

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2022

SESSION OF 2022

206TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 4

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 11 a.m., e.s.t.

**THE SPEAKER (BRYAN CUTLER)
PRESIDING**

PRAYER

HON. CARRIE LEWIS DeROSSO, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thank you, Speaker Cutler.
I ask you to bow your heads.

Dear God, thank You for providing us with another day to serve the residents of this great Commonwealth. As we round out the first session week of 2022, we ask for Your guidance as we navigate issues – both big and small – for our constituents. Allow us to work through conflicts with grace. Allow us to work together for the greater good. We pray for the people who find time to use avenues publicly to express discord. We pray for the people and all the legislators to work together on the issues we have in this diverse Commonwealth. We pray for those to have humility, civility, and agree to disagree yet to be respectful of others' opinions.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by members and visitors.)

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, January 11, 2022, will be postponed until printed.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2240 By Representatives ROWE, BERNSTINE, GLEIM, HERSHEY, KEEFER, LEWIS, MAJOR, MILLARD, MUSTELLO and SMITH

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in certificate of title and security interests, further providing for certificate of salvage required, for transfer to vehicle salvage dealer and for transfer to scrap metal processor.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, January 11, 2022.

No. 2241 By Representatives NEILSON, DELLOSO, N. NELSON, GUENST, MALAGARI, McNEILL, JOZWIAK and WARREN

An Act amending Title 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Pennsylvania Game Commission, further providing for organization of commission and for meetings of commission.

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES, January 11, 2022.

No. 2242 By Representatives KEEFER, RYAN, MALONEY, BERNSTINE, JAMES, HAMM, STAMBAUGH, GROVE, COX, KAUFFMAN, MOUL, TWARDZIK, WARNER and ZIMMERMAN

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, in administrative organization, further providing for departmental administrative boards, commissions, and offices; in organization of departmental administrative boards and commissions and of advisory boards and commissions, further providing for advisory boards and commissions and repealing provisions relating to Environmental Quality Board; in powers and duties of the Department of Agriculture and its departmental administrative commission, further providing for seasonal farm labor; in powers and duties of the Department of Environmental Resources, its officers and departmental and advisory boards and commissions, further providing for Environmental Quality Board and for powers of Environmental Quality Board.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, January 11, 2022.

No. 2243 By Representatives STURLA, KINSEY, SCHLOSSBERG and WELBY

An Act amending Title 44 (Law and Justice) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for reduction of local police services.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, January 12, 2022.

No. 2244 By Representatives WEBSTER, KINSEY, HILL-EVANS, SANCHEZ, BURGOS, KENYATTA, McNEILL, HOHENSTEIN, DELLOSO, GUENST, GILLEN, CIRESI, NEILSON, O'MARA, DEASY, DRISCOLL, INNAMORATO and MADDEN

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for person with disability plate and placard.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, January 12, 2022.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM INDEPENDENT FISCAL OFFICE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker acknowledges receipt of several letters from the Independent Fiscal Office regarding requests for actuarial notes for HR 59, PN 618; HB 1875, PN 2126; HB 2010, PN 2310.

(Copies of communications are on file with the Journal clerk.)

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Located to the left of the rostrum, the Chair is pleased to welcome Representative Herrin's son, Andrew. He is a student at the University of the Arts in Philadelphia. Welcome. Thanks for joining us today.

Located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome three students from Dickinson College who are externing with Representative Klunk: Haethyr Johnson, Hana Vu, and Peter Dovganik. Welcome.

Located in the gallery, the Chair is pleased to welcome Melissa Cotter and her daughter, Layla Cotter. Layla is a 4-H Ambassador for Bucks County and an FFA (Future Farmers of America) committee chair at the Upper Bucks Technical School. With them are Patrick McTear and his stepson, David Dutertre, who is also a 4-H Ambassador for Bucks County, and they are the guests of Representative Staats. Welcome. Thank you for being here.

The Chair is about to take the master roll.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Turning to leaves of absence.

