska. And there is a lot that we need to address on this map to make it right, not to mention when we get to the legislative district map. Think about what you're going to say on the mike today about LB1 because those same issues are going to apply to the legislative district maps that we eventually vote out from committee. If you don't like things cut in half, look at the legislative district maps. If you don't think there's good connectivity on LB1, look at the legislative district maps, make sure that the reasoning that you use for this map is the same reasoning you're going to use for the maps that come after it, because again, we are here to do the people's work. So my job today is not necessarily to change LB1 as much as to let you know that my goal is to keep Sarpy County whole, but to start the discussion as to how we do this. And I don't want to keep Sarpy County whole at the detriment to Douglas County. There is no reason we can't both remain whole. And so we need to have that discussion of why there's a thought process that that's not possible. There is no reason that we can't go north or west, for-- for example. We keep looking at the Nebraska maps as being thirds going west to east. Why aren't we thinking about Nebraska being thirds going from the south to the north? Actually, if you do your own maps on one of the free softwares, you'll find that all the concerns that everybody's complaining about are almost completely resolved by doing a map like that. So let's start the discussion today. Let's talk about what we can do right. And with all due respect, I would really like to not hear the word "Democrat" or "Republican" today. I would like to hear it just be about Nebraskans, because the more that we bring in words like "conservative" and "progressive" and conserv-- and "Republican" and "Democrat," the less we're going to get done on these maps. Let's make it about the Nebraskans today. Let's be fair. Let's be impartial and let's draw some good maps. And with that, I will close my opening. Thank you, Mr. President.

FOLEY: Thank you, Senator Blood. Long list of senators in the speaking queue. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're first in line.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. Good morning, Nebraska. Good morning, colleagues. I stand here in opposition to LB1. And I have not had a chance to look at Senator Blood's amendment, so I will have to take a look at that and consider if I support it or not. I-- I had a lot of things in mind about what I wanted to communicate this morning, but the opening on this bill makes me think that I need

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

to hit pause on some of those things and address some of the things that were said this morning. I attended the hearing in Omaha yesterday and there were maps distributed to those that were testifying. And I believe that they were supplied by the Legislature. They were the maps that are LB1 and LB2. To say that people were testifying to something they saw on Twitter, based on no fact whatsoever, it's galling. It's galling to diminish the voice of the people who came to testify, to say that they were wrong because you assume that they found something on social media. Fifty-six people came to testify in opposition to LB1 yesterday and 9 people testified in support and the committee immediately Execed on that bill and voted it out. The voice of Nebraska was not heard by that committee. It is disappointing and disheartening. And in the opening on LB1, we heard that the Chair doesn't even think that this bill is going anywhere, so we're going to spend eight hours on a bill that people opposed. The people of Nebraska, not just CD2, the people of Nebraska opposed LD-- LB1. And the committee Chair doesn't even think this bill is going to go anywhere, but the people of Nebraska supported LB2 and the committee held it. This is a day where I believe the people of Nebraska are going to feel disenfranchised by this body. They are going to see how hyper-partisan their nonpartisan Legislature has become. And it is-- it's devastating and the outcomes will be devastating. One person, one vote. If there's concern over the division between urban and rural, some self-reflection should happen because the rural senators in this body have been attacking urban since the day I got here. And these maps only go to show how little respect you have for the individuals that live outside of farming communities in the state of Nebraska. One person, one vote. We're not counting land. We're not counting acreages. We're not counting cattle. One person, one vote, and our maps should reflect that. They should use the prin-- principles and tenets of redistricting: core, community, connectedness, compact. The maps that we are going to be debated-- debating aren't going to do that because they take into consideration partisanship. And I understand that that's legal, but that doesn't mean that it's ethical or that it's right or that it's the right thing for the people of Nebraska. I don't care if my district has more Democrats or Republicans in it.

FOLEY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: I care if my district holds up to those tenets. I care that this map cuts my home county in half in the most arbitrary, nonsensical way possible. And if we were to move forward with the maps that Senator Linehan put forward for the Legislature, my district, my legislative district, would be right there, straddling CD 1 and CD 2.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

And-- and it-- for-- it like literally zigzags, zigzags. That's gerrymandering. This is gerrymandered. And--

FOLEY: That's time.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

FOLEY: That's time, Senator. Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Slama.

SLAMA: Thank you, Mr. President. And good morning, colleagues. I rise today in support of LB1, and I'll get into why I'm not supportive in AM-- on AM15 here in a second. I-- but Senator Cavanaugh's discussion today, it kind of comes off as someone who is sitting in class, got called on by the teacher, and didn't actually do the readings and is trying to talk through a reading she didn't do to prepare for class. Because as we get into debate today, the words you say matter. Gerrymandering has a legal definition. There are several legislative districts in rural areas that straddle different congressional districts. Mine is one of them. Otoe County is currently in District 1. The rest of my five counties are in Congressional District 3. Senator Cavanaugh, I promise you'll survive. So my first speech on the mike today references Otoe County because I think it is worthwhile to talk about. And to Senator Blood's amendment, this is intended clearly to be a poison pill amendment. She's saying that the entirety of Douglas County needs to be in Congressional District 2 and the entirety of Sarpy County needs to be in Congressional District 1. That throws off the population counts so that these maps do not fall within the deviation required by law. If she really intended to have a viable map and have LB1 be viable after her amendment, she would have switched the other boundaries to ensure that the population was within the bounds that we're legally required to be in. So Otoe County, it's the subject of my first turn on the mike today. I'm not planning to be on the mike too much. The reason why I'm in favor of LB1 and not in favor of Senator Wayne's proposal, which I'm guessing will come up several times today, is because LB1 keeps Otoe County whole. And that's important because I wholeheartedly reject the notion that Douglas County is a sort of sacrosanct entity that can't be divided while rural counties have to pay the price. Since at least 1890-- that's as far as we could find in the data-- Otoe County has never been split between congressional districts. This gives it just as much right as Douglas County to claim that it can't be split because of historical precedent. Unlike Douglas County, in addition to being a county, Otoe County is a distinct community of interest. It's an agricultural community and it has agricultural interests that are unique from the rest of the state, from the highest numbers of

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

vineyards and wineries per capita to apple orchards and sawmills, and with similar socioeconomic and educational backgrounds. By the way, AppleJack Festival is this weekend. No matter how today ends up, I hope tomorrow I can see you all in Nebraska City for one of the best fall festivals in the count-- country. Otoe County's unique cohesiveness means it should be in one congressional district under the redistricting guidelines we passed earlier this year. This is in stark contrast to Douglas County. Douglas County has a large population with many distinct communities of interest within the county. Past Legislatures have recognized this in their maps. In the current Public Service Commission maps, Douglas County is divided, while Otoe and the five-county area are not. The same is true for the State Board of Education maps. These maps were passed without any controversy that I'm aware of. As for which congressional district Otoe County should be in, the 3rd Congressional District makes the most sense, especially under LB1. The five counties in southeast Nebraska that I represent have similar unique agricultural interests, as well as a unique emphasis on the energy sector between Nebraska City's coal plants and Cooper Nuclear Station. Many people live in one of the five counties and work in another. Therefore, I believe all five counties should be in the same congressional district. And from a practical ge-- geographic perspective, the 3rd District is the best way to achieve that in this cycle. If we want to draw a map that keeps communities of interest intact, it makes the most sense to split Douglas County--

FOLEY: One minute.

SLAMA: --thank you, Mr. President--not cohesive rural counties that make up the whole communities of interest like Otoe County. That is why I'm testifying in support and speaking on the mike today in support of Senator-- Senator Linehan's LB1. And moreover, just to clarify what Senator Linehan was referencing on her turn on the mike with Twitter, is that congressional maps were leaked on Twitter by members of the Redistricting Committee before they were made public. So, Senator Cavanaugh, you might not have seen those tweets, but they still got out and those were the maps that were being used in reference by the partisan groups on the left during those testimonies and in preparing to testify against Senator Linehan's LB1, so just to clarify. Thank you, Mr. President.

FOLEY: Thank you, Senator Slama. Senator Matt Hansen.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President and colleagues. I have a couple of points I want to make, but since we're-- already spent so many of our first times on the microphone attacking the public for daring to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

testify at a public hearing and sharing their opinion, I want to remind everybody that is our goal. We are the representatives of the people and are here to do the people's business. And the people have a right to see our maps. The people have a right to see what we're doing. The people have a right to testify at a committee hearing, even if they're factually wrong about something. That does not dismiss that they are a citizen of Nebraska, a person in Nebraska who has an interest, who has a passion, who has a perspective. And to discount somebody's opinion because it's too partisan or because they're basing it on something you don't deem as accurate, is dismissing the public too out of hand. There's a reason we have to have these congressional district hearings across the state. There's a reason we have to have multiple hearings on this, because we know it affects the public and we know this is a bill that the people care about, and that is why it's important. And I'm appreciative that we had so many members of the public come out. And regardless of whether or not they testified for a map that I like or against a map that I like, I'm appreciative that they came, that they stood up in a public hearing and said what they wanted to say. I want to start focusing specifically on LB1, which I do oppose. We're going to apparently talk a lot about how preserving farms and farmers is more important than preserving the boundaries of cities. We see that in this map. We're going to see this in some of the proposed legislative maps where multiple districts come into the city limits of Lincoln and spiral out to the Kansas border, because apparently farmers in different counties have more in common than people who live across the street in the same neighborhood. That's apparently what we as a Legislature are going to start to argue today. I do want to respect political boundaries as much as possible. I'm going to push for that. And one of the clear ways to do that is to not break up Douglas County, and specifically not to break up Omaha by zigzagging through the counties and the specific route that it has been chosen. Interstate 680 has been referenced as a recognizable landmark, and I will agree with that. But LB680 [SIC] is recognizable because it was a giant infrastructure project that targeted and demolished specific neighborhoods through eminent domain. And we cannot ignore the history there. We cannot ignore that they targeted neighborhoods of high poverty and neighborhoods primarily of African American or racial and ethnic minorities, of immigrant populations, and cut them in half with an interstate. And now those wounds have been healing over time. The history of redlining is starting to get farther and farther behind us. But we know the impacts of redlining. We know the impacts to have segregated neighborhoods throughout the early 20th century and the fact that some of our roads and political boundaries are based on those still because we've never changed them. So to just say 680 is

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

good and can't be criticized because it's a notable road, yes, it's a notable road that we demolished and steamrolled significant neighborhoods to build, and that's why it's an easy and recognizable one. You can't divorce the roads from the history; you can't divorce history from the districts. If there's a minor tweak somebody needs to one of these maps to preserve a county, there's probably some other county that's nearby that can change and happen. I don't know if anybody is going to presume that any of these maps are going to go, start to finish, unchanged. Part of the reason I'm rising up so early is I was-- my understanding is this map is kind of recognized by both sides as a nonstarter and we just got to spin our wheels for eight hours. And if people who aren't on Redistricting Committee want to talk so maybe Redistricting can work something out, great. But in a way, we're going through more of a charade here than anybody who testified--

FOLEY: One minute.

M. HANSEN: --at the legislative hearings because they didn't know that this had been settled. They didn't know that everybody knows this map didn't have 33 votes. They were coming in based on the best information they had. Regardless if it was factually correct or not, they were coming in and telling their perspective of what they wanted to see. And if they got the map in the wrong way, they got the map too early, I don't agree with that because this is the public's business. This is the public's business, and they should be allowed to have a voice and their voice shouldn't be dismissed out of hand in the very start of the first day of debate when we have so many days of debate and so many maps to work through. LB1 has significant problems. I stand against it. That's not a surprise. I know a lot of people stand against it. Thank you, Mr. President.

FOLEY: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Arch.

ARCH: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, as a person who resides in Sarpy County and represents a district in Sarpy County, it should come as no surprise that I rise in support of LB1 because it keeps Sarpy County whole. I do understand the Redistricting Committee had a challenge in coming up with congressional district boundaries that represent the one-person-one-vote principle. And I know, given the population concentration on the eastern edge of the state, that either Sarpy County or Douglas County was going to have to be divided. I commend you on all the work you have to put into this effort-- you have put into this effort and thank you for taking on this task on behalf of the Legislature. Let me explain why I think LB1 is the appropriate way to go. First, the map follows the criteria adopted by

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

the Redistricting Committee. It follows county lines where practicable. It's compact and contiguous. Its boundaries are identifiable and it preserves communities of interest. And that's what I want to talk about, communities of interest as it relates to Sarpy County. Sarpy County is the state's smallest county geographically and the state's fastest growing county. There are five independent cities within its boundaries, which naturally forces it to be a community of similar interests in a county with a small footprint. Between the cities, there's a median age between 33.8 years and 42.9; 95.1 percent to 96.8 percent of the residents have high school education. The demographics of those five cities are so similar it is a community of similar interests. The map proposed in LB1 recognizes that Sarpy County is truly one community by keeping it whole and guaranteeing that its representation in Congress is somebody who is close to that community of interest. Other versions of the congressional map take a chunk of the county, splitting Papillion through the center of its downtown on 84th Street, lopping off part of La Vista, dividing the town of Bellevue, and separating much of it from Offutt. For me, for many others, Bellevue and Offutt are nearly synonymous. But Bellevue isn't the only military-rich city in Sarpy County. There's a strong military presence throughout all of Sarpy County, again, creating a community of interest. A new VA community living center is being established in Papillion, and the city of Papillion and Bellevue University have joined with the Nebraska Vet-- Vietnam Veterans Memorial Foundation to create a memorial near SumTur Amphitheater in Papillion. Offutt and military personnel have contributed to the business growth in all of Sarpy's cities: Bellevue, La Vista, Papillion, Springfield, and Gretna. And veterans and active military personnel live in all five cities. The five cities of Sarpy County and Sarpy County itself have worked together and continue to work together to grow the county as a whole, and it is obvious by the massive growth Sarpy has experienced that working as a community of interest has been effective. The cities and the county have worked in cooperation to attract new businesses, develop roads, and build other essential infrastructure. One of the more recent and significant examples of cooperation within this community of interest is the creation of the Sarpy County and Sarpy Cities Wastewater Agency. The agency is tasked with building and managing a unified southern Sarpy wastewater system to serve the southern portion of Sarpy County. Nearly 60 percent of Sarpy County lies south of a ridge line that has hampered sewer capacity and thus additional development. The agency was able to be created through an interlocal agreement made possible with the passage of LB253 in 2017. The bill was introduced by former Senator Crawford of Bellevue, cosponsored by former Senator Jim Smith of Papillion and currently serving Senator Carol Blood, also of Bellevue. The agency's

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

board of directors consists of the chair of the Sarpy County Board of Commissioners and the mayors of the county's five cities. This agency is a perfect example of how the entire county and all of the cities within that county have worked together as one community of interest to grow the county and the state. Another example of how Sarpy County is truly one community and should not be divided is the fact that all five cities in the county have been negotiating boundary agreements, finalized just last year to identify future growth. That is huge and it was done without any sort of legislative mandate.

FOLEY: One minute.

ARCH: It shows how the five cities of Sarpy have worked together on their own to resolve conflicts as one community. In 2007, the United Cities of Sarpy County was formed to protect the cities' interests and to give them a unified, strong voice in decisions impacting them, particularly in front of the Legislature. And I think their motto says it all for demonstrating that this is truly one community of interest. Sarpy County is a, quote-- this is their motto-- really big family in a really small house. We should keep that house in one piece, keep Sarpy County whole with respect to its congressional representation. Thank you, Mr. President.

FOLEY: Thank you, Senator Arch. Speaker Hilgers.

HILGERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in support of LB1, and I'll talk about that briefly at the end. I primarily rise, though, to just put a little bit of the work in context and to start off this debate with a note of gratitude to all nine members of the Redistricting Committee. I-- I think in the best of times, or in a normal year, this work is extraordinarily difficult. We've heard about the 2010 redistricting and how hard that was, and in previous years how difficult that can be. And in normal years, we're doing it when we have the Census Bureau data on time, we have 90 working days over the course of five-and-a-half-months to work through all the various changes that come from population shifts over the course of the-- over-- across the state. And even in those circumstances, it's incredibly difficult. But we are not-- we are nowhere remotely close to being in normal times. The Census Bureau didn't get our data until mi-- to the Legislature until mid-August. We weren't able to even start work with our software down below until the end of August. And the committee has worked extraordinarily hard-- hard over two weeks to-- to put together these maps. We have come into special session. And by the way, states around the country are actually doing this in regular session in January. We are here, though, because our election officials have asked us to get this work

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

done, and that's why we're here. And the Redistricting Committee has done everything they can to meet that challenge. They've worked day and night. All nine members, Chair Linehan, Vice Chair Wayne and the other seven members of that committee have worked tirelessly on these particular maps. And in presenting them, they have presented change. And we know change can be difficult. We don't have necessarily the time to internalize and digest the-- the change that we normally would like to have. And so I-- what I would ask the body as we proceed is a note of-- is to keep in mind the work that they've done and to at least be open to the possibility of change and to appreciate the nine members of that committee. Now I will just speak briefly on LB1 and what I think the debate will show and why I support it over the course of the next eight hours. Number one, I think this is the-- this is the map that takes the statewide interest-- that it is best positioned to take the statewide interest into account, not just one community over another community. I am convinced by the arguments from Senator Arch, I think Senator Sanders and the other-- the mayors and municipalities in Sarpy County, of the value of uniting Sarpy County within one congressional district. I also am convinced that giving two congressional representatives to Douglas County and to Omaha, our largest city, is actually a value add to that community. I also am convinced, and probably the next time I speak on the mike-- I don't anticipate speaking often on this-- on these debates. But the value of linking our largest city in some way with some of the other communities across the state, I think it's better for the entirety of the state of Nebraska. Ultimately, this is a map that meets all the requirements placed on us under L-- we see under LR134, under the federal and state constitutions, and I think this is the strongest map. Could it be changed? I think we all should keep an open mind. Change is difficult. I think Senator Linehan will keep an open mind. Supporters of this bill in the Redistricting Committee, I'm sure, will keep an open mind. We all should keep an op-- an open mind, and I surely will as well. I'll be listening to counterarguments throughout the day today. I know the lar-- the one-- I think the most significant one that's been leveled is gerrymandering. I think it was mentioned earlier today that gerrymandering does not mean something that we just don't like or we think it hurts one community or another. It actually has a legal definition, one that we should keep in mind as we proceed in the debate. I have also heard, and-- and thankfully, I-- I don't expect it to hear on the floor this debate. I don't-- I don't expect that. We-- as you know, for those of you who read LR134, we can't take political considerations in-- into account. We have heard a lot outside these walls about the blue dot. That shouldn't matter whatsoever here on the floor of this debate here today. That's external. We can't take into account partisan political makeup when

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

we're drafting these maps. So let's focus on LR134, what the actual legal guidelines are here today. Let's talk about communities of interest. We'll talk about how LB1 might impact Douglas County, what it might do to support and help Sarpy County, what it will do for the rest of the state. Let's have the conversation--

FOLEY: One minute.

HILGERS: --[INAUDIBLE] where it belongs. Thank you, Mr. President. Just briefly, I do rise in opposition to AM15, although I-- I need to take a closer look at it-- it was just filed-- in part because I think it's very difficult to do a piecemeal map. So as I understand A-- AM15, it actually says both of these counties should be whole and in their respective different congressional districts. I think if you do that without a full map, you actually-- you actually significantly, and potentially materially, unlaw-- unlawfully impact the deviation requirements. And so I think with Congress in particular, which has a much more restrictive deviation requirement than, say, the legislative maps, that actually would put the entire map out of balance. And so I think when we do amendments, certainly you could bring any amendment that's piecemeal if you'd like. But I think seeing it as a whole map makes it much more likely to be successful because we-- you can see how it im--how it falls under our di-- various legal guidelines. So I look forward to a very good debate today focused on those issues, and that's all I have. Thank you, Mr. President.

FOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senator John Cavanaugh.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor, and nice to see you. Well, I had a lot of things I want to say about this, but the first thing was I was thinking about this. You run for office, you get elected, and you obviously think about all the big things you're going to do. But when you think about the weight of history looking down and the seriousness with which we should take-- approach everything we do in this body, this is high on that list of serious-- thank you-- and seriousness that we should look at. And it should be, as Senator Hilgers was just pointing out, Speaker Hilgers was pointing out, we shouldn't look at it from a partisan lens. We should look at it for what's best for the state of Nebraska. But I think the first and foremost, we should not have a cavalier attitude about how we approach this. And the discussion here today has already, I think, drifted into the cavalier as it pertains to what has transpired previously. So I'm not a good social media person, as anybody who knows me can tell you. I don't really understand it. I don't get on the social media. But I did see the map to which Senator Linehan referred earlier. And my impression, when that map was shared, was an effort of transparency.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

And I spent the day yesterday listening in the-- the Omaha hearing, and I've watched the previous hearings on television, and I heard a lot of people come and testify. And I heard one person testify that I think referenced that map when they spoke to the deviation in the original map, which was 0.67 percent deviation in population, which is somewhere close to 50,000 people differential between-- where the 2nd District would have had more than it was supposed to. And those people, that-- that was a rightly identified problem with that map. And it was changed in the subsequent map, which was ultimately entered. And so that, I think, is-- is an honest mistake. The map looks relatively similar, and I think it's understandable that somebody could mistake the two from looking at them. And the reason I'm kind of discussing this is one of my biggest problems with this map is that it's continuously been referenced as drawn along clearly defined lines of Dodge Street and 680. And if you look at the first map that was shared, in the interest of transparency, that map does follow pretty clearly along Dodge Street and 680. However, the subsequent map, to which everyone referred yesterday in their testimony, does not follow 680. And it has been repeatedly stated by individuals that that is a clear, de-- defined border that everyone understands. I asked pages to circulate a turn-by-turn map of those deviations, but what I can tell you is it diverts. Well, you can actually see it in the map that was passed out this morning. So I guess when we're talking about this map and whether it meets these clearly defined communities and whether or not it is-- meets the standards of LB-- of LR134, we should actually know what we're talking about. And I know people have already criticized several people here for not knowing what they're talking about. But when you hand out a map and then you say something different than the map has on it, I'm wondering why we're here and having this conversation at all. We've already said that this map is not going to pass and it-- we-- it's not the right thing to do for Nebraska, that people are not going to agree to this and we need to go back to the drawing board. People's time is valuable. And I know for a lot of the rural senators in particular, their time is valuable in the fall. So I'm wondering why we're planning to spend eight hours here today discussing a map that everyone knows will not be the map, that is a map that, when we talk about it, is not even clear which map you're talking about, when the people introducing it are still making reference to the original map that they've criticized other people for referencing. So I am opposed to LB1.

FOLEY: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

J. CAVANAUGH: I don't know where I stand on AM15, but I would tell you that that was-- AM15 appears to be a-- a attempt to address the testimony that was presented yesterday at the hearing. I heard, clearly and consistently, that the people of Sarpy County want to be together. They do not care which congressional district they are in. They want to be together. Senator Blood has brought an attempt to address that. They had a hearing with, as the other Senator Cavanaugh pointed out, 56 people testified in favor of one bill and 9 in favor of another, and then it was quickly adopted right after by the committee with no attempt to address any of the concerns brought by those people. So when those papers are handed out, I'll talk about them some more and I'll talk about some other things. But I guess the ultimate question is, if we all agree this is not the map, what are we doing and why are we going to spend the rest of the day talking about this? We should go have people discuss, come back with a map that is ready for prime time. This one is not. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

FOLEY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Morfeld.

MORFELD: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I rise in opposition to LB1 and in-- I don't know if I'm in support of Senator Blood's amendment yet, but I'm going to look at it, review it, and go from there. That being said, I want to talk a little bit about the map and why I'm opposed to it from a substantive perspective. But then I also want to talk a little bit about transparency and some of the things that were also said on the mike. So first, I think we need to look at a few different principles. One, when it comes to congressional districts, we need to keep our counties whole where practicable. We should keep our counties whole when practicable. That is a legal standard. And in this case, the legal standard is not being followed. The legal standard is not being followed, and it's obvious that it's not being followed because we cut Douglas County, some people have said, in half. If you actually look at it, it's about by two-thirds, I guess, so when people say, well, that's not accurate, we don't cut it in half, well, OK, well, we cut it in two-thirds, so I guess, if we want to be specific about it. So, one, we don't leave that county whole, Douglas County, where practicable. It is totally practicable to keep that county whole. Why is it totally practicable? I don't know, because it's been done since the 1860s. So it is practicable to keep Douglas County whole. And in fact, it's been kept whole for over 100 years. So, one, it's completely practicable. And two, it's very clear that Douglas County has been the core of that congressional district because that's been the case for over 100 years. And, colleagues, we need to keep our congressional districts as compact as possible. We keep it more compact by ensuring that Douglas County is kept whole and

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

we have part of Sarpy County in there, because two counties is less than three, so, therefore, it's more compact, it's more contained to those county-- to that county. I'm opposed to this. And I don't care if it's the blue dot or not. I'm opposed to this just on the face of it. I'm opposed to it simply because it's not as compact as it could be, it does not keep counties where they should be, and it is not as contiguous as it should be and it can be. So, colleagues, that's why I am opposed to it and that's why I'm happy to debate this all day, if necessary. Second, I want to talk about the transparency thing. I'm not going to get too much into the weeds of this, but one senator said on the floor that I leaked the maps. I mean, you must have an interesting version of the word "leaked." When I shared those maps, we were not in Executive Session. The media were there-- was there. The maps were passed out not only to the senators, but also the media. I tweeted out the maps that were made available to the public. That's not leaking. So if you're going to accuse somebody of leaking something, which, by the way, this is a government body and we're members of this body as the government, I-- I don't know how exactly I would leak a document that was shared in public, not in Executive Session, and with the media. That's just false. So get your facts before you get up on the floor and accuse somebody of leaking something that should be a public document in the first place. Second, the only tweets that I've been making are the tweets that I've been informing the public of what's going on. They're not divisive. I'll read the ones that I-- I posted yesterday. Right after we took our Executive Session vote, I said: LB1, the gerrymandered Linehan maps-- I believe they're gerrymandered for the reasons I just noted-- that split Douglas County advances from the Redistricting Committee 5-4. Myself, Wayne, Lathrop, and Blood voting against. We debate tomorrow. Second tweet--

FOLEY: One--

MORFELD: --Unofficial count--

FOLEY: One minute.

MORFELD: --of today [SIC] hearing of the 2nd Congressional public hearing-- District public hearing was 56 people opposed to this map and 8 in support. If that is considered divisive, if that is considered unprofessional, then you should find a new line of work because this is work that should be done in the public eye. I will inform my constituents in the way that I see fit and that I see appropriate, and nothing that I have stated on Twitter with these maps have been inappropriate. They have been factual. They have provided timely information. And I will continue to do so because that is the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

exact thing that is carved on this building. And if you're uncomfortable with that, I don't care. Colleagues, I'm happy to talk about the substance of these maps, but let's stay focused on that and not red herrings. Thank you, Mr. President.

FOLEY: Thank you, Senator Morfeld. Senator Briese.

BRIESE: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise today in support of LB1. I'd first like to thank my colleagues on the Redistricting Committee for their leadership and efforts on a very difficult endeavor. I'd also like to thank my colleagues in the body for their input on these matters. And I'd really like to recognize and thank the public for the countless emails, phone calls, and their attendance at the hearings that we conducted the last three days. We value that input and we thank you for it. So we had three hearings the last three days and there were many takeaways, but perhaps the most glaring takeaway is that virtually no one is going to be happy with where we land. Kind of sad, but that's the reality of this process. We're all going to have to give up a little something, and that includes each of us, on this map, and especially on later maps, later issues, later bills. We're all going to have to give up something and we're going to have to live with it. Nobody's going to walk away happy from this thing. So what else did we glean from the hearings? There's a lot of angst. Maybe one of the key things was there was a lot of angst about splitting up Douglas County. But you know what? Douglas County grew by about 67,000 in population the last ten years, and that puts it about 69,000 under the maximum-- current maximum size for a congressional district in Nebraska. So depending on growth in the next ten years, it's likely that we're going to have to split up Douglas County in ten years. And I-- I shouldn't say likely in ten years; it's possible in ten years, likely, I would say, sometime after that. So folks are going to have to get used to the idea of splitting up Douglas County here at some point. And what else did we hear? A lot of angst about a fractured Sarpy County. We-- we heard from the Gretna mayor specifically. He spoke of a community, a community of interest in common to Sarpy County residents. A retired teacher told us about-- pleaded with us not to break up Sarpy County. A Papillion resident doesn't want Sarpy County split, noting that the map, the proposed LB2, would split her community. And she suggested that LB2 is more politically motivated than LB1. Another Sarpy County resident noted the need to keep Papill-- Papillion, La Vista, and Gretna together. Another resident suggested that Sarpy County has a unique culture and asked that it be made whole. So we did hear a lot of testimony in support of keeping Sarpy County whole, and that's what LB1 does. So I

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

do support LB1. I-- at this point, I oppose AM15, but I look forward to the debate on-- on LB1. And thank you, Mr. President.

FOLEY: Thank you, Senator Briese. Senator Hunt.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. Good morning, colleagues. I've really been looking forward to this debate. Let's not lie, though, about what this is about, or let's not be coy, let's not obfuscate or conceal, because the truth is that LB1 was drafted to be provocative. LB1 was drafted as a provocation because let's talk about what happened in the last year, what's happened in the last several years. Omaha, CD 2 sent a vote to the Democratic nominee for President in one of the most-- probably the most contentious presidential election that this country's ever seen. There was an attack on the Capitol that, like, a huge percentage of-- of people from that party still think was justified. They still think that-- that the losing candidate actually won the election. The trust of the voters in the political process is so incredibly damaged. And in Nebraska, we had no voter fraud. We had no voter fraud issues. We had no threat of voter fraud. The Secretary of State certified it. Everything went well. People cast their ballots because in Nebraska we have secure elections. But the majority of folks in control in this state didn't like that, and they want to prevent that from ever happening again. And if that wasn't true, you know, I would love to split up Douglas County someday when we get there. I would love to live in a state that has so much population that the biggest population center of the state has more than one congressperson. But right now, it doesn't matter if Nebraska has one congressperson or five congresspeople because the same folks are in charge, calling the shots and deciding how everything runs. And it's just like eight people at the top, and everybody knows that. And LB1 is a reflection of the will of those eight people at the top, not a reflection of the will of the people, the people who follow us on Twitter to find out what's going on, the people who take time off work in the middle of the day to drive to Grand Island or Lincoln or Omaha to come testify about how this map is going to affect them, the people who find childcare, the people who reach out to us to helpfully informed this body, which has no Jewish senators, that we held the hearing in the most populous part of the state for the most consequential thing that this Legislature is going to do on the most important holiday in the Jewish calendar. So I would love to live in a state where we have more congresspeople and we can divide up Lincoln, we can divide up Omaha, everybody gets 27 congresspeople, whatever. But the truth is, the eight people at the top are blocking the kinds of policies that attract the population that we need in this state in order to get there. I've heard senators,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

and I'm sure we'll hear some today, talk about how difficult it is, and I completely empathize, to represent a district that is so big. You know, I can walk my district in midtown Omaha in a few days. My-- my district is pretty compact and small. And then, of course, there's, you know, for example, Senator Brewer's district, which he's fond of saying is the size of Croatia, and that's huge. And I agree with Senator Brewer. That's too big for one person to have to manage with the same number of staff that some of us-- that all of us have, that I have. But if we want to grow our population in Nebraska, shrink the sizes of these districts, cut up Douglas County any which way, then we have to pass policies that attract people to this state. And it's always the folks that are complaining the district's too big, I can't run this, they're the people blocking those policies. So let's call it what it is.

FOLEY: One minute.

HUNT: Don't get cute and innocent and think that this process of redistricting is about anything other than coalescing political power, that it's about anything other than political gain for the eight people in charge. The way this was drafted by the dominant party is to give an advantage to the dominant party, and that's frankly how redistricting works. None of us are under any, you know, illusions that it's anything else. It's the most political thing we do. And it's for people who have the integrity, people in the middle, people in the minority, people who are fighting for those voices to be heard, to make sure that we do as much as we can to push back and keep those voices in the mix so that when people cast their ballot in Nebraska, they know that that vote counts and that matters.

FOLEY: That's time, Senator.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor.

FOLEY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Lathrop.

LATHROP: Thank you, Mr. President. And, colleagues, good morning. I will have much to say in this process. I hope to be-- to uphold the values of the institution when I speak with what's important to me and the tone I use during this debate. You can hold me to that. I serve on the Redistricting Committee. And like Senator Briese, I'd like to thank each member of that committee, all nine of them, for the work they've done over the last several weeks. Some of you may have taken the opportunity to go into the map room and realize that this is not an easy job. Making it all work is not easy. You make a tweak over here and it affects five districts away. It's not easy. These maps

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

aren't easy to do. They're not easy to get within the deviation. It's not easy work. And-- and thanks for the-- our friends over in Research for all their help and their late nights. I-- I will speak on this again. I want to say just at the outset that I oppose LB1 and I also oppose AM15. It's completely inconsistent with the vast majority of what we heard yesterday. But I want to talk about something else. As a member of the Redistricting Committee, we put out two maps, one that was prepared by Senator Linehan and others and one that was prepared by Senator Wayne and others. And we took that show on the road, so to speak, and we had hearings, this committee did, in three congressional districts. We were out in Grand Island, Omaha, and Lincoln. And at some point, I'll talk about what everybody had to say. But I want to talk about a certain group of people that showed up and that's the group of people that showed up to talk about this place. We lose sight, particularly in the last seven years, we lose sight of the fact that this isn't our place. This isn't the Republicans' house. This isn't the Democrats' house. It's the people's house. And in each of the districts that we went into to listen to people respond to the maps, we heard speeches from people that talked about this institution. They are proud of the Unicameral. They are proud of our nonpartisan tradition. Let me say that again, because I was moved by the number of people, even in the 3rd Congressional District, people that came in and said, I'm not really sure about the maps, but let me tell you what I am sure of, I really think it's neat that we have a Unicameral and that they are nonpartisan, and we expect you to observe that tradition in this process. Most of the people that showed up didn't show up to say, I want you to do the Democrat map or a Democrat map or a Republican map. A big share of these people-- were some people move to come by a Twitter or by an email they might have gotten from the party? Yes, easily identified. But, my friends, you can't believe the number of people that showed up that said, I really think it's important to me that the Legislature remain a one-house and nonpartisan, and we expect this process to observe those traditions as you move through reconciling these maps. And I think that's an important thing for me to carry from these hearings back to you before we get into the thick of it--

HILGERS: One minute.

LATHROP: --because this isn't about one map or the other. It's not about one party or the other or gaining an advantage or putting the other party at a disadvantage. The people want us to govern and to find solutions, not just with redistricting. This place is important to them. They are as proud of this place as they are the football team. And it is important that as we do our work over the next two

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

weeks, that we recognize what the people want us to do, the traditions they want us to maintain, and that we don't ruin this place by turning it into a red-and-blue fight like they do in the Congress. This place is important to them, and it's important to me. That tradition is important to me. Sometimes I feel like I talk about it and people start rolling their eyes. I'm telling you--

HILGERS: That's time, Senator. Thank you, Senator Lathrop. Senator DeBoer.

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. Good morning, Nebraska. There's an old Monty Python video that goes, "and now for something completely different," so I am going to talk about some things that I haven't heard talked about yet, so I'm sorry. What I would like to talk about is not something that anyone necessarily in this body needs to know. It's something that I think that the public ought to know, because it's not something that I've heard talked about so far. When we're talking about redrawing these congressional maps, I want the people at home to know that those lines have consequences that don't just pertain to who they elect for Congress, that these congressional boundaries also affect how we operate within this body. You heard Senator Lathrop so eloquently talk about the value of this nonpartisan system. I certainly didn't know before I got elected that the way in which we determine who goes onto our standing committees is dependent on where in the state they live so that we are able to spread, geographically, folks from different areas of the state into our different standing committees. So we caucus not according to party-- that's our nonpartisan tradition-- but we caucus based on geography, and the geographical divisions that we use are those congressional divisions. So the consequences of the congressional districting maps also affect this body in terms of who's on which of the various standing committees. And the way it operates is this. On the first day of a biennium, we have an election and we elect the Chairs of committees. Then based on where the-- the Chair of that committee lives, which congressional district the Chair of that committee lives, it's determined who's going to be in-- the Committee on Committee [SIC] decides who's going to be appointed to the various committees, and this is how it goes. If you have a seven-person committee, and let's imagine that the person who was elected Chair by the body is from CD 3, Congressional District 3, then the next person who is appointed to the committee will be from CD 1 because it wraps back around; after 3, it goes to 1; the next person will be 2, the next person comes back to 3, and so on. So not every congressional district will have three members on every committee. This is because we have standing committees that have eight people on them and we have

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

standing committees that have seven people on them. And so it depends on how many people are appointed to the committee and it depends on who is elected the Chair of that committee, so that there are committees that have some members-- or that have three members from, let's say, CD 2, where I'm from, and maybe two members from CD 3. So those congressional districts have a rather important impact on the standing committees and the changing of those congressional districts will have an impact on which of caucuses with which of us for determining our standing committees. It also affects the election. We have elections as a caucus before the beginning of the biennium and we determine who will represent our caucus on the Executive Board, which is the sort of group that's in charge of some of our day-to-day activities here in the Legislature. They deal with things like budgets and staffing and things like that. So when we draw those congressional district maps, I think it's important to also keep in mind who's going to be involved in--

HILGERS: One minute.

DeBOER: --in each of those standing committees. Now I did have a question. I was going to ask Senator Hilgers, but unfortunately he's in the Speaker's Chair and cannot answer. So I will ask Senator Lathrop, who is also an attorney.

