

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

[LB973 LR289CA]

The Executive Board of the Legislative Council met at 12:00 p.m. on Thursday, February 1, 2018, in Room 2102 of the State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska. Senators present: Dan Watermeier, Chairperson; John Kuehn, Vice Chairperson; Kate Bolz; Sue Crawford; and John McCollister. Senators absent: Ernie Chambers; Dan Hughes; Tyson Larson; Jim Scheer; and John Stinner.

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Welcome to the Executive Board Committee. My name is Dan Watermeier from Syracuse and I represent the 1st Legislative District, serve as the Executive Board Chair. Our hearing today is your public part of the legislative process and your opportunity to express your position on proposed legislation before us today. The committee members may come and go during the hearing. We get called away for various reasons. It is not an indication we are not interested in the bill being heard today. It's just part of the process. To better facilitate today's proceedings, I ask you abide by a couple procedures. Please silence or turn off your cell phone. The order of testimony will be the introducer, proponents, opponents, neutral, and then closing. If you are testifying, please make sure you fill out the green testifier sheet; and they are located outside in the entrance in the other room. When you come up to testify, please hand the green paper and handouts to the page. Please state and spell your name for the record at the start of your testimony. Each testifier will have five minutes to speak. After four, you'll get the yellow light. And at the end of five, you'll get a red one. I'll ask you to close it up. If you will not be testifying but want to go on the record as having a position on a bill, there is a white sheet in the back of the room. Please fill that out and leave it with your name on it. Written materials may be distributed to committee members while testimony is being offered. Hand these to the page when you come up and we will need 12 copies. If you have written testimony but do not have 12 copies, please raise your hand and the page will help you. I'd like to make you aware of a new policy we actually introduced this year and all the committees are trying to do the same thing and have our written testimony that you want into the record by 5:00 the day before. Otherwise, we will not be able to get it into the record. To my immediate right is legal counsel, Janice Satra; to my left is committee clerk, Laura Olson. And with that, I'll have members introduce themselves and we barely have a quorum. Senator McCollister.

SENATOR MCCOLLISTER: John McCollister, District 20.

SENATOR BOLZ: Senator Kate Bolz, District 29.

SENATOR KUEHN: John Kuehn, District 38.

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Good afternoon. Sue Crawford, District 45.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

SENATOR WATERMEIER: And helping us today is Heather Bentley from Miller, Nebraska. Thank you. With that, we will open the hearing on LB973. Senator Krist. Oh, I'm sorry. Did I get out of order? Excuse me, LR289. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: (Exhibit 1) Good afternoon, Chair Watermeier, members of the Executive Board Committee. For the record, my name is Bob Krist, B-o-b K-r-i-s-t. I represent the 10th Legislative District in northwest Omaha, along with north-central portions of Douglas County, which includes the city of Bennington. I appear before you today in introduction and support of LR289CA. LR289CA is a resolution to amend Article III, Section 5 and add two new sections, Sections 31 and 32, to Article III. Section 31 states that the Legislature shall not draw boundaries for a legislative district which intentionally favors or disfavors an incumbent or a political party; intentionally denies racial or language minorities equal proportion to participate in the political process or intentionally diminish their ability to elect representatives of their choice. Section 31 also states that the Legislature shall draw boundaries for a district which creates a contiguous and compact district. It would also create a district as nearly equal to population as practical to all the legislative districts and where feasible create a district using existing political and geographic boundaries. Section 32 does the same for the congressional districts. Now what I just capsulized in layman's terms are most of the federal requirements in the process itself. It is a process that we're supposed to follow. And when you turn it over, those of you who will be here for redistricting, my experience was that that went to our Legislative Research Office. They are the key. They are the role. They will give the Legislature the rules. You'll form a committee. That committee will then go out and try to draw some lines. The computer will do that in the Legislative Research function. This CA simply puts into the constitution what I think is the most fair and reasonable way for us to approach redistricting. What I've handed out to you is the language that I would propose. It is simple, single subject which is required for constitutions. The proposed amendment shall be submitted to the electors in a manner prescribed by the Constitution of Nebraska with the following ballot language: A constitutional amendment to provide, change, and eliminate standards for drawing boundaries of legislative districts and provide standards for drawing boundaries of congressional districts. It is that simple. So I would ask for your support, and I would like you to put this on the floor. I think it's worth a discussion. I think the discussion will lead potentially to gearing up people and understanding that one of the most important things that we do is drawing those lines. And they should be done within the federal guidelines but also fairly and emphasize that--fairly--within the legislative process. I am a proponent of keeping the redistricting process in the Legislature. There are many other proposals out there. I think that we need to keep it within the legislative process. Those are my words. Thank you for listening. [LR289CA]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: All right. Very good. Questions from the committee? Senator Bolz, you didn't have your hand up? Senator Crawford. [LR289CA]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you, Chair Watermeier. And thank you, Senator Krist. So as I understand the amendment, the amendment was very simple. That's what will actually...oh, here it is. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: That language is, yes, yes, ma'am. That's what the voters will see and yea or nay, yes or no. [LR289CA]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: So the amendment: A constitutional amendment to provide, change, and eliminate standards...I guess I'm trying to understand when they are looking at voting for this what they will understand...what are we providing, changing, or eliminating? [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: There currently is an introduction in the constitution on how this happens. It's a procedural issue. So what 31 and 32 are going to say, what the voters will see when they go to the ballot: A constitutional amendment to provide, change, and eliminate standards for drawing boundaries of legislative districts and provide standards for drawing boundaries of congressional districts. When they vote yes, if they vote yes in a majority, then it comes back to the Legislature for the enabling part of this whole thing. [LR289CA]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: To define what that would be. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: Correct. This by itself is the people speaking and saying this is what we need and then it comes back to the Legislature for action. [LR289CA]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: You bet. [LR289CA]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: I guess I just have a procedural question. This is needed over just a resolution like ballot initiative or something like that. I mean, this strictly would have...this is the only way to do what you are trying to accomplish. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: I believe so. [LR289CA]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: I mean it probably is. [LR289CA]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