The Speaker recognizes the gentlewoman, the majority whip, who indicates that there are none. The Chair thanks the lady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, the Democratic whip, who indicates that there are none. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to take the master roll call. Members will proceed to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—201

Armanini	Frankel	Longjetti	Roae
Benham	Freeman	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Benninghoff	Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rothman
Bernstine	Galloway	Madden	Rowe
Bizzarro	Gaydos	Major	Rozzi
Boback	Gillen	Mako	Ryan
Bonner	Gillespie	Malagari	Sainato
Borowicz	Gleim	Maloney	Samuelson
Boyle	Gregory	Markosek	Sanchez
Bradford	Greiner	Marshall	Sankey

Briggs	Grove	Masser	Sappey
Brooks	Guenst	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, A.	Guzman	McClinton	Schemel
Brown, R.	Hamm	McNeill	Schlossberg
Bullock	Hanbidge	Mehaffie	Schmitt
Burgos	Harkins	Mentzer	Schroeder
Burns	Harris	Mercuri	Schweyer
Carroll	Heffley	Merski	Shusterman
Causer	Helm	Metcalfe	Silvis
Cephas	Hennessey	Metzgar	Sims
Ciresi	Herrin	Mihalek	Smith
Conklin	Hershey	Millard	Snyder
Cook	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Solomon
Cox	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Sonney
Cruz	Howard	Mizgorski	Staats
Culver	Innamorato	Moul	Stambaugh
Curry	Irvin	Mullery	Stephens
Daley	Isaacson	Mullins	Struzzi
Davanzo	James	Mustello	Sturla
Davis, A.	Jones	Neilson	Thomas
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Kail	Nelson, N.	Topper
Day	Kaufner	O'Mara	Twardzik
Deasy	Kauffman	O'Neal	Vitali
DeLissio	Keefer	Oberlander	Warner
Delloso	Kenyatta	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Kerwin	Otten	Webster
DelRosso	Kim	Owlett	Welby
DeLuca	Kinhead	Parker	Wentling
Diamond	Kinsey	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dowling	Kirkland	Peifer	Wheeland
Driscoll	Klunk	Pennycuick	White
Dunbar	Knowles	Pickett	Williams, C.
Ecker	Kosierowski	Pisciottano	Williams, D.
Emrick	Krajewski	Polinchock	Young
Evans	Krueger	Puskaric	Zabel
Farry	Kulik	Quinn	Zimmerman
Fee	Labs	Rabb	
Fiedler	Lawrence	Rader	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lee	Rapp	Speaker
Flood	Lewis	Rigby	

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and one members having voted on the master roll, a quorum is present.

Turning to committee and caucus announcements.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, the majority leader, for a Rules Committee announcement. The gentleman waives off at this time. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, the majority leader, for an Appropriations Committee announcement.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be an Appropriations Committee meeting at 11:15 in the majority caucus room; 11:15 in the majority caucus room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

There will be an Appropriations Committee meeting at 11:15 in the majority caucus room.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Dunbar, for a caucus announcement.

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus at 11:45 in the majority caucus room; that is 11:45 in the majority caucus room. We will be prepared to be back on the floor at 12:30.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Dan Miller, for a caucus announcement.

Mr. D. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Democrats will caucus virtually at 11:45.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

**STATE GOVERNMENT
COMMITTEE MEETING**

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Representative Grove, seeking recognition for a committee announcement?

Mr. GROVE. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. You are in order and may proceed.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The State Government Committee will be meeting immediately for a voting meeting on HB 2219, and any other business that may come before the committee, in room G-50, Irvis Office Building.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The State Government Committee will meet immediately in room G-50, Irvis Office Building.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 12:30, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

AFTER RECESS

The time of recess having expired, the House was called to order.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE**HB 527, PN 2594**

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in public improvements, utilities and services, providing for public notice, public meeting and consent requirements.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2146, PN 2541

By Rep. SAYLOR

An Act apportioning this Commonwealth into congressional districts in conformity with constitutional requirements; providing for the nomination and election of Congressmen; and requiring publication of notice of the establishment of congressional districts following the Federal decennial census.

APPROPRIATIONS.

**BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED****HB 2219, PN 2589**

By Rep. GROVE

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.177, No.175), known as The Administrative Code of 1929, in temporary regulatory flexibility authority, further providing for COVID-19 regulatory flexibility authority; and making an editorial change.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

CALENDAR**BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 731, PN 1169**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of October 16, 1996 (P.L.712, No.127), known as the Charitable Gift Annuity Exemption Act, further providing for definitions and for exemption from regulation.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1351, PN 1466**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.103, No.69), known as The Second Class Township Code, in auditors and accountants, further providing for surcharge by auditors; and, in township manager, further providing for township manager and appointment, removal, powers and duties and compensation and bond.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1760, PN 1994**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 12 (Commerce and Trade) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in property assessed clean energy program, further providing for purpose, for definitions, for establishment of a program, for notice to lien holder required for participation, for scope of work, for lien and for collection of assessments.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. HEFFLEY offered the following amendment
No. A03234:

Amend Bill, page 6, line 30, by inserting after "may"
not

On the question,
Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Heffley.

Mr. HEFFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote on this amendment. It is a technical amendment just to fix some of the language in the bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,
Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the good gentleman and recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—201

Armanini	Frankel	Longiotti	Roae
Benham	Freeman	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Benninghoff	Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rothman
Bernstine	Galloway	Madden	Rowe
Bizzarro	Gaydos	Major	Rozzi
Boback	Gillen	Mako	Ryan
Bonner	Gillespie	Malagari	Sainato
Borowicz	Gleim	Maloney	Samuelson
Boyle	Gregory	Markosek	Sanchez
Bradford	Greiner	Marshall	Sankey
Briggs	Grove	Masser	Sappey
Brooks	Guenst	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, A.	Guzman	McClinton	Schemel
Brown, R.	Hamm	McNeill	Schlossberg
Bullock	Hanbidge	Mehaffie	Schmitt
Burgos	Harkins	Mentzer	Schroeder
Burns	Harris	Mercuri	Schweyer
Carroll	Heffley	Merski	Shusterman
Causser	Helm	Metcalfe	Silvis
Cephas	Hennessey	Metzgar	Sims
Ciresi	Herrin	Mihalek	Smith
Conklin	Hershey	Millard	Snyder
Cook	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Solomon
Cox	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Sonney
Cruz	Howard	Mizgorski	Staats
Culver	Innamorato	Moul	Stambaugh

Curry	Irvin	Mullery	Stephens
Daley	Isaacson	Mullins	Struzzi
Davanzo	James	Mustello	Sturla
Davis, A.	Jones	Neilson	Thomas
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Kail	Nelson, N.	Topper
Day	Kaufner	O'Mara	Twardzik
Deasy	Kauffman	O'Neal	Vitali
DeLissio	Keefer	Oberlander	Warner
Delloso	Kenyatta	Ortitay	Warren
Delozier	Kerwin	Otten	Webster
DelRosso	Kim	Owlett	Welby
DeLuca	Kinhead	Parker	Wentling
Diamond	Kinsey	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dowling	Kirkland	Peifer	Wheeland
Driscoll	Klunk	Pennycuick	White
Dunbar	Knowles	Pickett	Williams, C.
Ecker	Kosierowski	Pisciottano	Williams, D.
Emrick	Krajewski	Polinchock	Young
Evans	Krueger	Puskaric	Zabel
Farry	Kulik	Quinn	Zimmerman
Fee	Labs	Rabb	
Fiedler	Lawrence	Rader	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lee	Rapp	Speaker
Flood	Lewis	Rigby	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration as amended?

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 232, PN 844**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in school districts, further providing for how constituted.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman, Representative Mustello, has three amendments. It is the Chair's understanding that the gentlewoman wishes to withdraw amendments 530 and 3288. Is that correct?

The Chair thanks the lady.

But you will be offering amendment 3363, which the clerk will read.

On the question recurring,
Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Miss **MUSTELLO** offered the following amendment
No. **A03363**:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 8, by inserting after "district"
of the third class that is located within a county of the fourth class
or sixth class

Amend Bill, page 2, line 29, by striking out "in 60 days" and
inserting
immediately

On the question,
Will the House agree to the amendment?

The **SPEAKER**. On that question, the Chair recognizes the
gentlewoman, Representative Mustello, for a brief explanation.