HILGERS: Senator Lathrop, will you yield?

LATHROP: Yes, I will.

DeBOER: Senator Lathrop, if you don't know the answer to this question-- I was going to tell Senator Hilgers the same thing-- it is no mark against your character. But I'm curious-- you also were here, I guess, the last redistricting. I'm curious what happens to those various task force, work groups, etcetera, that are statutorily developed by this body, that require senators to be appointed from the various congressional districts. If we change those congressional districts, will that change who the membership on those task force, work groups, etcetera, should be?

LATHROP: I would think so.

DeBOER: So does that mean that even in the mid-biennium, because they're statutorily required, we're going to have to change the representation on those--

HILGERS: That's time, Senators.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. President.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Lathrop and Senator DeBoer. Senator Sanders, you're recognized.

SANDERS: Thank you, Speaker Hilgers. I'd like to read into record a letter that was sent out by the Sarpy County mayors: Bellevue Mayor Rusty Hike; Papillion Mayor David Black; La Vista Mayor Doug Kindig; Gretna Mayor Mike Evans; and Springfield Mayor Bob Roseland. The Omaha World-Herald editorial dated August 22 presents a one-sided case regarding the upcoming redistricting debate, a case so one-sided that other perspectives were not acknowledged. It is, therefore, incumbent upon us elected leaders from cities in Sarpy County to point out that there are two sides to this debate. In failing to acknowledge the history of redistricting in Sarpy County, the World-Herald has glossed over our citizens have been disenfranchised over the last two decades. The absolutist interpretation of only a single clause in the state constitution has resulted in the creation of two different and unequal standards when applied to the citizens of one county versus the citizens of another. It says to folks of one county that you can never be touched while telling citizens of another county they must accept their place as the sacrificial lamb. Furthermore, setting up redistricting process with such a rigid starting point in which only certain counties are to be respected puts adjacent counties in the position of being mangled in multiple ways. The outcome of handcuffing this process with such inflexibility could easily result in a lack of continuity in the rest of the district and it leaves yet another door open in the gerrymandering. As the World-Herald interestingly emphasized, former State Senator Scott Lautenbaugh justified the sanctity of the Douglas County by pointing out that the rest of it is the rest of it, while the rest of it actually has a name and the name is Sarpy County. In 2001 and in 2011, Sarpy County was hacked multiple times with very little consideration given to the feelings of the constituents. Lines were drawn that split communities and citizens have been bounced between congressional districts like ping-pong balls. In the untrackable position, the World-Herald has failed to truly account for communities of interest. The preservation of communities of interest is one of the points referenced in the Unicameral Legislature resolution and is frequently raised during redistricting debates, yet the position of the World-Herald ignores and dismisses the rest of it, of the south side of Harrison has a long, strong community of interest with everything on the north side that divide. As many and single-- as many in every single part of Douglas County more important than the city of Sarpy County when it comes to redistricting deba-- to-- when it comes to redistricting

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

debate? Do all the areas north of Harrison automatically have a stronger claim of a community interest with Ralston and south Omaha, La Vista, than Bellevue? Both OPS and Millard Public Schools cross into Sarpy County. Are the students and their families on the Sarpy side of those district [SIC] just the rest of it? Maybe it's a matter of Omaha wanting the contributions of Sarpy County's residents' dollars and talents, but not their opinions. One has to look no further than the Omaha World-Herald as to who they acknowledge are the significant communities and part of the metropolitan area by the Lee Enterprise [SIC] ownership--

HILGERS: One minute.

SANDERS: --of the Omaha World-Herald, along with the Bellevue Leader, Gretna Breeze and Papillion Times. To truly respect communities of interest, our Legislature needs to be able to have honest and unshackled conversation about what communities of interest really are. The only point about communities is the communicated by adhering to the rigid starting point espoused by the Omaha World-Herald that one special standard applies to one community and a different and unequal standard applies to another. While some politicians have written off our cities and neighborhoods as simply the rest of it, we should point out that the people who we represent are just as much part of the community as anyone else. Our communities are rich with men and women who bravely served our county-- our country, proud labor union members who have worked hard their entire lives, entrepreneurs who have put strong businesses, first responders--

HILGERS: That's time, Senator.

SANDERS: Thank you very [RECORDER MALFUNCTION].

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Sanders. Senator Groene, you're recognized.

GROENE: Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in support of LB1. I admire the bipartisan work committee did on this map. We repeat this over and over again. There are two growth areas, Douglas County and Sarpy County. That area is the largest growth. Lancaster County is next. Continually in the past, this body has continued to chip away at a declining rural population and stick them in the 3rd District. By taking the northern half of Douglas County, they injected a growth area into District 3 that in the future will grow and add to District 3's numbers. It is a area where blue-collar people work and they match District 3. It's a good map. And as far as this claim that I hear around the edges that this is partisan and we are trying to take

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

elective offices away from the Democrats, let me remind you, the mayor of Omaha is a Republican. The congressman from that area is a Republican. Three out of seven city council people are Republicans. Three out of seven county commissioners are Republican. It is not a strictly liberal dis-- area. Nobody's taking power away from one political party. On the other side of that coin is we have a congressman, a Republican one from the 1st Congressional District, does not like this map because we are taking conservative areas away from Congressional District 1 that makes it easier for him to win or the next Republican to win. Would not a partisan committee have protected District 1 for the Republicans? They did not. The other thing, I throw a tenet back at you: from those that have to those that don't. This map takes from those that have an excess population and gives it to a district that don't. Instead of continuing to isolate us as ru-- rural and urban, this map combines the two. So there's an interest. Whoever represents that district has an interest in urban, had an interest in rural. The city of Omaha will have now two congressmen out of three that they can influence because part of their districts are Omaha. I couldn't see a better map than this one. This is not an attack on a party, one political influence over another. This is a fair map. I have friends that live in the areas. They're content that they have a Re-- Omaha-- a Republican Governor. Some don't-- I mean mayor. Even when you look at the congressional record, Ashford was really a Republican who ran as a Democrat, not since Cavanaugh, which was a hey-- he at least was a moderate to conservative Democrat. People in Nebraska vote for the best candidate. Some in this body will be starting to say it's got to be an R or a D and everything's decided by that map. I'm a little concerned, if you want to talk fairness in the constitution and our statutes, it says in our constitution they're supposed to eliminate, take out those numbers who are aliens. They didn't do that because the Census Bureau does not ask if you are a legal alien or if you're a visitor on a visa here. You're just here. So constitutionally, you want to sue? I could sue on that.

HILGERS: One minute.

GROENE: I could sue on that issue that this committee did not take into a fact aliens. I don't care what the Census Bureau did. They should have went door to door and found out. How much letter of the law do you want to follow? They didn't. Lancaster County has a lot of aliens. They accepted a lot of the refugee resettlement; so did Omaha. They get to count those. One vote, one person? Tell me about it. It's one citizen, one vote, not visitors to our land. But they get a count in this number. You get those. Should I complain? I just did. This map

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

is the best you could have done. You took from those who have and gave it to those who don't, and into the future it isn't cannibalization of rural Nebraska against two cities. We can never have that, rural Nebraska against two cities--

HILGERS: That's time, Senator.

GROENE: --because-- anyway, thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Groene. Senator Albrecht, you're recognized.

ALBRECHT: Thank you. Speaker Hilgers. And good morning, Nebraskans. Today is truly a historical day. We're getting started on what's going to happen for the next ten years in the state of Nebraska. And never before have I recognized how difficult a process this is to oversee the division of our lands and the people. Each community has a history and a way of-- of doing things. At least for the last decade, it means something to all of us. We do resist change and it's just in our nature. But I've joined you this week in spending time. I went into one of the committee hearings. I didn't go out to Grand Island, but I was there on the second day and I listened in on the third. And the second house does have an opportunity to speak. That's why we make changes. That's why we put on amendments. I hope today that we can just get through this and move on, on Monday, to the other maps that we have to take a look at. But it is evident that we're probably going to have to-- to take a step back based on the conversations over the last three days. But I just want to talk a little bit about District 17, where I'm at. I personally have always been in Congressional District 1 while in Thurston County. But before, my predecessor, Senator Bloomfield, he had Wayne, Dixon, and Dakota Counties. So Lydia Brasch's area, District 17, or Ben Hansen's today, they actually had Thurston County. So I'm getting kind of used to a little bit of movement, as there should be. But District 17 grew when District 16 this past ten years did not. So I'm expecting some movement. I'm expecting some more people in my district. But at the same time, I'm a legislator who thinks first of my district and secondly, overall, for the greater good of our state. And I-- in working with the congressional districts, I've had no problem working with Congressman Smith, Congressman Fortenberry, or Congressman Bacon. We all have issues that are in different parts of the state. You know, I was very active before I moved up north to-- in Sarpy County and I hear their plea. But if-- Sarpy County is probably looking at the fact that, hey, they just split Douglas County, so, you know, we're going to have to stand up and fight if we want to stay together. But again, those decisions are going to be made by this Redistricting Committee, you

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

know, and-- and when-- we're going to have one map and one vote on this. So I just-- I just ask that you keep an open mind. And to the public, there have been articles that say, you know, Pe-- Pender is no longer going to be in District 17. Well, they are. I don't know what maps they're looking at. So just for the public who's listening, there's still going to be changes. No matter what-- what you've looked at in the past, there'll be changes throughout the whole week. And I have to-- to keep it open mind and go wherever it is that this map is going to take us. I mean, I might not keep all three of my districts or-- or my counties before-- in my district before this is all over. But we all have to understand there is going to be movement. And with that, I just hope that we can get to a resolution be-- before the end of the day. Thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Albrecht. Senator Blood, you're recognized.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Fellow senators, friends all, I have a lot to say in five minutes and I'm going to start now. So I want to thank Senator Arch for shoring up my reasons for AM15 and also for further explaining the Sarpy County wastewater project that I specifically talked about in my introduction that started without Sarpy County being whole. I want to thank my friend, Senator Lathrop, for his opinion on my amendment. But I-- I disagree politely about it being inconsistent with what we heard yesterday, because what I heard yesterday was, let's keep Sarpy County whole, let's keep Douglas County whole, and that's what my amendment does. I respect the Speaker's comments, but when you say let's not make it political and then you mention the blue dot, you made it political. And when my introduction is ignored, where I clearly say that I want to keep Sarpy County whole but am offering an alternative, it's unhelpful to make comments about how other Sarpy senat-- senators are standing to keep it whole, but only through one particular map while my amendment does the same thing. And then the comment about there being no map with the amendment, we all know it's impossible to get a map made that quickly. And it's been my experience, looking through past transcripts, that you do have the ability to make a-- the amendment and then you go to the map room and you make a map that everybody can look at that fits the guidelines that are required for us. We're under a tight timeline. If I had had the ability to get a map out in time, I would have had a map. So I received the same letter from our Sarpy mayors and I took it seriously, and that is why I've brought forward AM15. Staying on message doesn't change the fact that there are alternatives, and saying it over and over and over again doesn't change the fact that we'd only have one way to do it. There's more than one way to keep

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

Sarpy County whole and it's really a ridiculous impression that there's only one way to do it. What that says is that we're inflexible and it's not in the overall best interest of Nebraskans. Why would we want-- not want to be good neighbors to Douglas County, allow them to be whole, allow Sarpy to be whole? We're being good neighbors, but maybe I'm the only one that sees that. So going back to Senator Slama, Senator Slama, it is not meant to be a poison pill and I think you actually know that. I think that that's kind of insincere. It is a viable option and an option that I talked to the committee about yesterday. So I didn't just drop this and surprise everybody. I expressed that my intent was to address this issue with a possible amendment. And clearly it's a starting point for discussion, is what I said in my original introduction. So I find it puzzling when we have to use words like that to try and show that I have some kind of ulterior motive to not be authentic in what I'm asking. I don't-- I'm not thinking anything nefarious. The words "poison pill," I think, are-- are meant to try and paint a picture where I'm up to something. And maybe, if that was not Senator Slama's intent, I apologize in advance for saying that. But that, when I hear words like that, I don't hear words like, hey, this is an-- an alternative, let's talk about it, let's be flexible. You know, we've already heard it multiple times. We're going to have to figure out what we're going to do. We're going to have to come together and we're going to have to figure out what everyone can come to terms with, and that's what AM15 is about. No matter how many times you say you support LB1--

HILGERS: One minute.

BLOOD: --because you want to keep Sarpy County whole, doesn't change the fact that AM15 also keeps Sarpy County whole. And to say otherwise and to act like there's only a handful of Sarpy senators that want to do-- keep it whole is horse-pocky. It's not true. There are other senators that want to keep it whole as well, but there are more-- there's more than one method. So please consider this as we move forward that LB1 is not the only way, that there are alternatives. AM15 is a suggestion and a good starting point. But please, folks, let's be flexible, let's think about what we can do, let's think outside the box, because I know that there are other ways to do this. And to consistently say there's only one way is not a flexible Nebraskan way and not how we do business here in our state. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Blood. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Colleagues, I'd like to reference the map that the other Senator Cavanaugh passed out a little bit ago. It has images of-- up close of the divide of Douglas County. And if you were to turn to page 5, you can see-- well, it's a little hard to see on the map, but I'm happy to have you come to my desk and I can show you up close. It goes through someone's backyard. LB1 goes through someone's backyard. Now one of our colleagues this morning indicated that I didn't understand redistricting maps or gerrymandering, but I-- I do, actually. I do understand. I understand one plus one, and I understand when somebody's yard is being districted into two congressional districts and that that's wrong. I believe somebody yesterday was asked a question by one of the test-- the committee members about separating counties, and they said two wrongs don't make a right. It is just wrong. This map is wrong. It's not even genuine. The introducer of this map even stated that in her introduction. This is a waste of our time. At least Senator Blood is making genuine amendments to this to do the will of the people, the will of what Senator Rita-- Rita Sanders said her people wanted in her district, to make another county whole. This map is a joke. And I don't know that it's a joke for District 3. I'm not speaking about that. It is a joke to tear in half-- not in half, I'm sorry, in two-thirds Douglas County. It is completely for political reasons. It is completely for gerrymandering. It is-- in the dictionary, moving forward, there will be a picture of this map to define gerrymandering. Gerrymandering is when you take into consideration nothing except for your own political ambitions and desires and you cut through somebody's yard. It doesn't get any more ridiculous than this. I, for one, am so frustrated that this is the bill that we're talking about today. This should not have been our starting point. This is not a good starting point. And we all know that whatever we land on, it's not going to be the original bill. But we could have at least started on a-- with a bill that took into consideration the actual tenets of drawing maps and didn't cut apart somebody's yard. And we talk about communities of interest. I believe Sen-- Speaker Hilgers mentioned communities of interest. Again, right around where this person's lawn is cut in half, there is a ch-- a-- a school in Omaha, St. James Catholic School. I had a lot of good friends that went there, actually just attended a funeral there a couple of weeks ago. St. James is one school, two parishes. This map, communities of interest, puts those two parishes in different congressional districts. Why? Why does it do that? That school has, for my entire life, been two parishes, one school. They even have this really fantastic, if you ever get a chance--

HILGERS: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

M. CAVANAUGH: --madrigal that they put on at the Sokol Auditorium in downtown Omaha. It is hilarious. It is their fundraiser. The audience throws popcorn at the actors. It's very-- it's just very fun. But it is a community thing that those two churches do together because they are a community of interest. And I think we can argue that whoever lives there's house is probably-- they have an interest of, like, having equal representation by one person. This is ridiculous. This is the definition of political theater. We shouldn't be talking about this bill. We should be working on a real, genuine bill that even the Chair thinks is a genuine bill. Thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator-- thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator McCollister, you're recognized.

McCOLLISTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in support of AM15 and in opposition to LB1. During my seven sessions in this body, I have brought at least three redistricting bills and written a number of op-eds in the paper. I recognize that this-- in this particular year, with the late census, that our time period was compressed, but that's no excuse for the poor work product that came out of the committee yesterday. It's unworthy of this nonpartisan Nebraska Unicameral. It is a partisan bill, and I think that we need to recognize that it was DOA on arrival and it's a nonstarter. And I'm eager to work on a bill that is more nonpartisan and something that both political parties and all rural and urban folks can embrace. When I was elected to this body, I went door to door. And I suppose that during my-- my years, I have called on perhaps 20,000 houses. We have to recognize that most of the people in Nebraska are not hyper-partisan. And I think that we need to figure out a bill that recognizes the traditions of the Nebraska Legislature of nonpartisanship. We need to do that soon. One of the things I learned from the-- the broadcast that I listened to was that-- the principle of keeping counties whole. Douglas County needs to be held whole, and I recognize that Sarpy County ought to be held whole. I have an amendment coming that would move the boundaries and embrace Washington County, Colfax County, and Dodge County, and that would give us the nec-- necessary population to only give us a 0.03 deviation. So I think that might be a solution to the conundrum that we're currently in: Move the northern boundary of Nebraska-- or the Douglas County congressional district north. Matter of fact, when my dad was in Congress in the '70s, it included Washington and Burt Counties, so I think that's something that we ought to take serious consideration and look at. As I mentioned, I've written at least a couple op-eds, and I'd like to read one of the op-eds that occurred just last Sunday in the World-Herald. The Nebraska Legislature's "decentennial" [SIC] task

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

of redistricting will begin this year on September 13, just this week. Unlike some states where redistricting has become a blood sport, the Cornhusker State's handling of the task has, with a few exceptions, been fair and constructive. Unfortunately, we haven't seen that yet in this particular redistricting effort. With only three congressional districts and just 49 legislative seats, the temptation to gerrymander political boundaries has largely been absent. In some states, political parties are eager to draw electoral boundary maps either deep red or deep blue. Fortunately, the nonpartisan Nebraska Legislature has largely avoided this practice. This year, the timetable for redistricting will be compressed because the collection of census data was delayed by the national presence of the COVID-19 pandemic. The 2020 data was just produced a few weeks ago. With just 2020 spring election deadlines looming, all of Nebraska's political subdivisions need the Nebraska to make redistricting decisions as soon as possible. Unfortunately, the shortened time period compromises the opportunity for the public to follow the redistricting pro--

HILGERS: One minute.

McCOLLISTER: --process over a longer, more deliberative time period. Like Nebraska's one-of-a-kind Unicameral, the redistricting process in our state is also unique. The Redistricting Committee includes nine members chosen by the Executive Board of the Legislature. Five members are from the majority party, Republican, and four members are from the majority-- minority party, Democrat. This committee is required to draft six maps, as outlined in the Nebraska Constitution, to include the congressional and legislative districts and districts for the Public Service Commission, the Nebraska Supreme Court, University of Nebraska Regent, and State Board of Education. The maps must be then presented to the entire Legislature for debate. Before the Legislature votes on the maps, the public can review, comment, and even present alternative maps at meetings to be scheduled in each of the three congressional districts. I'll continue on my next time at the mike. Thank you.

HILGERS: Thank-- thank you, Senator McCollister. Senator Vargas, you're recognized.

VARGAS: Thank you very much. I'd yield my time to Senator Lathrop, if he shall have it.

HILGERS: Senator Lathrop, 4:50.

LATHROP: Thank you, Mr. President, colleagues. And thank you, Senator Vargas, for the time. I'd like to talk about LB1 and AM15 and why I

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

oppose it. So were there people that came in-- and I'll start with AM15. Were there people that came in and talked about keep Sarpy County whole? Yes, there were a couple of people in T-shirts. My friend Senator Sanders came in and asked to keep Sarpy County whole, and there were a group of people, some people, a handful of people. I appreciate Senator Blood oftentimes took the opportunity to ask those folks questions because she wants to be informed about Sarpy County. And I appreciate their sentiment, right? I appreciate their sentiment. But here's the problem. Here's the problem, and that is, if we were to take Sarpy County and stick it in the 1st, we would take Don Bacon out of his district, OK? One of the things this committee did, whether you agree with it or not, and you can get on the mike and tell me you don't think we should, but we tried to keep all of you in your own district, including-- including Don Bacon. He's the current congressman. We were not going to put him in the same district with Fortenberry for the two of them to run off. That wasn't going to happen. Well, you can't do this "put Sarpy County in its own district" thing without putting Fortenberry and Bacon in the same district, so that's the logic behind that. I sat in that hearing yesterday. I-- I hope my colleagues watched these on television. I sat in that hearing yesterday. Overwhelmingly, overwhelmingly, the testifiers were critical of LB1 because it split Douglas County, overwhelmingly. Now, I've heard the argument that, well, next, in ten years, Douglas County will have so many people in it that we'll have to split it off, some part of the 2nd District won't be in-- in Douglas County, let's just do it now. But if that same logic prevailed, we would say, the rural districts are going to lose more population next time, let's take three seats away from them. See, that logic doesn't work. We're the keepers of the current census, not the next one. And overwhelmingly, if we're going to go out and listen to people, then we ought to incorporate their opinions into what we are doing here. Is it-- would Sarpy County like to have their own le-- congressional district? I'm sure they would. My guess is, if I talk to the people in Lincoln, they'd like to have their own congressional district, but they don't have enough people. We have a history here. Douglas County has always been intact as a congressional district. We've gone from Douglas County out to other places. Senator Wayne, when he introduced his map, LB2, did a wonderful history of L-- LD2 and Douglas County. There are parts of Sarpy County that ha-- are a community of interest with Douglas County, and in particular Bellevue. I can tell you as an Omaha senator that the Chamber of Commerce in Omaha is very, very, very invested in Offutt, very invested in keeping Offutt in our community, very invested in the success of Offutt, very invested in--

HILGERS: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

LATHROP: --making it a base that never goes away. And that base is now married to the NExT project. One of the reasons we got the NExT project is Offutt. At some point we'll have an opportunity to consider what is the substance of LB3. We have historically, historically used Douglas County and gone into Sarpy County, starting with Bellevue and moving west, and incorporated that into LD2. Why does it make sense and why, colleagues, does LB3 make sense-- pardon me-- LB2 make sense? Because it maintains Douglas County. It keeps Don Bacon in his district. We don't have a situation where Bacon and Fortenberry are both in the same congressional district, which makes no sense. And if we open the door to taking someone out of their own district--

HILGERS: That's time, Senator.

LATHROP: --we will scramble this process.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Lathrop and Senator Vargas. Mr. Clerk for items.

CLERK: Mr. President, the Redistricting Committee, chaired by Senator Linehan, reports LB5, LB6 to General File. I have a conflict of interest statement by Senator Morfeld. Remi-- announcement: Planning Committee will have their meeting at 11:00 in Room 1525; that's Planning Committee. Mr. President, a priority motion. Senator Aguilar would move to recess the body until 12:30 p.m.

HILGERS: Co-- colleagues, just as a note of clarification, yesterday I indicated we would probably come back at 1:00. I've spoken to the Redistricting Committee and in light of their lighter committee hearing workload at 11:00, we actually are going to come back at 12:30. So instead of 1:00, we will come back at 12:30. We will, of course, keep the queue intact. Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Opposed say nay. We are in recess.

[RECESS]

HUGHES: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber. The afternoon session is about to reconvene. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call. Mr. Clerk, please record.

ASSISTANT CLERK: There's a quorum present, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Do you have any items for the record?

ASSISTANT CLERK: None at this time, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We will proceed with the first item on this afternoon's agenda. Mr. Clerk.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, when we left this morning, pending was LB1 from Senator Linehan. Additionally, there is currently an amendment pending from Senator Carol Blood.

HUGHES: Those in the queue are Senator Clements, Walz, Matt Hansen, and others. Senator Clements, you're recognized.

CLEMENTS: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition of AM15 and I'm supporting LB1, the redistricting plan. LB1 moves Cass and Otoe Counties from Congressional District 1 to Congressional District 3. And I approve of that because Congressional District 1 is dominated by Lincoln and it's a very urban county, Lancaster County. Congressional District 3 is much more rural and Cass County is primarily rural and Otoe County is even more rural. The property valuation in those two counties is indict-- indicative of that difference. The valuation exceeds-- of ag exceeds commercial like quite a bit in both counties. I looked up Cass County. Its agricultural valuation is \$1.2 billion. Its commercial valuation is \$221 million. So there's five times the valuation of ag in Cass County as commercial. In Otoe County, ag valuation is also \$1.2 billion. Commercial valuation is \$165 million. And so in Otoe County, seven times the valuation of ag land as commercial. I went ahead and looked at Sarpy County, which is to the north of Cass, where I am. In Sarpy County, there's \$310 million of ag valuation and \$4.4 billion of commercial. So in Sarpy, the-- it's reversed. It's 14 times commercial valuation to ag valuation. And so that is indication to me that Cass and Otoe areas align better with the rural district counties to the south of us in southeast Nebraska and Congressional District 3 being mostly rural. I think we will get along with the Linehan map, LB1, putting Cass and Otoe into Congressional District 3. With that, I would yield my time to Senator Groene if he'd like it.

HUGHES: Senator Groene, 2:15.

GROENE: Well, thank you, but I wish I had something to say. [LAUGHTER]. Always got something to say. But the more I look at this map and like-- thought and like interest, let's be realistic. Sarpy and Douglas and southern Douglas County fit together. Those people in Sarpy County work in Douglas County, those in Douglas County, it's basically, as I'll borrow from Senator Blood, when I visit that area, I have no idea what city I'm in. It's all blended together. La Vista, Bellevue, it's all one metropolitan area. When you go to northern Douglas County, it's more urban, a little bit, not urban, but a little

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

bit more rural, a little bit more-- spread out a little bit on the acreages and stuff and it blends in better with District 3. But all of Sarpy County should be along with Douglas County, this southern Douglas County, because it fits as an--

HUGHES: One minute.

GROENE: --economic unit. They both abut the Missouri River. It's a good map. And into the future, as I said, with this map, I think in the decade coming, you would be surprised how equally balanced those three districts will remain because of the areas they've blended together. So I applaud the committee again for coming up with LB1. Forget about the lines, look at the common sense of who's in each district. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senators Clements and Groene. Senator Walz, you're recognized.

WALZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I-- first of all, I guess I want to start off by saying thank you to the Redistricting Committee for all their hard work. I know it's taken a lot of time, a lot of nights, a lot of patience to get to where we are now and I really do appreciate that. Senator Lathrop talked earlier about this being the people's house. And when I try to base my decisions, I try to base my decisions on that, the people and what-- and what they want. My staff and I have watched as much of the hearings as we could this week, but we've had our own hearings and things to do. It seemed like there was a pretty packed house in-- in all the hearings. And I do have some questions since I wasn't able to watch the entire-- the entire hearing. So, Senator Wayne, would you-- I don't see Senator Linehan or Senator Lathrop, so you-- I'm going to ask you a couple of questions.

HUGHES: Senator Wayne, will you yield?

WAYNE: Yes.

WALZ: About how many-- I'm-- and I'm just curious because again, I haven't been able to watch the whole thing, but about how many people do you think attended all three hearings? Just a guess.

WAYNE: Attended or do you mean speak because at the Grand Island one, that was filled and there were people out in the hallway, but they didn't necessarily get up and talk. So I would say attended, probably 1,000 altogether. There was probably like 200 people or 300 yesterday. I think there were probably 80 to 100 here. It's not 1,000. Probably like 6-- 500, 600, safe, safe call.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

WALZ: OK, thank you. And what do you-- just-- just for my own information, what was the general consensus of-- of the hearings overall?

WAYNE: As it relates to congressional, most of the feedback was they liked LB2 over LB1, that was-- it was probably a three to one, maybe a four to one.

WALZ: Three to one, you think?

WAYNE: Three to one or four to one. It was, it was heavily leaning towards LB2.

WALZ: OK, and then the other question I have is LB1, I believe, is the map that splits Douglas County.

WAYNE: Correct.

WALZ: Is it absolutely necessary, because that, from what I understand, was a major concern with the people who attended the hearings.

WAYNE: Correct.

WALZ: Is it absolutely necessary that we do that?

WAYNE: No, not at all. In fact, since we-- we were a state, Douglas County has been in-- wholly in one congressional district, either one or two, but it's always-- always been intact. So there's no need to do that. We can-- my map doesn't do that. LB2 doesn't do that, nor-- we can come up with any map, but historically, we've never split Douglas County.

WALZ: OK, all right. Thank you, Senator Wayne. At this time, I'd like to yield the rest of my time to Senator Hansen.

HUGHES: Senator Matt Hansen, 2:04.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, and good afternoon again, colleagues. Colleagues, I want to talk a little bit about this issue of Sarpy County because that seems to be a lot of the crux and a lot of the focus and a lot of the support for LB1 centers on Sarpy County needs to be kept whole. And I don't think that passed-- and, and why should Sarpy County be split if necessary and Douglas shouldn't? We're not just talking about splitting Douglas County, we're talking about splitting the city of Omaha. And so we're getting to this point where we're arguing five or six different cities in Sarpy County, including

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

some that are miles apart from each other, have more in common than the north side of Dodge Street has with the south side of Dodge Street in west Omaha. That's what we're getting at. We're saying Springfield is more connected to midtown Omaha than the north side of Dodge on the west side of town is. And those-- that's the argument we're making. And colleagues, I think the public is right to criticize that because that just kind of doesn't pass a simple test of just looking at it and does that make sense?

HUGHES: One minute.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. This isn't like a test of, if you look at it, does it make sense? Do you genuinely believe that some areas in Omaha, basically one entire city council district as I understand it, have less to do with the rest of Omaha than Springfield and Gretna and Papillion and La Vista and Bellevue do? I think the answer is clearly no. I think the answer is clearly no, and I think you could just tell and know that. Yes, I understand that and I think that's important. I think it's important to have some of these maps that along Harrison Street, especially on the eastern side of Sarpy County, Bellevue, Papillion, La Vista, the-- isn't necessarily a clear distinction between Omaha and Bellevue, between Ralston and between Papillion and La Vista. And honestly, right now, off the top of my head, I know all those cities touch and I don't necessarily know where or know how. And I get that, you know, along Harrison I can see this divide. But then you start saying that Sarpy County as a whole cannot be split. So within--

HUGHES: Time, Senator, but you are next in the queue, so you may continue.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. So then the argument becomes we can't split Sarpy County as a whole and so, therefore, we have to split Omaha in order to make this work. And not only should we split, not split Omaha, should we split Omaha, we want Sarpy County along Harrison to stick with southern Omaha, but we don't care if, like, northwest Omaha sticks with the rest of Omaha. So that's more important to have Bellevue, Papillion, La Vista with Omaha un-- uninterrupted and Sarpy and Gretna and probably another township or two in Sarpy that I can't think off the top of my head than it is to have neighborhoods that have grown up together for decades and are literally within sight of each other in west Omaha. As has been mentioned on the microphone already, LB1 goes through alleys and people's backyards and we're arguing that those people are more likely to be separate communities and not care what their neighbor thinks than, you know, Springfield is to midtown Omaha to downtown Omaha.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

And, colleagues, the reason this get widely panned by the public, it just didn't pass the obvious test of like, does this make sense? Do these lines make sense? I know it's going to be difficult to draw a map that pleases everyone. I know we're probably not going to draw a map that pleases everyone. One thing we could do to speed this up is probably not care about where our congressmen want to live or currently live. I think that would be inappropriate to do. I'm not going to advocate for that. But that would free up some flexibility that we could probably have a very nice metro Omaha district with Bellevue, Papillion, and La Vista that makes sense. We didn't have to worry necessarily about where Congressman Bacon's house is or where he wants his house to be. Again, I don't think we should go down that path, but that would be easier to draw some lines. I bring all of this up to say, you know when we're talking about communities of interest and not splitting counties, we're also splitting the city of Omaha. I just-- I just have to make that so fundamentally clear of-- of there are zigzags through a single neighborhood in Omaha. And I cannot think of another instance or principle in which we would say divide the city of Omaha unless population required it so, because I know we're going to get and somebody is going to point out the Public Service Commission or Board of Regents and stuff. That's where not all of Omaha could be in the same district because Omaha is a larger population than the districts. Fundamentally, and I know we're going to talk about it on this bill, people have been pretty transparent about how they want the legislative maps to be too, including disproportionately valuing rural districts, getting them to the maximum valuation, to have as many people in them and a small amount in Omaha and other districts as possible. And fundamentally, this is clear to me that there's people-- and they've said it on the microphone, they've said it in the paper, want to overvalue rural, agriculture-driven voters over voters who live in cities. And you know, that's-- that's your right, you get to argue that, but when you're transparent in that, it's hard to then believe that, you know, these maps just kind of fell out of the sky and have perfectly divined and you genuinely believe that Springfield has more to do with midtown Omaha than Dodge Street, a couple dozen blocks west does. That's what the voters-- that's what the public sees, that's what the people of Omaha see, kind of this disregard for their own neighborhoods and their own communities. You know, there's always going to be tough decisions to make in redistricting. We're always in a situation, especially now, where so much of our state's population lives in three counties. But if the mayors of all the Sarpy cities want to be serious that they are unified and cannot be split and their political allegiances are so strong we shouldn't divide them up in any capacity,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

maybe we as a Legislature should start looking at forcibly merging some of the Sarpy County cities.

HUGHES: One minute.

M. HANSEN: That would be a huge savings to a lot of local taxpayers to not have duplicate and next-door, overlapping districts, not have paying multiple mayors and city councils and things of that nature. And I could tell you how exactly popular that's going to be in Sarpy County, based in all my time in Urban Affairs and Government Committees, is not at all. So I don't know how you argue that your cities need to be independent, need special protections, how you routinely come for the Legislature and get special carve-outs for Sarpy County because you're a really unique system where you have different cities who don't want to annex each other and at the same time be, we absolutely, unquestionably need the same congressperson because we're so united. That's also something that doesn't kind of pass the eye test. With that, I know I'm about out of time so thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Matt Hansen. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Nice to see you up there. So-- well, I just want to start by saying I was remiss in my initial comments in not thanking the hard work of the committee. I did attend the entire hearing yesterday. And so I appreciate the time that people have put in in terms of drawing the maps. I did attempt to draw my own maps and it was a cumbersome process and so I appreciate the work that people are doing and the time and commitment for that. What I wanted to talk about is in particular, I handed out those maps and they got handed out after my last conversation, and I hope folks have had a chance to take a look at those. I could kind of walk you through them a little bit. If you look at the first page it's just the map that was handed out this morning and you can kind of see the jagged line. If you go to the second page, you can see a closer-up view of that jagged line where it diverts from 680 and into that neighborhood Senator Hansen just explained. So leave 680 on Sprague Street and then follows up along on-- well, it's hard to read on this map, but it looks like Taylor Street up to-- I'm sorry, it's up to Taylor Street and then cuts north and then across and goes up to Meredith and then north on 96th Street. And that kind of jogs a little west and continues following that around Tomahawk Park up to Fort Street and then jogs again, goes straight north on 93rd and then goes a little bit west at Community of Christ Church. So the part we're talking about is when it goes north on 93rd Street, crosses Ellison, 93rd jogs to the west and

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

then goes around on Laurel Avenue and-- but the map continues directly north through these houses on-- that are on both 93rd Street and 92nd Avenue. So if you live facing 92nd Avenue and Ellison, you are in the 2nd Congressional District. If you live on 93rd Street and Ellison, the backyard neighbor of that person, you are in the 1st Congressional District. And so I brought it up initially to point out that this map does not follow clearly defined lines. If you tell me that you know the route, you take Ellison Avenue or 93rd and Ellison often, I would not believe you unless you live at 93rd and Ellison. 680, however, is a street that a lot of people know and use. But it's clear that this map does not follow 680 in that neighborhood and juts across and goes through quite a few neighborhoods, divides blocks, divides churches, divides parks, people from parks, and separates communities of interest. And the reason I bring it up is LR134, which was passed by this body in the spring, for the guiding principles of how to draw this map. Section 4 states insofar as possible and within the context of principles set forth by the United States Supreme Court, district boundaries shall be defined districts that are easily identifiable, understandable to voters. So if your backyard neighbor is in a different congressional district than you are, I would question whether that is clearly understandable to voters. Preserve communities of interest, if you're dividing churches, parishes, schools, you're dividing communities of interest, and allow for the preservation of core of prior districts with feasible district boundary lines shall coincide with the boundaries of cities and villages. So here's the other part. This divides the city of Omaha, which has been always in the 2nd Congressional District, not just Douglas County, but the city of Omaha has always been in one congressional district.

HUGHES: One minute.

J. CAVANAUGH: And it divides the city out-- it divides out almost one entire city council district and parts of two other districts. So this is certainly violating many tenets of LR134. It is not following clearly defined boundaries. It is dividing communities of interest. It's dividing cities, the biggest city in the state of Nebraska. And it's-- and it is not preserving the core of previous districts that have been drawn for 100 or more years. And so, I would again encourage you to vote against LB1 when we get to that time. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator McKinney, you're recognized.

