

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

May 14, 2001

LB 851

the map, it appears that Senator Bromm has moved, let's see, one, two...he's moved two counties and split two counties, and that kind of doesn't follow with our redistricting resolution that we unanimously adopted. Another element, number four on page 2: district boundaries shall define districts that are easily identifiable, understandable to voters and preserve the cores of prior districts. Now, as it relates to Sarpy County, that is the only...the only county in the entire state that has to be split just by the sheer number of the population growth in Douglas and Sarpy County. If you...if you look at the map and you look at the numbers from the state, as the whole, the only county that we necessarily have to split is Sarpy County, so then it just becomes a function of where do you split it. And following along, like I said, with the legislative resolution, boundaries shall define districts easily identifiable, understandable. If you look at the committee amendment, which is AM1876, and go to page 2 and just kind of...just kind of look at the differences between the split in Sarpy in the committee amendment, AM1876, and then the split between the Bromm House proposal, AM1993, and as you can see we clearly...or as you can see, the Bromm proposal has clearly violated, in my opinion, the legislative resolution that we have adopted. Another point here, if a city, county...or, excuse me, if a county, city or village must be divided, the division must be made along clearly recognizable boundaries as described by census geography. And if you look carefully at the Bromm map, it seems to me, I've heard talk from other Sarpy County individuals, that this map has split school districts, the Papillion School District. I know that part of the Bellevue School District is not in this. So we haven't, again, we haven't honored clearly recognizable boundaries as defined by census geography. Another point in the resolution is in drawing district boundaries, no consideration shall be, let's see, given to demographic information other than population figures, results of previous elections, et cetera, et cetera. So, again, I haven't had time to look at the Bromm proposal because I just saw it as we only had one copy of it, but it clearly seems to violate several of the provisions found in the legislative resolution that we have adopted and the committee amendment seems to make more sense. It's concise. The deviation is well within the acceptable range. It's one-half of one percent. The ideal district is roughly 570,100