Miss **MUSTELLO**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask for a "yes" vote on amendment A03363, which narrows
the scope of this bill to apply to a third-class school district
located within a fourth- or sixth-class county.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask for an
affirmative vote.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair thanks the lady.

On the question recurring,
Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The **SPEAKER**. On that question, the Chair recognizes the
gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. **OBERLANDER**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the
gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. **HARRIS**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

Armanini	Frankel	Longiotti	Roae
Benham	Freeman	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Benninghoff	Fritz	Mackenzie, R.	Rothman
Bernstine	Galloway	Madden	Rowe
Bizzarro	Gaydos	Major	Rozzi
Boback	Gillen	Mako	Ryan
Bonner	Gillespie	Malagari	Sainato
Borowicz	Gleim	Maloney	Samuelson
Boyle	Gregory	Markosek	Sanchez
Bradford	Greiner	Marshall	Sankey
Briggs	Grove	Masser	Sappey
Brooks	Guenst	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, A.	Guzman	McClinton	Schemel
Brown, R.	Hamm	McNeill	Schlossberg
Bullock	Hanbidge	Mehaffie	Schmitt
Burgos	Harkins	Mentzer	Schroeder
Burns	Harris	Mercuri	Schweyer
Carroll	Heffley	Merski	Shusterman
Causar	Helm	Metcalfe	Silvis
Cephas	Hennessey	Metzgar	Sims
Ciresi	Herrin	Mihalek	Smith
Conklin	Hershey	Millard	Snyder
Cook	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Solomon
Cox	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Sonney

Cruz	Howard	Mizgorski	Staats
Culver	Innamorato	Moul	Stambaugh
Curry	Irvin	Mullery	Stephens
Daley	Isaacson	Mullins	Struzzi
Davanzo	James	Mustello	Sturla
Davis, A.	Jones	Neilson	Thomas
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Tomlinson
Dawkins	Kail	Nelson, N.	Topper
Day	Kaufner	O'Neal	Twardzik
Deasy	Kauffman	Oberlander	Vitali
DeLissio	Keefer	Ortitay	Warner
Delloso	Kerwin	Otten	Warren
Delozier	Kim	Owlett	Webster
DelRosso	Kinhead	Parker	Welby
DeLuca	Kinsey	Pashinski	Wentling
Diamond	Kirkland	Peifer	Wheatley
Dowling	Klunk	Pennycuick	Wheeland
Driscoll	Knowles	Pickett	White
Dunbar	Kosierowski	Pisciottano	Williams, C.
Ecker	Krajewski	Polinchock	Williams, D.
Emrick	Krueger	Puskaric	Young
Evans	Kulik	Quinn	Zabel
Farry	Labs	Rabb	Zimmerman
Fee	Lawrence	Rader	
Fiedler	Lee	Rapp	Cutler,
Fitzgerald	Lewis	Rigby	Speaker
Flood			

NAYS—2

Kenyatta	O'Mara
----------	--------

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was
determined in the affirmative and the amendment was agreed to.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration as
amended?

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman, Representative Sonney, has
amendment 3351, which the Chair understands he is
withdrawing. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,
Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration as
amended?

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2146**,
PN 2541, entitled:

An Act apportioning this Commonwealth into congressional
districts in conformity with constitutional requirements; providing for
the nomination and election of Congressmen; and requiring publication
of notice of the establishment of congressional districts following the
Federal decennial census.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?
Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. This bill has been considered on three different days and agreed to and is now on final passage.
The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The House State Government Committee and the Senate State Government Committee started the redistricting process on Wednesday, February 24, 2021, with a joint hearing on the delayed U.S. Census data. On Monday, July 12, the majority leader, the prime sponsor of HB 22, and myself held a press conference in Bucks County announcing a new congressional redistricting process. This process included a brand-new Web site to track everything that occurred on congressional redistricting and receive direct public input. That Web site is paredistricting.com. It is still available for the public to continue submitting comments on HB 2146 as we move forward with public debate here in the House and eventually in the Senate. That Web site includes direct public comment on the 2018 maps, which were completed behind closed doors and even the Supreme Court put a gag order on the actual map drawer. It offers the public the availability for general public comment. It allows the public to draw communities of interest, to submit written comments for hearings, to sign up to testify at public hearings, and also to submit full maps.