McKINNEY: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to LB1 and AM15, but I rise today to also discuss what happened on Wednesday. On

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

Wednesday, the Judiciary Committee held a listening session with staff from the Department of Corrections. We-- we had this listening session because our current prison system is currently having a staffing crisis and we wanted to get the perspective of the staff about the situation, which was-- which has been very alarming. Throughout the summer, I've spent a lot of time in multiple facilities trying to better understand what is going on, not only from the perspectives of the department, but from staff and those that are incarcerated in those facilities. One big thing with the staffing crisis is staff morale. They're having a lot of individuals walk off because of the situation. It's-- if you would have sat through that listening session, you would have been shocked about what the staff were saying. Also, the morale of incarcerated individuals is-- aren't the best either. My office has received many calls and communications about the situation and a lot of those that are inside are fed up with the department and don't know what to do. They are being locked down for long periods of time now because our prisons are not staffed properly. Staff are working more hours, longer time. For instance, one guy that was speaking, he said he worked 25 hours straight. Just think about that. Somebody actually worked 25 hours straight. I don't think that's safe. With the staffing crisis, there is a lack of programming going on inside, so those that may need some programs to be released, to decrease the crisis can it-- can't even take programming on a regular basis because we're not staffing our prisons properly. They also mentioned in the Lincoln Correctional Center on the weekends, those incarcerated are spending three days pretty much shut down and only time they get to come out is to take a shower and maybe use the phone. So from Friday, Saturday and Sunday, incarcerated individuals are spending 70 hours inside of a cell. That is not humane at all and I-- you can never explain that to me, how that's even reasonably OK. This topic is important because we've been discussing a proposal to build another prison. I just don't understand how could we build another prison and we can't staff the ones that we currently have. Even if we were to build another prison and take the Nebraska State Penitentiary offline, we would still be-- we would still end up in an overcrowding crisis and it still wouldn't help. So I believe that, one, we should be investing in our staff and making sure that they are whole and feel appreciated by the department. Two, we need more treatment, services, and facilities for individuals that deal with substance abuse and mental health. We also need better programming options for those incarcerated. And we also need to focus on reentry and making sure that we have some type of workforce housing and job-- job and skill preparation for those that will be released because most of the individuals that are currently incarcerated will be released one day. And another thing before I close, the state--

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: One minute.

McKINNEY: --also needs to invest in communities like north Omaha. And we got an update from the Inspector General and I'll just read this off. One of the towers at NSP was not manned overnight. Three staff were responsible in the Nebraska State Penitentiary for two housing units with a total of 400 inmates. Most of the higher security units ran with just a single staff person in each. This includes Unit 4, a restrictive housing unit. And this is the picture and this is the life that our staff and our incarcerated individuals have to deal with every day and I would implore everyone in this body to really start paying attention to this situation because this staffing crisis is going to create a bigger crisis if the Governor doesn't do something and we don't do something next January to pass some legislation to improve our criminal justice system and our-- and our state prison system. Thank you.

HUGHES: Time, Senator. Thank you, Senator McKinney. Senator Moser, you're recognized.

MOSER: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of LB1. One of the main reasons is that the overwhelming response that I've received from citizens in my district is that they would like to remain in Congressional District Number 1. And the other maps have proposed moving Platte County to Congressional District 3. I think that Platte County has more in common with the other areas in Congressional District 1. Platte County still has the primary business being agriculture, but paired with that, Platte County has the highest per capita manufacturing output of any county in Nebraska. And there weren't 46 people at the hearing to support that, but our chamber of commerce exec was there, I testified, and we both feel that Platte County should stay in the 1st Congressional District. The ratio of testifiers shouldn't be necessarily the deciding factor in how we move the state forward. It's such a small percentage of the 2 million people in Nebraska that numbers alone are not sufficient to make a good argument. What does matter is what they say and what ideas they bring to the discussion, however many there may be on whichever side. I find it ironic that they quote the numbers in the Omaha hearing, but if you look at the hearing held in Grand Island, the overwhelming majority of testifiers in Grand Island support keeping Custer County in Legislative District 36. So I think we need to take the big picture and look at Nebraska as a state of almost two million people and do what we think is best for our state. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Moser. Senator Morfeld, you're recognized.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

MORFELD: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I want to just talk a little bit more about the map that's been proposed in LB1, not necessarily the Blood amendment yet here, but I just want to go back to LR134 and really the requirements, well, I guess you can't say the requirements, but the guidelines. The guidelines, some of them I feel like are requirements because they're based on court cases and other constitutional means, but I want to talk just a little bit about-- and maybe we should just read it first off. So looking at LR134, page 2, it states, "the following criteria shall be specifically applicable to the public bodies for which the Legislature will create new district boundaries in 2021." It starts with the United States House of Representatives. First, three single member districts, we've achieved that. That's reassuring. If we were debating over that, we'd-- we'd have a much longer debate, but (b) the population among districts shall be nearly equal as practicable. That is with an overall range of deviation at or approaching zero percent. I believe both maps have achieved that and then no plan shall be considered which results in an overall range of deviation in excess of 1 percent or relative deviation in excess of plus or minus 0.5 percent based on ideal popula-- district population. "Any deviation from absolute equality of population must be necessary to the achievement of a 'legitimate state objective' as that concept has been articulated by the United States Supreme Court." And still reading from the resolution here, To the extent that such objectives are relied upon, they shall be applied consistently and shall include, but not be limited to, the creation of compact districts, the preservation of municipal boundaries, the preservations of communities of interest and allowance for the preservation of the core of prior districts. Whenever there is presented to the Legislature more than one plan that will substantially vindicate those objectives, preferences will be given to the plan that provides the greatest degree of population equality. So there's a few things in there that I want to talk about that I feel as though the proposal before us, LB1, not the Blood amendment, but LB1 does not follow, particularly in comparison to the alternative map, which I'm getting my numbers a little mixed up because we've got so many maps, but I believe it's LB-- believe it's LB2. And so the first is "shall include, but not be limited to, the creation of compact districts." Well, I don't personally believe that this is as compact as we could get it because it includes three different counties when in fact, we currently have it in one and then part of another county, Sarpy County. So this extends into three different counties when it could encompass one and then part of another county, which is the current case with the 2nd Congressional District. So I do not believe that is as compact. It is contiguous, of course, but in any case, the preservation of municipal boundaries. Now, when it comes to Omaha,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

I'll tell you what, I don't know the boundaries of municipalities as well as I do in Lincoln or Lancaster County, but that being said, it's certainly-- it certainly cuts through the Omaha metro area. And I'll have to, after I get off the mike here, look at the Omaha city boundaries a little bit more closely and get back on the mike here. The preservations of-- the preservation of communities of interest and the allowance for the preservation of the core--

HUGHES: One minute.

MORFELD: --prior districts. As I noted earlier, Douglas County and all of Douglas County has been in a congressional district for over 100 years. That is clearly a core of that district. It clearly is a core of the district. And so we are not preserving the core of the district by making this change. There's no denying it whatsoever. And in addition, it is not nearly as compact as it could be, as I discussed earlier, and I'm going to get on the mike a little bit and talk about the preservation of municipal boundaries as well. That's why I'm in opposition to LB1. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Morfeld. Senator Wishart, you're recognized.

WISHART: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues. First, I want to echo what a lot of my colleagues have said before me. Thank you to the Redistricting Committee members for their tireless work. I know this is a incredibly challenging task ahead of you. I also want to do a shout-out to all of the staff members, in particular those who are responsible for drafting the maps. I know you've worked countless hours on this and we appreciate your skill in bringing these maps before us. Where I stand when I am looking at the task we have ahead of us is that I do not plan on voting for any map that was not drawn with our nonpartisan values in mind. So I intend to support a compromise between all political parties in coming to a map that best reflects Nebraskans and our nonpartisan values. I ran specifically for the Nebraska Legislature because we are a nonpartisan Unicameral. I will not run again for any office that is not nonpartisan. For me, it's important that I am surrounded by a diversity of thinking that is open to a rigorous discussion. I don't want to support a map that is drawn to create an echo chamber of a certain type of thinking. I don't want to be surrounded by that myself. I do not want to be surrounded by people that say yes to every idea I have. I want to be challenged and I want all of us to be challenged every day. That's the purpose of being a nonpartisan body, is that we are deliberative in our thinking and we're open to being challenged. This is the best chapter of my life by far. And one of the main reasons is I've gotten to work with

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

someone like Chairman Stinner who frankly says no to a lot of the things I bring before him. And what that makes me do is do my work and bring it again to him and try a different way of explaining why I want something, why I think it's important. I wouldn't replace him for any Democrat that was running in his district. Why are we looking at drawing maps to benefit sitting in a room with a bunch of people that say yes to you? Why are we not looking at this and saying how can we have the most diverse group of people sitting in this body so we truly have deliberation about how we move the state forward? Because I guarantee you, if we sit in a room and we truly listen to each other from a diverse part of the state, from a diversity of thought, from a-- heaven forbid, diversity of political party, that actually what comes out of that deliberation is in the best interests of Nebraskans. Because, yes, when we are challenged, when we challenge each other to think differently, that's when we actually have innovation to solve some of these incredibly tough challenges that frankly have nothing to do with political party.

HUGHES: One minute.

WISHART: Nothing to do with political party. They are challenges that impact every Nebraskan. So for me, moving forward, my expectations for the committee and for the entire body in terms of what I'm going to vote on will be it has to be filtered through the value systems of a nonpartisan Legislature and until it meets that test, I will not be voting on a map. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Wishart. Senator Hunt, you're recognized.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues. Good afternoon, Nebraskans. Senator Wishart said that very well and she said it in her way. She's such a talented communicator, so clear, at times so diplomatic in a way that I'm always, like, striving to be, but really, really struggle with. But she said it right. I, too, am not going to support a map that doesn't reflect our nonpartisan tradition and values because that's what matters to Nebraskans. And it doesn't matter if you went to a hearing in CD 1 or 2 or 3, if you went to Grand Island or Lincoln or Scottsbluff or Omaha or Blair, where I'm from, anywhere in the state, everyone you talk to is so proud of our nonpartisan tradition here in Nebraska. And the process that this has gone through is not in honoring that culture and we know that. I love this debate. This is not the stuff that stresses me out that we do. I've been really looking forward to this special session because I'm excited to see all of my colleagues again. I'm excited to use this time to talk about some things we want to do in 2022. I'm excited to be here with all the screens down so I can actually lean over and talk

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

to some of my colleagues behind me and in front of me, and of course, the pandemic is still going on and we're still being careful. We're all getting vaccinated and doing our best to protect each other, but I have really missed the pace, I guess, of being here in the Legislature and doing the work here for Nebraskans. And what that is in this redistricting session is the balance of the hard work of getting it done and making sure the maps are fair, balanced with some of the theater of being like, oh, none of this is politically motivated, when we cut Douglas County in half, we had no idea that people would have a problem with that. We're just trying to draw the fairest map. Like, come on, nobody believes that. You don't even believe that. Like, literally don't say that. Among so many reasons that I don't support LB1, I don't support this map because my constituents hate it. My constituents have told me over and over again, please don't let this happen to Douglas County. This makes no sense for our culture and it makes no sense for Nebraska because there's no reason that this is the way we have to do it. There's a better way. And so why did the Redistricting Committee, last night in a 5-4 vote, vote LB1 out and not LB2 and we can have a debate on both of them? We know that we're going to need to come to a compromise between the two maps. We know that LB1, isn't it? We've got to take up time today so that, you know, folks can get together and talk about what that solution is going to be. And that's part of the work. It's the work, it's the theater, it's everything that makes the Legislature fun, but it's really important that we get this done correctly for Nebraskans. And I know that all of us think that. I know everybody agrees with that. I was trying to see the overlay. So LB1 is the congressional map that was drafted by Senator Linehan and others. And LB3 is the legislative map that was drawn by Senator Linehan and others. And so I was looking at-- and I'll say this, as a state legislator, I have had a lot of trouble reading these maps and I know that it's doable. Like you got to get into Google Maps and you can find people on social media and Twitter who have, like, layed it over Google Maps, then it makes it a lot easier to read. And there's links on the website of the Legislature and there's-- you can talk to staffers and figure out how to read the map, but it's not easy. And so I understand Nebraskans who have come to my office and said, how do I read this map? What are these streets? Is this a street or a census tract? Everybody's having trouble reading these maps. Anyway, that's all to say I, too, am having trouble reading these maps. So my staff helped me put together-- if the congressional and legislative maps introduced by Senator Linehan--

HUGHES: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUNT: --thank you-- pass, my district, which is midtown Omaha, Dundee and Benson-- if you know Omaha, that's right in the center of town. It's obviously a pretty progressive part of our state sending me over here, but I thought that my district was going to overlap part of CD 1 and that CD 1 and CD 2 would be split in my district in midtown Omaha, which makes absolutely no sense. We finally zoom into the map close enough to see it does not quite split, but it is literally a matter of like two or three blocks. And in no world does any Omahan think it makes sense to put part of District 8 in CD 1, which represents, you know, so many other parts of rural Nebraska. And we love rural Nebraska, but politically and geographically and culturally and communitywise, which is what's most important, not a lot a common with Lincoln, for example.

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

HUNT: Like that's not a community of interest. Back to the drawing board. We're going to get it done. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Lathrop, you're recognized.

LATHROP: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I am on my second time speaking. The first time I-- I said swiftly, politely, that I have a problem with AM15. I want to elaborate on that. I think-- I need to express that my opposition is stronger than I might have led people to believe the first time and here's why. This business of drawing maps is complex. You do one thing and it affects things counties away, districts away, and to put something up that simply says Sarpy gets to be independent and stay whole doesn't tell you how that map works. It doesn't tell you whether that's possible. With all respect to my good friend, Senator Blood, I think we should defeat AM15 and-- defeat AM15 and then if there is a map that keeps Sarpy County whole, then we can take up a map that leaves Sarpy County whole and Douglas County whole, if that's the object, but here's the challenge. Are we putting two congressmen, two sitting congressmen in the same district? Who's going to run against whom? Where is the area going to come from? Does this new Sarpy County standing alone district include Lincoln? Does it-- what-- what land does it and voters does it pick up and is that suitable? We could pass this amendment and find ourselves trying to work a map around this amendment that no one likes. I think this-- this process is better served when we have an amendment that includes a map and then we can debate the merits of it, because I guarantee you, we will have huge disagreements over what counties should be included with Sarpy and what counties should be included with Douglas. I go back to this. I go back to this and-- and in some respects and with all due respect to my friends from Sarpy County, this is as a

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

solution looking for a problem, right? We had a hearing yesterday and overwhelmingly, people did not want to split Douglas County and they were fine picking up part of Sarpy County. Senator Sanders, who I have a great deal of respect for, opposed the idea and wants her own-- wants Sarpy to stand alone and so do the mayors in Sarpy, not surprisingly. But that doesn't make this the crisis that it is being represented to be. It's not. And putting up an amendment that simply says Sarpy should be made whole, and then what? What do we do after that and what's that map look like? And how do we make that work? And can we get consensus around that? Otherwise-- otherwise, it effectively-- it effectively brings us to a place where we have to make an accommodation on account of the amendment, but we don't talk about the details. And if you've been in the map room and you've tried to make this work, you know, and if we brought out a map, we can't even agree on what to do out in western Nebraska at this moment or in greater Nebraska or in places in the legislative districts west of Lincoln. So the idea that we would put something in that says, this county is going to get this and now you, the Legislature, need to figure out how to make that work is not a-- is not a good process. If Sarpy County is to be on its own, then let's see a map that does that and whether it puts two congressmen in the same district.

HUGHES: One minute. One minute.

LATHROP: Gotcha. I think that's all I got to say at this time. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Lathrop. Senator Groene, you're recognized.

GROENE: Thank you, Mr. President. I don't know if I'm helping a filibuster here or if I'm speaking to the camera. I believe I am more than anything else because I think a lot of minds are made up. But a couple of collegial things that I-- bothers me is-- Senator Lathrop hit on it-- that somehow a whole state, 1.9 million people should make a decision if some politician happens to be in his district or she does for the next election. That should be not even involved in this debate. I hear a lot about, well, we only can change a district where the-- somebody is term-limited out. Why? That tells the state of Nebraska this is a country club. We're more worried about each other's little egos, the 49 people, and I'm not saying all you are, than we are about what's best for the state, for the people. That should stop. If you are good and you were serving the people and you run, may the best woman win, or best man, even if you have to run against another incumbent, but that should never play into how we draw these lines. We're talking about a ten-year period here. So anyway, I don't see a better map. We talk about urban and rural. We start drawing a map

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

around Douglas County, we're talking about Omaha against the rest of the state. You want to get isolated? Go ahead and do that. You're already pretty well isolated. You know, there's a lot of talk about giving Omaha-- or hope the next flood, the river, the Missouri River, goes west and around Omaha so Iowa can have them. But if you want to get collegial, you want to be-- get along, your elected officials have to look at the good of the whole state and the only way you do that is to make there-- to have a little influence from agriculture, have a little influence from manufacturing and blue-collar workers from ethnic diversity. I'd gladly take north Omaha in my district. We need a little congressional district. We need a little more diversity out there and representation. And we've never had red lines out there so we might be better off. But that's my point. Let's not worry about so much county lines and who the egos are, the politicians that have served there now. We are doing the duty and the mission of the populace of the people. And that's the way I look at this. I do not want to isolate the people of Omaha into one district because maybe the other two districts might gang up on you. We've been very good to Omaha; \$300 million for a hospital and jobs, \$50 million for an Air Force base that didn't work out at command, economic development. There's a reason you guys are growing. We favored you and that's what where the jobs are, and then therefore that's where the populace is. Maybe we ought to stop that. You want to be isolated? Good. We'll draw a-- put up a fence around Douglas County and then, boy, don't ask this body for a lot of help in the future. You want to go one against two? That's what you're doing here if you start isolating the county. Split it, give some diversity to it, diversity and representation. That's what we need to do here. Make us whole, don't divide us. I think the committee did a good job on this map. And I really don't see-- as I was talking to a friendly friend of mine who is a Democrat--

HUGHES: One minute.

GROENE: --he said, really, both maps don't change the mix up of that-- voters that much, LB2 or LB1. But as I said, and I'll repeat myself, it allows for growth, some of the growth in our state to be transferred over to District 3, which needs growth. So anyway, I hope we don't beat this to death and we come up with a worse map and we draw around who's-- who's elected and who isn't elected now and sitting politicians and who wants to run and all that stuff and do what's best for the people of Nebraska. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Groene. Senator Blood, you're recognized.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow Senators, friends all, I said from the very beginning that as written, I do not support LB1 and that

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

truly AM15 was meant to start a dialogue, a dialogue where we discuss that there are other options besides LB1 to keep Sarpy County whole while also keeping Douglas County whole. Now, I respect and actually agree with Senator Lindstrom, which I think I need to clarify right now. So because of the time, I had to bring an amendment forward without a map. So looking at it, it's clear that you can keep Sarpy County whole. And yes, it would include Lincoln and move Douglas County whole keeping them north as well. But my intent is certainly not to move out Mr. Bacon from his elected position. It was really more to prove a point. And what we've done today is, some of us have proven the point that we know how to dialogue on issues and discuss the haves and have-nots and the wants and want-nots, especially-- I said Lindstrom-- Senator Lathrop and I apologize for that. Senator Lathrop, my apologies. Senator Lindstrom, my apologies. We have too many " L" senators. But I want to bring to light some of the things that have been said that apparently nobody knows the answer to. So one of the things that we did for all the hearings is a flow sheet and if anybody wants to look at these and I keep offering them to people and for some reason nobody wants to see it, which kind of tells me people's minds are made up. But we tracked every single testifier as to what they supported and did not support and any comments that they made, including-- including the senators who spoke. And so when you add the three hearings for Senator-- for the LB1 map, I'm not going to say Senator Linehan because it sounds partisan, there were 22 in favor and 97 against. For Senator Wayne's map whose number I'm drawing a blank on, I want to say it was LB2, right, 94 in favor, 18 against. So Senator Moser can say the ratio of testifiers really shouldn't be a marker, but what they say matters, I couldn't agree more. And if you look at the comments of what was said, it really was about communities wanting to stay whole, communities that had shared things and common interest wanted to be kept together. A lot of what we're already talking about on the floor today and a lot of whatever our LR that guided us said to us as well. So I'm a little confused by a lot of this dialogue that we're having and this debate that we're kind of having because I'm not-- I'm not seeing an understanding that LB1 is not the end all, be all. Yes, we voted it out 5-4 with the discussion, by the way, in the committee that we thought that we probably weren't done with that map. So to hear otherwise that it's OK how it is and let's keep Sarpy whole with only this one particular way and it's OK if Douglas County is cut in half because, you know, who cares about Douglas County?

HUGHES: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

BLOOD: I don't understand any of this dialogue. What I do understand is that LB1 was meant to be a starting place and AM15 was meant to start a conversation to let you know that this is not our only option. So I really wish people would get more involved in the dialogue today and not just talk about supporting or not supporting as much as what else can we do with LB1 to make it a better bill, to make it a better map. Because that is what we're here to do. We have a short window of time and we need more people to actually engage in the process as opposed to just sitting around and listening to the debate and being told how they should vote or not vote.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Blood. Senator Geist, you're recognized.

GEIST: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Legislature. I just wanted to stand up and speak as a member of the Redistricting Committee. First, I just want to thank everyone, each and every one who came out to testify in all three of the congressional districts that we visited. Many people drove many miles and we appreciated that. It's nice to see when Nebraskans are engaged in the process-- excuse me, but I know that we did also get feedback that since it was in the middle of the day on each of those three days, that there were many people who couldn't come and attend face to face. So I have received many, many emails from people across the state and mostly from people in my district and I appreciate those as well. I'm always an office that's open to comments and emails, and we do try to do our very best to respond to each of those. We are a little bit behind. We've received many, many, as I said, so we are a bit behind. And I do want to thank my fellow committee members for their hard work. And it has been hard work, much more than I anticipated. I knew it was going to be a lot of work, but until you actually get into this, you have no idea. So now I have an idea and I appreciate my-- my colleagues very much. Please know that we are listening, that we do listen to your concerns. We have listened to your concerns. And even if some of us make a different decision than what you may have expressed in an email or a face to face, that doesn't mean we haven't heard what you had to say. We all come in with our own ideas and-- and I know that many who make their ideas known come in with theirs as well and I know they don't all agree. So I do want to thank-- to thank people who have reached out and made their-- their wishes known. I do want to let you know that maybe because it's the makeup of my particular district, but I have had an overwhelming number of emails recommending LB1. I do stand in support of-- of this congressional map. And-- and I have had a number of emails that reflect that. Now, of course, I've had some as well that are not in support of LB1, but I have had an overwhelming number from my district that are. We know there are going to be

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

changes. There are going to be changes all along the way in this process, but I just wanted to let those of you know that I do support this-- this bill. I support this map. And-- and I appreciate all the hard work of everyone that's been on the committee and those who are in the public who have made their wishes known to us. And I do stand in support of this. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Geist. Senator Pansing Brooks, you're recognized.

PANSING BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I'm standing up to, number one, thank the people from the committee including the Chair, the Vice Chair and all the members of the committee. Everyone has done yeoman's work to make sure that their constituents are heard. There's disagreement as to how we're doing it, and I guess that's to be expected. But I also want to stand up because there's been a lot of talk about the fact that the Supreme Court has allowed people that-- that people can look at this in a-- in a partisan light. And while that is possible, it shouldn't be done. We have a unique, valuable treasure right here in the middle of our country and that's our Nebraska Unicameral. Yeah, I know you're going to look at it and try to save your own district and try to keep the voters there and-- but we're also representing the whole state. I am not sitting up here only representing the Democrats in my district. I represent everybody, Republican, independent. Democrat, atheist, LGBT person. Whatever classification you want to give somebody, I represent them all in my district and across the state. And I echo a lot of the wise words that Senator Wishart said. This body needs to keep its part-- nonpartisan tenor going. It's-- I am the-- I am the only woman in the senior class, the only woman in the senior class. So some people have come up to me and said, oh, well, you're the mother of the Legislature then. And I don't-- I wonder if that's said derogatorily, the mother. I know what you're thinking, some of you, and I'll happily wear that. But I do believe that the tendencies of a mother to bring everyone in together to make sure that we can disagree kindly, to make sure that each person is heard, to make sure that each opinion is valued. Those are the things that a mother does. That's what I did to my family. I want us to be sure. I know that-- that Senator Linehan and I have opposing views on things, but that doesn't mean I don't respect her and admire what she does both on revenue and this. I'm going to still bug her about if she-- if she's doing something I don't agree with, but I'm not going to disparage her on the floor. I'm not going to say that anyone who doesn't agree with me is a nonperson. We have to do better. The rest-- we have a chance right now if we want to become partisan and bring in the parties, which we've fought doing on our

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

side, if we want to bring in the parties, we can turn right into Congress and right into what the other states are doing. We are unique. We are able-- I'm able to support Senator Brewer or Senator Clements or Senator Arch on various bills. That's because we're nonpartisan. Why would there be any discussion about, oh, well, we have to look at this through partisan eyes. Please protect the value and the strength and the history of our beautiful Unicameral. Yes, we'll disagree. Yes, we're making sausage.

HUGHES: One minute.

PANSING BROOKS: Perfection is the enemy of good. Not one of us in here is going to have perfection. Not one of us is going to be totally happy. You know what? My kids weren't either when they were growing up and I was a mom. And half the time I'd say, listen, I can't tell which of you started it, both of you are going to the stairs. Then they were mad at me. That's fine, I don't care if they're mad at me. They weren't mad at each other. They were focused on me. So if you guys want to be mad at me as the mom of the Legislature, that's fine. We are going to fight to be nonpartisan and keep this precious treasure in the middle of our country alive and well. That, to me, is our most important task as we go through this issue of redistricting. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Pansing Brooks. Senator Matt Hansen, you're recognized and this is your third opportunity.

M. HANSEN: Of course. Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon again, colleagues. Colleagues, I want to talk a little bit about the map broadly, including I have been focused a lot on what is happening in the Omaha metro area, but obviously, I am a Lancaster County area senator and what happens in CD1 matters a lot to me. And before lunch, somebody had indicated that Congressman Fortenberry was upset at this map, specifically that this map took conservatives out of his district by eliminating Saunders County and gave Omaha instead. Now, I don't know if he spoke to Congressman Fortenberry directly or if he's just making an assumption, but I think that's probably fair. I would not imagine Congressman Fortenberry likes this map. This makes CD1 probably more competitive or maybe more in the future because you're taking away some of the areas closest to Lincoln and instead giving us kind of a "C" or a loop to grab the new and expanding areas of Omaha. From a CD 1 perspective, this probably makes this map better for myself and for my own party. And I don't like it because it's an obvious gerrymander where there's an opportunity of our state to have good, straight lines, good cities and counties and congressional districts that make sense and we're actually grouping groups together

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

that make sense and have historically stood together. From a perspective of this, you know, one of the times I first saw this map, I had to like-- like, well, that's great, we'll have a Democratic congressperson in Lincoln by the end of the decade. I'm still not willing to do an obvious gerrymander to get there because I think we can have a good, balanced, fair district and that's what we should do as a body. That's what we should do as a nonpartisan body. So I guess that's the one thing we're going to have to decide as a body. I know people have strong opinions on whether or not to protect or not protect incumbents. I fall in the line of, you know, not going out of the way to punish incumbents, but if something truly doesn't work, you know, it's an OK to wade into that area. And that's something we're going to have to decide and we're going to have to decide probably in these congressional maps because as people have described the maps they want and the maps, they have an ideal map, it's 100 percent pitting Fortenberry against Bacon. And I don't know if there's plans in the Republican Party. I don't know if one of them is ready to retire or going to run for something else, maybe there's coordination, I don't know. I would not at all be the person to know. But if that's the route we want to wade into and that's the route everybody's kind of banging their fists on the podium and saying Sarpy makes sense as a whole and let's loop it in with 1st Congressional District we want, OK, that's something we can look at. And that's going to probably make multiple competitive purplish districts in the state of Nebraska and that might be great. And that might be what we as a body decide we want. But at the moment when we're talking about this and, you know, we've kind of got this backhanded lens of-- of don't accuse us of partisanship and part of the reason you can't accuse us of partisanship is we didn't necessarily make it great for Congressman Fortenberry. I think that's accurate. I think that's accurate. And that should say something that the rest of the gerrymander is so bad that people aren't willing to take that deal and give the 1st Congressional District kind of like a good deal. That's where we're at. That's where the skirting through alleys in Omaha is just obviously like-- I can't in good conscience do something like that without a good reason. I know we have to be razor thin on population. I know every once in a while-- in past maps we've done this-- you need a block or two extra to just get to the right number and that has to happen somewhere. It does not have to carve Councilwoman Melton's entire district out of the 2nd Congressional District and throw it into the 1st Congressional District.

HUGHES: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

M. HANSEN: That is not anything at all we've seen. There have been multiple maps. People have drawn them on Twitter that have shown how to solve this issue and create some districts when you're not thinking through a partisan lens, which I think kind of unfortunately has crept into this in a number of ways and people have acknowledged on the floor. I'm trying really hard not to do that. Somebody is welcome to call me out if I've overstepped or overshared, but that's where I think we're at. And that's something that I think we have to factor in. Do we want to protect incumbents? Do we care what incumbents think? And if not, no, OK, but then there's some solutions that probably lead to Fortenberry and Bacon being in the same congressional district and if that's something we don't think is a problem, we can look at it. But I imagine once we actually get to that point, people are going to think that's a problem. So with that, I think I'm about out of time, so I will conclude. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Matt Hansen. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized and this is your third opportunity.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. So, well, it's convenient going after Senator Hansen because he kind of previewed some of the points that I was going to make. So my last time on the mike, I talked about the criteria set out in LR134. Senator Morfeld has addressed those since then and I just kind of wanted to drill down on that a little bit because the-- specifically in that Section 4 where I talked about, the-- the insofar as possible that the maps should have easily identifiable and be easily identifiable and understandable to voters. And so I was sitting here thinking, well, Senator Hansen was talking about that, easily identifiable. So he said that this map draws all of Councilwoman Aimee Melton's district into the 1st Congressional District. I actually kind of looked at it. I think it draws all but a precinct and a half, which is dangerous in the sense that if you want to make things identifiable and understandable to voters, you shouldn't have those big types of districts, being city council, something that somebody would say, I live in Aimee Melton's City Council district. Oh, you're in the 1st Congressional District. People should be able to have that be a shorthand and so we're cutting that. And that's one of the reasons you have these definitive boundaries of cities, counties, municipalities, other identifiers, why we want to have a clear road like 680 and-- or 370 or Harrison Street, roads that people are familiar with, that are clear. You know when you hit them, you know when you cross them, so that you know which district you live in so you know who your elected representatives are so that you know who to contact when you have an issue. That is the reason that we have-- we-- our objective is to make it clear, understandable,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

identifiable to voters so they don't have to go and get a county line plotting map to figure out if they're in the 1st District or the 2nd District like you have to do when you're putting a fence in between your house and your neighbors. Get somebody out there to draw a boundary line to make sure that you're in which district. It shouldn't be that difficult. And we are making it unnecessarily difficult by doing this. And there are answers that are easier and clearer for voters to identify what district they're in and that is one of the reasons why LB1 is an unacceptable map and an unacceptable interpretation of LR134. Just a few other districts that get cut by this map would be the Omaha Public School District. A large portion of Omaha public schools would be in the 1st Congressional District in this map. The Omaha Police Department enforcement area would be in separate congressional districts. But the other big issue in terms of dividing Douglas County is something that we heard when I was at the hearing all day yesterday from people is that the arguments to preserve the continuity of Sarpy County are valid and they should be applied to Douglas County for the same reasons. Senator Sanders testified as to her time as the mayor of Bellevue and that when she was mayor, they had two congresspersons and it made it difficult for them to coordinate getting federal funds. This is the city of Bellevue, which has the Air Force base, which is, I think the third-largest city in the state of Nebraska, was having difficulty getting their fair share of federal funds because of what some would call the tragedy of the commons, which is when everybody is responsible, no one's responsible, which means when you have two congresspersons. It's not actually doubling your representation, it's decreasing your representation because you don't know who is responsible to help you. And now imagine taking that problem and applying it to the largest city in the state, which I know a lot of people around here don't have the best feelings for, but I think you can all concede that the city of Omaha is the major economic driver of the state of Nebraska.

HUGHES: One minute.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. And that it has drawn in many federal funds which-- which benefit the state as a whole, and that it-- the objective when we're talking about federal elections and federal districts should include an eye towards efficiency in that nature and making sure that we are not going to cause ourselves harm in achieving those federal funds. And so the testimony from-- I would consider a reputable source at the hearing yesterday made clear that a divided city is not a good idea when it comes to congressional districts. And so that is one of the many reasons that I'm against LB1

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

and would be looking for a compromise map that will include and hold Douglas County together as one map. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator McCollister, you're recognized.

McCOLLISTER: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues. Senator Pansing Brooks says she is the mother of the Legislature and I have to agree she is, as she's the woman in the senior class. So thank you, Senator Pansing Brooks. My district is in the center of Omaha. If you take a bird's-eye view of Omaha and stick a pin right in the middle, that's my district. It's the so-called west side district. It goes from 72nd Street on the east to 144th Street on the west, Pacific Street on the north, and essentially I-80 on the south. That is the center of the city. When I first ran for the Legislature in 2014, it was plus-7 percent Republican. And now after five, six, seven years, it's about 2 percent Republican. But on this particular issue, the redistricting issue, I'm getting emails 6 to 1 against LB1 and LB3-- 6 to 1. I suppose I've received 30, 40 emails on this particular topic. And actually the testimony that we heard yesterday in Omaha would mirror those kind of statistics. I've been really rea-- reluctant-- and the emails that I received say so-- to divide Omaha. So I think that's a nonstarter from my point of view. So how do we move forward? I have an amendment coming out that would actually move the northern boundary of the congressional district north to include Colfax, Dodge and Washington Counties. And the population works pretty well. The deviation is very darn close. Maybe we'd have to pick up a neighborhood or two to make it exactly right, but I think, you know, that's a possible solution. So I'm going to offer that amendment. We'll vet that amendment and perhaps that is a possible way forward. Senator Wishart's point about this Legislature being a rather unusual and unique place is exactly right. As I talk to other people that represent legislatures in different part of the country, the Nebraska system really stands out. It is unique and it, I think it is more productive than the other-- other bodies that we've studied. We have a tradition to uphold and we need to continue that tradition as we do this redistricting. LB1 and LB3 are not the way forward. And it's clear to me that we need to get our heads together, get the leaders of our-- our body together and work out a new system, and I'm hopeful we can get that done. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator McCollister. Senator Day, you're recognized.

DAY: Thank you, Mr. President, and good afternoon, colleagues. I am listening to the conversation today. I'll be totally transparent in

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

saying that I have spent a lot of time looking at the legislative maps, and I have not come to a conclusion yet on how I feel about the congressional maps. So when people say that we've all made up our minds and made a decision, that's not true. Some of us are actually sitting here listening to the debate and the discussions on both sides. And so on a personal note, I did have-- I do have to mention and give a little shout-out to my son, Noah. He's had a rough couple of days and had to be peeled off me this morning. He's had a hard time with Mom being in Lincoln all day. And-- but we had to have a little discussion this morning about mom having the responsibility to do the job that she was elected to do, even if it breaks our heart sometimes. So-- so I just have to say, hey, Noah, I love you, buddy, and Mommy will be home as soon as she can tonight. And with that, I know that Senator Wayne had some items that he wanted to mention, so I will yield the rest of my time to Senator Wayne.

HUGHES: Senator Wayne, 3:45.

WAYNE: Thank you, and thank you, Senator-- thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Senator Day. So I just want to-- there's been a lot of ideas "afloating" around about splitting counties. No matter what congressional district you draw, a county will be split. In order to achieve zero deviation, you have to split somewhere, doesn't matter. There's going to be two counties in the state of Nebraska that will be split in order to meet the Supreme Court guidelines, period. If you want to keep Sarpy County whole, there's going to be another issue that comes up. And that issue is you cannot keep Sarpy County whole, Lancaster County, Cass, Platte and Madison in the first. It's mathematically impossible, too many people. So you got to figure out which one you want to give up. So if you keep Sarpy County whole and you want to go left, which is west to Lancaster and go south, then all of that becomes the first and you still have to cut off somewhere down by Pawnee because the numbers don't work out. If you go north, you can do it, but Senator Clements, Cass is out of the first. In order to get to Madison and Platte, you have Dodge and Colfax are the only way to get there. There's nowhere else to go. That's just math. Senator Erdman, that is math. There is just that many people there because we been having math conversations. Under Senator McCollister's plan, if you go-- or proposed plan, you go Washington, Dodge, Colfax, Platte and Madison, you have to go to the third. Saunders, you probably have to go to the third too. Maybe you're OK with that, but my understanding from the feedback that I got from my map was Madison and Platte want to stay in the first. What I got from Cass, people who have contacted my office, is they want to stay in the first. Maybe they don't. I don't know. I heard that they do. My point is, you can't

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

have Sarpy County and Lancaster County and Dodge County and think you have a lot of room to go. So all the rural senators who represent those counties that are in the first district understand they will be moved to the third. There's no other way to do it, because between Sarpy County and Lancaster County, you're over 520,000. You add Dodge County, that is-- and Saunders County, you're at another 60,000. All you can put in left is around 80,000 people. So that means you have to make a decision. Are you going north to Madison? Are you going south down to Saline, over to Gage and somewhere down there?

HUGHES: One minute.

WAYNE: That's going to be a urban-- I mean, a rural-on-rural fight. I'm not involved in it. You figure out where you want to slice and dice. That's up to you. But understand two things are going to happen no matter what map. There's going to be two counties that have to have a split. That's the only way you achieve it. There's no other way to achieve it. Second, if you add whole Sarpy County, you've got to figure out what you're going to do with Lancaster and Dodge and in-between there is Saunders, and figure out which way you're going to go. Otherwise, all that middle area, you're moving to the third. If you're OK with that, that's fine. Now I want the body to think about what that does to our caucus. You think urban Senators have power now, think about what that does to your caucus, because we don't have power. We're actually the minority in the group, but it will switch that. So all this talk about keeping Sarpy County whole, I'm cool with that. I can draw the map. I've been down-- I just left the map room.