SENATOR KRIST: I believe it is. In talking with Legislative Research and with other "experts," they felt that this actually putting it into the constitution is the only way to get it done.
[LR289CA]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Okay. Thank you. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: You bet. [LR289CA]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Further questions? Yeah. [LR289CA]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you, Chair Watermeier. And thank you, Senator Krist. So is your concern about the original language that it's more than one subject? Is that why you were concerned? Or why go from the detailed language in the first bill to the simple language?
[LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: Well, the bill itself says that that's what we're going to do. It outlines what we're going to do. I'm just giving you an example of what was recommended as the language that would actually go on the ballot. So the bill is very precise in saying it has to be single subject; it has to...all those kind of things. And that's supportable in terms of what goes to the floor. When it goes to the floor, someone could say, no, that's not clear enough and then that amendment would be changed because you're basically voting on what you're telling the electorate to do...
[LR289CA]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Um-hum. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ...the election commissioners, and how it would appear on the ballot.
[LR289CA]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you. [LR289CA]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Senator McCollister. [LR289CA]

SENATOR MCCOLLISTER: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. How does the language differ from what's already in statute or the constitution? [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: Well, the statute covers the way we go about redistricting as it currently sits. The constitution is pretty much silent on how that's supposed to happen. And so we're governed

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

by federal law. In other words, a population or minority base cannot change by a certain percentage. It has to be as compact. There's so many rules involved on the federal level to guide us down the road, but nothing in the constitution really speaks to how this process would work. [LR289CA]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Are the...what you proposed more stringent than the federal rules? [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: It would remind us that there are rules that we would take into place and that's why the language is conditionally vague in terms of saying we'll change or we'll adjust or we'll do what we need to do, but these parameters will always be sacred. And that is, it will be done fairly in this way and this way. [LR289CA]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Thank you. [LR289CA]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Further questions? Senator Kuehn. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KUEHN: Thank you. Senator Krist, I have one question just for you to think about. One of the reasons, as it was explained to me, that the constitution is silent on the issue of redistricting is that there are federal constitutional requirements and that the potential for vague language in the constitution then opens the possibility of essentially endless legal challenges to any redistricting map, whether they seem fair or not. I absolutely 100 percent support the concepts that are outlined for fair and efficient redistricting. As a matter of practice, are we then potentially establishing a situation in which continual litigation about district maps prevents effective redistricting at any point in time? [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: You're asking me for my opinion. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KUEHN: Yes. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: And from what I saw going through the process before, most of our guidance came from the federal government. Most of our actions were internal in terms of statute, and they really could have been challenged at any point as it existed. I don't think this makes it any more of a challenge of primers. I believe that it sets the constitution in place. And it will end the discussion on whose responsibility it is and how we do it because it will be in the constitution in terms of moving forward. With...and we've had discussions like this before, with term limits and different ideas and people changing their mind and moving back and forth, if the