The committee held a total of 12 hearings, with 8 being regional hearings across Pennsylvania, to gather public input. One of these hearings was with Ms. Amanda Holt, who drew the citizens' map for us today. She spent 2 hours with the committee, answering questions from both parties. I introduced Ms. Amanda Holt's map on December 8, and the committee approved the map with minor updates on December 15. The committee received 399 public comments on the citizens' map during this time period.

Now today, Mr. Speaker, with that new process, we have a chance to make a historic vote. For the first time in the history of the Commonwealth, we will be voting on a citizens' map – a map designed by a citizen on behalf of the residents of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for our 17 congressional districts. It is an achievement. I am proud of the work that the committee – both Republican and Democratic members – did, attending hearings all summer and into the fall to create a map, which was done without partisan data.

Now, many have asked what the general changes were between Ms. Amanda Holt's and what we had before. I am going to read those. I did send a letter to Governor Wolf on January 6 specifying those changes in writing to make sure the Governor was updated on this process as we moved forward.

District 3 went from 49 percent African-American voting age population to 52.49 percent, Mr. Speaker. I think it is worthwhile to repeat. District 3 went from 49 percent African-American voting age population to 52.49 percent. In compliance with traditional redistricting principles, precincts were shifted between District 3 and District 2.

District 5 was adjusted—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please suspend. Several members are indicating they cannot hear the good gentleman. Members, please take your seats. Remove any conversations to the back or off the floor of the House. I apologize.

However, while we are taking this break, I would simply remind the good gentleman that when referring to the Governor, simply refer to him by title, not name, and the same would go for outside individuals.

Now that the chamber has restored order, you may continue your comments.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

District 5 was adjusted to increase compactness, and we received numerous public comments from Willistown Township residents requesting to be part of District 6, so while we increased the compactness of District 5, we also moved Willistown into District 6.

Districts 6, 10, 11, and 13 were all adjusted to increase compactness. Further, residents of the Camp Hill area filed numerous public comments requesting to be connected with the Capital Region.

The "left-hand pinky" in District 10 was eliminated to increase compactness.

District 9 was adjusted to increase compactness, to ensure the Susquehanna River communities were whole, and to eliminate the "zipper" in Potter County.

District 7 was shifted back into Monroe County to increase compactness and align new boundaries with the current map developed by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

District 8 was adjusted to increase compactness.

District 12 was adjusted to increase compactness; notably, the "zippers" in Butler County were eliminated.

District 17 was adjusted after receiving citizen feedback on Washington Borough not being in District 17. District 17 and District 14 were adjusted to meet constitutional population requirements.

Mr. Speaker, these adjustments were minor in nature. If you look at the square-mile percentage change between the citizens' map submission and the updated amendment, 95 percent the same in square miles; square miles, 95 percent the exact same map. If you look at population changes between the preliminary map and the update with the amendment, 95 percent the same population base, Mr. Speaker; 95 percent the same map.

Let us talk about split analysis. One of the things the Supreme Court – or within the Constitution is not splitting municipalities or political subdivisions unless "absolutely necessary." The current map before us has 15 county splits which are split 18 times. Municipalities are split 18 times, or there are 18 municipalities split a total of 18 times, and there are 19 voting precincts split a total of 19 times.

Mr. Speaker, I had these same splits run with the current remedial plan that the Supreme Court put in place in 2018. County splits under the current plan are 14; proposed congressional are 15. Municipal splits under the current plan are 19; current splits under the current plan before us are 16. Voting district splits, Mr. Speaker, 32 voting district splits under the current plan; there are 9 under the proposed plan in front of us.

When you look at compactness on Reock and Polsby-Popper, very similar in data between the two plans. So, Mr. Speaker, we are hitting the benchmarks of the Supreme Court.