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senators Day and Wayne. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized and this is your third opportunity.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues. I-- I am opposed to this map because I don't-- well, for a lot of reasons, one of which it's not-- it's not even a legitimate attempt at redistricting when you're cutting through people's yards and when you're cutting out one city council member from a city council of seven. I don't know why that wouldn't be considered not keeping a community of interests together. I-- I don't know Councilwoman Melton well, but I do believe she considers herself a part of the Omaha City Council and being put into a different congressional district doesn't seem to make sense to me for her constituency. Senator McCollister introduced a bill earlier this year, LB267, which would merge Douglas

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

County and the city of Omaha's services. This is something that the county and the city that's been talked about over the years, over the decades back and forth, if that makes sense or not. Well, clearly, the fact that we are even having that conversation within Douglas County and the city of Omaha means that we identify Douglas County and the city of Omaha as a community of interest. I'm not opposed to changing CD 2. I'm opposed to a ludicrous map that goes through people's backyards, zigzags through neighborhoods and disrupts the core of our largest population center. At the start of today, it was even stated by the introducer that this wasn't a serious map, but we're taking eight hours and we have to take eight hours for the people at home because if we don't, 25 people in this Legislature will vote for this not-serious map and it will move to the next stage. So this ludicrous map, we have to talk about for eight hours because 25 people in this room are willing to vote for a fake map. I've heard several of our colleagues today talking about how we need to advocate for rural communities and we can't be losing the whole rural communities and the influence they have, and that just feels really disingenuous to me. If you really cared about keeping populations in rural communities, you would enact public policies that helped your constituents, that would make them want to stay in those communities. You would expand childcare subsidies so that working parents in your communities had a safe place to put their kids. You would invest in programs like SNAP. SNAP for convicted felons, expanded Medicaid, expanded Medicaid coverage for mothers, paid leave. You continually cut the core of what the people of Nebraska need and then complain when they leave your communities for mine. One person, one vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Morfeld, you're recognized and this is your third opportunity.

MORFELD: Thank you, Mr. President and colleagues. Again, I rise in opposition to LB1 and I just want to note that, you know, obviously people are talking, people are coming up with different solutions and discussing them. But I think that the main thing that I want to emphasize is that we need to stay true to what we put in LR134. And I didn't realize it because I just came up on the floor from a work meeting, but apparently Senator John Cavanaugh noted that the plan under LB1 actually violates LB134 [SIC] in the sense of keeping municipalities whole. And the bottom line is, is that we do not need to cut Omaha into two-thirds or half or whatever the case may be. I don't know the Omaha muni-- municipal boundaries well enough, but the bottom line is it's unnecessary. So not only do we violate the compactness requirement in our resolution, we also violate keeping municipal boundaries whole as well. And I think that goes to my

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

primary argument of why LB1 is not the map that we should be considering. This is not the map that the committee, in my opinion, should have put forth. And there's a lot of other options, including LB2. So colleagues, I look forward to having this debate today and I also look forward to looking at some of those alternatives. And I hope that it is going on right now because we have a short amount of time to get this done and the people expect that we have the leadership and we take the time to get it right. But we also get it done so that people can run for office, people understand their boundaries and constituents know who they will be represented by or who they need to choose from to be represented by because if we condense this too much, it'll cause a lot of confusion and will lead to a lack of trust in our ability to do one of the most important jobs that we have. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Morfeld. Senator Wishart, you're recognized. Senator Wishart waives her time. Senator DeBoer, you're recognized.

DeBOER: I'm sorry, colleagues. I didn't expect to come up quite so quickly. So this morning I was talking about the way our caucuses are divided based on congressional district lines as well and-- ah, he's not here-- Senator Clements pointed out that technically they are in the rules is how the caucuses for our standing committees are divided, but what is the tradition of this body is to follow those with the congressional district so there is an intermediary step. I suppose it wouldn't have to be that way, but that has been the tradition is to go along congressional district lines. So the other piece of that is that for statutory committees, work groups and task forces, those would matter what this-- what the lines were, because those are statutorily required and not by our rules. So then the question becomes if you change the lines, which we will do at the end of this special session, there will have the emergency clause, which means it will take place immediately, which means that once that law goes into effect, those changes take place. The question of whether or not then those appointments have to be changed is one that I would like to know the answer to. I don't know the answer to that. I know that probably seems like a very esoteric question, but I think it's one that we ought to know when we're making these decisions. Another point I want to make that I don't think has been made yet, and I was going to ask Senator Wayne, but I don't see him now. Oh, there he is. Senator Wayne, would you yield to a question?

HUGHES: Senator Wayne, will you yield?

WAYNE: Yes-- yes.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

DeBOER: Senator Wayne, you're Chair of the Urban Affairs Committee, which deals with things about cities and all the various-- all the way down to villages, is that correct?

WAYNE: Correct.

DeBOER: So how many cities of the metropolitan class exist in Nebraska?

WAYNE: One.

DeBOER: And what's that city?

WAYNE: The city of Omaha.

DeBOER: So what does it mean to be a city of metropolitan class legally?

WAYNE: Legally, we have an entire chapter-- 16?

_____ : 14.

WAYNE: --14 where grants them-- grants the city of metropolitan class enumerated powers that we explicitly grant them to function essentially.

DeBOER: So, in fact, there are legal differences between the city of Omaha and other cities and villages in the state of Nebraska?

WAYNE: Significant differences. So just real quick, I know it's your time. City-- we follow the Dillon rule. So the city of Omaha can actually do a lot more than any other cities because of that. So the rest of, like Sarpy County, we actually have to pass more legislation to allow-- give them authority to do things-- the cities.

DeBOER: And then cities of the primary class, how many cities of the primary class exist in Nebraska?

WAYNE: Primary is one.

DeBOER: And what's that?

WAYNE: Lincoln.

DeBOER: So are there differences for cities of a primary class that are different from metropolitan and other classes of cities?

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

WAYNE: Yes, and that's, again, primarily because of the Dillon rule, but yes.

DeBOER: So then what other types of cities and villages exist in the state?

WAYNE: We have--

DeBOER: First, second--

WAYNE: First, second, villages and unincorporated.

DeBOER: OK. So the rules that apply to cities of the first class, do they apply regardless of where they are in the state?

WAYNE: Regardless of where they are in the state, yes.

DeBOER: And cities of the second class, do they apply regardless of where they are in the state?

WAYNE: Yes.

DeBOER: So what I understand is that there are legal differences between the city of Omaha and other cities in the state. There are legal differences between Lincoln and other cities in the state, and that there are legal similarities between a variety of villages, first-class and second-class cities. Is that correct?

WAYNE: Correct.

DeBOER: Thank--

WAYNE: Everything from lending and-- as far as lending and how they even can acquire debt, all of that is different.

HUGHES: One minute.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Wayne. So one of the points that I would like to make is we're talking about how we're dividing these districts and we're saying, oh, the people on the north side of Dodge Street have the same things as common, the south side of Dodge Street, the same as in Bellevue or something like that. Bellevue is a city of the first class. People who live in the north side of Dodge Street and people who live on the south side of Dodge Street are all citizens of metropolitan class cities. So there are legal similarities between people in the north side of Omaha, on the south side of Omaha that are not similar to the cities-- the people who live in Sarpy. So the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

point, I think, is to say that there-- it is a little disingenuous to say that there are not-- that the differences between the people in Sarpy County are--

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

DeBOER: --the same as the differences between north and south of Dodge. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senators DeBoer and Wayne. Senator Hunt, you're recognized and this is your third opportunity.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. The problem that I have with LB1 is related to the same problem that I typically have when I oppose something in this Legislature. Where this body always falls short is when we don't listen to the people who are affected by our decisions. You know, I think that I believe in Midwestern values of working hard and earning what you have and leaving people alone and helping your neighbor. And that's ostensibly the values that many of us have here in this Legislature, but when it comes to the way we actually vote in terms of policy, it's a lot of paternalism, it's a lot of control over people's decisions and their lives, and it's a lot of ignoring the voices of the people who are expressing to us directly how this affects them and why they like it or they don't like it. The people of Congressional District 2 overwhelmingly dislike LB1. They overwhelmingly in the hearings expressed their dissatisfaction with the way the lines are drawn and none of that should be a surprise to this body or to the people on the Redistricting Committee. And that's what's led us to this conversation today, which is going exactly the way everybody knew it was going to go. When I speak to my constituents about it, on Wednesday night, I was at Pageturners Lounge in Dundee in District 8 and Pageturners Lounge is this really, really cute bar. It's at like 50th and Dodge and it used to be this old bookstore, like this old used bookstore called Pageturners and it's really famous and everybody in the area knows it and has shopped there and stuff. And then the bookstore closed down like maybe 10 or 12 years ago, but this guy in the neighborhood, he bought the bookstore and he turned it into a bar called Pageturners and he retained like a lot of the character and charm of it. Anyway, I was there on Wednesday with a friend of mine and this guy came up to me sitting on the patio outside and his name was Will and I don't know him, but he was really nice. And he said to me something that a lot of people in Nebraska when they reach out to me in my capacity as a senator, whether it's emailing my staff or talking to me on the patio at a bar at midnight or whatever it is, he said, I'm not a political person. I don't usually get involved in these things. I've never written a letter to my senator. I don't know

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

who my city council member is. I didn't vote last-- you know, whatever the case may be, they don't see themselves as a very politically engaged person. But this guy saw the maps in LB1 and he got so mad and he said, how can the Legislature do this? This makes no sense based on our-- on our community. This doesn't really reflect the ident-- the character, I guess, is the right word, the character of the people in CD 2. And I said, man, there's a hearing on Friday morning. If you want to come down to Scott Conference Center, you can tell the committee that. And he asked me, is that even going to matter? Does that really matter? And I said, I think people have their minds made up, but the more the public can reach out to senators and build a public record of support or opposition, that really helps us create a sense of how people actually feel about the legislation. And folks have stated many, many times today during this debate, the ratio of people who supported LB1 versus the people who didn't. And there is overwhelming opposition to LB1 in Congressional District 2, including from this guy I met at the bar on Wednesday who did show up on Friday to testify. And I wish I knew who he was or how to contact him because I thought he did a really great job. And that is what this work really has to be about, right? It's listening to the people who are directly affected by the decisions that we make in here--

HUGHES: One minute.

HUNT: --for them, when we're telling them that we know better than them. Senator Moser said the ratio of testifiers shouldn't tell us how we're going to vote and how we're going to move forward. OK, there's something to that because we have to hear people's feedback and then we have to use our own brains and our own judgment and make the best decision we can, but at the same time, then why have a hearing at all? Why have a hearing at all if we're not going to listen to the people who reach out to us and are affected, the people who have to take time off work, the people who have to find childcare? It's not easy for people to come and engage with us. I'm grateful to the people who did. I'm listening to you. That's why I'm opposing LB1 because you all don't like it and I heard you say that and I pledge to continue to work with members of the committee to find something that does work for everybody and does-- does honor the nonpartisan tradition we have in this state. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Friesen, you're recognized.

FRIESEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I've been listening to the debate this morning and it's-- it's actually been pretty civil and everybody is trying to throw out their good points and I'm just going to, you know, first of all, say I'm really glad I'm not on the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

Redistricting Committee. I think it's been a lot of hard work and I appreciate everything they've done. And I think in the end, I think this body will come up with a solution. It's just maybe how we get there. I just want a little perspective from where I sit and recently when I was listening to testimony in Grand Island, I know there was an individual there talked about District 34, in a way, and they said what Grand Island really liked is to be represented by three senators. They had Senator Halloran, they had me, and they had Senator Aguilar and so when they call a meeting, there's three senators jump and we come running and we're all on different committees and they ask us for legislation and things like that. So they're pretty proud of the fact that they have three senators representing them in the State Legislature. And I look at this from Douglas County view, and I don't live there. I don't-- I mean, I just look at it as if they had two congressmen representing them. When they call a meeting, they're going to be there. They're going to be interested in it. But then I look at it as the state of Nebraska and the way I have to view it from where I'm at, I mean, what is best for the state in how we choose our representatives and how we're represented as a state when we get to Washington, D.C.? Because we are a very minority state in the scheme of things, we don't have many votes there. And so it's important to me, I guess, in trying to figure out how we're going to elect those representatives and the broader picture of are they representing the whole state? They're not just representing Douglas County or Omaha or Lancaster County. So it's, in a way, where I live, I look at the map and it should be no difference to me that they can draw the lines all the way they want and-- and it won't affect me or my district. But I go back to the fact of we've got to look at this and as we get into some of these other maps, how does it affect the state? What is best for the state and the big picture in how we're represented, whether it's here in Lincoln or whether it's in Washington, D.C.? So I hope everybody keeps an open mind and I don't know how the committee is going to go about coming up with something. We'll see here at the end of the day where we're at in votes, but I'm going to continue to look at how this impacts my representation in Washington. And it doesn't matter what district, whether it's the first, second or third, they're all supposed to be representing the state of Nebraska. And if we keep that in mind, I do think there's, you know, we look at in the past, I-- I-- in one of the districts and I'll-- the name of the community is Shelby. They split a community of 800 right down the middle. So as far as splitting communities and picking a path, I think they used the railroad tracks, which, you know, everybody could identify them, but split a community of 800. So the precedent of splitting communities is, it's out there. Every community or every district has had some counties taken away, some put back and so in rural Nebraska at least,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

we're used to having boundaries change. And that's one thing I think that the future Legislatures here should be focused on is, how do we fix our population shift from the east to west?

HUGHES: One minute.

FRIESEN: We have to start getting rural Nebraska growing or we're going to just keep losing representatives out there and there, pretty soon is going to be two-thirds of the state who's going to be represented by three or four people. And I know population matters. I'm not complaining that we're losing a representative or a state senator. We've lost population. We are going to lose a state senator. And so I'm going to be looking at it is, what is the least damage that can be done to rural Nebraska when that happens? Is it my district, is it some other district? But if we don't look at the long-range problem that we have and if-- I don't know if it's our tax policy that we've enacted in the past or what's driving this, but we've got to start looking at regional areas and making sure that they start to grow, or the number one industry in this state is going to suffer and we're going to continue to talk about--

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

FRIESEN: --property taxes and school funding. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Friesen. Senator Wayne, you're recognized.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I just talking to people off the floor and just off the mike and just talking to them. I just want to try to remind people again, I am-- I'm not opposed to keeping Sarpy County whole. What I'm trying to figure out is how do you do it and how you do it with Lancaster County being so close? You have Sarpy County that has 190,000 and you have Lancaster that has 322,000. You add those two together, you're looking at a little over 500,000. You can only find another 100,000 somewhere. So you can go south and southeast, which doesn't quite get you there, or you can kind of go up through Saunders, Dodge, over to Platte, Madison, somewhere over there. I think people don't understand that when we do that, the maps will not look clean at all. There's no way to really make it look clean. It's going to be-- look-- it'll look gerrymandering no more than what maps probably kind of already do. Here's the problem with Douglas County and I want to put this in perspective for-- I'm asking colleagues who are outside of Douglas County to think about this. All we need is roughly 60,000 people to make it an entire district. And if you look at all the maps that's been handed out, you'll see population

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

numbers and we can go north all the way to Cedar to get to 60,000. We can do Washington, Dodge, Colfax, Saunders, around there, and get to 60,000, or we can take literally a little four square mile area out of Bellevue, which is almost identical as far as people. They're one of the oldest cities in-- they are the oldest city in Nebraska. You drive across it, there's no real difference. They most of the time shop, like we do, in Omaha. They-- they are a part of the Omaha community. In fact, Omaha Public Schools goes into Sarpy County and Bellevue and that area, on like 38th Street to Cornhusker, then to 45th is Bryan Middle School, Bryan High School-- High School in Bellevue. They are part of the same communities of interest. So rather than disrupt and I'm just saying, rather than just disrupt the entire rest of the state by literally taking more counties, it just seems simple, logical. And what we've always done for the last 130 years is leave Douglas County whole and take a little bit of that Bellevue. I wish I could take all of Bellevue, but I'm over. And so we've looked at La Vista. La Vista is only 12,000 people and Ralston-- and 6-- maybe I have 6,000 and 12,000 flipped, but that's only 18,000. So I can't just find a small city and just say we're going to take the whole city because I still have to go into Papillion and split Papillion. There's just no way not to split something because even if you take the four that I mentioned, that Senator McCollister mentioned, they're short 650 people. That means I have to go into Saunders County, where Cedar Creek is-- or Cedar Bluffs and in that area and pull at least 650 people from there. So I'm still going to split a community of interest and I'm still going to split a county. It's mathematically impossible to get to the deviation without splitting something. So for this body's sake, would we rather split four to five square miles and yes, it is in Bellevue, or do we want to go through counties and still have to split more rural areas and split those communities?

HUGHES: One minute.

WAYNE: We can have that conversation, but if you want your rural community split, that's what's going to happen if we have to leave Sarpy County whole. And it's going to happen more than once. It'll happen three or four times just by the nature of where we have to go to make it work. That's how I drew the map on-- on-- on LB2 or how we drew the map on LB2. That's why I think it's better, not just about splitting Douglas County, I don't need to get into that debate. I'm saying do you want the rest of your community split in order for me to meet 60,000 people? It's just math. Washington County, Dodge, Colfax, fine, we can go that way, but understand Platte, Madison, Butler are no longer in the 1st Congressional District. They're in the third. To my rural colleagues, what does that do to the caucus?

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator Blood, you're recognized to close on AM15.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow Senators, friends all, as part of my closing, I would ask that Senator Matt Hansen answer a quick question for me if he would yield.

HUGHES: Senator Matt Hansen, will you yield?

M. HANSEN: Yes.

BLOOD: We are all so tired, Senator Hansen. The mapping is exhausting.

M. HANSEN: Yes.

BLOOD: Can you explain very briefly, you being the Bob Ross of the Nebraska Legislature and your Bob Ross voice, what a shell bill is?

M. HANSEN: A shell bill is a bill that is introduced to preserve a topic, but you kind of recognize the material inside is not going to be the final bill.

BLOOD: So if indeed we have amendments or ideas, things that we would like to change by LB1, one of the many shell bills that came out of the Redistricting Committee could potentially be used to do that. Is that correct?

M. HANSEN: Yes.

BLOOD: Thank you very much. So again, I go back to my opening. AM15 was meant to create dialogue, not to cause chaos, not to-- to-- to pit people against each other, but to start a dialogue because LB1 does not address the needs of most Nebraskans. And I agree, we cannot make everybody happy. We sure would like to try, but that's not going to happen. AM15 shows that I have understanding that Sarpy County would very much like to stay whole. How we're going to do that differs based on whose maps you look at. Everybody is working hard on their maps. There are things that are useful in all the maps that I've seen, but not a single map is one that we can all agree on at this time. Knowing that we have shell bills that have come out of our committee, knowing that many of us have participated in healthy dialogue today and expressed some of the things that we need, what we're looking for, what's important to us, gives us the ability to present a better map

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

to Nebraskans. Within the guidelines we've been given, within the window of time we've been given, we're still going to be really tired, but it's for the greater good of all Nebraskans and we only do this every ten years. And so with that, because I have consistently said the same from the very beginning, this was to start a dialogue and I ask to please withdraw my motion, AM15.

HUGHES: Without objection. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Morfeld, I understand, Senator, you had-- you're next in line, AM17, but I understand you want to withdraw and refile.

MORFELD: Correct.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Matt Hansen would move to amend with AM12.

HUGHES: Senator Matt Hansen, you're recognized to open on AM12.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, and good afternoon, colleagues. The content of AM12 is the content of LB2, which is also been referenced as Senator Wayne's maps through the redistricting process. And it is the other set of congressional maps that was heard at the Congressional District hearings these past three days. This has been one of the maps the public has looked at. This has been one of the maps the public has given their feedback to and this is an opportunity for us to debate this amendment on the floor. I filed the AM introducing this, in part because I knew Redistricting Committee members, as Senator Wayne has just indicated, have been in the map room and talking amongst each other working on issues today. This is, of the two kind of finalized, formalized maps, obviously the one I prefer and the one that I think continues the tradition and provides the less-- the least amount of changes and probably the least amount of shock to the average voter. For the last ten years, we've had three congressional districts that I've always kind of thought of as kind of like a fish eating a Pac-Man eating a dot, but-- or kind of, you know, 3rd Congressional District surrounds the 1st Congressional District, which is based in Lincoln, Lancaster County, Saunders County, Dodge County, which then kind of in turn surrounds the 2nd Congressional District, which is based in Dodge County and parts of Sarpy County. This is a map the public has seen, this is a map the public has provided us with a lot of context on, and I think it's a map that's been proven popular among the general public or at least among the general public who has come to the public hearings. I think it's our obligation and our duty as the Legislature to discuss and debate this

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

map and talk about the things we like about it. I personally like it because it is a minimal change from where we have been. We have split Sarpy County in the past and we are still doing that. And we are keeping kind of the core districts of CD 1, such as Saunders County, basically kind of the Highway 77 corridor between Lancaster, between Lincoln and Fremont and surrounding counties intact. As Senator Wayne has said, there's probably no way, or I believe him, there isn't a way to draw three congressional districts without splitting some county somewhere. And so I do concede that this map splits two counties. That seems to be the duty and the place that we're going to end up to-- in order to-- excuse me, it seems to be the place we're going to end up in order to do our duty and pass congressionally sound-- constitutionally sound congressional maps. Apologize, got a little tongue tied there. And that is the fundamental issue. And Senator Wayne, in his last time on the mike, and I'll yield him time here in a moment if he's interested, kind of explained the difficulties of splitting counties as few as possible. There are just certain numbers we have to hit and there are certain things we have to do such that splitting Sarpy in some manner, but keeping some of the urban areas of Sarpy County, including keeping portions of Omaha Public Schools, for example, that roll into Sarpy County. This map is going to be somewhat similar in the 2nd Congressional District area to the map that existed prior to 2011. The previous version of CD 2 that was Douglas and Sarpy County based with Bellevue being kind of the anchor of the Sarpy County section. I think this map has some support within the body. I think this map has some support within the general public. I think we have a prime opportunity to discuss and debate whether or not this is the map we want to move forward or whether or not this is the map we want to use as the baseline for future negotiations as I think we should. With that, Mr. President, since Senator Wayne was the lead architect of this map, I yield the balance of my time to him if he'd like it.

HUGHES: Senator Wayne, 6:08. I don't see Senator Wayne. Senator Pansing Brooks you're recognized.

PANSING BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, to follow up on the previous discussion on nonpartisanship, I think that I'm, I'm so grateful that Senator Hansen has put in AM12. I'm wholly supportive of it because I had just gone up to, to Senator Wayne and said, where the heck is your bill? That's the one that so many people agree with. That is a bipartisan bill. That's one that, that there are Republicans that support it. There are Democrats that support it. If we have to look at party, there are conservatives that support it and liberals. So I'm thrilled it's up. I hope Senator Wayne comes back and will speak to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

his bill. It's an excellent, it's an excellent vision for our state and doesn't harm any individual too significantly. I wanted to talk about something he had talked about just, just when he was up last, too, something that really matters, which is communities of interest. I, I think that there's some confusion about what a community of interest even is. Generally speaking, a community of interest is a neighborhood, a community, a group of people that have common policy concerns and that would benefit from being in a single district. So another way of understanding a community of interest is simply that it's a community that gets together and is able to tell their own story about neighbors who share stories in common and what makes them unique when compared to other surrounding communities. They are defined by the local community members within that, within that community of interest. They aren't defined by R or D, by Republican or Democrat. They're defined by their interests and their interests are far, far greater and spread much farther than their political party. So then why is a community of interest important? I think that-- my opinion is keeping communities of interest together is important in redistricting because community members can then define their communities by telling their stories and describing their concerns and their policy issues and ideas to policy makers to the rest of us. Without this, those who may not have their best interest in mind will define their communities for them. So I think it's really important that the consideration of communities of interest be-- that, that have been traditionally left out-- when those, when those communities that have been traditionally left out of the political process are not considered, then we've, we've done significant damage to our state. The-- LB1 standing alone, in my opinion, divides the black population in Nebraska. The population of African-Americans is certainly a distinct community of interest. And to split it, as LB1 does, in my opinion, makes it arguably constitutionally suspect. Dividing Douglas County impacts way more than the current division of Sarpy County. Dividing Douglas County will affect-- impact over 100,000 people. The current division of Sarpy County affects about 59,000 people. So it's unfortunate that Sarpy was divided and that it is divided, but to then divide Douglas County, in my opinion, will not undo that harm. Two wrongs do not make a right, especially when the harm is caused to even more people than is currently existing. Every community matters. In my opinion, LB1 is not protecting the communities of interest in the Omaha metro area. Is Senator Wayne back? Nope, he's not back, so I'll, I'll keep at it a little bit if I have some time. You know when I think about community interests and about Lincoln, it'd be very difficult to have Lincoln split apart and splitting, splitting Lincoln in the middle, we're not the most--

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: That's time, Senator.

PANSING BROOKS: Oh, OK, I didn't get a minute. OK, thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Pansing Brooks. Senator Hunt, you're recognized.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. My last time on the mike, I was talking about a constituent, not my constit-- one of John Cavanaugh's constituents, actually, my, my neighbor as a state senator to the south. We connected when we were both out for drinks with our different friend groups and, and met each other at a bar. And he was so frustrated with me about LB1 and I encouraged him to come testify on Friday thinking like, yeah, he's probably not going to do that. And he did. And he did a great job. And then I said, I wish I could thank him and we just connected on Instagram. So there you have it, Nebraska. You know, that's the power of when people are civically engaged and people's elected officials are civically engaged as well, and the power of being accessible in the real gift of this job. And that's really what we do it all for at the end of the day. People's opinions here really matter, especially when we're making choices that affect areas that we don't really know that well ourselves. All of us walked, knocked, rode a mule across, in the case of Senator Brewer, we went across our whole districts and we know our districts really well. We know the cute little bars and lounges. We know the bookstores. We know the, you know, little mom-and-pop shops that we're so proud of that build the character of the communities that we live in. But we don't know that about each other's communities. You know, there were Lancaster County senators working on the Douglas County map and throughout the mapmaking process as we're trying different things and moving different census tracts into different areas, seeing what works, playing around in the map room, we had to communicate with each other to make sure that all of these communities of interest were included. The same thing goes when you're talking about communities in CD 3 out in western Nebraska or any part of the state. And that is why I support AM12, which is LB2, which is a bipartisan map that more people can live with, that more people testified in support of in the many public hearings that we've had. And that anecdotally, not part of the public record, but this is the map, AM12, that I've gotten the most support for, whether that's in my email or in Twitter or in Instagram comments or, you know, on a patio at a bar somewhere. So this is the, the map that people are really comfortable with that people really want. The public has been-- has seen it. The public has seen the map. They've been able to make comments on it. We have on the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

record how many people like it. And I like it because I think it reduces the most amount of change, which is more comfortable to voters. Civic engagement is something that's really important to me, whether that's stopping voter suppression or using technology to make our hearings accessible to more people, what have you. And another thing that we honestly need to do to keep our civic system easy to engage with is we can't every ten years be putting people in a completely different district. I obviously understand that sometimes that has to happen. You know, I mentioned my colleague, Senator John Cavanaugh. District 9 and District 8 every ten years are always switching the line a little bit. And when I knock doors, I always meet people who go, oh, I thought I was in District 9, and I'm sure that he hears the same kinds of things. And Senator DeBoer, who's on my, on my northwestern edge, and Senator Wayne, who's on my northern edge. And that's really common in a densely populated area where sometimes those lines have to change.

HUGHES: One minute.

HUNT: And I get that we have to draw a line somewhere, but it isn't reasonable to draw a brand new line across an extremely concentrated population. And the more we do that, for example, with LB1, when we're cutting Douglas County in half, a community that, you know, is not used to that kind of, of boundary in terms of voting. What we're doing is confusing voters, frankly. And I know voters are smart. I trust Nebraskans to make decisions and be civically engaged. But it's a lot to ask people honestly to, like, stay engaged, to know who their representatives are to, to get past all of the different voter restrictions laws that we pass here and show up and, and vote for the people they want to represent them when we're always changing the boundaries on them. And this is the amendment that I would support because this is the map that got the most positive feedback. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Wishart, you're recognized.

WISHART: Thank you, Mr. President. I do have a few questions about this map, was hoping that either Senator Hansen or Wayne would be able to yield to a question. Senator Hansen, will you yield to a question?

HUGHES: Senator Hansen, will you yield?

M. HANSEN: Yes.

WISHART: So I don't have this map in front of me, and I know it was distributed earlier, but I'm working off of memory right now. The

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

question I have is with this map and-- with this map, does it include the entire city of Bellevue?

M. HANSEN: I believe not the entire city, but I-- it's, it's centered on the core of Bellevue.

WISHART: OK. One of the concerns I have with the previous map, LB1, is that it not only splits a county, but it splits a city as well. And I recognize through the discussion today from those who have been much more on the ground in terms of developing maps and looking at what works and what doesn't is that it's virtually impossible not to split some county in the state to get to the population numbers that we need to get to, which is, frankly, pretty much all we're supposed to do in terms of redistricting is population. So I recognize that we have to meet that threshold. That's our obligation. That would be a concern I have with this map. I prefer it to LB1, but I do think that we may need to have further discussions about how we can try and keep communities whole. With that, I would be happy to yield the rest of my time to Senator Wayne so he can talk a little bit more about the map he drew.

HUGHES: Senator Wayne, 3:00.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Wishart. No, it does-- just to clarify, it does not include the entire city of Bellevue. We initially tried to do that, but it was-- city of Bellevue is a little too large. And one of the principles that the committee laid out was to not remove incumbents when at all possible. So we included part of Pappio to make sure Senator [SIC] Bacon's house was in the district. Well, we later found out, it was two days ago, I found out when the World-Herald called me that he bought a land somewhere farther south. And so there's no way we can make that work if he moves to his new house. There's just-- it's physically or mathematically impossible. So just a little bit about my map, I want to take everybody back to the LR134 and some of the guiding principles that this body adopted, which was to follow county lines whenever practicable, to make sure districts are compact and contiguous, easy identifiable for voters, but also to have preserve the core and the community of interest. And so when I look at preserving the core, I want people to realize I look historically and I'm talking about all the way back to before we were a state. And even before we were a state when we were admitted in 1867 and-- or from 1867 to 1882, there was only one congressional district, so obviously throughout the whole state. So Douglas County was obviously whole because there was only one congressional district. But since that time, after 1882 when we were redistricting, we actually had four redistricts, Douglas County

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

was placed in the 1st Congressional District, but it was whole, its entirety, whole. And actually, since we've been a part of the Union, we've always maintained Douglas County as a whole. So that tells me that generation, generation, 130 years,--

HUGHES: One minute.

WAYNE: --the core of Douglas County has always been the entire county. And we've always moved around to add the number of people we needed to make sure Douglas County remained whole. At one point we went up to Washington County, but since then, because the growth was to the south and those communities are very much alike, meaning school districts, actually Ralston, Omaha Public Schools, even Millard all crossed into Sarpy County. So all those schools districts actually go into Bellevue and Sarpy County. So that's where we started, was what's, what's a similar as far as community interest? And Bellevue was the ideal location because we not only have schools that are there, but we, we share a lot of the same communities around there as far as demographics. So it just made sense to start there. And we literally just started there and started moving west until we hit our number. That's how it works when you do districts, you click block by block until you get to the number achieved. Then you look and say, well, are the lines straight? Are you breaking up neighborhoods? Are you doing those things? And then you kind of back around to make sure you have the right communities at the micro level as far as the community--

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Senator Lathrop, you're recognized.

LATHROP: Thank you, Mr. President and colleagues. And thank you, Senator Wayne, for that explanation. I don't know if you guys have listened or, or watched or attended any of the three hearings that we had, but Senator Wayne did a really good job of providing an historical perspective for what is generally been referred to as the Wayne map that is the subject of AM12. I appreciate that because, of course, Douglas County has always been whole. And as it has grown, it has essentially taken parts of Sarpy County to round out a legislative district. And historically, that's always been the Bellevue area. The reason for that, of course, is there's much about the Bellevue having been long ago established and having Offutt Air Force Base in that area. It had much in common with Omaha. Colleagues, we knew or understood at the beginning of the day that this LB1 was not going to pass. It was never going to have the votes to pass. This amendment is

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

a serious amendment. I'm going to say that again, this amendment is a serious amendment. You may look at these maps. I hope you do, pull them up. If you need to see one, I have it on my desk. You can come back and look at it. It is a serious amendment because it represents a thoughtful place to start. If you need, for example, you think some county should be in the first that's now in the third in this map, that's something that can be, like every other bill that we take up, worked through before Select File. But what this does is it leaves Douglas County whole. Why is that important? When we had hearings and went into the districts and yesterday we were in Omaha, in Douglas County, overwhelmingly, overwhelmingly, my friends, people want Douglas County to remain whole. I'll say that again, people overwhelmingly expressed their desire to have Douglas County remain whole. That being true, the historical perspective leads us to what is the AM12 and the map that has generally been referred to as the Wayne congressional map. Again, I have a copy of it. If you look, and we have the detail, you will see how much of Bellevue or Sarpy County is taken up. And as Senator Wayne said, when you draw these maps, you start out with Douglas County, you go into what is historically been part of CD 2, Bellevue, and you add blocks, you add population. And we made a point to ensure in the preparation of this map that Congressman Bacon was included. Our committee, the people that have prepared maps, have been careful not to take an incumbent and put them outside of their district or require one incumbent to run against another. That explains the little piece of the map in Congressional District 2 that goes south from the biggest portion of Sarpy County that's included in the LD 2 map. I'm happy to answer questions. I'm happy to work with people. I think we all are. But I think this should be our starting point because splitting Douglas County is a nonstarter. I would ask my colleagues to adopt AM12. If you want to make changes to that, which counties come in, which counties go out, what part of Bellevue is in, what part of Bellevue or Sarpy County is out, we can talk about that. This is not a take it or leave it,--

HUGHES: One minute.

LATHROP: --but this is a starting point in the process. It's a realistic starting point. We do not have to have this go down and then say nothing happens today. We have an opportunity to pass with this amendment a map that represents a good starting point that will not require an overhaul and will not require us to go back into the map room and start all over. And with that, I would encourage your support of AM12. Thank you.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Lathrop. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I rise in support of AM12 and I'm pleasantly surprised to see it offered here today. I, as Senator Lathrop said, I was one of those people who watched the hearings. I watched the Grand Island hearing and I actually missed the Lincoln hearing because I was in hearings myself. And then I, I was present for the entirety of the Omaha hearing, which was set in District 9 in Omaha. And, you know, we've had some discussions about what is the point of hearings, public hearings. And of course, the ideal is we present an idea, we go out, we talk to the public, we have hearings here or wherever. We make available to the public to comment and come in and maybe point out things that we didn't think of or express their concerns about issues and to identify things, sort of crowdsourcing, if you will, about spotting issues, problems, concerns. And then the ideal is that you would take that information, synthesize it, implement it into the plan to fix those identified mistakes, errors, problems. And from the hearings that I observed, there were a lot of concerns about LB1 and a lot of support for what is now AM12, the-- what is being referred to as the Wayne map. It is by no means perfect. And it did have some concerns that were addressed about it as well, but far fewer and more technical concerns. And so if we're going to be talking about a map going forward, if we're going to try and get to something that works for most Nebraskans, there is, though not dispositive, there is some evidence that a larger majority of Nebraskans agree with the Wayne map and that they would like to see a version of the Wayne map adopted, AM12, that would serve the best interests of the most communities in Nebraska. Obviously, there are some-- there's room for improvement. There's some lines that maybe could be changed. And with the new information about where the incumbent congressman in second district is planning to live, I do think it is important to revisit some of those boundaries and make them make more practical sense in light of the fact that we can't adhere to that one requirement of drawing in the incumbents in the district. When it comes to LR134, which I've talked about a bunch of times today and others have mentioned, the, the charge of that document is to lay out criteria that we can objectively employ to draw fair maps, but they are not ironclad, required to follow all of them. There is the caveat of where practicable, meaning that when a necessary deviation arises, that we will have to engage in that. And so I was talking about as it pertained to western Omaha and the city council district there and the large portion of northwest Omaha. And it is clear just by the fact that the Wayne map exists that there is a more practicable way to draw a map that does not violate the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

territorial boundaries of the city of Omaha, the Omaha Public School District, the police department jurisdiction of the city of Omaha, and all of the other levels of government and services that are provided at that city level. So I, I think that the Wayne map is the better place to start. I hope people, as Senator Lathrop asked, pay attention to it, take a look at it, see how it works for you, legitimately consider voting for this map so that we can--

HUGHES: One minute.