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

constitution says this is what we're going to do, I think that's what we'll do and then internally the statutes could change. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KUEHN: So a second follow-up question: The language specifically addresses legislative redistricting and congressional redistricting, but there's a whole other redistricting process that takes place in Nebraska of our local political subdivisions. I would argue that we have a whole lot of one man, one vote issues in the redistricting... [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: Right. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KUEHN: ...that's happening locally. And so some of the characteristics of good redistricting that I see such as not favoring an incumbent and things like that I think we all know that when public power districts and others redistrict there's an expressed intent sometimes to preserve and protect the district of an incumbent. So why not include all redistricting that takes place in the state and just limit it in the...if we're going to take the constitutional step on the principles of redistricting, why not extend that to all political subdivisions and make clear that there's an expectation that standards of redistricting will happen from top to bottom in this state? [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: I would have no problem extending that across the board and setting that standard in the constitution because I think it's the right thing to do. I wanted to focus on the legislative process, the statutes, the Legislature, and the districts. You've all heard war stories. People were intentionally drawn out of districts and people were intentionally drawn into their district and a little fishhook here, a little fishhook there. But that clearly would change if it were in the constitution. So I agree with you wholeheartedly. I just wanted to be very simple in terms of an initial step for our constitution. [LR289CA]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: All right. Further questions? All right. Thank you, Senator Krist. [LR289CA]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you very much. [LR289CA]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: (Exhibit 2) We will open up the testimony for proponents of LR289, constitutional amendment. Seeing none, is there any in the opposition to LR289? Anyone in the neutral? All right. Seeing none, Senator Krist to close. Senator Krist closes, excuse me, waives...oh, I'm sorry. We do have one to read into the record. We have a letter in support from Danielle Conrad of the ACLU in support of. All right. [LR289CA]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you for your attention, appreciate it. [LR289CA]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: So that will close LR289, the constitutional amendment, and open LB973. Senator Crawford. [LR289CA]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: (Exhibit 1) Good afternoon, Chairman Watermeier and members of the Executive Board. For the record, my name is Sue Crawford, S-u-e C-r-a-w-f-o-r-d, and I represent the 45th Legislative District of Bellevue, Offutt, and eastern Sarpy County. And I'm honored to be here today to introduce LB973 for your consideration. LB973 would require that state-issued redistricting software purchased by the Legislature be used to create any map that is part of a legislative bill or an amendment to a legislative bill introduced for the purpose of redrawing district boundaries. Currently Rule 3, Section 6(f) provides that the Redistricting Committee shall adopt substantial and procedural guidelines to guide the Legislature's redistricting process. In the past, the Legislative Redistricting Committee created by the Legislature has adopted guidelines stating that all plans submitted to the committee or proposed as amendments to the floor must be created on or verified by the Legislature's primary geographic information system in order to ensure the plans conform to the consensus, geography, and population figures being used by the Legislature for redistricting. Most recently and in 2001 and 2011, these guidelines were adopted by the Redistricting Committee. LB973 will codify this guideline that has been used in the past into state statute and will ensure all maps that are debated on the floor have undergone expertise and scrutiny of the Legislative Research Office. This is critical because the review process conducted by the Legislative Research Office ensures that the maps have the correct number of districts, no unassigned blocks or precincts, no noncontiguous districts, no unlawful dilution of voting strength of minority populations, no shape suggesting inappropriate racial, ethnic, or political gerrymander in districts that are single-member districts, and no cities or villages that are unnecessarily split. It is also important to note that the redistricting data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau and used by the LRO to draw all maps does not consider any data on political party affiliation, pass voting record, or socioeconomic status. Although nothing in the previous guidelines or this bill requires a senator make changes to their map suggested by the LRO to be in compliance with state and constitutional standards, the verification process will allow for an assessment of every map introduced and provide an avenue for the independent Research Office to advise the Redistricting Committee on the shortcomings and legal implications if such a map were to pass. Without codifying this guideline in statute, it's possible that a future Redistricting Committee could omit this guideline, making it possible for maps drawn by outside stakeholders that conflict with legal redistricting requirements to be debated without review by the Legislative Research Office. Without this pass-through, it could be easier for maps to hit the floor that could be challenged in the courts. Recent events in North Carolina have shown how difficult and costly this court process could be if approved maps are legally challenged. A North Carolina newspaper reported to that date "The general assembly has spent almost \$5.6 million defending against a