J. CAVANAUGH: --make some progress here today, so we can get to a point we're having a sincere conversation about which maps matter and not stuck in this place where the introducer admittedly says there are not the votes for LB1. There are more community support and interest in AM12 than there are in LB1. And that is the place we should be operating going forward and deciding which-- how the districts will look for the, for the next ten years in the state of Nebraska and what we should be doing. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator John Cavanaugh. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of LB-- or AM12. I'm going to echo some of the comments that Senator Cavanaugh already made. But I-- this is a much better starting point. It doesn't-- I don't view this as the ending point. I view this as the starting point. But this map makes at least logical sense and it's a better place to work from than somebody's backyard being sliced in half. It, it takes into consideration the tenets of good redistricting and map drawing, which I know is something that we seem to be struggling with as a body today, but it is still what we should be doing. This map is also LB2, which the Redistricting Committee could vote out of committee. And we could just work on that as it is, or we can adopt this today and work on it over the weekend and make additional changes to AM12 moving forward. But this is a much better starting point. This is a starting point where it's genuine. This is a genuine map. This didn't have dozens upon dozens of people coming in opposition to it. It's not perfect, but it sure is something that we can start the conversation on. And to the point of our current Congressman Bacon and his housing choices, I, I know that Senator Wayne and his office worked really hard in drawing all of the maps to include the incumbents. And so that is why this map does zigzag a little bit down south. But that was to accommodate the incumbent. And if the incumbent is moving in the middle of redistricting, it will make it very challenging to accommodate the incumbent. And therefore, I think we all would be open to other suggestions on how CD 2 should

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

look. But starting with Douglas County and the city of Omaha as a whole makes a lot of sense. It makes the most sense. We can move it north, we can move it south, we can move it west, we can't move it east, but keep it whole. And that's what AM12 does. This is already, and we still have several hours to go, been a tiring day for, I think most, if not all of us, because we spent the first several hours of today talking about a map that nobody cared about, that nobody thought was real. The people who testified in support of it, I don't even think they knew what it was. This is a better starting point. This would show the people of Nebraska that we are taking our job seriously and that we are willing to work with one another to ensure fair maps are drawn for the citizens of this state. I've been following the news reports. I've heard what colleagues have said in this body in hearings and in meetings. There's a lot of talk about partisanship and party and I am very disappointed in that. As Senator Groene pointed out--

HUGHES: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --thank you-- I am the daughter of a former congressman from CD 2 and a Democrat and my father is a Democrat. And I'm proud of that fact. But I would never put that above drawing a real map to reflect the people of Nebraska ever, never, ever, ever would I put that above it. And I'm disappointed that people talk so openly in this body about doing just that for political gain. I find that to be abhorrent. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Matt Hansen, you're recognized.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, and good afternoon, colleagues. Again, thank you for the senators who have spoken after my introduction. I do agree this is my attempt to move the debate forward with, of the two maps that have been presented and publicly available, the one that I genuinely think is more popular and more likely to be adopted or more likely to be an actual starting point. Senator Wayne's map, LB2, has been out in the public for quite a while now. We've had time to scrutinize and look at it and the public has had time to weigh in. And if there's, you know, a minor tweak or two in terms of some of the exact boundaries, obviously, when we're getting down to the nitty-gritty, as Senator Wayne talked about, of trying to find, you know, exactly 600 people, you have an opportunity to go different places to find maybe groups that don't mind or would be happy to serve as the sway to make things work out and make things numerically correct. What I do want to talk about is my AM-- LB2, when we talk about the map, a lot of times in gerrymander-- excuse me, a lot of times of redistricting, the issue comes down to when you're looking at

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

your map and there's a line or somebody has a question, can you explain it and can you talk about it? And as we started about LB2 talking about the continuation of school districts like Omaha Public Schools into Bellevue, talked about how the kind of downtown Bellevue kind of seamlessly goes into south Omaha and feels like one community. Indeed, if you're from outside the city, you know, visiting Nebraska and you were in "south O" and drove down to Bellevue, you might not even realize that you've crossed counties or crossed city lines. Similarly, there's a little panhandle, admittedly, in, in Congressional District 2 in this map, and that is to accommodate the incumbent officeholder who happens to live pretty close to the current boundary of his district. Again, if we as a body decide we don't care about an incumbent congressman, it's probably easier to draw a even cleaner and nicer line when we split a county. And that's a decision we can make and discuss. But I do think we owe it to the public to talk about maps that we kind of know have some traction and know have some support, which is what I think LB2 is. Senator Wayne and others have laid out the difficulties in getting this to balance and recognizing some counties have to be split in all likelihood, and that Sarpy County has been the one traditionally split. And traditionally, up until the last redistricting, Bellevue had been included in part because, again, of the continuation of, you know, Bellevue really feels-- the border at Harrison Street really does feel kind of minimal at that point. It does feel like one community, certainly, certainly feels and, and acts that way. And I bring all this up to say is as we move forward, you know, this is an obligation. This is something we owe it to the state of Nebraska to get done this month, to get done this fall, is to give them maps that they can know and they could plan accordingly and they can know how elections are going. I know other-- it's been referenced already, other states are doing it in January. Keep in mind in Nebraska, we have some of the earliest primaries anywhere in the country. Most other states, congressional primaries are in the summer going up into September. We have ours in the second week of May. We are appropriately getting this done in September, hopefully the very first week of October at the latest. We're getting this done in the fall so we can know when the filing deadline comes up, when people are deciding what to do or what they want to do, what the maps are both for Congress and for everyone else.

HUGHES: One minute.

M. HANSEN: Because we're going to be one of the first states to hold a congressional primary next year and pushing it off and trying to get this done in January or February is not even a route that I think we should, we should consider because you're going to risk having-- any

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

chance of having, you know, a free and fair election. Really appreciative of Speaker Hilgers' leadership and the Governor calling us to here to get this done here in September. I think with the delay of the Census Bureau, this is our best opportunity to do our duty to the public, to our constituents, to give them maps for Congress, Legislature, and all the other state-elected offices that make sense. And I'm glad that we're going to plow through over the next couple of weeks and get this done. And hopefully by getting this done, we base it off of LB2 and my amendment, AM12. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Blood, you're recognized.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators, friends all, I stand in support of AM12, at the very least as a starting point to craft a better map for all. And at this time, opposed to LB1, as I did not vote it out of committee, not because I didn't respect Senator Linehan and the vote and the others who voted it out of committee, but because I didn't feel that we were where we needed to be yet to even kick it out. So with that, I would ask Senator Wayne if he would yield to a question?

HUGHES: Senator Wayne, will you yield?

WAYNE: Yes.

BLOOD: Senator Wayne, if you were to have the best-case scenario when it comes to this debate today in reference to AM12, what would that be?

WAYNE: Best-case scenario, that we pass it and we move on to the PSC.

BLOOD: All right. With that, I would yield any time that I have left to Senator Wayne.

WAYNE: Oh.

HUGHES: Senator Wayne, 3:45.

WAYNE: Thank you. So just to continue with a little history lesson, in 1932, 1942, and 1962, we actually lost congressional seats and that's how we, we ended up with three. We had five and then we went up and down and now we're stuck at three. So what happened over the last ten years, just to put things in perspective, is CD 1 grew about 6,000 over the ideal district. CD 2 grew significantly, about 47,000 over the ideal district. CD 3 lost over 53,000 people under the ideal district. So I think this map shows and goes with-- so basically we

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

have to move everybody over to the east as far as how it goes because CD 1 and CD 2 grew, but particularly a lot of CD 2 grew. And it used to be CD 2 always had part of Sarpy County that was actually the eastern part of Sarpy County for the last 20 years. But last-- 2011, this Legislature adopted to alter CD 2 by taking Bellevue out and moving south-- what is essentially southwest Sarpy into Congressional District 2. Under this amendment, we would put the city of Bellevue back into its original place where it was over-- for at least over 30 years and we would retain much of the city of La Vista in the 2nd Congressional District. And that was done to really to keep Congressman Bacon in his, in his boundary. But I do want to talk a little bit about Congressional District 1 and 3. So my plan actually splits two counties-- or LB2 underneath AM12, which is Otoe and Sarpy County, and that is to achieve the zero deviation that we are trying to achieve. The reason the zero deviation is important in congressional maps is because there are federal and U.S. Supreme Court cases that say zero deviation for congressional maps are necessary to a-- and can be achieved and are necessary to ensure one person, one vote. So obviously we want to follow the law. The simple fact is that I don't agree a whole lot with Governor Heineman, but even Governor Heineman came out against the underlying bill, LB1. And again, it's-- it just-- it divides Douglas County in ways that we don't have to. So going back to the conversation about the underlying bill, colleagues, I just want to remind people that if we don't do this to Bellevue, we have to do it through counties.

HUGHES: One minute.

WAYNE: And when we do it through counties, we're going to start disrupting not just what happens in here as far as how we do caucus, but we actually disrupt counties. Does Saunders County want to be represented by-- or does Dodge County want to be represented by Douglas County or with Douglas County for one congressional district? That is a very urban area in Douglas County. And while Dodge and Fremont area is growing, the rest of Dodge County is just not urban. They're not really communities of interest. And that's what we're trying to preserve here, the core and communities of interest. I don't think we're asking for too much to find 60,000 people in Bellevue. And let me be clear, if we do not have to keep the incumbent Congressman Bacon in his district, then almost the entire city of Bellevue, which is about 70,000, can be brought into District 2. So we wouldn't have to divide the city. We just did that to make sure we were following the principles we adopted to not draw out an incumbent. Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: Time, Senator. Thank you, Senator Wayne. Senator Kolterman, you're recognized.

KOLTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues. I appreciate the opportunity to visit a little bit with you today. I think this is the first time I've talked since we've been back, other than to pray for you and with you. I'm not sure where I'm at on all of this. I, I, I am on record as indicating that I liked LB2 better than I liked LB1, as these maps were all presented simply because it did keep my counties of Seward and York together. But now we're talking about congressional maps. One thing I like about the idea of LB2 is, it puts Saunders County back in the first district. And what would be even better yet is if we put Polk or some of Polk County, but also Platte County back in. To the people that are watching on Unicameral for shut-ins on Channel 12 or whatever it is, I think that you need to understand that behind the scenes, a lot of negotiations are going on with both sides of the aisle. And it's very positive to see us working this way. We have had very good dialog all day long. While we can agree to disagree, that's what this body is all about, bringing people of like minds together. And so as we move forward with this, we might take some votes today. We will probably take some votes today. But whatever comes of that doesn't necessarily mean that that's the final outcome. As I started out by saying I like LB2 better than I do LB1, and I've got my reasoning behind that, but at the end of the day, we're making progress. I think it's important to recognize the hard work that's going into this by both our Chairperson, our Assistant Chair, and the committee. To think that we are moving legislation that affects our state for the next ten years in a two-week period is unfathomable. It's just hard to believe that we've been put in this position. But we are resilient Nebraskans and we'll get the job done. So bear with us as you watch us and just watch for page two. So thank you, Mr. President. And I'd again like to thank my colleagues for their open-mindedness on all of this. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Kolterman. Senator Pansing Brooks, you're recognized.

PANSING BROOKS: Amen, Senator Kolterman. So anyway, I am standing again to talk about the fact that, you know, for those at home, the redistricting process never starts from scratch. And so if you consider LR34 [SIC] and the law and the standards applicable to the redistricting process, redistricting begins on the existing districts themselves that are already formatted and already used in, in electing legislative senators. And so that's what honoring the core districts means and why we have that in consideration today. So-- and, and

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

again, the redistricting process is done by our current-- by updating the current districts and by updating the boundaries of the districts in light of the census. So for continuation-- and that's, that's all for continuation of representation, for fairness to the public and to the people. This is all about making sure that we are supporting the people. We must keep the population as equal as possible for the-- in order to satisfy the principle of one person, one vote. Also, our charge is to keep the counties intact as much as possible. That's what I really like about AM12, which is really Senator Wayne's map. So applying this general rule leads to the necessary conclusion that we shouldn't be dividing in district-- dividing Douglas County. So I'm, I'm really standing in support of AM12 from Senator Hansen, which encompasses LB2, which is, is Senator Wayne's map. And I have a couple of questions for Senator Wayne, if, if you please?

HUGHES: Senator Wayne, will you yield?

WAYNE: Yes, yes.

PANSING BROOKS: OK, thank you, Senator Wayne. So I have, I have talked to both conservatives and to progressives. And Senator Wayne, your map is the one that I get by far the most agreement on and the one that I understand that the most people really support. So can you tell me why, why the, the conservatives support your plan? What-- in a nonpartisan manner, what is good for conservatives on your map, which is LB2 and encompassed in AM12? Thank you.

WAYNE: Thank you for the question. And so whether you're conservative or liberal or, or Democrat or Republican, we, we tend to in Nebraska to like our communities. We tend to make sure that our-- we like our neighbors and get to know our neighbors and talk to our neighbors. And so the overall feedback that I, I continue to get from both conservatives and liberals or progressives, whatever you want to them, is the community aspect of making sure that Dodge-- western Dodge, when I say western part of Dodge, which is Senator Linehan's district isn't, isn't split, that Elkhorn and Millard and those who are similarly situated, they're still held together whole. From conservatives from Saunders that I keep hearing feedback from is they keep saying while many people may live in Wahoo and drive and work in Omaha, it's a different community. And so they like the community aspects of that. They can sit there and talk politics and talk things and know their neighbor and be able to be represented by the same person who kind of represents the area of community of interests. And so Douglas County and Sarpy County are growing urban population. I mean, a little secret is Millard--

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: One minute.

WAYNE: --Millard, Millard Public Schools considers themselves a urban school. And so that's the kind of urban versus nonurban, people feel like naturally that's their community of interest. And so by adding-- well, when cutting them in half and then adding really a real rural area just doesn't mesh well from the feedback that I keep getting. It isn't so much about numbers and politics. I've heard a little bit about "germaning" and there is this misconception that under Senator Linehan's plan that somehow it dilutes the minority vote. As a black man, it does not dilute the minority vote. Let's be clear about that, because 80 percent of black and brown people live east of the interstate and that is all moving underneath her map to the south. That's the last I'm going to talk about Senator Linehan's map. I just wanted to clear that up to people who keep maybe thinking that. The second thing-- the last thing I'll say is that it's just about communities.

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

WAYNE: And so people just-- thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Senator McCollister, you're recognized.

McCOLLISTER: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon again, colleagues. You may know that I have an amendment in place that includes in Douglas County, a projected Douglas County map, Washington, Dodge, and Colfax Counties. Well, since that time, I'm starting to understand the complexities of map drawing. And I can see that, you know, my maps that I, I drew for the 2nd Congressional District may be somewhere between, oh, 5,000 and 10,000 short. So where do you find those folks? And I think I've been convinced that we've got to include parts of Bellevue to make that happen. So my map, just like Back to the Future, that photograph, when circumstances started to change, my map is starting to erase. It's unfortunate, but I can, as I mentioned, see the complexities of map drawing. You know, my dad was in Congress from '71 to '77, three terms. His district included Washington, Burt, Cass, and, and-- Washington, Douglas, Burt, Cuming, and parts of Cass County, a big area. You can see it's a much larger area than what we're looking at now for a 2nd Congressional District. But that's because the eastern Nebraska has grown and western Nebraska, the rural areas, have lost population and that will continue. Perhaps in the next census, Douglas County will be a congressional district all by itself. I don't know. Would Senator Wayne yield to a question?

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: Senator Wayne, will you yield?

WAYNE: Yes, yes.

McCOLLISTER: The residence of Senator-- of Congressman Bacon has been at issue. Can you tell me and the body why that really isn't much of an issue? Isn't a federal law he can live any-- anywhere in Nebraska?

WAYNE: Yeah, so it's, it's a-- yes. The short answer is yes. Because most people end up living in D.C. the entire time, they no longer require Congress to actually live in their district. It becomes a political issue, not an actual law issue.

McCOLLISTER: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senators McCollister and Wayne. Senator Wishart, you're recognized.

WISHART: Thank you, Mr. President. I yield my time to Senator Hansen.

HUGHES: Senator Matt Hansen, 4:54.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you, Senator Wishart. I do want to agree and highlight something Senator Kolterman said earlier is that part of the reason we've been talking today and part of the reason some of us have been talking today is to give other members the opportunity to meet and discuss and plan. I'll acknowledge I have not personally been in the map room, I've not necessarily moving the lines around, but have heard the difficulty from a number of members of that. And so in fairness to members of the Redistricting Committee and others who are interested in discussing, that's why I filed the amendment. It's part of the reason I'm talking. With that, I do continue to support a base concept of LB2 as incorporated in my AM12. And fundamentally, I think one of the issues is, is there are different thoughts and schools of redistricting. You know, do you want to start from a blank slate, kind of with the veil of ignorance and just figure out how a state should look? Or do you want to start with the old maps and make as minimum changes as you need? I know different states and different independent commissions have employed different ones over different times. Here in Nebraska, and frankly, both of the maps focused on today, both LB1 and LB2, start with the latter, start with, OK, we currently have the 2nd Congressional District based in Douglas and Sarpy County. Lincoln is the population center of Congressional District 1, which kind of hugs it in a-- Omaha and suburban areas in kind of like a semicircle going to the Iowa border. And then everything else falls into Congressional District 3. Both of

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

these maps that we've seen today rely upon that principle and that concept of that's where we're starting from. I think LB2 started off to be more faithful and kind of a lesser of a shock to voters than LB1 because of some of the, the changes and because of, frankly, the lack of some of the changes. So when you look at our current maps and you compare them to my AM12, Senator Wayne's bill or Senator Wayne's maps as in the Redistricting Committee's LB2, fundamentally, we are used to-- as elected officials, we are used to as just people of Nebraska, Douglas County and specifically Omaha as a whole is the population center of the 2nd Congressional District. LB1 did not maintain that. LB1 cut out much of an entire city council district of Omaha, as well as a lot of suburban and rural Douglas County, including the cities of Bennington and, I think, Valley. LB2, AM12 doesn't do that and instead it tries to find kind of some of the clearest and most contiguous areas of Sarpy County. Again, probably the most, the most-- the, the less-straightforward area of AM12 is the little peninsula, the little kind of panhandle that juts straight down. And that is again to accommodate the incumbent Congressman Bacon and not redistrict his current house out of his district and has to deal with just kind of where he lives in relation to many of his voters and kind of the population center of his district. And this kind of relies on a lot of good practices in redistricting, a lot of what the Supreme Court has told states they need to do in redistricting, a lot of what our Nebraska Constitution, our Nebraska Supreme Court has told the state we need to do in redistricting, which is to respect political boundaries, primarily counties, but cities as well--

HUGHES: One minute.

M. HANSEN: --thank you, Mr. President, to the best extent possible. And by showing that there's a map to keep Douglas County whole and the incumbent in and have kind of minimal impact or minimal change from prior maps in Sarpy County, it shows that there is-- maybe this isn't the exact final version. We didn't get street by street how we're going to finish, but it shows that this concept is possible. It is possible to have, you know, a contiguous, compact map that respects the established political communities, established political boundaries, reflects past congressional district maps that have had the 2nd Congressional District and the 1st Congressional District much like this. So if we can move forward with this concept, we can kind of debate and tweak the edges and get the right few hundred people on some of the borders in the right spot. But I think this is a very good-faith attempt to get this done the way that people want. With that, thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I rise again in support of AM12. And, well, I would support LB1 as amended by AM12, but barring that, I wouldn't support it. So there's been a lot of good conversation. Senator Wayne keeps getting called up here. Senator Wayne, I promise in my five minutes I'm not going to call on you or yield to you so you can do whatever work you're doing right now. But so I wanted to go back to earlier in the day, we were-- some talk about the word gerrymandering. And there was actually a lot of folks at the hearing yesterday who would bring up the word gerrymandering. Some of them, I think, were probably accurate and others were misusing the word. So I, you know, thought it would be valuable to discuss what it means. So in the-- I think it was 1800s, there was a governor of Massachusetts named Elbridge Gerry, who signed off on a redistricting plan that created a district that looked like a salamander. And so the Boston Newspaper, or whatever it was called at the time, made up the word gerrymander or gerrymander to describe what had happened there, creating this district that was so grotesque in appearance and jagged lines all over the place that it looked like an animal, was clearly a abuse of the power of the party in power. And so that is the creation of the word. And so a lot of people have adopted other sort of uses of it and misuses of it and appropriations of it. Though there have been some, I don't think statutory definitions of gerrymandering, but there have been court interpretations of what gerrymandering is. But the bottom line is gerrymandering is drawing a map, the party in power, party being group in power, not political party, but the party in power, using that position to draw maps that disproportionately favor their interest or their side. And so there's been a lot of conversation about what the political makeup of this CD 2 under LB1 would be and that is one kind of criteria we can talk about. But I thought it's pretty telling when Senator Wayne draws a map that goes out of his way to include the incumbent, which he is under, not an obligation, but I guess just a, a good comedy, you know, a good fellow feeling to do. But he goes out of his way and then his map is subject to criticism by members of the other party because he went out of his way to draw a map that included the incumbent that we now know has so little respect for the people of the district that he's willing to move almost out of it in the middle of redrawing a map that he knew was going to have to get smaller. So but that's a whole other issue, not really the reason I rose to speak, but that is just something that someone should say. So when you're drawing maps that disproportionately affect one side or the other, I think it is pretty telling that the fairness of the map that Senator Wayne drew, that he

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

went out of his way to preserve the residency of the incumbent of the opposite party. And so I think that is a good demonstration of him not using his position to disfavor the opposite party. There's further evidence, if you were to look, I guess, objectively at which one is more or less gerrymandered, if we're talking relatively, and Senator Wayne's map is much more compact, captures only the amount of territory necessary. And as many people have mentioned, it continues with representation of many of the people that are in the district. It doesn't add whole new counties and whole new swaths and doesn't cut out whole parts of counties that have been in the district forever. It doesn't radically depart from the historical nature of the district. Douglas County has been in CD 2 probably since the word gerrymandering was invented, as Senator Wayne has discussed--

HILGERS: One minute.

J. CAVANAUGH: --in his history lesson about where Douglas County has been centered. And so I think it's important to think about as we all stand here, regardless of your feelings about a lot of other-- a lot of things, if we're just to look objectively at which map has-- is drawn in a fair way, this AM12 meets objective standards of fairness and is one of the reasons I'm supporting AM12 instead of LB1. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Arch, you're recognized.

ARCH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am going to speak against AM12. I am in opposition to AM12 and I want to tell you why. And it has very much to do with my community. We've spent a lot of time talking about community. I think Senator Wayne was talking about sitting around a coffee shop and having discussions of politics and that's very, very important in a democracy. But today, what, what I'm looking at on the map here that is proposed in, in AM12 is, is dividing Papillion straight down the middle of main street. 84th Street is the main street of Papillion. That is the downtown street of Papillion. Now let me describe to you Papillion Days. So Papillion Days is held on the Saturday of Father's Day weekend every June. And it's a big parade and all the community comes out. And by the way, if you've never come, it's, it's a wonderful community event. Lots of families and people on the street and people set their chairs out the night before. And I mean, it's a, it's a big event. But I'm going to, I'm going to paint the picture of what this next parade is going to look like if we pass this, because on the west side of the street we'll have one congressional representative, on, on the east side of the street we'll have a second congressional representative, and they can walk parallel

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

down the street because we've just divided Papillion into two congressional districts. Not only that, when we go to La Vista, we've also lopped off the west side. So we lopped off the west side of La Vista, the west side of Papillion, we've divided that and we talk about communities. And so what we're talking about today is we're talking about which community of interest will be respected. And right now, there seems to be a, a message being sent that Douglas County is inviolable, that you don't touch Douglas County, but you can carve up Sarpy County like a turkey. And that's how I'm feeling today. It's like, well, oh, no, historically, Douglas County can't be touched. There is history there. You're right. But things are different today. Sarpy County is the fastest-growing county and I don't think it's being considered. It is the fastest-growing county in the state and, and we are laying roads out in the western part of Sarpy County and we are building infrastructure. We're continuing to grow. And I think that this community of interest in Sarpy County is, quite frankly, more defensible than saying that Douglas County is, is an entire community of interest. I think you can paint the picture that, that Douglas County has multiple communities of interest and Sarpy is much more as a single community of interest. So here's my question to those on the, on the Redistricting Committee. Is there something else that can be considered? Right now what we have before us, if we-- we have all Douglas County and you carve up Sarpy or you have all Sarpy County and you carve up Douglas. Can we consider that we're going to give on both sides here, that we're going to, that we're going to consider that times have changed? It's not just history, but times have changed. And we're going to take some Sarpy and we're going to take some Douglas and we're going to find a compromise in something like that. I understand it's very complicated and, and I haven't gotten into the software myself to draw maps and I haven't drawn maps of any, of any kind in this, in this process. But I would challenge people to say just, just stop for a second and say, is there something here that we can say we're going to give? We're going to recognize that Sarpy County is coming up, is growing. It's, it's not what it used to be. It is not Douglas and then those other people. And now we have an opportunity to recognize that, we have an opportunity to set something going forward. We actually have an opportunity to set history for the future if we would consider that. So as it stands right now,--

HILGERS: One minute.

ARCH: --I am going to vote against AM12, but I am hopeful that perhaps we can find a different path where maybe these communities that we're talking about here would consider that it's not one or all the other, but maybe we can find something in the middle. Thank you.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Arch. Senator Lathrop, you're recognized.

LATHROP: Thank you, Mr. President. I'm glad I'm following Senator Arch. You know, that line down 84th Street was to make sure you're-- you're probably friends with Don Bacon, that Don Bacon's house was included in his own district. We're going to-- something's going to get-- something's going to happen. There's going to be a community that makes the same argument you have. The idea that we would carve up some of Douglas and some of Sarpy and then feel better about it, I don't, I don't really think that's the solution, but I appreciate your concern. I appreciate that if we're going down 84th Street-- by the way, my daughter lives in La Vista. The parade goes by her house. I've been to these, I've been to these events in Sarpy County. I appreciate what you're saying. It sounds very much like Ralston. We do those things in Ralston on Independence Day. In fact, we have the best Independence Day in the state. That said, that said, I understand, I understand the concern. Just understand that no one without regard to or carelessly went down 84th Street for no purpose other than to carve up Sarpy County. That was intended to put Congressman Bacon in his own district. If he doesn't care where he lives or if he wants to buy a lot somewhere else, which apparently he's demonstrated a willingness to move, we can get him a realtor and solve the problem. I'm trying to be a little funny, but at the same time, I think we can find a way to take care of this without going down 84th Street. It just depends on whether Congressman Bacon wants to be included in his own district or not. But, but going into Douglas County and chipping away at Douglas County to make people in Sarpy County feel better about being chipped away at or being included in the 2nd Congressional District, which, by the way, they have been for a long time, a long, a long time. I, I would ask Senator McCollister to yield. I think the answer is Sarpy County used to be entirely in the 2nd CD with Douglas County. He's shaking his head yes. And so what we've done is whittled away how much of Sarpy County was actually in the 2nd. We're not just randomly grabbing Sarpy County with no historical perspective. So I appreciate Senator Arch's concern. I very much understand that that's the middle of their community. There may be a different way to find a line in Sarpy County that is less offensive or more keeping the community together. But the point-- here's the point I wanted to make and why I'm supporting AM12, and I'd like you to really give this some thought. So when we were going around the state and doing our three hearings, a lot of people complained about the process. We had many testifiers come in and say this process is happening too fast. It's not transparent enough. And I don't mean to suggest that, that that is the fault of our Chairperson, OK? I'm not. I wouldn't and I'm not. It is compressed by virtue of the fact that we're trying to do this in a

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

special session. So does it not make sense if this is the direction we're going in, and we're not going in the direction of the original LB1, to amend LB1 with AM12 so that people can see the direction we're going in? They can see where this process is at and say, you know, I'm in Platte County and I'd rather be represented by or in the 1st instead of the 3rd, or I'm in Otoe County and I'd rather be in the 3rd and not the 1st. I think it is an opportunity to have people weigh in on--

HILGERS: One minute.

LATHROP: --the finer points of the ultimate work product and our ultimate decision. But we all know, and I--with all due respect to my Chairman, we all know that LB1 is not the final product and it's not going to look like that. We're not going to carve up Douglas County. That's not happening. And, and AM12 is the direction we're going in. And it is not the last or the finished product, but at least the public would be able to see what we've adopted as an amendment, see the direction we're going in, and then you can get input in the form of emails, phone calls, however they communicate, stop you in the back at church on Sunday and, and fine tune those boundaries between which part of Sarpy County is in Douglas County, what those boundaries look like, and what the boundary line looks like between the 1st and the 3rd Congressional District. So I think it makes a great deal of sense procedurally.

HILGERS: It's time, Senator.

LATHROP: Thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Lathrop. Senator Matt Hansen, you're recognized.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Yeah, let me chime in and continue the line of thought here from Senator Lathrop and Senator Arch. I agree with Senator Arch. I don't necessarily expect him to like or enjoy or think that it's good to split Papillion down 84th Street. If 84th Street is the main street thoroughfare, heart of his community, I get that. The main street I think of in Omaha is Dodge Street and LB1 cuts Omaha in half along Dodge Street for most of Omaha. We have the same fundamental issue and fundamental problem. Are we holding up Omaha more than other cities? Possibly. That's fair to argue. But if we are picking winners and losers, are we picking the largest city in our state that has-- or are we picking a town of-- smaller than my legislative district? There's considerations on the amount of people you are impacting when you have to pick a winner or a

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

loser. Much as it would make no sense or be difficult, makes sense because this is for good reason, to accommodate Congressman Bacon's current residence and the difficulties we have with a congressman who kind of already lives near the edge of his current district. You know, while it be frustrating and unusual to have multiple candidates walking in your parade and having multiple-- the parade route go across different political boundaries, we're going to have, you know, Omaha Public Schools in different congressional districts under LB1. There are kids who are going to go to Burke High School who are going to wake up in CD 1, go six blocks south, go to high school in CD 2, and go back and have dinner in CD 1. That makes-- that's up there with the parade crossing in two congressional districts. And to the point, and to the challenge of is there a way to keep Douglas whole and is there a way to keep Sarpy whole, yes, probably is. I think Senator Wayne has explained the challenges with that and the priorities of that. The single first challenge of that is as long as Congressman Bacon lives in Sarpy County, we're presumably going to put him and Congressman Fortenberry in the same congressional district. That is something we have the power to do. It would violate the spirit of the LR that we did earlier this year. But if keeping Sarpy County intact is more important than protecting incumbent congressmen, you start getting pretty far along a map and then it's which counties and kind of which direction do you want to roll? And then occasionally you're going to admittedly probably have to take a township or two. And there's probably a place where there's a township near a county border that ultimately won't mind or, you know, feels allegiance or connection. You know, maybe it's a school district that, you know, is cross county lines. But there's-- we're getting to the point where this body seems to want to do several things: keep Douglas County whole, keep Sarpy County whole, and then the-- OK. The next step is do we want to keep all three of our incumbent congressmen in their own districts? And if the answer to that's no, these maps become so much simpler to draw. But I presume the answer isn't going to be no unless, as Senator Lathrop points out, unless Congressman Bacon starts looking at houses in Douglas County pretty soon. I don't like cutting Papillion, but the reason we cut Papillion is an accommodation and an understanding to the incumbent congressperson. I cannot understand why you would cut basically city council District 7 out of-- in Omaha, Councilwoman Melton's district out of the city of Omaha and just put it in with Lincoln, put it in with a number of other counties. That's the one that I don't think makes sense.

HILGERS: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

M. HANSEN: As frustrating as it would be to split up Papillion-- again, we can not split up Papillion, but we would have to decide where we then split up La Vista or where we split up Bellevue or where we split up Gretna or where we put Congressman Bacon and Congressman Fortenberry in the same district, or whether or not we have a completely squiggly, scrambling, you know, worst-of-the-worst gerrymandered maps and make some of those national lists. I don't think anybody wants to go that direction at all. I'm glad we're all fighting for contiguous cities and contiguous counties, even if we disagree on which cities and counties are more important. But that's kind of like the fundamental issue is, it's what we're boiling down to is, currently Congressman Fortenberry lives in an awkward-- sorry, Congressman Bacon lives in an awkward spot in CD 2 to have a good otherwise constitutional map that keeps communities relatively intact. It gets hard to do. That's something we're probably going to have to figure out over the weekend.

HILGERS: It's time, Senator.

M. HANSEN: And with that, thank you, Mr. President.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So to sort of continue what Senator Hansen was just saying, and to speak to some of the concerns that Senator Arch mentioned, I, I don't, I don't think, or at least I'm not going to speak for all Douglas County senators, but as far as for myself, I don't think that Sarpy County should be divided either. And I think that there's definitely a path forward for that not to happen. But as has been stated numerous times, we're trying to honor our current representative's home. If, if Congressman Bacon were willing to move into Douglas County or into another county that is small enough that wouldn't need to be split, then we wouldn't have to do that. But-- and he clearly is willing to move in the middle of redistricting. So, you know, I think if we were to not take into consideration Congressman Bacon's home, we could be talking about Saunders County in completion or Washington County in completion. We would have more options. But we're trying to keep Sarpy County, the part of it that we have, that houses Congressman Bacon. I feel like that's the right thing to do and I am sorry that that breaks Sarpy in, in half because I think that that is not the right thing to do at the same time. So we're kind of with a conundrum here as to what to do when it comes to Sarpy County. But I think that Sarpy County needs to decide that for themselves. Do you want us to keep your-- the congressman in his district or do you want to be whole? It has to be

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

one or the other. Those are the options before us. I'm not here to argue either point, but I do believe that the Sarpy County representatives need to, need to voice what it is they think Sarpy County wants. Do you want to be whole or do you want Congressman Bacon to be in CD 2? Because we cannot do both. If we could, we would. This map that Senator Hansen has introduced is the best effort possible to keep counties in this state whole. And there's room for adjustment, but that's going to take senators that live in, in some more east-central counties to decide where you want your counties. That's not, that's not for me to decide for sure. I don't know if Platte County would be better represented in CD 1 or CD 3. That's the conversation we should be having, but I think we all know, whether you're willing to admit it or not, that Douglas County, our largest population center and also our largest city, that is a compact, continuous community of interest. That doesn't mean that Sarpy County isn't those things as well, but Douglas County is big. It's really big. So we need to keep that together. We need to keep as many counties continuous as possible. So I'd put it to the members of Sarpy County, do we split it or do we keep Congressman Bacon?

HILGERS: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: I'd vote for whichever one you think is better for your constituents. Thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Linehan, you're recognized.

LINEHAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues. The kind of the joke today, and I understand it about Don Bacon, whether he's willing to move or not, if I recall correctly, he has already moved 16 times. He's moved his wife 16 times because he served his country. Like many people who live in Sarpy County, they have moved multiple times because that's what their country asked them to do. So though I understand the humor in it, I think we need a little reflection on exactly, besides serving us in Congress, what Don Bacon has done for our country. I think I just heard Senator Cavanaugh say there's no map you can draw that keeps Sarpy County whole and keeps Congressman Bacon in his district and there is, it's LB1. And as far as communities of interest, I know there's those in Sarpy County and those that are in Douglas County, but-- Senator Wayne, would you yield for a question?

HILGERS: Senator Wayne, would you yield?

WAYNE: Yes.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

LINEHAN: See if you can reach way down there for some humor that we're about out of, OK? Senator Wayne, can you tell me what Waterloo in my district has in common with Dundee, which I think is Senator Hunt's district?

WAYNE: Their-- probably income is very similar. I think they have probably the same amount that your district would have with the city of Bellevue underneath your proposal.

LINEHAN: Do you think people in Dundee come out to Waterloo to Boyd and Charlie's very often for barbecue?

WAYNE: That is a good barbecue spot. I drive out there and I'm in District 13. But I, I understand.

LINEHAN: You know what-- can you explain to me what Valley in my district has to do with most of-- I mean, not has to, has in common with Senator Vargas' district in south Omaha?

WAYNE: Both working class people, but not-- I mean, not a whole lot. I mean, that's true, Senator Linehan, I will, I will give you those points. But that's the same argument for Saunders County with Senator Vargas' district underneath your map.

LINEHAN: Well, thank you for bringing up Saunders County because you've been in western Douglas County. I know you have. And I know you've traveled all over the state with Senator Brewer. So are-- do you find when you're driving through Valley and Waterloo, that it's that much different than Saunders County?

WAYNE: When I-- yes, I think once you get past what I would consider West Shores Lake, it does change drastically for me.

LINEHAN: OK, but I, I wasn't talking about West Shores Lake. I was talking-- is there agricultural land in my district?

WAYNE: Yes, there's agricultural land in my district.

LINEHAN: And do we live in Douglas County?

WAYNE: I do live in Douglas County.

LINEHAN: And is most of that agricultural land north of 680?

WAYNE: Yes.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

LINEHAN: Thank you, Senator Wayne. As to, I think it was Senator-- I'm not sure who said it and I think I've heard it more than once this morning so it doesn't matter, about somebody going to school in District 2 and then returning home to District 1, we already have that. I mean, Millard School Board goes across Douglas County, Millard-- Douglas County and Sarpy County line. So we have children who get up in the morning, go into District 2 and come home to District 1. OPS crosses into Sarpy County. So it-- this whole idea, I-- here's what-- and I think, maybe because I didn't grow up in Omaha, the thing all these people have in common is they're Nebraskans. That's where we should start.

HILGERS: One minute.

LINEHAN: They're all Nebraskans. And then whether people-- when people move to the Omaha area, they look for houses in certain parts because they have a home-- or they have a job, supposably, so they look where's a place I can live close? They don't look at legislative districts or, frankly, at congressional districts. This is about being fair to everybody and to stand here and hear how Douglas County cannot be touched, but, oh, my goodness, we can carve up Sarpy County every ten years three different ways, it just doesn't make any sense. And I don't think it makes any sense to anybody in Nebraska who doesn't live in Douglas County. I'm not even sure it makes sense to the people in my district. Most of the people in my district didn't grow up-- I shouldn't say most, a large number of people that live in western Douglas County and western Sarpy County, and I think Senator Day would agree with me on this, did not grow up in Omaha. They moved there.

HILGERS: It's time, Senator.

LINEHAN: Thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Linehan and Senator Wayne. Senator Hunt, you're recognized.

HUNT: Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon, colleagues once again. I understand the important points that have been made about that the line has to be drawn somewhere and also the role that historic precedence takes in deciding where we're going to draw that line with the understanding, however unspoken it may be, that there are political motivations to where that line is going to be drawn as well. It's my view-- I, I want to say this out loud, so somebody said it on the record, it's my view that the redistricting process doesn't have anything to do legally or practically with where the incumbent lives. Redistricting is about drawing fair maps that apportion votes equally among residents as the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

population changes every ten years to make sure that folks are still getting accurate representation from the people they elect. It's not about incumbents. It's not about candidates. It's about voters. And voters are the only people who we need to be centering in this debate. It is unfortunate. It really sucks if somebody gets redistricted out of their district. That's been a conversation that's happened in the body, of course, like there's many maps that have been drawn that did put some of us out of our districts. And we, we fought about that and we talked about that. And, you know, this may happen to Congressman Bacon, apparently. I hope not. I hope it doesn't happen to anybody. But it is wrong to center any candidate, anybody who might run for office or any elected official who currently holds office in this conversation that should always be about placing the voters first. How do we apportion these districts so that everybody gets their fair vote, that they get their fair representation, and that they're represented by people who understand the background, the cultural experience, and the community of interest that they come from? So that's the important thing that we have to keep. And the center of this is the voter, not the candidate, not the elected official, not what's going to happen to us, and not what's going to happen to Don Bacon. I don't really care. What I care is how fair this is for voters. And I would like to acknowledge more concerns from my constituents about the entire process of this redistricting period. It's been obviously a very weird year with a compressed timeline because of COVID, because of, you know, problems at the federal level and, and doing the census, but I would really like to talk about the problems with the public participation. The map we are considering, maps we are considering, I guess, LB1 and LB2, which is AM12. It's the same thing. These are maps that were released online last week, folks began talking about them immediately and AM12 rose to the surface almost as quickly as the preferred map of most Nebraskans. I have heard from many Nebraskans, constituents and otherwise here and there and everywhere about redistricting, and a constant theme is a profound frustration about the lack of access that people have in terms of being able to be heard or being able to share their views about the subject of redistricting, whether that's a lack of technology access, you know, people can't testify via Zoom, people have to come into a packed room during a pandemic with people who, you know, don't believe in vaccines or masking. And we have like a, a very fraught political situation there. And that's the only way for them in a redistricting process to make their voices heard, that this is during the workday in the middle of a day, in the middle of a week during the most--

HILGERS: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUNT: --holy holiday in the Jewish calendar. A lot of Nebraskans told me that they did not find this a very accessible process. And another thing that wasn't accessible is finding things online is really cumbersome for the public. The redistricting website is not easy to find or understand. It's not a separate stand-alone site. There's not a clear or obvious banner or link on the Legislature's website. People have to click through a series of links. So we have to wonder how many people just didn't bother to weigh in. But of the people who did weigh in, the people who took the time, LB2 was the overwhelming preference. And that is what we have the opportunity to vote for in AM12. This has to go through rounds of voting just like everything else. We know that this is a starting point. And I think it's important to signal to Nebraskans that we've heard their concerns, that we're centering them and not candidates or politicians, and that we're going to move--

HILGERS: That's time, Senator.

HUNT: --forward with their consideration in mind. Thank you, Mr.--

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Day, you're recognized.

DAY: Thank you, Mr. President. I yield my time to Senator Matt Hansen.

HILGERS: Who'd you yield to, Senator Day? Senator Matt Hansen, you're recognized. 4:55.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. And good afternoon again, colleagues. I want to continue with this because I think the which communities go together with which communities make some sense. And I'm glad we started down this track. So I'll recognize this, does Valley and does some of very much western Douglas County have much to do with downtown and south Omaha? Probably not, other than being in the county itself. My wife grew up in Fremont, and Fremont-- probably Valley and Fremont, that little stretch probably has more to do with each other than Valley to downtown Omaha. I recognize that. I concede that. LB1 doesn't just carve out Valley and loop it in with nearby Fremont. LB1 cuts a considerable portion of the city of Omaha out. And so, you know, granted, Valley doesn't have a lot to do with south Omaha. What does the north side of Dodge Street at 120th have to do with the south side of Dodge Street at 120th? A ton, like literally everything. It's the same city. It's the same school district. It's the same city council district. I mean, that's, that's how bad some of these cuts are going to be in Omaha under the base 1 plan-- under the LB1 plan. Admittedly, LB2 does that to some of Sarpy County. I recognize that. And that's, again, the thing we're going to have to do. But the-- just like everybody has been saying is like, I don't

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

see, you know, I don't see why we can't cut up Omaha, I don't see why we can't cut up Douglas County. I don't see why we can't cut up Sarpy County or find a way to do it. We're arguing that Spring-- so in the same way that you're arguing that Valley doesn't have anything to do with downtown and south Omaha, Springfield and Gretna probably have very little to do with downtown and historic Bellevue. So that's what we're going to have to get at. But fundamentally, I, I kind of object to any sort of notion that my amendment, Senator Wayne's map, LB2, does more of this than LB1. I think that's a-- just a flat argument. And the public has already weighed in strongly that they won't believe that. LB2 tries to keep Bellevue as whole as possible, Douglas County as whole as possible, and only cuts Papillion for the sake of Congressman Bacon. I don't have his main line, I don't have his personal number, I haven't talked to him. And if that's something that can change or is changing or what have you, we can look at it. But to, but to just talk about LB1 as if it's just taking some small rural kind of agricultural-centered towns and recentering it into a different congressional district dismisses the huge swath of Omaha that it takes. Not only does it take about a third of Douglas County, it takes probably, I don't know, 20 percent, 25 percent, a quarter of the city of Omaha proper, takes an entire city council district, among others, out. And so I get it, I get why the senator from Papillion doesn't want to vote for a, a map that cuts Papillion in half. I hope you'll understand why so many of the senators from Omaha don't want to vote for a map that cuts Omaha in half. I'm a senator from Lincoln that doesn't want to all of a sudden have my congressional district swing around. And, you know, this is kind of some of the things we're getting to that if I wanted to go to other portions of CD 1, let's say I'm on a board or a commission that we do based on congressional district,--

HILGERS: One minute.

M. HANSEN: --you know, you could be considering my application as somebody who lives in northeast Lincoln and somebody who lives at like 120th and Blondo and we're the same congressional district and that just-- does that make sense? That's a shock to pretty much everybody. We've established a tradition, we've established a norm that Lincoln is the population center of CD 1, that Omaha is the population center of CD 2, and we try to disrupt the communities around those as little as possible. Cutting off a huge chunk of northwest Omaha, the city proper, not just Douglas County, kind of is an obvious flaw in LB1 and why, frankly, it got so widely panned by the public of Omaha yesterday. With that, I realize I'm about out of time. So thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Hansen and Senator Day. Senator Wishart, you're recognized. This is your third opportunity.

WISHART: Thank you, Mr. President. I yield my time to Senator Hansen.

HILGERS: Senator Hansen, 4:50.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Senator Wishart. And thank you, Senator Day. I don't think I said that earlier. Again, the goal and one of the principles of redistricting is to basically split up political subdivisions, existing political subdivisions as minimal as possible. And there are some potential maps that split very few municipalities and split very few counties. And of the counties it does split, it's largely, you know, rural, unincorporated areas. And we recognize that this is possible, so when you recognize that this is possible and you see a map that doesn't do that, you know that that map has some other intent or thought. Honestly, if we wanted to have a Sarpy County-centric district, we probably could figure that out. But again, when we weigh the fact that, like, half our state's population lives in three counties and two of those counties are right next to each other and the other one's not far away, there's only so many ways we can draw these lines and end up with equitable districts, equitable districts. And so this kind of gets into, I think, this fundamental crux of one of the issues that I've always struggled with or conceptualize is the interesting concept of Sarpy County. And I mentioned this earlier today, where I have, over the course of my tenure, served all seven years so far on the Urban Affairs Committee and I've served five of my seven on Government. And I bring that up because Urban Affairs oversees cities and Government oversees counties. And so we-- I kind of am on the political subdivision run, I know I don't get natural districts, resource districts or school boards, but get a lot of the other ones, get a lot of the big ones, cities and counties. And the amount of unique things we have to do because Sarpy is a divided county with unique cities that do not want to annex or merge, that have separate independent identities is a lot. There are a number of things we have to do because that county typically operates differently. And one of the reasons they operate differently is because they are already so divided amongst different governments. I know and I appreciate that the United Cities of Sarpy exist. I know and appreciate that the mayors of those communities have tried to be more coordinated, have tried to do more things together, and I know in particular to redistricting that they are speaking in one voice. I get that. But they are still, at the end of the day, rely on separate political boundaries that they have then drawn. They have staked out what is theirs and what is not theirs. And sometimes it

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

seems like get into, you know, annexation fights where we can't concede this ground to another city or what have you. I know this happens elsewhere. But when we talk about Sarpy County, I still haven't gotten over or heard a good reason why Sarpy County needs to be unified other than it's a growing area. Well, if Sarpy County is a growing area, west Omaha in Douglas County is a growing area. I, I-- some of the, some of the thoughts talking earlier and from a number of senators, you know, on west Omaha, Valley, things of that nature, I am surprised at how quickly-- it used to be leaving Fremont, you felt like you're in the countryside forever and then eventually you got to Omaha. Now it's starting to feel like a beltway. It is starting to feel that there are more and more interstate-like overpasses. There are newer road constructions and these areas are booming. I have family that are moving into some of these areas and it is not going to be--

HILGERS: One minute.

M. HANSEN: --because they want to live in a small agriculture town out in the middle of nowhere. It is because they are becoming bedroom communities for Omaha. So, again, they're technically separate, we could draw a line in between them, we could argue they're different, but any time you use that logic, it equally applies to Sarpy County. If Valley doesn't make any sense in Omaha, neither does Springfield. And that's fundamentally the issue we're getting at. And as you've seen, the public has kind of resoundingly gave us their input and their opinion on splitting Omaha and it was not popular. It was not popular. I would argue it's not constitutional and we get into these problems. So just over and over again, if we're going to be splitting up cities to have a good reason, you have to have a good reason, such as the math physically doesn't work, which is what we get to with say, trying to put all of Bellevue with all of Omaha.

HILGERS: That's time, Senator.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Hansen and Senator Wishart. Senator Walz, you're recognized.

WALZ: I'll yield my time to Senator Hansen.

HILGERS: Senator Hansen, 4:55.

M. HANSEN: All right, thank you, Senator Walz. And thank you, Mr. President. As I was saying, these are all things we fundamentally get

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

to do. And this is something we've seen in Nebraska, is that our Supreme Court, among others, has given us some guidance and has been skeptical of political boundaries that cross other preestablished political boundaries. Mathematically, it sounds like we might need to split a couple of counties. And as we've said over and over again, and I really appreciate Senator Wayne saying over and over again, you know, it's too-- no matter how you cut it, there isn't a way. I've seen some maps and some reports that allege that they're able to do it. I haven't necessarily run the numbers myself, but I wonder if it is, in fact, possible. But what I know what is not possible is to do it and keep Douglas and Sarpy or the base population centers of Douglas and Sarpy in the same congressional district. If we're willing to shift where the 2nd Congressional District is, if we're willing to shift some of those things, we can. But there's probably not a scenario in which we are keeping Sarpy County whole and including any of Omaha in it, because for the similar reasons to keep Sarpy County whole, and the reason the map is kind of drawn like this, as I understand, the math doesn't line up, that you can't necessarily take all of Douglas and all of Omaha. And so that's where you're left with this thing of, of what's the split and what's the reason? And again, that's where I think some of the arguments that Sarpy County is united because it's growing falls flat because western Douglas County is united because it's growing. Parts of the Omaha are united because they're literally the same city. They're literally the same school district and they have a united, unified government. So having some of these lines and having some of these lines drawn are kind of a fundamental issue. So in full transparency to the public, I think every senator walked in here today knowing that we were going to spend eight hours talking and that the real negotiations would start tomorrow or start Monday. I'm actually kind of pleased and surprised at how much I've understood has happened today and some of the thoughts and perspectives that we've bantered around and come up with. And I'm really appreciative that we're having some of this debate and discussion on my amendment, AM12, on Senator Wayne's bills, because this was a bill, as we heard across all three congressional district hearings, especially the Omaha one yesterday, is a popular concept. Maybe we didn't get the lines of Papillion accurate. Fair. But we got it close and we got it close to where it exists today and we got to close to where it needs to be. I am in continued support of my AM12 and I would encourage my other colleagues to continue to support this concept. Fundamentally, when we talk about this, as Senator DeBoer kind of walked through earlier, Omaha does get treated specially and I understand why that might be frustrating to other senators or other communities or other political subdivisions. But there's been a, a wide variety of historical reasons of that, including that we have

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

functionally our own set of statutes that only apply to Omaha. We have the category of cities of the metropolitan class, and cities of the metropolitan class is functionally just Omaha. We have a similar thing for Lincoln and cities of the primary class. We as a State Legislature repeatedly have held up Omaha as significant and different as-- significant and different, and significant and different to the point where it needs its own set of statutes. It needs its own chapter of statutes in order to--

HILGERS: One minute.

M. HANSEN: --accommodate all of its unique opportunities and all of its unique challenges. And to just say, Omaha-- or Lincoln, but we're focusing on Omaha today-- to just say Omaha is just like any other city and you could slice and dice it doesn't, I think, pass scrutiny. That's kind of a fundamental issue I have here. And with that, thank you, Mr. President. And thank you-- was it Senator Wishart or Senator Walz? In either case, thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Hansen and Senator Walz. Senator McKinney, you're recognized.

McKINNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to LB1 and in support of AM12, but I'll continue my conversation around the staffing crisis. And this time I'll focus on programming and why we need more access to programming for individuals that are incarcerated. And a program that I'll highlight is the Community Awareness Program. To whom it may concern: In the past year, there's been so much pain and division that has been brought to the forefront of society. In the summer of 2020, during some of the most tumultuous times this country has ever seen, Laron Jones and Avery Tyler were having a discussion about wanting to make a difference in our community. As we sat talking on the prison yard at the Nebraska State Penitentiary, we realized that a lack of accountability, positive leadership, self-awareness, and mutual community respect were the primary culprits behind seeing so many men incarcerated. We realized at that moment that we had to do more than just talk about that change that we wanted to see. Therefore, we embarked on becoming the embodiment of the change we were longing for in our communities. A team of respected, reformed ex-gang members and others, and others convicted of various crimes have, have partnered with the Nebraska Department of Corrections at the Nebraska State Penitentiary to create the program entitled the Community Awareness Program. This partnership has created a pathway for us to create actionable change for those who are incarcerated and seek true change. Our primary focus is to create mutually responsible, mutually responsible relationships by forming and implementing

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

prolific ideas through lived experience. We are all able to accomplish this through multiple curriculum that are designed and taught by inmates. Our curriculum focuses on social and emotional awareness, self-worth, accountability, and community respect. One of the greatest concerns pertains to the concept of men leaving prison without addressing the core issues that lead to their incarceration. In a situation like this, men are often leaving prison in a worse state than they, than they are when they arrive. This is a vicious cycle that has-- that must be eradicated. Science has proven and our lives have borne witness to the fact that most men do not reach maturity until their mid 20s. We have seen an influx in the number of men being incarcerated to lengthy, lengthy prison systems-- sentences before the age of 25. I'm sure we all can agree that we don't want inmates leaving prison with the same mentality that they had coming into the system. This creates a danger to society as a whole and the communities in which our children are raised. Once young men have been incarcerated with the Nebraska Department of Corrections, our hope is to step in before the prison mentality has been adopted and apply a shared vision of common community goals. Within the Nebraska State Penitentiary, our approach is to offer a safe and trustworthy environment in which law enforcement agencies, judges, social workers, and community leaders can engage in productive conversations with the Community Awareness Program board members and other members of our organization. The Community Awareness board membership is comprised of six men who fully understand and relate to the mindset and trauma that is caused by the gang member mindset and mentality. Although not all board members were former gang members, we believe that they have valuable insight to what is plaguing our communities. We fully believe that those who were closer to the problem are also those closer to the solution. With the utmost respect to the victims in the judicial system when there is a young man or woman under the age of 25 who has been found guilty or pled guilty to a serious crime, this letter will be sent out as a formal reminder of the Community Awareness Program and other rehabilitative--

HILGERS: One minute.

McKINNEY: --programs throughout the Nebraska Department of Corrections. We understand lengthy prison sentences are imposed for various reasons related to public safety. However, those sentences become unjust when they are based upon prejudged-- prejudging assumptions of a behavior. I'm highlighting this program because this is what individuals inside are seeking, but because we have a crisis with staffing, the programs like this cannot take place. And that is a problem because a lot of the men that I've met throughout the summer

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

would like to change and want access to programs like the Community Awareness Program. But if we continue to have a staffing crisis, those that are incarcerated, which most will return to our communities, will not get access to this type of programming. So I implore the Governor to do all he can to boost our staffing in our prisons.

HILGERS: It's time, Senator.

McKINNEY: Thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator McKinney. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized. This is your third opportunity.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Senator McKinney, for highlighting the issues. And I join you in your call for the Governor to increase staffing and availability of programming for all of the reasons you stated. So I rose, obviously again, to support AM12 and I support it for reasons I've articulated before, but there's been some ongoing conversation. And again, as Senator Hansen pointed out, it's been-- I think there's been some constructive conversation around what we want these districts to look like, what we think is fair, what we should do, and I think we're getting closer to ideas being discussed that are important to discuss. And, you know, there has been a conversation talking about what-- what's realistic, what can we divide, what can we not divide? Where should we cut the lines? And there's sort of, I guess, sitting here listening and listening to the people speaking yesterday, I've kind of been synthesizing things that people want to see. And we talk about communities of interest and, you know, natural boundaries and identifiable and all these things. And there's been-- Senator Arch has pointed out a lot of concerns about this map in the way that it addresses certain parts of Sarpy County. And I appreciate those comments and I think that they should be-- they would be hopefully integrated into whatever map is ultimately adopted. And when you are deciding how to do this, there is kind of a zero-sum game because it is the moving people from one place to another. And to get to the ideal number, there is going to be some places that are shifted into either a place they want to be or shifted out of the place they want to be. And Senator Wayne, I think, has done a good job of explaining a lot of the domino problems that are caused by these shifts. But I wanted to, well, address two things: One is obviously, I think that the city of Omaha and Douglas County are a community of interest that should-- that belong together, have historically been together. But there is no question that a city-- city of Omaha is a single community and that people who live in west Omaha are part of the same community as people who live in east Omaha and that it's patently ridiculous to claim that someone who lives in west Omaha is

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

different, more dissimilar from somebody in, in the rest of Omaha, in their interests and their experience, than somebody in east Omaha. I would just tell you, anecdotally, I know quite a few people who live in the part of Omaha that is being cut out of the 2nd Congressional District by this map. I know them because I went to grade school with them in central Omaha. I know them because my kids go to school with their kids now or play sports with them. I know them because they go to my church. I know them because I've worked with them in downtown Omaha. I know these people because they grew up in Omaha. They continue to live in Omaha, they moved to west Omaha because it was part of Omaha and not part of another community. So people chose to continue living in the community they grew up in, the community they work in, the community they go to school in, their kids go to school in, where they worship. And we heard people testify to that yesterday as well. We heard one man who lives, I actually believe it's in Senator Hunt's district, but very close to my district, about how he goes to a church that is in that portion of Omaha that is now in the 1st Congressional District in LB1. And that he takes, I believe, it was piano lessons there and that many of the people from his community, his church, live in that area and that he has always viewed that as part of the same community that he is part of in central Omaha. So there is no question that the part of Omaha that's being cut out is part of Omaha. And there is no question that you are dividing a community of interest, a city, a municipal lines, any political entity, any way you want to describe it, you are dividing a group--

HILGERS: One minute.

J. CAVANAUGH: --out of another group that belong together in the interest of making a map that is more reflective of what some objective you're trying to achieve. And that is the wrong way to go about this. AM12 does divide some community to Sarpy County, not purposefully, but, but because of a necessity to draw in the current incumbent. And so it's taking a more measured approach to that. And I think there is room again for improvement to minimize the impact of that. But there is going to ultimately be some communities that are unhappy, but it should not be the largest city in the state. And we should attempt with every effort to get communities wholly together in their congressional district. And it sounds like there is a possibility of that. I don't have the numbers handy, but thank you, Mr. President.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Brandt, you're recognized.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

BRANDT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And first, I'd like to thank the Redistricting Committee for all their hard work. This is the first time we've been on the mike all week and it'll be the last time we're on the mike all week. First, I would like to welcome the 55,000 Nebraskans that will be moving from the 1st to the Big Red 3rd District, whether that's Platte County, Madison County, or whatever County, welcome. We have a lot of room for you. We look forward to having you in the Big Red 3rd. Second, I would like to acknowledge Mr. Steve Reichenbach. He's a retired professor of computer science and engineering. He did a data analysis and a graphic compactness map that is really neat. It's straightforward. It's a straightforward approach to the congressional districts in Nebraska. And it was emailed to all the senators and I would encourage you to look at it. It is in your email. Finally, I believe compromise is in the air. And for that reason, I will be a "P and V" on LB1 until changes are made specifically concerning Saunders County coming out of the 2nd District map. And that is all I have. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Brandt. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized. This is your third opportunity.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't anticipating being up that quickly. So I, I, I just continue to support AM12. I think that, as Senator Brandt just mentioned, there are conversations around a compromise and it seems like this is we're not that far from the finish line. I-- I'm hearing a lot of people are open to these conversations. I know I am certainly open to conversations about how the congressional districts end up looking. And I, I think Sarpy County should be whole. I don't dispute that for a moment. But we still go back to the, the issue of if we're going to make Sarpy County whole and we're going to keep Douglas County whole, then Congressman Bacon will be moved to a different district. So I-- and I really do think that that's a conundrum that the Sarpy County representatives should be discussing and, and sharing with the rest of us, if that's what they want to see us do moving forward as a body. Even though Sarpy County is a neighbor to the south from Douglas County, it is not-- I'm not extraordinarily familiar with Sarpy County. I mean, I have visited Bellevue on-- I've been known on occasion to attend the Bellevue Farmers' Market and, and Offutt Air Force, and all of the other wonderful things that Sarpy County has to offer. But I would never be presumptuous enough to say that I could draw Sarpy County and be true to your communities of interest. And the same, I think, has been said numerous times about Douglas County and Omaha. In this map without this amendment-- oh, I do want to say, if she's still watching, my mom, it is not your house that the yard is split. You're

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

good. She texted me and asked if she was the house divided. I think she was kind of hoping that she and my dad could both vote in different congressional districts, like, depending on which one registered in [RECORDER MALFUNCTION]backyard. But unfortunately for you, Mom, no matter what, that doesn't-- that's not going to happen. Well, I shouldn't speak-- that's not going to happen today. Who knows what the weekend holds. But I just, you know, I appreciate the work that the committee has been putting into this, that they put into both of the bills and all of the hearings and listening to the people. I, I don't think that anyone thinks that LB1 reflects the will of the people as it is drafted right now. It certainly is very zigzaggy in Omaha. And I, I just hope that we can all come together over the weekend, find a solution, move forward on these congressional maps, because we, of course, have so many other maps that we need to get to as well. And I, I, for one, feel that we are moving in a good direction as a body. I'm sure the people at home are wondering, been talking about this bill, the same bill for hours and hours and hours. But what the people at home don't see is that the committee members are, are talking and working on solutions and, and trying to make sure that communities of interest are kept intact and that we are compact and continuous. And so that's sort of the work that's happening behind the scenes. And I would like to, to take a moment to just acknowledge the staff--

HILGERS: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --that has done all of this work from the Research Office and Senator Linehan's office and Senator Wayne's office and everyone else on the committee. I know your staff have all been pitching in and helping. And thank you so much. I am so glad I didn't have to use one of those machines to draw a map because they made it sound like torture. So I just want to end with thank you to the staff. I very much appreciate your work. And you are the ones that keep us all moving in the best direction for Nebraska. Thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Wayne, you're recognized.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. I-- I've intentionally not talked about LB1 because I don't really find it productive to go negative on, on a bill that, quite frankly, is, is bad policy. So we're going to, we're going to have a conversation and I'm going to maybe file some motions and we'll have a little fun because Senator Arch got me going when I was listening to him in my office. Senator Arch, we went down 84th Street just to make sure Don Bacon was in his district. I can easily solve that. And would you be willing, and I'm not going to ask

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

on the mike, but would you be willing to just get rid of Don Bacon and let's just go ahead and incorporate all the city of Bellevue, which is around 70,000, which is the number I need, so there's clearly definable lines that we don't have to worry about that? That'll take care of your Ralston issue. Then how do you put that and compare that to Senator Hansen's district, where we are literally taking a school district, Oakland-Craig, and dividing Oakland and Craig that spent years and years rebuilding trust up there when they had to merge over that fight? And you can talk to Senator Hansen about that history there. But the biggest problem I have with Senator Linehan's map is what it does to my district. It divides my community up into pieces. But you're OK with that, but you're not OK with going down 84th Street, which is a clearly definable major, major thoroughfare in, in Ralston. But if you look on page 2 of her map, it goes down through Fort Cook-- Fort Calhoun Road up to 47th Street, which literally divides Ponca. If you look over by Wenninghoff and by Standing Bear-- Lake Cunningham, it is using back streets to divide the community. You're OK with that. Not just back streets, they are literally dividing neighborhoods, neighborhoods. So if we want to talk about what's important and what's getting sliced and what-- we did our best to keep things whole. But, but for Senator-- or Congressman Bacon, I can literally take the city of Bellevue. So I am going to ask if Senator Arch would yield to a question.

HILGERS: Senator Arch, will you yield?

ARCH: Absolutely.

WAYNE: Would you be OK if we took the entire city of Bellevue?

ARCH: That's a Hobson's choice, Senator.

WAYNE: How is that?

ARCH: So this is the choice in front of us, right? The choice is carve up Sarpy or Congressman Bacon won't be in the district. I've got another-- there's another choice out there.

WAYNE: No, no, I asked you a simple question. Would you be OK with-- well, he's already moving out the district anyway, so that's not even a real question anymore.

ARCH: I understand why you went down 84th Street. I do understand.

WAYNE: My question now is, if we focus on the city of Bellevue and put that into the district, would you be OK with that?

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

ARCH: I, I think there needs to be a compromise here.

WAYNE: So why is it OK to split Oakland-Craig when they're actually a community of interest up in Butler [SIC Burt] County? Why is Butler County OK to split but not Sarpy? What makes Sarpy sacred?

ARCH: Why is it OK to not give anything in Douglas County? Why is it OK to say we can't possibly start with anything talking about Douglas County? Why is that OK?

WAYNE: No, because one of the things that we've adopted that you voted for was to preserve the core and the core of CD 2 has been Douglas County since we were a state.

ARCH: We are not recognizing what the, what the changing facts are and that is that Sarpy County is the fastest-growing county and that needs to be recognized.

WAYNE: We are recognizing and by saying the city of Bellevue, the fastest-growing part of county is not the city of Bellevue, it is Papillion.

ARCH: I am hopeful that after today we can find this compromise.

WAYNE: So are you OK with splitting Butler County?

ARCH: I have no comment on Butler County. I don't even know what you're talking about.

WAYNE: Well, you support the bill. You support the bill, right?

ARCH: Support the bill?

WAYNE: You support LB1?

ARCH: Oh, there's a lot of pieces to LB1, absolutely.

WAYNE: It's a real simple question.

HILGERS: One minute.

WAYNE: Do you support LB1?

ARCH: I think that everything-- I think that everybody here needs to compromise. And I think that, I think that digging in on Douglas County and saying we absolutely can't touch Douglas County is not in the spirit of compromise.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

WAYNE: It's not digging in, sir. It's actually a part of our constitution. We can't divide counties, right? We're supposed to use reasonably practical, right? So why is it OK to divide Butler, but not Sarpy County?

ARCH: Oh, I'm not saying we can't possibly have a compromise with Sarpy County, but what I am saying is that the-- that what is going on right now is you can't possibly touch Douglas County, but we can carve up-- we can carve up Sarpy any way we want to. And I understand what you did with 84th Street and I understand what you're doing with Senator-- with Congressman Bacon's home and all of that. I get it. There's more to discuss here than just the, the, the-- this AM12 that's on the floor right now.

WAYNE: There may be more to discuss, but when you got up, you said you supported LB1.

HILGERS: That's time, Senators. Thank you, Senator Arch and Senator Wayne. Senator Hunt, you're recognized. This is your third opportunity.

HUNT: Now I got to talk? Oh, God. So the facts, the facts about Douglas County haven't changed. It's still the core of CD 2. And when you ask what's so special about Omaha, what's so special about Douglas County? I'll tell you, Douglas County is a really special part of Nebraska because it's one of the only places in Nebraska where the nonpartisan spirit of our political culture in this state that we're all so proud of is actually, you know, visible in our political system. In Douglas County, we have a Republican mayor in Omaha. We have a Democratic majority city council. It's one of the last swing districts in the whole country. And the current district has almost the same number of registered Democrats, which is 157,996; as Republicans, 162,306. It's almost the same amount. And we also have the most registered independents in the state at almost 110,000. Thanks to Nebraska's unique system for dividing electoral votes, nearly every presidential candidate has fought for the 2nd Congressional District's vote since 2008. Likewise, our house seat is a battleground for both parties. The 2nd Congressional District matters and it is the core of Omaha as a district and it's the core of Douglas County as a county. To divide it up as proposed in LB1, it would become just another safe Republican district in a Republican state that is taken for granted. That's reality. People didn't want to say parties and stuff out here, but it is what it is and we shouldn't not say the thing that we all know is going on. I want Nebraska's CD 2 to matter. And that doesn't mean that the presidential electoral vote will always go to a Democrat. It doesn't mean it will always go to a

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

Republican. But we have to earn the votes that we get. If your candidate isn't getting votes from people, maybe put up a better candidate. Don't throw sand in your opponent's face and cheat and draw the district in a way that's unfair, that takes apart the core of the district, that takes part of north Omaha, which is the biggest majority black and brown community in our whole state and puts it in communities like any other part of CD 1 that's majority white. That's disrespectful to the people of north Omaha, especially the people who have fought so hard for the voting rights that this body keeps trying to take away. The nail in the coffin, the hugest insult to these people who are patriots in our state would be to take them out of CD 2 and take away the impact of their vote because we can draw it that way because we have the majority. We heard the people of Nebraska come testify on these maps. We've heard them in the hearings, we've heard them in our email, we've heard them on social media, they've been calling, they've been stopping us on the street. And they don't like LB1. Now do we have to do what the majority of Nebraskans want? No, we really often don't, as seen by the brain drain and the loss of talent that we see in our state year upon year, the net loss of population that Nebraska has, the way that we're not keeping up in the state with growth the way other states in the Midwest are. Do you think that taking away political representation and diluting the thing that makes young people so excited to move to Nebraska is going to help that? Do you think your districts are going to get any smaller when we do that? Not going to be riding 400 miles across the district on a horse. It's not going to get any smaller if we can't get more people to want to live here.

HILGERS: One minute.

HUNT: And some things that we can do about that is pass policies that young people say matters to them. I'm not even saying every policy. I mean, I have brought up policies year upon year, raising the tipped minimum wage, allowing people with drug convictions to receive SNAP and bringing in LGBTQ equality workplace protections, all of which cost zero dollars and zero cents to the state and none of you can throw me a bone on that. None of you can ever say, OK, we hear the people. We know that this is important to them. And so this is a compromise that we're willing to make because we want to grow our state. We want our districts to be, you know, more populated. We want more congressional representation. Colleagues, we can have that. But LB1 is not something that young professionals like. It's not something Omahans like. And I don't want to have all of those people feeling less excited about living in the state,--

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HILGERS: That's time, Senator.

HUNT: --feeling less represented. Thank you, Mr. President.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Morfeld, you're recognized.

MORFELD: Thank you, Mr. President. I yield my time to Senator Wayne.

HILGERS: Senator Wayne, 4:55.

WAYNE: Well, I was going to ask some more questions, but some people left the floor. I guess it's easy to sit up here and just have talking points and that's something I don't ever do. I don't just get up here and say, don't divide Sarpy. I got up here, the first thing I said is fine. And I went downstairs and spent an hour and a half with my staff drawing maps. Nobody has yet to say, if you don't divide Sarpy County, what do you do with the rest of CD 1? It's easy to get up here and talk talking points, but if you have Lancaster County with 300-- I'll give you the exact number, 322,000 people and Sarpy County with 190,000, how do you keep them in the same district? How do you incorporate Platte? How do you incorporate Madison? How do you keep Saunders? We can't make up people in new places. So rather than get up here and start talking talking points, there's four, there's four machines available, three machines available downstairs, show me how to do it, because I spent two weeks doing this. And I took your advice, I went downstairs and I tried to figure out Sarpy County. And every answer I get is, well, we got to, we got to think about it. We got to think about it. Tell me how to do it. Because right now, LB1 divides my community. It divides neighborhoods in my community and I haven't said that for three days because it doesn't do any good to bash the other side right now. I'm trying to come to a solution, but at the end of the day, getting up here and just hitting talking points isn't solving anything. Yes, we got to take time. At least Senator McKinney is talking about an issue that he knows about and is not talking points. But all those who say save Sarpy, tell me how. And how do you do it without moving Saunders? I don't know. You're going to have to keep Saunders in District 1? Well, then have a conversation with your congressman because he doesn't want it out. That's the problem. We're just talking, talking, but come up with a solution. If you don't want 60,000 to 70,000 people from Sarpy County, then how do you find them? There's only two ways: you go all the way up to Cedar Bluffs or you take the four counties around, Washington, Dodge, Colfax, and part of Saunders. Because guess what? Those three alone, you're still short about 1,500 people. So guess what? I have to split Saunders County, but we're splitting a county again. And not only that, I've just made CD 2 over four counties and now we have

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

agricultural land that makes no sense to north Omaha, but that's fine. I can show us a map where everybody has agricultural in their CD district. We can draw that. I can draw any map you want, but it can't just be we can't touch Sarpy. Then who can we touch? You can't stop at one and not finish the whole sentence. Then who? And if you look at the hearings, that's the question I kept asking and even Senator Brewer started asking because if we don't move who-- we don't move one, then who? If we can't move you, then who? If we can't get 60,000 from Sarpy County, then where? I'm all for keeping both of them, but nobody's coming to the table with solutions. We're just talking right now.

HILGERS: One minute.

WAYNE: I'm going to push my button. I might even file some motions because we'll start having a conversation on the mike and we'll start calling out people because Saunders County has nothing like north Omaha. True. Oh, well. Oakland and Craig are being divided and they're very, very similarly situated and are both communities of interest. But that's quiet. Nobody said anything about that. Both maps are going to split counties and divide something. What makes more sense? You want CD 2 to spread over eight to four counties, fine, but then you better figure out how CD 1 is going to completely change. And there's no way, just so you know, if you draw CD 1, it doesn't become more competitive with Sarpy County. For all the partisan people watching,--

HILGERS: That's time, Senator.

WAYNE: --the numbers are the numbers.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Wayne and Senator Morfeld. Senator Bostar, you're recognized.

BOSTAR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I want to take a moment to talk about the city of Lincoln and where Lincoln gets its water. So Lincoln gets its water from Saunders County, that's where the Lincoln city well field is located. And I have some notes and some background that I just want to share about what that well field looks like. So currently the well field pumping capacity consists of 40 vertical wells and three horizontal collector wells, or HCWs. The well field has a maximum instantaneous capacity of between 110 and 130 million gallons per day, depending on streamflow conditions. The summer seasonal capacity of the well field for 60- to 90-day production capacity ranges from 75 to 80 million gallons per day when streamflow is less than 1,000 cubic feet per second and from 71 to 77 million gallons per day during a streamflow event that correlates to a

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

100-year recurrence interval drought for the same duration. Water is treated at the Platte River Water Treatment Facility, which is located in Ashland. There are two treatment [INAUDIBLE] at the site, the East Plant and the West Plant. The East Plant has a capacity of 60 million gallons per day and primarily treats water from the HCWs. The East Plant consists of oxidation for iron and manganese removal, filtration, disinfection, and fluoridation. The East Plant has been designed for four future expansions in 30 million gallons per day increments. The West Plant has a capacity of 60 million gallons per day and treats water from the vertical wells. The West Plant consists of aeration, chlorine oxidation of manganese filtration, disinfection, and fluoridation. Drinking water standards are regulated by the U.S. EPA under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Public water supplies must follow the standards set forth by the EPA. And a review of water, raw water quality and finished water quality shows that these facilities, these facilities are in full compliance with drinking water standards. The midterm horizon, which consists of a range from 2026 to 2040, raw water demands are projected to exceed supply capacity by 15 to 25 million gallons per day by 2040. Groundwater model simulations were performed that considered a well field consisting of 40 vertical wells and six HCWs. Under this well field configuration, the model estimated that the well field could produce 111 million gallons per day for 60 days and 107 million gallons per day for 90 days with a streamflow of 200 cubic feet per second. These modeled values compared favorably to the values estimated using conservative summer HCW pumping rates of 10 million gallons per day for the new HCWs. If you assume that each new HCW will increase the summer seasonal well field yield by 10 million gallons per day and the maximum instantaneous pumping rate by 15 million gallons per day, a fifth HCW would increase the summer seasonal pumping capacity of the well field to between 91 and 97 million gallons per day during drought conditions. This pumping capacity would meet projected seasonal demand through 2035. The addition of a sixth HCW on the east bank of the well field would further increase the summer seasonal pumping capacity of the well field to between 101 and 107 million gallons per day during drought conditions. This pumping capacity would meet--

HILGERS: One minute.

BOSTAR: --projected seasonal demands until approximately 2045. Adding a fifth HCW would cost around \$12.6 million in 2013 dollars when it was last modeled, a sixth would be \$24.3 million, again, in 2013 dollars. I say all of this because Lincoln's water resources are imperative to protect, imperative to plan for, and our limited water supply is one of the greatest challenges that the city is going to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

face in the near to mid future. Having unified federal representation over both the city of Lincoln and its source of water is imperative because we will need that partnership in order to secure a sustainable future for the population of Lincoln. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Bostar. Senator Wayne, you're recognized.