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

continuing series of lawsuits attacking the legislature's most recent redistricting efforts." I brought with me an amendment that would create a stronger safeguard against redistricting maps that do not follow state and federal guidelines for passing the Legislature. This language would be added to the end of the bill to require that any breach of these laws or guidelines identified during the LRO process would have to be addressed before the bill could be debated on the floor. I'll distribute that. I'll let the page distribute that amendment. Thank you. As we approach the next redistricting cycle, it's critical that the Legislature contemplate innovative approaches to ensure the equity and integrity of this integral democratic process. LB973 allows for utilization of existing state resources to strengthen the process already in place. The guidelines being codified by LB973 have led the Legislature in past redistricting cycles and ensuring adherence to these guidelines as well as state constitutional requirements is the commonsense reform that protects this important process. And I thank you for your attention to this important issue, and I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: All right. Thank you, Senator Crawford. Questions from the committee? Senator McCollister. [LB973]

SENATOR MCCOLLISTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What kind of software exists for the state to utilize in this effort? [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: I don't know the name of the software that we have right now (inaudible). We have the software in place and this ensures...the intent is to ensure that any map is confirmed with our existing Legislative Research Office and their software. [LB973]

SENATOR MCCOLLISTER: Has it been utilized before? [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: We have in the past. I don't know if they're going to use the same software they utilized in the past, but this standard of requiring that it's confirmed has been done in the past. So...and that I think raises one of my concerns about whether this goes far enough is that similar to a standard used in the past. And so there were still consultant's maps brought in that were redrawn with the software. So it doesn't prevent that as much as I was hoping it would do, but it does ensure that they meet standards, the guidelines. [LB973]

SENATOR MCCOLLISTER: Thank you. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you. [LB973]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

SENATOR WATERMEIER: I might just interject. I think what happened in 2011 was they didn't have the software inside of Research. They went to the CIO's office and there was collaboration there, but it was back and forth, back and forth. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Oh, okay, just for the record to clarify that. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: And so then they hired somebody, a GIS specialist in Research. But I think that spot is open right now. [LB973]

JANICE SATRA: She's leaving. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Yeah, she's leaving, okay. So that may be part of the puzzle too. But I get what you're doing on your bill. I get it so. All right. Good question. Anything else? Any other questions? All right. Oh, yeah, Senator Bolz. [LB973]

SENATOR BOLZ: This is just the first chance I've had to look at the amendment. Does the software give Legislative Research the tools that they need so that they could in fact certify that all constitutional and statutory standards could be met? I'm just wondering what we are asking of the staff of Legislative Research. Because if the software can verify that in some sort of formal way, then it's easy to ask Legislative Research to play that role. If it's more of a judgment call, I'm debating what the appropriate approach is. May be a question to ponder. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Oh, confirm that to check. It's my understanding is that the software is using data that confirms with constitutional statutory guidelines. And so they would be able to check that, whether or not the map meets those guidelines can be drawn meeting those guidelines. [LB973]

SENATOR BOLZ: Great. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Okay. Senator McCollister. [LB973]

SENATOR MCCOLLISTER: Yeah. Is this the same process that we had in 2011 (inaudible) different? [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: What my understanding is, is a similar standard was in place in 2011. You were saying... [LB973]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

SENATOR WATERMEIER: But I think it was the same standard but not done in-house. But what you're saying now with the bill is that...it goes a little further in that regard what you're doing I think. [LB973]

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: Thank you. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: All right. Further questions? All right. Thank you, Senator Crawford. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Yeah. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: We'll open the floor up for proponents of LB973. Welcome. Come on up. [LB973]

GAVIN GEIS: (Exhibit 2) Senator Watermeier, members of the Executive Board, my name is Gavin Geis, G-a-v-i-n G-e-i-s, and I'm the executive director of Common Cause Nebraska. Common Cause supports LB973. I will be brief. The majority of what I have to say is right there in front of you. The few things I have to say, first of all, our main support for this is that it would create a pretty comprehensive public record of the maps. And that's something that in 2011, even with the outside process, even if it was codified in the process, you didn't get. It was there but being codified actually in statute and being in the Legislative Research Office you would get a more full process and a deeper record we believe, we would hope, and with staff that you can know and trust; people you can go in and talk to, that you could work with, and that you could rely on; people that we work with and that we know and work with throughout the session, throughout the year, throughout the intervening period, throughout the intervening ten years between redistricting processes. When you have an outside agency doing these things, organizations like ours actually know these people and I would hope interested citizens know these people like the Research Office. The other thing that I will note, we work in the redistricting world. This is an issue I've been working on personally for the last two, three years. I've been working with staff that worked on this issue in 2011 and talking with staff that worked on this. And I can say at the very least they were unsettled by the number of outside maps that were thrown around during this period of time; the number of maps they saw introduced and the uncertainty that came along with those maps; the frankly fear that came along with not knowing what map was real and not real; and what was going to at the end of the day be a real map and not a real map; and who was going to codify that into an introduced map at the end of the day. So having this introduced into law, statute, I think would bring a level of certainty to staff and legislators and the public. So this could bring certainty to the process that a simple rule would not. Finally, right now is a period of debate about the redistricting process that we haven't seen in ten years. Right? We have four bills introduced this session, two previously, about redistricting.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