WAYNE: Thank you. And I, for the transcribers, although I was saying Butler, put parentheses Burt County the whole time I kept saying Butler. I want to apologize to Burt County. So just go back when you transcribe, put parentheses Burt. He really means Burt County, because that's clearly I'm going to have to get some new contacts. So colleagues, again, I-- we spent a lot of time and I know everybody has. And the reason, like I said, I didn't try to, but when I sat downstairs and I tried to leave the floor and I heard people just talk, particularly, Senator Arch, negatively about what was going on in our plan. Let me point out another area that I really have a fundamental problem with LB1. And if Senator Arch was on the floor, I would ask him if he thinks it's a good idea to, to split federal tribal land on congressional districts. See what people don't know when they look at these maps that we've been looking at for so many days is when you look at the first page and you see this almost yellow area on the map, that's a federal reservation. That federal reservation goes into Cuming County. That's split. Why? Because we're trying to keep county whole. But we should probably keep the federal reservation all on the same congressional plan. That doesn't happen here. The federal res, the res is actually split between two, between the 1st and the 3rd. There's ways to fix that because it's actually four census tracts. I know it because I keep changing it so many times and all you got to do is add the four census tracts and it's about roughly 350 people. But if you do that, guess what? You're going to have to split somewhere else to make up that 350 to 400 people. That's how this works. So nobody is saying Douglas County can't be split. Nobody's saying anything like that. I'm saying tell me how it works. I don't like Saunders County and Lancaster County-- Saunders County and Sarpy County being in District 2. I can tell you right now, I got national calls about the-- some people actually like this map. It actually makes it more competitive in some areas. I don't look at that, nor do I care. We looked at numbers and data and looking at people trying to keep people together and whole. And dividing a city, when I-- and this is the part that's-- I almost pulled a Brewer and said an inappropriate word. This is the part that's making me frustrated is that people are saying, let's not split Bellevue. They're the third-largest city. I agree, but we're OK with splitting

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

the largest city. How do you put those two together? Nobody-- it doesn't make sense. And just because up by Standing Bear and the growth going north of Dodge to Maple and they are building new schools and, yes, there is a little bit of farmland up there, that makes it nothing like what's in Madison. And we start thinking about all the HUD programs that, that Congressman Bacon was able to deliver funding for north Omaha, funding for many projects throughout Omaha, it's because the city and the county can work with one congressman. Now we're going to divide that in areas where some of the areas we need some of our most federal dollars.

HILGERS: One minute.

WAYNE: That-- that's-- federal grants are important to many, many people, including rural Nebraska, who go after federal grants. So tell me if Senator-- or if Congressman Fortenberry stays in office and there is a hundred and something thousand people in Douglas County applying for a grant versus Madison County, how is Madison County going to feel? Where-- where's the pressure going to be? It's going to come from the voting block, that's the biggest. So we're going to take 130 years and we're just going to disrupt the applectart. That's fine. And when we get to voting, I want to vote on some things because we're going to have that same argument so much more coming this session. The way it used to be, if we're just going to throw it out the window, as a core, we're going to have a lot of fun on legislative district maps. Because there are maps--

HILGERS: That's time, Senator.

WAYNE: Thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Senator Linehan, you're recognized.

LINEHAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I get the feeling it's time for a deep breath for everyone. It's been a long day, a really, really long week. And I will give Senator Wayne and his staff, Trevor, enormous thanks and praise for, by this time, hundreds of hours that Trevor has spent in the map room and Senator Wayne and others. I know we have guys on our side in the map room. And I do understand Senator Wayne's frustration when people come and talk to you about this little corner of the map or that little corner of the map and they haven't been in the map room and they're too busy and they don't want to mess with that. They just want to fix-- just fix it. I get the frustration. I also want to take some time here to thank the staff that's sitting here under the balcony, Ben Thompson, LaMont, Tim, Grant, Trevor's not

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

up here. Is Trevor up here? In the map room. Senator Wayne, would you yield to a question?

HILGERS: Senator Wayne, will you yield?

WAYNE: Yes.

LINEHAN: Have you still got Trevor in the map room?

WAYNE: No, he-- it's 5:00. I told him-- he still downstairs, but he's no longer in the map room.

LINEHAN: Did you have him in the map room all day?

WAYNE: Yes, we were working on Sarpy County.

LINEHAN: So how many maps have you handed me today, Senator Wayne?

WAYNE: At least six.

LINEHAN: And my response was each and every time.

WAYNE: Wait till the weekend. You're going to sleep tomorrow and then we'll talk on Sunday.

LINEHAN: And why did I want to wait?

WAYNE: Because we are overloaded right now.

LINEHAN: And is it a good idea to make big decisions when you've-- no sleep and you're tired and to the point now which we rarely see from you, Senator Wayne, a little anger? We hardly ever see that.

WAYNE: No, I'm, I'm, I'm ready to go till 7:00, so we'll, we'll be having fun until at least 7:00. I got my second wind. This is great.

LINEHAN: OK, so we can start having some fun now--

WAYNE: Yeah.

LINEHAN: --like we had all week at the hearings to the point of getting kind of punchy where the people are like, oh, you all have a sense of humor. And we're, like, no, we just don't know what we're doing.

WAYNE: Right.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

LINEHAN: Yeah. So, yeah, we have a big, big jigsaw puzzle with people-- like each little piece of that puzzle has people in it and they care about their communities and whether they're in Douglas County or Sarpy County, they care. I think the floor has made clear today, we care about our congressmen. We don't want to push people out of their seats. Part of the issue in that map room down there and several senators know this, and I mistakenly put-- I won't-- a senate-- a legislator out of his district and then got a very-- a phone call, which was very energetic. Because when you, you click on that map, there's no, there's no sign there that says, oh, you just, just put Carol Blood in Rita Sander's district, there's no sign. You got to fix the map and then you have to go back in and make sure that you didn't accidentally put Senator Hunt with Senator Cavanaugh or Senator Cavanaugh with Senator McDonnell. It's really, really hard. And I have not spent as much time because I use the excuse that I'm old and I can't see and the numbers are really tiny. But I know Justin has been in there a lot, Grant has been in there a lot, other staff. So I think we just-- we have to get to the end here today and then we'll have a day off--

HILGERS: One minute.

LINEHAN: --and there will be a lot of conversations going over on the weekend and people will be looking for a compromise. Thank you, Mr. President.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Linehan and Senator Wayne. Senator Blood, you're recognized.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators, friends all, I have my second wind and I want to talk real briefly. I've listened to the debate and I have learned a lot of things. And I want to express several concerns. First of all, Senator Arch is most definitely from Sarpy County, but he is not from Bellevue. I want to make that very clear. It is Senator Sanders and myself that represent Bellevue. We all represent Sarpy County. We all represent Nebraska. But I just want to make that really clear. So to ask him particularly about that community might not be so appropriate. With that said, when we're talking about Sarpy County and keeping it whole and I hear that nobody brought anything forward that kept us whole, you want to slice and dice us. My amendment kept Sarpy County whole and Douglas County whole. And the only person that came to talk to me about it was Senator Erdman and Senator Hilkemann. So don't stand there and say nobody brought anything forward. I tried to give a starting point and to encourage people to talk about how we might be able to do that and whether we can do it. I never had the expectation that it would get

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

passed as much as that we could start working together, not arguing about it, but working together. And these same senators that are pushing this when it came down to votes that those same mayors asked us to either support or not support because we were creating unfunded mandates, yet again, for Sarpy County that ultimately raises property taxes by the way, they were, they were nowhere to be found. That support went away. So now we see cherry-picking when it comes to support. We're a community. We all work together. Well, that's not always true. And that's unfortunate, by the way. And in reference to changing things as far as whether people can win or not win elections, I think although that Sarpy County was most definitely gerrymandered last time and you've not heard me say that word this time because I feel like we're working on the opposite of it, there are two senators in this body that overcame that alleged gerrymandering and still won. So I'm not really concerned about things like that because I think it's about the candidate and not so much the party. And we need to just get over that. Good candidates can be from any party and if they work their butts off, they deserve to win. So with that, I would yield any time that I have left to Senator Wayne.

HILGERS: Senator Wayne, 2:20.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Blood. So, you know, actually, I'm not really mad. I just kind of am, am awake now and ready to, and ready to go. And what it comes down to is we are talking about, well, it makes it sound like that Douglas County is sacred and we can't splice it. But here's, here's why I'm really frustrated. I'm really frustrated because after we get done with this map, we're going to have legislative maps come up and they're going to argue and argue and argue about preserve the core. They're going to argue and argue about making sure their district stays intact and that we don't move or stretch too far somebody to the east. They're going to make the exact opposite argument that they're making here today. So I don't mind if we filibuster and just talk, but when you get up and start making statements that are going to be the exact opposite you're going to make next week, that's disingenuous. And unlike the first four years, probably because I'm not running again and I ain't going to be hanging out with the whole bunch of you, I'm calling people out.

HILGERS: One minute.

WAYNE: And we're going to have a dialog every time you make a very inconsistent statement about preserving the core and make sure we-- we make sure that rural Nebraska stays whole, when right now you're saying let's divide Douglas County for the last 130 years from staying whole. So you don't get to have it both ways in a special session on

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

redistricting because they're too close together and I can, I can remember what you say a lot better than when we got 155 bills. Just be consistent. Don't tell me that I can't move Ralston too far because it takes away the core of their district when you're OK with dividing Douglas County as a whole and, and taking away that core. That's all I'm saying. That's not being argumentative and mad. I'm saying, how can you say both? Why is your district core that important, but Douglas County's district as a whole isn't?

HILGERS: That's time, Senator. Thank you, Senator Wayne and Senator Blood. Senator Pansing Brooks, you're recognized. This is your third opportunity.

PANSING BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to give the remainder of my time to Senator Wayne. He's on a roll. But I do want to just add one small moment of levity because I had a couple of conservatives come to me and say they were wondering if, if-- that there were odds on me about whether or not this coat was worn today because of the blue dot in Nebraska. And I wish I had been that clever. I really put on the dress and thought, what, what would look cute with the blue dress? Instead, I should have been pulling this thing out and saying, oh, what would look cute with the blue dot? So anyway, in the spirit of, of a little bit of levity, thank you, Senator Wayne, for all of your work and, and would you please continue the discussion?

HILGERS: Senator Wayne, 4:07.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you, Senator Pansing Brooks. So I do want to take a moment because, because yesterday something happened that I think everybody in this body should be-- should know. And I'm not-- this is not a negative remark to the opposite of what you hear, but yesterday, Senator Sanders sat there and waited for every public person to testify before she testified. And I publicly thanked her yesterday, but that was something that stood out not just to me, but when I was thanking her, many of the people in the room were nodding their head in agreement that, first of all, it's uncommon and really we don't do it at all is testify on other senators' bills or even bills in general. I think Senator Chambers did it once, well, not in the last four years, but typically, we don't ever do that. And I want to put in perspective that this is a bill, although it's redistricting, it is a bill. And that didn't happen the first two meetings and people-- and there was quite a bit exchange in dialog with those senators, but it took about an hour, hour and a half before really the public started, started doing it. And so I just-- I think Senator Sanders was-- did it perfectly. And I

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

really thank her for that because it was noticed and I had lots of emails of people saying that to me from my districts so I wanted her to know that. Going back to what we were talking about, we are going to start a conversation about legislative maps and that's what I'm setting up now. We'll work out the congressional maps. I get that. But when I, when I start putting amendments and bills on the floor that are moving your legislative district or stretching it out in a way that doesn't work, I'm going to ask you when we get to voting, why is your district so safe and sacred? Why can't your district be touched? Because that's essentially what is happening. You're essentially saying, saying that we have to preserve the core, because this is what I heard from multiple people I've talked to, we want to make sure rural that they don't lose a voice. And in fact, underneath my proposal or underneath the proposal we put out, west of Kearney, they would be down to five senators. I get that. That, that's a-- western Nebraska, half of Nebraska is down to five senators sounds really bad. I'm willing to work on that. I'm willing to figure out how to do it. But what I don't get up here and, and do is, is say one thing and then tomorrow turn around-- or next week turn around and do something else. That's what I'm tired of when it comes to not just redistricting,--

HILGERS: One minute.

WAYNE: --but generally. So I wasn't going to really engage at all today. But then I started thinking, if you can say that today, then I want you to be consistent when we get to the legislative maps. I want to put everything on the table. Every district we can have that conversation. Every district, let's change it. Let's not preserve the core anywhere. If I were to ask what is Sarpy County's core, I might get different answers from different senators. Senator Blood might say around Bellevue. Senator Sanders pretty much said that yesterday in her testimony, Bellevue. If I ask Senator Day, she's going to talk about Gretna and the-- in the western-- south Sarpy-- western part of south Sarpy. That's a growing area. If I ask Senator Clements, he's probably going to talk about Springfield. So which core is it? In Douglas County, it's really clear. The city of Omaha is the core. There are some SIDs and suburbs that are all next to the city of Omaha.

HILGERS: That's time, Senator. Thank you, Senator Wayne and Senator Pansing Brooks. Senator Morfeld, you're recognized.

MORFELD: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I rise in support of the Hansen amendment for a lot of the reasons that have been discussed already. Well, there's a lot of things I want to say, trying to figure out exactly where I want to start. When we're talking about the core

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

of the district, when we're talking about maintaining compactness, the Senator Wayne maps that are in AM12 maintains all of that. Maintains the core of the district. It ensures that the maps are compact. It maintains the traditional communities of interest that we have. And I've heard a few different things, one, that Douglas County is growing so quickly, eventually it'll have to be split. Well, right now it doesn't have to be. So let's focus on what the reality is right now. Right now, Douglas County does not have to be split. Right now, Douglas County is the core of the district. And right now we have, for the most part, and I am not the queen of Sarpy County, that is Senator Blood and maybe some others, Senator Sanders can fight over it. Senator Day. And, you know, even Senator Arch to a certain extent. I think there's another senator in Sarpy County too. But in any case, for the most part, it tracks the current maps. What LB1 does is constitute a significant departure from the status quo. And some people would say, listen, the whole state's changing, population's changing. We can't maintain the status quo in all the maps. Well, that's true. But there are some areas where we can maintain the status quo and there are some areas that have traditionally been the core of the district since the founding of the state and that's Douglas County and CD 2. So, colleagues, the reason why I'm in support of the Wayne map is because it maintains the core of the district, not only in the 2nd Congressional District, but also the 1st and the 3rd. And in addition, what it does is it makes sure that we have maps that are fair and in some cases competitive. And quite frankly, there's ways to make the Senator Wayne map more competitive for one side or the other. But that wasn't done because we followed the guidelines of LR134. We're going to have a lot more debates about things that I think will strike even closer to home than the congressional districts. And when I say that, I mean the legislative maps and there are going to have to be compromises made. I made plenty of compromises in my own district, which we'll talk about in depth. But I know a lot of other folks have to make compromises in their districts, too, because some people's districts, yes, shrunk. But some people's districts also had a lot of population growth, which means that they have to shrink the physical footprint of their district. And for folks that have gone door to door and gotten to know all of the people in the legislative district that they represent, the community that they represent, it's tough to give up a part of it. I'm on the Redistricting Committee and it was tough for me to give up certain parts of my district based off growth and population changes. So, colleagues, given all of our criteria in LR134,--

HILGERS: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

MORFELD: --the Senator Wayne map that is represented in AM12 by Senator Hansen is the map that most closely follows LR134 and the guidelines that the Legislature passed and I urge you to adopt AM12. Thank you, Mr. President.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Morfeld. Senator Lathrop, you're recognized. This is your third opportunity.

LATHROP: OK, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Colleagues, this might be your first special session. I remember mine, I was probably in my second or third year, I'm not even sure anymore, it's been so long ago, but I thought this is going to be kind of cool. We can all get back together again. It's kind of fun. We can get back down to Lincoln and see some old friends and get the old band back together again and spend some time. One thing I learned in my first special session is this all gets compressed pretty significantly, like there's a lot of different rules that we're not observing or that are different as a consequence of being in a special session. So today we have our first bill, first bill. It's getting filibustered because I think everybody in the room knows that LB1 is not getting across the finish line and we're not carving up Douglas County. We're an hour away, hour and a half away from cloture, something like that, and I'm sitting in my seat here thinking, why are we taking this to cloture? I think everybody in the room realizes, or at least everybody that's not chained to a text string realizes that where we're going to end up is probably pretty close to AM12. Like, are we going to run down 84th Street? We may not, but this isn't, this isn't Final Reading either, right? We got two more opportunities. We have Select File. We know the direction this is going in. Like, there's enough conversation on the floor. We know where this is going. We know where it's going and it's not LB1. And it may not exactly be AM12, but AM12 is pretty close to where we're going and I don't know why we don't just adopt it, move on and go home and have this thing on Select File. Because I'm struggling with the strategy or the idea that we're going to filibuster this, it won't move, and we'll come back and do it all over again on Monday. To what end? How is coming back on Monday, hopefully people talk on Sunday and iron this out, come back on Monday and start on General File with this all over again? It doesn't make sense. We should be, we should be adopting AM12, recognizing that it is, it is much closer to where we're going to end up in-- at than is LB1. We don't need to take this, it's got to be my bill, it's got to be LB1, we're going to amend. It doesn't matter. We're going to run out of time if we're not careful. We need to recognize that in a special session time is a precious resource. And in this case, there's no point in wasting it continuing to filibuster when the answer is simply to adopt AM12 into LB1, call

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

it a day, move this thing to Select File. And the people that need to get together to figure out what to do with Sarpy County or 84th Street or where Don Bacon lives can sort that, or whether Platte's in or out or Madison's in or out or Otoe County. That's my thoughts as, as we get a little-- you can already, already tell a little bit--

HILGERS: One minute.

LATHROP: --that this being close to each other for six hours is starting to get to us. And we haven't even gotten to the legislative maps. And I can tell you that's going to be a little more difficult than carving up the state into three equal districts. It's Friday night. Let's move AM12 into LB1, get rid of the other amendments, have this thing sit on Select File, and make some changes over the weekend. Thank you.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Lathrop. Mr. Clerk for a motion.

CLERK: Mr. President, priority motion. Senator Wayne would move to recommit LB1 to the Redistricting Committee.

HILGERS: Senator Wayne, you're recognized to open on your motion.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I was going to say great minds think alike because we were both talking about how to get out here earlier. And Steve's-- excuse me, I call you Steve. Senator Lathrop's a little more optimistic that we'll have 27 votes to move it to Select. I'm more like, how about we just recommit and then-- I got a proposal. This is a proposal. We're going to recommit the bill, and Senator Erdman's listening so I know this might be good, we're going to recommit the bill, ask the Speaker to start at 1:00, and the committee can meet at 8:30. And maybe we can hammer out something better on Monday to have a discussion because everybody's pretty much agreed this isn't the final version. I mean, even with me and Senator Arch's exchange, he's hoping that there's going to be some kind of amendment or some kind of agreement going forward. So while I really would like to adopt AM12 and just go ahead and move to Select File and negotiate after that, my gut just tells me we probably don't got 26 or 27. Don't have-- I got just corrected by my English, so see, Senator Groene, we do it all the time. We-- just me and you, we just don't always speak clearly and properly. But we get things done, don't we? OK, anyway, so that's my thought. My thought is we know we're going to negotiate. We know we're going to do things. We know that there's proposals and things we're going to talk about. The committee has to meet anyway if we're going to move any legislation for the legislative seats. So my thought is we take a vote, put it back in the committee,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

we pressure the Speaker really, really hard to start like at 1:00, and that way we can still get our \$2 per diem for coming down. And then we, we all meet, the committee meets. We have a conversation, maybe we can come to a better understanding. I just thought of this on the floor. I did not-- actually it was brought to me by somebody else. And so I haven't had time to confirm with the, the Chair of Redistricting, but, hey, things happen on the floor. So that's my idea. If people are in the queue, I think Senator Groene next, say you endorse my idea of recommit, Senator Groene, we can go home now. Thank you, Mr. President.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Debate is now open on the motion to recommit. Senator Groene, you're recognized.

GROENE: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Wayne and I do agree on a lot of things. And I do speak clearly, sir. What's interest for District 3 and what's interest for Senator Wayne's area has coincided a lot. Economic growth, rail parks. His district fits well into District 3, Congressional District 3, because we have done a lot of the same economic development bills. Senator Lathrop, some people have said, boy, this is the most partisan thing that's ever done in Legislature. I haven't seen a nickel's worth of difference in the debate here and what side people are on as I've done for the six previous years. This body is always partisan, the same individuals who lean left are on one side, the right is on the one side, and I, as I call them, [INAUDIBLE] just sitting there waiting to see what side they're going to take. Nothing has changed in this debate or a month ago or two months ago, whatever, three months ago. Senator Wayne, your point about the school-- poor little school districts being split, it doesn't make a nickel's worth of difference to anybody in a school district, in a city, in a NRD as to what congressional district they live in. They won't know the difference or give a damn when this thing passes. What they care about is right now their school districts are in two different-- where they live in two different legislative districts. We got school districts, ask Senator Hughes, we got school districts that are in different time zones of people. Some kids are getting up at 6:00 to go to school. That's what they care about. This is purely political. This blue dot ideal, it's not a blue dot because of a congressional seat. It's a blue dot because of an electoral college dot. I pulled up-- hey, if you want to compromise, I'll put an amendment on-- we go back, we'll give you your Douglas County, we'll put an amendment on that we go back to winner takes all. Hey, compromise, guys. The Congressional districts, the Congressional districts cost of running for vacant a seat will get cut in half because the national Democrats and Republicans won't come in over,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

over that little red dot hopefully next time. They won't come in. They don't care. It'll be a local election again, not a national election. There's my compromise. I looked back at the history in 1991, 25 to 22, we became no longer a winner take all. You don't think your vote matters? There was a senator named Conway. Ashford wasn't here to vote. Schimek didn't have the votes so he told-- she went up and winked her blue eyes at Conway and said, would you give me the vote on General File to add 25? That vote, one vote is why we no longer have winner take all because on Final, he voted no like he should have done on General. Ashford would back who was a Republican and he voted yes. It was never meant for Nebraska. It should not have been in Nebraska that we ever lost winner take all and let's get rid of it. Let's get back to winner take all and all of this politics goes away. The national parties aren't drawing the maps anymore. We are, we are, not the national parties over a stupid dot, an electoral college. So let's do that. Let's do that. By the way, I hadn't heard the numbers, so I asked Research to do it--

HILGERS: One minute.

GROENE: --and it's amazing how fast they work. If we split-- if the Douglas County and LB1 were passed, 140-- it's about people, not about counties, counties don't even have a football team to root for. Anyway, 143,522 citizens of Douglas County will be in District 3, 441,004 will be in District 2. It's about a one-third, two-third split or a little more than that. People don't care on a congressional district. They don't worry about who their neighbor is voting for. They look at their congressional and they vote. Doesn't split backyards. Nobody cares. They care about their school districts, which one they're in, where their kids go. They care about their, their county where they're in, they care about the boundaries, if they-- they don't want to be annexed, but they care about that. But they don't care--

HILGERS: That's time, Senator.

GROENE: --about congressional district.

HILGERS: Thank you, Senator Groene. Senator Day, you're recognized.

DAY: Thank you, Mr. President. I yield my time to Senator Hunt.

HILGERS: Senator Hunt, 4:55.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Day. Senator Groene just said the quiet part real loud that his compromise idea is to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

adopt LB2, basically is AM12, in exchange for winner take all. Because what's the goal with this whole LB1 all along? It's winner take all. It's to move Douglas County into a more Republican population and hurt the chance that the voters of that county are going to get to have their say in the Electoral College. His goal is to make Republicans win and he just out and said it. If the blue dot is so stupid, if it's such a stupid little blue dot, why are you so wrapped around the axle about it? If the congressional districts don't make a nickel's worth of difference to anybody, why are you so wrapped around the axle about it? Don't worry then. Let's adopt the map that most Nebraskans said worked best for them. I appreciated so much the point Senator Wayne made about the Ho-Chunk Reservation in Thurston County. I introduced AM16, which I hope we get to, which would replace the congressional map of LB1 with LB2 with one small change. It would keep the Indian country votes in the Ho-Chunk Reservation in Thurston County from being diluted. And I'll talk about this more when this amendment comes up. But in LB1, Congressional District 1 takes out a really small chunk of Thurston County. And you can see on the, on the map, it's a shaded yellow area. That shaded yellow area is all Ho-Chunk Reservation. It's all Indian country. And what this map does, LB1, which is one reason of many that I oppose it, is it cuts a sliver of that country out of CD 1, so it's in part of CD 1 and CD 3 and it splits the reservation. I introduced a map that will keep that reservation whole altogether and it brings in a deviation of negative .39 percent and puts CD 3 to .39 percent and keeps LD-- or CD, sorry, not LD, CD 2 as zero percent. So that's something I would like to talk about when we get down the way a little bit. I'm curious about how much of this redistricting process was done with input from our Native American community. How much consultation was done with the four tribes that we have in this state? If there wasn't any, then that's a real embarrassment for this Legislature and there's still time to fix that and my amendment does address that. Another thing that I've heard so much from other-- oh thanks. Breaking news, Senator Pansing Brooks says Winnebago Reservation, not Ho-Chunk. Did Winnebago change-- Senator Pansing Brooks, will you yield to a question?

HUGHES: Senator Pansing Brooks, will you yield?

PANSING BROOKS: Yes, I will.

HUNT: Did--

HUGHES: One minute.

HUNT: --did the Winnebago Tribe change their name to Ho-Chunk?

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

PANSING BROOKS: No, they did not. Ho-Chunk is the economic development group that's tied to Lance Morgan, but part of the, part of the Winnebago.

HUNT: OK, thank you for the clarification.

PANSING BROOKS: Thank you.

HUNT: Then that's what I meant to say. And I apologize for not saying that correctly. Thank you for correcting me, Senator Pansing Brooks. Another thing I've heard from so many constituents, and people are still continuing to say this in the committee hearings as well, is why don't we have an independent oversight commission like so many other states do? When I got elected, I talked to so many of my friends in other states who are elected about, well, what are you guys doing for redistricting? Because we're just starting that process and I'm wondering how we're going to do that here in Nebraska. And so many of those people in the other states said, oh, we have an independent committee that does it and it's nonpartisan. And then it's, it's not really a huge deal for us. And I'm so envious of that process. Even though we have this really awesome and amazing opportunity to put the maps together ourselves, it--

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Blood, you're recognized.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators, friends all, as day becomes night, I see a lot of people going off to the side, kind of relaxing. They know we're getting closer to the end. And I want to say that I stand in support of Senator Wayne's motion because he's right. And you heard Senator Linehan say it already, we're going to work on stuff over the weekend. Why don't we go ahead and, and move that through? I mean, ultimately, it would be nice to see AM12 be the starting point. But no matter what we do today, we're going to have a starting point, right? Because we're not all going to come to terms on LB1. We've heard that said multiple times by people from different parties even though we're a nonpartisan body and we just want to point that out and kind of follow up with what Senator Groene said. But I think that, ultimately, we can move forward and go home and see our families because we're not going to see them at all next week again, give the Redistricting staff a day to have a break, let them get back to it on Sunday, let some of the tempers calm down, let people really mull over what's important. Because I guarantee that if we're this

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

stressed over just dividing the state into three portions, boy, wait till you see those LD maps because there's a lot to discuss with those. So with that, I would likely yield any of my time remaining to Senator Morfeld if he'd like to talk.

HUGHES: Senator Morfeld, 3:10.

MORFELD: Not quite sure what I want to talk about right now, but thanks, Senator Blood. In any case, yeah, I think I'll yield the rest of the time back to the chair. I wasn't prepared. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Blood and Senator Morfeld. Senator Morfeld, you are next in the queue.

MORFELD: Friday night. Thank you, Mr. President. You know, I'll, I'll chat a little bit about a few different things. Well, I think Senator Hansen-- Senator Hansen, I'll yield my time to Senator Hansen. He looks a little bit more prepared than Senator Morfeld. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Senator Hansen, 4:45.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. And good evening, colleagues. And I'm pleased to hear some chuckles and some, some lightheartedness right now. This has been a difficult week and an intensive week for a lot of us, a lot of our constituents, a lot of our staff. So one of the things that I wanted to talk about is there's a little bit of some things today that have just kind of been-- I don't want to say choreographed, that hasn't-- that we're not, as you could just tell, we're not that organized. But there was the understanding that, say, people like myself who live in Lincoln, who aren't on the Redistricting Committee might need to take some time to free up Redistricting Committee members to negotiate and talk amongst themselves and each other. So it's part of the reason I filed the amendment, it's part of the reason I've been talking so much. I wish I could pan the NET camera around and, and zoom in on particular groups and discussions that are happening even to this moment, because while we've been kind of spinning our wheels a little bit on LB1, I think overall we are in fact making progress. I do think tonight is going to end in about an hour ten with a cloture vote. I think we all know how it's going to happen, but that doesn't mean today was a waste or a misuse or whatever. It was some things that needed to happen, needed to happen. For a lot of us, it's the first time we've been able to publicly, in any fashion, talk about redistricting as a whole, specifically these congressional maps. And I think we all knew walking in here today that we weren't going to pass LB1 or LB2 on its face

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

without changes. Something was going to happen to one or the other. And maybe there's a little bit of jockeying over which one is going to be the base model. I don't know if we've resolved that. Certainly think we have heard some good things about LB2, and I'll continue to, to pitch and promote that. But I do think some more negotiation discussion is important. And I even I knew coming into today that some of this was going to needing to take place on Sunday and more likely Monday morning. We were just too close, too quick to the redistricting hearings themselves to necessarily have anything good to go today. So a little bit this has been perfunctory. It's a little bit of this has been understood was probably going to be happening. And I don't think maybe particular motions, particular floor speeches have been a surprise or not. But I think the fact that this took all day, is going to take all day, and it's going to be the only thing we're going to do today was probably a surprise to nobody in this body and very few recurring and repeat viewers of our, our Legislature. I do think we have some good progress and some continued progress of we are setting a record and we are setting a baseline today as what do we as a 49 want to see going forward? Undoubtedly, there will be a new map, whether it's Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, what have you. There'll be a new map that we'll start looking at that'll be offered as an amendment to presumably LB1 or if they'll use LB2 as a shell bill and kick it out and we'll get the opportunity to look at it once it's developed. And I think we've laid some good groundwork today. And I'm actually very appreciative. I know there's people I've strongly disagreed with. I guess I was maybe a little surprised at the strength and unified desire of Sarpy County to stay whole. I don't know if that's going to be possible in the long run, but I think I have personally a clearer view of that for debate today as we've reached--

HUGHES: One minute.

M. HANSEN: --thank you, Mr. President, as we've reached the end of debate. And I bet definitely the members of the Redistricting Committee have, as I know, Senator Wayne's been one of the most vocal and has talked about arranging and coordinating these maps. I do also think that, as people have noticed, kicking some of the rust off, trying to figure out redistricting, that I think is a process very few, if, if more than one or two of us in this room have any personal experience with really many capacities. And I think getting the start, getting to understanding some of these terms, communities of interest, core of the district will kind of provide some benefit down the line, even if today is not necessarily the most productive day we've ever had on the floor of this Legislature. So with that, I'm about out of time. Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hansen. And you are next in the queue.

M. HANSEN: Perfect. Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you again, colleagues. So as I said, we've been weighing-- laying a lot of the groundwork for what we want to see as our state. I do think a lot of us are very directly relaying the wants and needs of our constituents. Some people throughout the day have definitely shared which map they think their constituents have called for or spoken for. I think I have, too, and I understand that's not necessarily going to be the same map. And I understand, you know, for example, for me, I'm very concerned about Lincoln and I'm concerned about the influx and influence of Omaha and the new shift of a considerable portion of Omaha into my congressional district. I know we've been speaking on a very Omaha-centric and CD 2-focused lens, but obviously my interest as well relies on, you know, the impact that CD 2 will have on CD 1. Because we have this, you know, unique system, whether or not it's how we organize the Legislature, whether or not it's how we do boards and commissions, the congressional districts are often used as a proxy for dividing the state. And I think it would be interesting, you know, in all these different boards and commissions and things that say, like the Governor gets to appoint, oftentimes they're broken down by congressional district. And that's something I think is one of the reasons I have a little bit of concern that we haven't necessarily gotten to of splitting up the city of Omaha, is that you could essentially what is originally meant for kind of a 1st Congressional District, a Lincoln and central-- probably central and southeastern Nebraska perspective could potentially be a northwest Omaha perspective. And you could have, you know, people representing different congressional districts who live on either side of Dodge Street, you know, live in either side of 144th & Dodge. I understand that's still an issue today with people who live in either side of, you know, Harrison Street might have functionally similar views. And that's something we're never totally going to solve. But that's been one of the concerns of my-- mine in terms of a Lincoln senator, a Lancaster County-based senator and which new voters and which new perspectives are you putting into CD 1 and does that make sense? I think, as history has shown, we are used to having parts of Sarpy County. I think conceptually a lot of people know and understand and recognize having portions of Sarpy County. As the crow flies, it's not that far. But it would be strange to have kind of northern parts of Omaha that you either had to drive through an entire congressional district or drive around be in-- and be a pretty considerable portion of the congressional district. You know, it's not a few neighborhoods. It's not a few things. As it was said earlier, it's 100,000 people or so more. When you think about that, that's a considerable weight and

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

sway on our congressional district. And I'm not even necessarily talking about voting because I think the voting interest of Lincoln and probably western and suburban Omaha probably do align in terms of being urban metropolitan areas. But as we try and do some of the lenses on the state in terms of using the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Congressional Districts as proxies for kind of respectively central, southeastern Nebraska, greater Nebraska and metro Omaha, that stops working when you start splitting Omaha and probably would necessitate us revisiting and looking at a number of things, including how we decide committees in this Legislature, how we apportion boards and commissions, just as-- just offhand. But I was thinking about this yesterday, I was meeting with a-- the executive director of a commission in the state of Nebraska--

HUGHES: One minute.

M. HANSEN: --who has-- thank you-- who has board members are appointed by congressional districts. And we were talking about this because we hadn't really considered it until this point to this meeting yesterday, which was on a different topic of, oh, yeah, what happens if all of a sudden several of my urban Omaha board members are now technically in the 1st? Am I overrepresented, am I underrepresented? Are their terms continuing? Do they end? What's this mean? And that's where shifting, especially shifting over 100 years of history with Omaha and really Omaha being intact and whole in a district is so meaningful and impactful and impacts so many more things than just congressional representation. So with that, I know about out of time. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Hunt, you're recognized.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. I don't know about Senator Matt Hansen, but I do think it's been a really productive day. I think it's been good for us to kind of get back into the swing of things with opportunities to speak and to get back into the swing of things with lots and lots of side conversations and what folks don't see on TV when they're watching online or watching on their TV on NET is all the side conversations that happen in here. And there's, you know, mixtures of power, mixtures of, you know, what do you think they're talking about? What are-- I know she introduced that, so why is she talking to him? Like, that's always the game in here is just the interesting part of seeing who's talking to who. And it's not always even a political conversation. Sometimes it's just catching up. And that is one thing that makes our Unicameral so special. People know that we're the only nonpartisan Legislature in the country and we're the only Unicameral Legislature in the country. But some people don't

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

know we're also the smallest Legislature in the country. And that really gives us the opportunity to know each other on a personal basis. And it stays like this when we really have the opportunity to foster and grow those relationships, which are so important when we want to find compromise on bills like this, on LB1 on redistricting. When we don't have any, you know, official party leadership, when we don't have any caucuses or aisles or majority/minority leader, there's nobody really whipping us into shape. And there's only 49 of us and so it's really, you know, 49 independent people with basically equal power who represent the same number of people who have constituencies with very different needs and priorities. And the only way that we can advocate for those constituencies is by walking around the room talking to folks who have the power to go with us or go against us and come to an agreement. And I see, you know, those conversations happening all around us. And that's a really, really productive way for us to use our time. Personally, this whole redistricting process has made me even more opposed to term limits because we have so many people in this body who have never done redistricting before and we have a few who have and we've leaned on them for a lot of experience and information. The Clerk's Office, of course, has been really helpful in helping us understand the history of redistricting in Nebraska. Of course, we've never done redistricting in a special session. So this is historic and very interesting and special to be a part of. And of course, there's people in the, in the second house, just our, our voters and constituents who have gone through redistricting before and who can tell us about the history and the impact that's had on their communities over the decades that they can remember. But because of term limits, we really don't have that experience or that wisdom in this body to turn to. There's a few people, but that's something that I really feel like I've missed here as a legislator is just the opportunity to learn from the experience of senators who have been through some of these really momentous responsibilities like redistricting. And, you know, I would like to think that if I could be here in 2030 and I wasn't term limited, that maybe I could be a mentor to those newer senators as well and help them understand the process for when I'm gone. And that's just an opportunity that we don't have here because of term limits. And why do we have term limits? A lot of people think that it's because of Senator Ernie Chambers and the fact that he kept getting reelected year after year after year and he was able to hold so much power in the Legislature because of his mastery of rules and procedure that the only way folks could get rid of his power in the Legislature, which his constituents kept sending him back here to term after term because they liked the work he was doing,--

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: One minute.

HUNT: --is to pass term limits and get him out of office. So what did he do? He waited four years and then he came back. And that's a pattern that we've seen, you know, Senator Chambers repeat, Senator Lathrop, Senator Aguilar, Senator Pahls. We have, we have different senators who have been able to come back. So I'm very grateful for their experience in redistricting to be able to share that. And I hope that they do share it and continue to share it with us newer senators because somebody has to hold the institutional wisdom in this place. A lot of it is going away and it breaks my heart to see that. So that's why we have to have these conversations and keep talking to each other. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Good evening, Nebraskans. And good evening, colleagues. So we've been at this for seven hours almost exactly and I'm tired. I think others are tired too. I also was up most of the night with my son. He was having trouble sleeping and so I'm just running on coffee at this point. I'm going to go back to some of the things that Senator Hunt brought up that I really appreciate. First of all, the historic nature of doing redistricting with such a young body. Because of term limits, we are now seeing the effects of term limits on a Unicameral. And another thing, in addition to the other points that Senator Hunt brought up that people might not understand about term limits in other states is that you have a House and a Senate. And so if you have a member who you've elected to the House and they're termed out, they oftentimes will run for the Senate seat and back and forth they go so that institutional knowledge that they have doesn't leave the building. Now our institutional knowledge resides predominantly with the wonderful faces that I'm looking at-- and Senator Bostelman-- the wonderful faces that I'm looking at sitting at the front of this room and off to the side and that is the staff of the Legislature. It is with the staff that we keep this body moving forward in the direction that hopefully we all want to be going in, but we can't rely on our staff forever. I'm sure they all have other life plans at some point. And, and that's when we're really going to be in crisis with these term limits. Eight years is not very long to serve in office. And when I went through my orientation, I had several outgoing senators and current senators and former senators say, oh, when you're a freshman, you know, you're not going to talk very much. Well, when you're a freshman class and you're a third of the body, and then the next year, the freshman class-- I mean, it just

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

keeps going and going and going. And so we have-- I've been here for three years. We have several people who have been here for one year and most of us have never had a special session. And most of us have never done redistricting. And several of us have only been in the building for nine months, ten, almost ten months. So there's a learning curve here for sure. And we got the data later than typically anticipated and so our wonderful, amazing staff has been working overtime. They worked over a holiday weekend. They worked with a lot of different personalities in this Chamber and they did it with grace and patience. So I don't think that we can state that enough. And since we have the time to talk about it, I think it is important to talk about it. I've been looking at the map again for LB1 just, just strictly LB1 and the counties and--

HUGHES: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --thank you-- I realize that at this point in the evening, not too many people are going to jump in the fray here, but I just-- I just-- I go back to I know people are upset about Sarpy County. I know people are upset about other counties that could be-- why does this county matter more than that county? I would not argue that any county matters more than another. I would just argue that it is important to remain-- to keep the core of all districts that we have right now, if at all possible, and for CD 2, that is possible. And I, for one, am again open to conversations about what to do about Sarpy County. And I think that that's about my time. So I will yield the remainder of my time.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Walz, you're recognized.

WALZ: Thank you. I yield my time to Senator Hansen.

HUGHES: Senator Matt Hansen, 4:50.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Senator Walz. And thank you, Mr. President. Really appreciative of everybody who's jumped into the queue and spoken in the last little bit. I know we've kind of ebbed and flowed over where we're wanting to go today. And I think one of the important things is talking about some of these terms that we've been using today and communities of interest. And that is important and integral to redistricting and important and integral to a constitutional redistricting, more specifically for a variety of reasons. But, you know, it's defending some of the core concepts and it is defending some of the core concepts and tenets of our democracy. You know, we talk about things in this country, obviously, one person, one vote comes up noting that disproportionately sized congressional and other

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

representative districts are or can be unconstitutional. And we've applied a stricter standard to congressional districts than some others. So a little bit more flexibility or at least the Supreme Court hasn't cracked down as hard on legislative districts and others. But still the fundamental idea that these districts have to be roughly equal in population, which gets us into some of these extra little squiggly points where, as Senator Wayne talking earlier, you know, being at the point where you can find a couple of things that add up together over hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people, and then all of a sudden you need like 602 people somewhere to make it work. And that's why you get one final twist or angle or corner turned. And something like that, where to preserve one person, one vote, you end up taking a chunk or adding something here or there is presumed or can be presumed to have a good reason. You can even split a political subdivision. Our state Supreme Court recognizes that as well, that, hey, sometimes to get the districts the right size, you can't split a political subdivision or you can, excuse me. Other times, though, when you don't have the need to do that and you go out of your way to do that, that's where you get in trouble. That's where if there's, you know, a county-- in Nebraska, for example, we have the court history that if there's a county that's roughly the size of a legislative district, it's presumed to be its own legislative district. And if there's a need or a reason to change that, the courts are going to be incredibly skeptical. And, and there must be, you know, some good, good rationale for that. And we see that again with all of these cities. And I do want to say there's been some talk about, you know, we shouldn't necessarily treat one county different than another. And I, I understand where that's coming from, but it doesn't-- you have to keep it in the context of history of this Legislature and other things. And fundamentally, one of the issues we're going to keep running into and one of the issues we're going to keep running into when we're talking about this map and dealing with Congress and in this session, we're going to talk about Omaha specifically. As we've established, Omaha is a city of the metropolitan class. It has its own section of statutes, has its own chapter of statutes, and has its own dedicated kind of exceptions to a lot of things. There are 100 years of history and case law necessitating unique and special things for Omaha, in part because Omaha has always been disproportionately larger and other things compared to the rest of the state. And recognizing that, that makes it a pretty unique object.

HUGHES: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

M. HANSEN: I would say-- thank you, Mr. President, and I would say cutting that without clear reason should probably be looked at with different scrutiny than it is, say, splitting a couple townships from a rural county from the rest of the county. You know, there's not necessarily eons-- not eons, excuse me, there's not necessarily decades and decades of case law, you know, treating an individual kind of generic county in Nebraska separate as there is for Douglas County, a little bit as there is for Lancaster as well, where we have in the city of Lincoln with primary class cities. Those two cities, those two metro areas, those two counties are ones we have routinely had to come through and find special legislative findings that they are, in fact, unique situations that require their own exemptions or their own restrictions, good or bad, give or take throughout state law, throughout history. And which is why--

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Vargas, you're recognized.

VARGAS: Thank you. I yield my time to Senator Machaela Cavanaugh if she'll have it.

HUGHES: Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, 4:53.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Vargas. So continuing on discussing LB1, which is the redistricting. For those that are just tuning in-- it's 6:00 p.m. on Friday night-- LB1 is the redistricting map that was voted out of committee yesterday for our congressional districts here in Nebraska. And we are spending the time discussing it as our colleagues work to resolve conflicts within the current version of the map. So I, I appreciate so much everyone taking the time to be, I think for the most part, pretty collegial today. We had a few heated moments, but I think, I think overall we all understand that this is tedious and needs to get done. And we're in this boat together, all 49 of us for now. There's rumors of a 50th, but for today it's 49. So one of the things that I have been focusing on during this interim and trying to get more access to the public on is the COVID-19 dashboard. So a few weeks ago, I sent a letter to the administration requesting that they turn the COVID-19 dashboard back on. I have not received a response, though. A response was given to the press that it was a HIPAA violation. However, 49 other states do provide this information to the public and many lawyers have weighed in saying that it is not a HIPAA violation. And so I am just going to take this time again this evening to say that it would be very helpful

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

to all of these communities of interest on this map to have that access to that information. I know that our medical community would really appreciate it. And being able to do contact tracing and keep an accurate count of where we're at with testing and vaccinations and hospitalizations would be really helpful at this point in time. I know that the hospital system in Omaha is at capacity. It's really stressed. And even though individuals-- even though it is starting to plateau, that is in large part due to people going back to putting masks on again. I've been wearing my mask today. I'm vaccinated. If you haven't gotten vaccinated and you're over the age of 12, you should get vaccinated. It is a very helpful tool. I know that when other vaccines became available, that that was a very helpful tool for society. This is just the same, another helpful tool. And I'm not any worse for the wear of getting that vaccination.

HUGHES: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: One minute? OK, thank you.

HUGHES: Correct.

M. CAVANAUGH: So the dashboard would help us see how we're doing as a state and to not share that information with our, with our communities and our businesses and our elected officials and our medical professionals is really detrimental to us being able to fully get back to where we were two years ago. And I, for one, do not want to go back to the summer of 2020. I-- those were very difficult days and we're not out of it yet. So the more people that get vaccinated, the better. And please encourage your Governor to reinstate the dashboard. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Speaker Hilgers for an announcement.

HILGERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Good evening, colleagues. I want to have a little update regarding the schedule. So first and foremost, we will have cloture at 6:50. At 6:50, we'll have cloture on this bill. This is the only thing we're going to do this evening. So after that cloture vote, we will adjourn for the weekend. I know the Redistricting Committee and others are going to be working over the weekend working on these maps and the Legislature-- the legislative maps. Next week on Monday, I've spoken with Senator Linehan and Senator Wayne, on Monday what we're going to do is we're going to start at noon. We're not going to start at 9:00, we're going to start at noon, primarily to allow the Redistricting Committee to meet formally and Exec and be able to kick out some legislative maps so

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

that we can start debate Monday on that. That is all that I intend to do on Monday. Now on Tuesday, this is a little bit more in pencil than on Monday, but on Tuesday, if you remember the filibuster rule, if we do-- if cloture is not successful tonight, if it's not successful on Monday, if we go to cloture, then the next round will be two hours. So on Tuesday, we'll actually have more time to do some of the other things that we have on, on our plate, primarily General File on the other maps, in addition to we also have some confirmation reports and the A bill, as you're aware. So Monday, we will start at noon and we will do the legislative maps. On Tuesday, the start time will be TBA-- TBD depending on where we're at. But I intend to do probably if we have to come back for the legislative maps and congressional maps, anticipate that will be on Tuesday, again, as well as General File on the other maps. So I appreciate everyone's debate today. It's been a good debate. It's been a really good discussion. I appreciate that. And I hope everyone has a wonderful weekend. I know many of us will be talking and working together quite a bit over the weekend. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Speaker Hilgers. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I rise in support of the motion to recommit. I would echo what Speaker Hilger's just said is I think there's been some really good points raised today. And we started out the day, I think, talking about that this plan was not the plan that we all assumed was going to get adopted. We had a good discussion about reasons why people don't like the, the LB1 plan and problems with it. Then we moved on to a discussion of the AM12, which is LB2, and there were some issues pointed out with that, reasons people like it, people didn't like it were addressed. And I think after the hearings that were had this week, after the-- now we've had the floor discussion in light of those hearings and in light of taking a look at the-- these plans as they came out, I think the conversation was very productive, constructive, helpful in the long term of determining what it is people will-- are willing to adopt. What concerns certain, you know, proposals might have in the future. I think it will be easier for the committee to draw maps, a compromise map that would be acceptable to all parties. And so I think that a motion to recommit is in order at this time. And the day was useful in that, that way that we learned all those things, we learned people's positions. We learned what things are important to which senators and how they may be able to be addressed. And so I'd encourage a green vote on the motion to recommit. And it sounds like we've got a plan moving forward that will allow us to move pretty quickly if we can come to a compromise and make some progress on getting this special

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

session to be successful and get maps that all Nebraskans-- represents all Nebraskans, represents all the communities in Nebraska, and make sure that we don't unnecessarily divide communities of interest, communities that have historically been together and would benefit from unified representation. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would yield the remainder of my time back to the chair.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator McCollister, you're recognized. Senator McCollister, you're recognized.

McCOLLISTER: Thank you, Mr. President. Good evening, colleagues. A couple of times during today, we've talked about the commission model that many states have, have utilized. In fact, 16 states use a commission model that's become increasingly popular. Eager to minimize partisan influences, each of these states create a commission of citizens at large to draw maps which are ultimately presented to their legislatures for approval. In 2015-16, this concept was proposed in Nebraska by then Senator John Murante, his LB850. The bill was passed by the Legislature by a vote of 29 to 15, but it was vetoed by Governor Ricketts. The Governor suggested that using an outside commission was an unconstitutional delegation of authority by the Legislature. In 2020, I introduced LB1207, which is very similar to the Murante bill, but is modified to eliminate the constitution-- constitutionality issue raised by the Governor. To be certain the issue is properly resolved, we asked the Nebraska Attorney General, Doug Peterson, for an opinion about the bill's constitutionality. He opined that the provisions of LB1207 were constitutional. Despite the fact my bill was not scheduled for debate, the commission option still exists for the Nebraska Legislature to adopt in the future or, alternatively, the citizens of the state might choose to use a ballot initiative process to put the issue on a general election ballot if our current redistricting method is deemed this year to be unfair or overly partisan. Six states have used a citizen initiative to create a nonpartisan commission and the consensus is they help to eliminate partisan tendencies. We all hope that redistricting goes well this year. If not, the courts or the people themselves can correct unjust redistricting errors. I don't know if the commission model is ultimately going to be decided here, but if we do something that's deemed to be unfair or partisan, I think that could very well happen and it would be a citizen initiative kind of process. I hope that doesn't happen. I'm hopeful that over the weekend we can resolve the congressional issue that we've been working on all day today and then start work next week on the legislative maps that have been drawn. Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator McCollister. Senator DeBoer, you're recognized.

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. President. I will say that I am thankful for the work that Senator McCollister has done on this idea to reform our redistricting process. I was involved a little bit in that as well. I think that one of those problems of term limits, again, is that the folks who were working on those things hadn't been involved in one of these processes. I certainly know that I am learning a lot about this process, how this process works even more than I could have if I studied, even more than I did in my interim study when I talked to the people who were involved in it. Being involved in it yourself, you learn more about it. So I think that we certainly will look at legislation and be able to have a sort of more experienced eye to either reject or, or put it forward after this experience. So at least, at least that's an important thing to think about. I do think that a number of people in this room, maybe even most of the people in this room really want to do this work in a fair way, and, and I appreciate all the work. You know, I think about Trevor down in that map room, and I don't know why Senator Wayne has to chain him up down there. I just think that's probably not fair. But we, we have a lot of people who've worked really hard on these maps and I appreciate that. I appreciate the work of the committee and Senator Linehan and Senator Wayne on them. I think we've got a lot, a lot more work to do. And as we go through this process, I hope we're all sort of thinking about how we might create better legislation in the future to help guide this process or maybe, maybe we just say, hey, this is perfect. I, I have a feeling we won't say it's perfect, but I think it's, it's a useful thing to take a moment now and say, how could we make this process better and think about process as we're going through it. I did promise Senator Matt Hansen that I would yield him some time, so I'll stop talking so that I can give him the rest of my time.

HUGHES: Senator Matt Hansen, 2:45.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you, Senator DeBoer. Yes, I know I don't want to belabor the point or get into this time of night where we just thank staff because we have nothing else to say. But from everything I've heard and experienced, these map softwares are not simple tasks and they're not quick, so thank you to all the legislative research, Trevor, all the other personal staff that has worked on the maps. I do want to kind of continue with the kind of notion of we are laying some kind of baselines tonight. And I'm appreciative that Senator Wayne's proposal to give us a little extra time to negotiate Monday morning seems to have been accepted and

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

we're, and we're going to move forward with that. I do think that's a, a good thought and hopefully leads to productive discussion. I do want to say, just as kind of throwing a flag up of a note, you know, we're going to be talking about legislative districts and one of the crux, and we kind of got away from it in the-- but one of the crux points in the early part of this debate was rural with rural and that's a community of interest on its own and is whole. And I don't disagree, but there is a dis-- we need to be as a body, careful to not give that a disproportionate amount of weight for a variety of reasons, but including that, you know, you can by proxy or unintentionally end up with partisan and/or potentially other disproportionate districts if you're focused on that lens.

HUGHES: One minute.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. I know some people have advocated for structuring the legislative districts on their own to as much as you can, 10 percent up and down. And to kind of do that somewhat intentionally. 10 percent is the absolute limit where it's presumed unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. Less than 10 isn't necessary guaranteed safe. And I'd hate for us to be the test case in Nebraska where we maximize that, you know, 9.99 and the Supreme Court comes in and rules that out too and kicks the, kicks the number lower. So just some things to consider as many people will be drawing maps over the weekend. I think it's unlikely that I will be involved directly in any map drawing. So wanted to flag that out there. And thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Morfeld, you're recognized.

MORFELD: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I'm happy that the, the Speaker has given the, the committee a little bit more wiggle room and a little bit more time to start working on some compromise and some maps, and I think that all of us today do not want to be at this point in the debate again next week. I know many of us want to get the maps done. I know that there's been some hopefully productive conversations over the last few hours. So at the very least, today has given us an opportunity to step back a little bit, reflect, and then also talk to our colleagues. I'm confident that we can do what we need to get done next week in the time allotted so that next year we can come back and focus on other business. And then, quite frankly, people can start, one, one, understand what their constituency is because you don't know what your constituency is until this, this-- the final product of redistricting is over. But then, two, constituents know exactly who they should be talking to, who the future candidates are, because quite frankly, the other thing at stake here, colleagues, is by my

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

count, we're losing at least a third of the body to term limits. And that means that there are going to be a lot of different districts and constituencies throughout the state that are going to need to know who are the candidates that they have to choose from and who, quite frankly, can run in each district because you can't make that decision until you know which district you live in. And as we all know, there's at least a one year, not at least, there is a one-year requirement that you be a resident of your district before you run for the Legislature. And that's not something we can change with statute. So while the debate has been long today, I do think it's been fruitful in the sense that it's given us an opportunity to come together and it's given the committee an opportunity to communicate with each other after all of the different hearings, even if the result of the hearings wasn't exactly what some of us would have liked. So, colleagues, I urge all of us to continue working together over the weekend, not on Saturday per the Chairwoman's request, full support of that. But we need to come back definitely on Sunday and Monday and get the people's work done. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Morfeld. Senator Lathrop, you're recognized.

LATHROP: Thank you, Mr. President and colleagues. We are going to cloture, so I want to talk about something else. And Senator McKinney earlier today talked about the hearing that we held in the Judiciary Committee. I think he made an important point. And as long as you're all a captive audience, I thought I would take a little bit of time to talk about some of the things that we learned in that hearing. The Judiciary Committee held a listening session this last week. I'm losing track of my days. It was Wednesday evening from 4:30 until 11:00 at night. The purpose of that was to allow staff from the Corrections facilities to come before the Judiciary Committee and tell us what their circumstances are, their employment circumstances. As you know, the Inspector General issued a report documenting the dire circumstances of our staffing. I hope you're listening because this is really, really consequential. This is consequential, colleagues. We have a staffing crisis. We've been using that term for a while. I don't know what other term to use, but it's a lot worse. The Inspector General's report documented the number of vacancies in the Department of Corrections. And this week we listened to staff talk about what it means to them. And you should understand, we had people in that committee hearing who came in and told us that they have worked 24-hour shifts, 24-hour shifts in the Department of Corrections. They can't leave their post at the end of their shift when they are mandatory or they are disciplined for leaving their post. We have

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

facilities that are not being guarded. They simply lock people down at night and they don't have enough people to do the checks. We have yards where there should be four guards or more and they're down to one watching a yard full of men. These conditions that our staff are involved in are dangerous. Our staffing problems have led to dangerous conditions, not just for our staff, which we all are concerned about, but for the inmates. I would implore you to read the Inspector General's report. I would implore you to speak to someone who is on the Judiciary Committee and attended this hearing, that would include colleagues that you're comfortable with talking about these Judiciary Committee issues and the hearing. I was impressed. I can't tell you the commitment. We are lucky to have the people who have stuck around. We are lucky to have the people who have stuck around because they are sacrificing a family life. They are in many-- in some cases working 24 hours a day. One lieutenant told me or told the committee they are concerned when they assign people to their posts that they are assigning them to an area where they might get hurt. There was one particular member who told us that she was assaulted in a galley. She did not get help in a timely fashion. She was beaten. She hasn't been able to go back to work since October because of the physical and emotional injuries. We have a crisis and I-- it's not enough for the Judiciary Committee to listen to these people. We must demand that something be done, demand that something be done. We have people that are not compensated the way they need to be. We have a--

HUGHES: One minute.

LATHROP: Pardon me?

HUGHES: One minute.

LATHROP: We have a payment structure that is not incentivizing people to join and, more importantly, a payment structure that's not incentivizing people to stay. They are leaving in droves. And we are at a point where if nothing happens, we don't do something as a state, we're going to need the National Guard to intervene and man posts. It shouldn't come to that. This was a problem before COVID. This is not the department's trying to compete with a diner or with Walmart. This was a problem before COVID. It has gotten worse. And we are lucky to have committed officers who have stuck around and stayed because they believe in the mission. Their fellow officers are family. Colleagues, we need to do something. We need to do something. And if we don't, we are going to have people get hurt in there, not just inmate on inmate, it's going to involve our staff--

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

LATHROP: --in that facility. Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Lathrop. Senator Wishart, you're recognized.

WISHART: Thank you, Mr. President. I yield my time to Senator Hansen.

HUGHES: Senator Ben Hansen, 4:45. Senator Matt Hansen, I'm assuming.

M. HANSEN: I would assume, too. Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you, Senator Wishart. And thank you all. And let me just acknowledge and I'm very appreciative of Senator Lathrop and for bringing up that point on the floor and for the entire Judiciary Committee for sitting and listening on that. That's been an issue, yes, before COVID, it's been an issue through much of my tenure in the Legislature. And unfortunately, it's a continuing issue that is becoming a safety crisis for employees, if, if, if nothing else, and I hope we get that resolved soon. With that being said, I know we're approaching the end and there's a little bit of just making sure we get to 6:50. And I know a little bit of this is kind of perfunctory at this point. But I do want to talk about the continued goal of redistricting. We're talking about one person, one vote, and that's kind of related to other concepts that are kind of not necessarily, you know, written down, they're not in the constitution. But one of the other concepts in kind of core American values, core American democracy is kind of majority rule with minority rights. And that's embodied everywhere from the First Amendment, you know, freedom of speech and throughout the constitution and throughout a lot of our norms and institutions such that, you know, generally, you know, you get to the point where if you get 50 percent plus one of the vote, you will win the election. If you get 50 percent plus one of a legislative body, you would get to control and you get to do what you want. Obviously, some rules and norms have caveats to them. And I bring that up to say that's related to why communities of interest are important and one of the things we have to keep focusing on. Because it's intent to, you know, not crack a significant minority population, whether that's a geographic, whether that's political, whether that's racial or ethnic, but a core group that would ordinarily be an important group to keep the same, to have the same local government or local government district apply to them. And it's fundamentally this, this is the issue is we-- even though we're a democracy, even though normally when you get 50 percent plus one of the vote, you win, there are certain things, you know, baked into the Constitution, baked into our norms and traditions that are there are certain minority rights that you cannot infringe upon. And political rights and really the right to participate in democracy get to a core of that. And that's fundamentally, I think, why courts

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

are sometimes so skeptical of redistricting maps that don't have good reasons or rationales for splitting up clearly defined groups or deviating from normal history. Because we recognize all the way back to, you know, our founding this right of minority, specifically, minority political parties, minority political perspectives to have a point and, and a place in our democracy and deserve some protections. And it might not necessarily get to set their own policy, but they get to exist and they get to advocate for themselves. And whether-- and splitting them up, cracking them or packing them intentionally or unintentionally--

HUGHES: One minute.

M. HANSEN: --is the problem. Thank you, Mr. President. And so that's where we get to and that's where we look at in redistricting and part of the reason redistricting is so important. You know, it's one of the few institutions that we as a body get to do because of the Constitution. You know, there's very few-- if you read the Constitution-- it's Constitution Day, everybody, if you read the Constitution, it's very brief and sets out some broad strokes. And one of the few things that it expressly says is the census, the enumeration clause, the census every ten years and redistricting following that. And that's tied to the ideas of core democracy that some of our founders laid down. And part of the reason that I'm glad we get a special session to give it its own deserved focus and scrutiny. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Pansing Brooks, you're recognized.

PANSING BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise, too, to speak briefly about what we saw at the hearing. Well, it wasn't a hearing. It was a listening session for the, the workers and the staff at the prison. I've written down, we had, we had almost 50 testifiers who came. And I, I want to just read some of, of what I-- what we heard that day. And again, I think, colleagues, we all have to listen to this and, and recognize the fact, which, of course, no one's listening right now. We have to-- oh, some people are. Some of my friends are over there. Anyway, what's important is the, the Inspector General did come out and say that one of the options is to call in the National Guard. Are you listening? The National Guard. We are being told by the Inspector General and by staff at the prison that they need the National Guard. They don't need to be going down to Texas, the National Guard is needed here in our prisons because we do not have the capacity. We do not have the number of, of staff members, of guards, of correctional officers to take care of our prisons. That's

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

probably one of the most shocking things that has come to our attention and been recommended to us in the whole time in, in this Legislature. The people that are protecting us from the people that we are most scared of are telling us they cannot do it anymore and that the National Guard needs to be called out to supplement their work. And meanwhile, we need to be talking about buying-- building a new prison. Senator McKinney wisely asked every single person who testified, do you think we need to build a new prison? Well, a number of them thought a new prison was, was important to build. And because, of course, the State Pen is, is getting quite outdated. But if you-- if he then-- if any of us asked, then, well, do you think we need to build a new prison if we keep the staff as, as we have them? No one thought a new prison needed to be built. We need new staff. We need additional staff members. And again, some of it has worked to pay more. But then we've got problems that are coming in because when we pay more to the new people that are coming in, the people that are already there that have seniority are getting, are getting bumped down. They don't get as much. And, and so we aren't rewarding seniority. So it's a total mess right now. It is not working. I, I want to read a couple of things. Jerry Brittain from the FOP talked about the fact of how proud he was because over half of the Nebraska State Pen staff was there, that he was awestruck. They've been working 16-- one person said 25 hours. So Senator Lathrop's right. But one person actually said he had to work 25 hours. So 16 to 25 hours and they come to inform us so that we can do our duty to take care of these people. And this isn't just about taking care of inmates, this is about taking care of our communities. Because if there's not enough staff and there's a prison outbreak,--

HUGHES: One minute.

PANSING BROOKS: --something happens like that, this is our fault. This, this lies with us and the Governor and the, the executive branch, but this comes to our doorstep. They talked about 4,100 staff are impacted. And but then they said that's not quite true because it's also affecting their families. One woman talked about the fact that she lost custody in our supposed, quote, pro-life state. She lost custody of her child because her schedule cannot be counted on. She, she cannot be a reliable parent because the prisons don't have a normal schedule to allow her to keep custody or joint custody of her child. That's what our pro-life state is doing to our children in Nebraska. I'm upset about it. They were very upset about it. They say they keep coming to us and we all pass it down the road.

HUGHES: Time, Senator.

PANSING BROOKS: Thank you.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Pansing Brooks. Senator Matt Hansen, you're recognized.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I was talking about the census the last time on the mike and obviously this is the foundational constitutional requirement that underlays all of redistricting. And obviously, we're here in September, the census didn't necessarily go as planned, in part because 2020 didn't go as planned for really anyone. But that might be the understatement of session so far. But nonetheless, that is why we're here and that's why we're going to do this. But the census is, you know, relied a lot on a lot of local and community groups to impact and to encourage participation and so we have accurate and reporting data. Nebraska, unfortunately, was one of the few states that did not have a statewide complete count committee. That was legislation I had championed and we didn't get it done. And nonetheless, we still had one of the best census response rates. The city of Lincoln especially stood out as well. And I'm really appreciate for that. And I'm really appreciative to our local leaders, our local complete count committees at the county or city level all across the state that really championed and pushed this. Because at the fundamental day, end of the day, you know, making sure we have an accurate notion of where people in the state live, how many people live in the state is important for redistricting, certainly. It's also so important for the apportionment of federal funds, both within the state and between the states. It's so important for so many different metrics. And thank you to everybody who worked on the census, who volunteered for the census, or a complete count committee. And thank you for everybody for, for participating. And please get ready to do it again in nine and a half years [INAUDIBLE] where we're at. And I bring up all this to say is, again, this is kind of a fundamental and solemn responsibility a little bit in the sense that this is, again, one of the few things that we are doing that is baked in and directly tied to the Constitution. This is a direct charge that, you know, James Madison and all those others wrote down in Philadelphia for us to do for the states to decide redistricting every ten years following the actual enumeration of such persons. And it's important for us to do. And part of the reason that we have this is then to do it accurately. You know, this ties into even just, you know, the great compromise of, you know, the Virginia plan versus the New Jersey plan of big and small states having different representation in the United States Congress, why we have a bicameral Congress, why the Senate is such a unique body, why we get the exact same number of senators as every other state, but we

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

hang out with three members of the House of Representatives because, you know, an advocate for proportional representation of the states balanced with representation of the states of the whole. And I think that's important for us to recognize. I'm also very appreciative Nebraska, thankfully, has grown and continue to grow. You know, I think about every ten years looking forward, we're worried we're going to lose the 3rd Congressional District and then we grow enough to not be close or not lose it, which is good and absolutely excited to see Nebraska continue to grow. Looking forward to us officially crossing 2 million soon. But, you know, you can just imagine the impact if this was a session where we had lost a congressional district and we're trying to have all of this debate with all the frustration of losing a congressional district and drastically shifting our maps, as other states are certainly doing either now or in January when they get to their redistricting. Ultimately, again, fundamentally, this is an issue about kind of the core tenets of democracy: one person, one vote, majority rule with minority rights, making sure that people's--

HUGHES: One minute.

M. HANSEN: --right to the political process is understood, is supported, is championed, and they have the opportunity to discuss and to debate and to effectively choose their representation, both here in the Legislature, we're going to get to Public Service Commission, and, obviously, today we're talking about members of the House of Representatives. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Hunt, you're recognized.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Good evening, Nebraskans. I rise in support of the recommit to committee. LB1 is not the bill that was supported by most Nebraskans, and it's certainly not supported by most of my constituents in LD 8 or in Congressional District 2. There was extensive testimony to that effect at all three of the hearings that we had over the past week and the feedback that I've gotten from all of our constituents is also to that effect. I am in support of AM12. I'll vote for that because that essentially puts LB2-- and replaces LB1 with LB2, which is a map that most of my constituents find much more fair, much more fairly drawn, and is a great starting point for us to continue to collaborate and compromise and work. I also want to thank the press who has been here all day under the balcony. The only way that the second house can find out what's going on in here is if they can follow what we're doing through the journalists that, that follow what we do and the media through the newspapers and TV and social media. I've, I've seen folks here from a few social media outlets. That's how the people actually find out what it is that we're

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

doing down here. And I know it's been a long day for them, too, and a long week for them. And it's because of their work that the second house is able to follow what we're doing. And I don't think that that should go unrecognized. The things that I didn't like about this process are that we did not actively engage our Native American reservations in Nebraska. LB1 cuts the Winnebago Reservation in a way that doesn't really make a lot of sense when we talk about the core of a community. Native communities can absolutely be seen as communities of interest. Oftentimes we see, especially in Nebraska, sometimes in those communities, they get left behind so much by the state and so much by, you know, us here in the body, then we need to take responsibility for that. And for us to divide their district the way that LB1 does is further disadvantaging them in a state where they're already left behind so often. The other thing that I really didn't like about this process is the way we're doing prison apportionment. I know we had a hearing scheduled on Senator McKinney's LB15 this morning and it was a last-minute hearing and not all the members were present and the public didn't really have the opportunity to organize and prepare for it. But this is an issue that we've spoken about in this Legislature that we have had hearings on and that's the idea that when incarcerated people are counted in their prisons instead of the communities that they plan to return to in Nebraska, for Nebraskan incarcerated people. What we're really doing is using the bodies of inmates to-- for political gain without giving them any representation or any vote. We got a little quiet when I said that, and I think that that's really wrong. That's a process that we have to end. Whether we do that through legislation or whether we can put an amendment on one of these maps that says we can, we can request that data so that we get that accurately done. We know that other states do this and there are organizations in Nebraska who have been working on this for a long time. And it's something that we need to do because to count incarcerated people in their prison instead of the communities that they're planning to return to, we mess up the data, we mess up the process,--

HUGHES: One minute.

HUNT: --and we aren't actually able to give them the representation. And not just those incarcerated people, but the other people in that community where the prison is located. And that apportionment issue is a problem in Nebraska, given that it's unlikely that we will resolve this before we pass these maps in this special session. This is an issue that we're going to have to work on for 2030. And I'm sorry to those incarcerated individuals who will continue to not have representation because of that, that practice. And I do hope that we

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

continue to work on enfranchisement for those incarcerated people so that elected officials like us actually have to care about them as a voting block, because I think that would really change the culture we have here in Nebraska for the better. Thank you, Mr. President.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I don't know if this-- well, it doesn't matter if it's my last turn or not. I think I'm the last one probably that's going to speak for the night. So I appreciate members of the Judiciary Committee bringing light-- to light the conversations that they had at their committee hearing earlier this week. I know that it was a very long and arduous day. In addition to participating in redistricting, three members-- four, four members of the Judiciary Committee, maybe more, are also on the Redistricting Committee and they went until at least 11:00 p.m. on Judiciary on Wednesday night listening to the people that take care of our Corrections. And it was, it was heartbreaking to hear the stories and I am grateful to them for being there to listen and receive that information. And I do plan to take Senator Lathrop up on, on his challenge to read the Inspector General's report. I know that the Inspector General was distributing reports today. So I am looking forward to-- well, probably I wouldn't say I'm looking forward to, I'm intending to read it. I'm sure it will, it will be an eye-opening account of what we are doing. And if our Inspector General is calling for the National Guard to come in, I hope that we as a legislative body can take that call to action serious and, and do something because I, I believe that the employees of the state deserve us to take their safety into the highest account in our work. We are responsible for them as they are responsible for our inmates and it is unfortunate that the situation has gotten to the place that it is. Senator Lathrop and I think perhaps also Senator Pansing Brooks pointed out earlier that this staffing crisis is not because of COVID. It, like everything else, has been exasperated because of COVID. But they were already having a staffing crisis prior to COVID and building a new prison is not going to fix that. We will not miraculously have more employees working in Corrections. So we have to stop turning a blind eye to this and we need to start addressing the problems. We need to address the systemic problems that lead to mass incarceration and recidivism. And we need to address the problems within our employment policies and processes and how much we pay these individuals that really do put their lives on the line. I know that if we had more time this evening, I would, I would probably ask our

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

colleague, Senator Blood, to, to yield to talk more about her experience, but I think-- well, if-- how much time do I have?

HUGHES: 1:30.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. Senator Blood, do you have-- would you yield?

BLOOD: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: Is there anything that you'd like to add as a former Corrections staff member?

BLOOD: I can tell you that the conversations that I'm hearing on this floor, and I want to point out that I worked maximum security men's institution, right, boots on the ground, that the conversations we're having aren't any different than the conversations we had in the '80s and '90s when I worked there. And I think that that's unfortunate. So the issues that you talk about, the systemic issues,--

HUGHES: One minute.

BLOOD: --are not new issues. And so my concern with everything that I'm hearing isn't that we're not going to try and fix it, it's that why didn't we try and fix it decades ago when this first started? I was literally just telling someone a story of when they closed down the gymnasium at LCC and put 150 inmates in bunk beds and one control-- and one officer. And the only way out was to go up three, three steps to the exit door.

M. CAVANAUGH: Wow.

BLOOD: And all you had was your radio. There's a lot of stories we can tell. If we have late nights and we want to talk about it, happy to share them with you.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you so much for doing that. And thank you for that work. That's very, very challenging indeed. And I am sure as we go through this redistricting process and we have opportunities for conversation, I'll be coming back to you, Senator Blood. Thank you.

BLOOD: Happy to share.

M. CAVANAUGH: I think that I'm about out of time, so I will yield the remainder of my time to the chair.

HUGHES: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh and Senator Blood. Mr. Clerk, you have a motion on the desk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

CLERK: I do, Mr. President. Senator Linehan would move to invoke cloture pursuant to Rule 7, Section 10.

HUGHES: It is the ruling of the chair, there has been full and fair debate afforded to LB1. Senator Linehan, for what purpose do you rise?

LINEHAN: I'd like a call of the house. A record vote in regular order.

HUGHES: There has been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed to vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 35 [SIC 36] ayes, 3 nays to place the house under call.

HUGHES: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel, please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senators Slama, Bostar, McDonnell, Brewer, Ben Hansen, and Halloran, the house is under call. Members, the first vote is the motion to invoke cloture. There's been a request for a roll call vote in regular order. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Aguilar voting yes. Senator Albrecht voting yes. Senator Arch voting yes. Senator Blood voting no. Senator Bostar voting no. Senator Bostelman voting yes. Senator Brandt voting yes. Senator Brewer voting yes. Senator Briese voting yes. Senator John Cavanaugh voting no. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting no. Senator Clements voting yes. Senator Day. Senator DeBoer voting no. Senator Dorn voting yes. Senator Erdman voting yes. Senator Flood voting yes. Senator Friesen voting yes. Senator Geist voting yes. Senator Gragert voting yes. Senator Groene voting yes. Senator Halloran voting yes. Senator Ben Hansen voting yes. Senator Matt Hansen voting no. Senator Hilgers voting yes. Senator Hilkemann voting yes. Senator Hughes voting yes. Senator Hunt voting no. Senator Kolterman not voting. Senator Lathrop voting no. Senator Lindstrom voting yes. Thank you. Senator Linehan voting yes. Senator Lowe voting yes. Senator McCollister voting no. Senator McDonnell voting no. Senator McKinney voting no. Senator Morfeld voting no. Senator Moser voting yes. Senator Murman voting yes. Senator Pahls not voting. Senator Pansing Brooks voting no. Senator Sanders voting yes. Senator Slama voting yes. Senator Stinner voting yes. Senator Vargas voting no. Senator Walz voting no. Senator Wayne voting no. Senator Williams voting yes. Senator Wishart voting no. 29 ayes, 16 nays-- or 17 nays on the motion to invoke cloture.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate September 17, 2021

HUGHES: The motion to invoke cloture fails. Mr. Clerk for items.

CLERK: Mr. President,--

HUGHES: I raise the call.

CLERK: Mr. President, a series of amendments to be printed with respect to LB1. And a priority motion, Senator Pahls would move to adjourn the body until Monday morning, September 20, at 12:00 p.m., 12:00 p.m.

HUGHES: Colleagues, you've all heard the motion to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Opposed nay. We are adjourned.