We're talking about it. So it's up in the air. And no matter what process we come down with, a bill like this will stick. This type of a bill matters. No matter if we have a system like Iowa's where the staff handles it, no matter if we just create a special committee like we've done in the past, or if we create an independent commission like Senator Murante or Harr are suggesting, this sort of a bill will work and be meaningful no matter what type of system we create. So what I'm trying to say is this has meaning no matter what we decide on. So I would encourage you to take this seriously and give it your full backing. This has real meat on its bones. It has meaning to all of Nebraska. Thank you. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Okay. Thank you for your testimony, Mr. Geis. Is it pronounced Geist? [LB973]

GAVIN GEIS: Geis. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Okay. All right. Questions from the committee? All right. Thank you for your testimony. [LB973]

GAVIN GEIS: Thank you. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: (Exhibits 3, 4) Anyone else as a proponent, LB973? Anyone in opposition? Anyone in a neutral capacity? All right. I do have two letters in support: John Else and Sherry Miller of the League of Women Voters in support; Danielle Conrad of the ACLU in support as well. So Senator Crawford to close. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you, Senator Watermeier, and just a couple of questions we were able to get...pull some answers to so. The current software is called AutoBound and again uses U.S. Census data. And so one of the...again, this codifies regulations that were in place in other years. But what it does do is requires that, especially with the amendment, requires that those maps actually meet these standards. So before they could verify or indicate whether or not they were meeting standards. In this case we're saying these maps must meet these standards to actually be a part of the process. And so that's, I think, part of the added protection that we have in place. And they do have checklists in terms of...in the Legislative Research Office in terms of meeting those requirements. They have been a part of meeting those before. But again, here we're asking that...ensuring that the maps are all drawn with that software with their data and that uses the U.S. Census data. And the important part there is that we're not using any previous political voting data and then also requiring that those maps meet those standards in order to actually be voted on and become a part of the process. So I urge your consideration and support and further conversation. [LB973]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

SENATOR WATERMEIER: I have a question if it's not too late to ask. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Yeah. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: This is naive in how this process works in redistricting and the maps. I think about a legislative bill and we came up with an amendment, it's very clear to the members and the public the language of the amendment, exactly what it does. Through all this conversation that we had in 2011, they had, were every one of these map options made available to the public at that point in time? Is that part of the process that they went through? I realize...I mean, I was obviously away from it, didn't know. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Right. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: There was a comment that somebody made in their testimony that made me think about that arrangement right there. Is that brought up just like an amendment is? I mean, I don't know how it worked. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Yeah. That's a very good question. I was not here to see what those amendments looked like, and we're ensuring that our focus here was really thinking about ensuring that any map that is an amendment goes through this process. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: And each amendment or proposed map would have a certification to know that we're actually looking at, voting on, discussing something that would pass muster so. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Right. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Senator McCollister. [LB973]

SENATOR MCCOLLISTER: Yeah. I'm just wondering if Mr. Geis has a copy of those maps that were considered in 2011, the various maps. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: I'm sorry. We got to make sure the questions would have to be directed to whoever is up here for the transcribers. So he could probably do that... [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Right. [LB973]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Executive Board Committee
February 01, 2018

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: I'll ask him. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Because we are in closing. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: And I'd be happy to...I'll follow up with that question... [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Okay. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: ...to bring back to the Executive Board what those amendments look like in terms of...because many of us on the board were not here in 2011. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: None of us, none. So yeah, that would be good. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: So sorry to interrupt your closing. Is that your closing? [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: No, that's fine. I'm happy to see what other questions people still have... [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: Okay. [LB973]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: ...that we make sure we address those as part of the conversation. Thank you. [LB973]

SENATOR WATERMEIER: All right. We'll close the hearing on LB973. And I did advertise to our members that we would go into Exec. I don't know if we have enough to do that. [LB973]