I think it is worthwhile to read into the record what the expectation is of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. In *League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania et. al. v. Commonwealth of*

Pennsylvania in 2018, the court explained, quote, "We recognize that other factors have historically played a role in the drawing of legislative districts...However, we view these factors to be wholly subordinate to the neutral criteria of compactness, contiguity, minimization of the division of political subdivisions, and maintenance of population equality among congressional districts. These neutral criteria provide a 'floor' of protection for an individual against the dilution of his or her vote in the creation of such districts.

"When, however, it is demonstrated that, in the creation of congressional districts, these neutral criteria have been subordinated, in whole or in part, to extraneous considerations such as gerrymandering for unfair partisan political advantage, a congressional redistricting plan violates Article I, Section 5 of the Pennsylvania Constitution."

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to say that HB 2146, the congressional plan for the new congressional districts coming in for next year, meets these criteria. The citizen mapmaker developed it without partisan data. We updated it without using partisan data. This is how you end gerrymandering in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. You base maps on those clear constitutional guidelines spelled out by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court to ensure that you are not basing these maps on partisan information.

Now, we do not have data, we do not use data for partisan information. You will have to go to outside sources. For instance, the Princeton Gerrymandering Project scores this plan very high, an A on competitiveness. I think we got a B overall on the preliminary map. They have not updated that score with the new updated one, but there is not a lot of change between the two.

Dave's Redistricting; Fair Districts put this on Dave's Redistricting app, scored high in compactness and those constitutional criteria we are looking at, completely moving away from gerrymandered political data, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a map the citizens can be proud of. And maps are tough. We hear it all the time: not everyone is happy with every single map. We are a big State. We have a lot of communities of interest, and we have to weigh communities of interest and citizen input with those clear guidelines spelled out by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

Now, according to Fair Districts' submission of this map on Dave's Redistricting, this is an 8-8-1 map, Mr. Speaker: eight Democrat districts, eight Republican districts, and a toss-up; 8-8-1. Perfect .500 score. Now, if one would claim partisan gerrymandering, one would think that score would be tipped to one side or the other, but this is what happens, Mr. Speaker, when you do not use political data to drive the conversation on maps. You get fairness. You get openness. You get transparency. You have the ability to pick a citizens' map for the first time in history and put it on the floor for this body to vote on. This is a big deal, and I think you should all be happy of the work the House State Government Committee did to put a plan that is fair and meets our constitutional requirements spelled out by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying, today we all have an opportunity to make a vote, to make a vote against gerrymandering, to make a vote against partisan data in our congressional redistricting process. We can make a vote that states we support citizens drawing maps and utilizing all available resources to improve our process of congressional redistricting so we do not have to worry about court cases, so the residents of Pennsylvania know that we took their input into

consideration and know that we are not drawing these districts for the sake of politicians, but based on their requests and making a fair process for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we all can sit back and support HB 2146 for what it is – a citizens' map; a historic departure from the way this body has operated in the past. And I look forward to continuing this conversation and working with our Governor and the Senate on bringing this to enactment in the near future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the good gentleman, Representative Vitali, on final passage. The gentleman waives off. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair will now recognize the gentleman, Representative Conklin, on final passage.

Mr. CONKLIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Sorry, Mr. Speaker, you know what? We are saying it is the 8-8-1 map. No, I am going to tell you what: this is a 411, because we have got to call 911 to get this one taken care of.

You know, let me give you a little revisionist history of what really happened. We traveled the State and we listened to the population. They came out, even though there was no public transportation most of the time and there were not convenient times for individuals and it was not done, you know, in many neighborhoods where the population was. People were very clear, since we were bringing up how we got to this point: Do not do what you did before. Now, we can call "transparency" what we want. It is a great word. Just because we call it, it does not mean it is. We traveled about and we listened; at least I did, I heard what they said. They said, do not play the games that you played over the decades. Be open. Be fair.

So let me tell you about the map we talked about while we were out seeing the State – which is beautiful, by the way. Oh, there was no map, sorry, so we cannot talk about that. So when we finally got to where the maps were done, our first two maps were blank. They passed, but they were blank. So the next thing we did is that we had to do exactly opposite to what the public asked. The public asked, be open, be transparent, work together. Mr. Speaker, you may not be aware of this, but the portal was my colleagues' portal; not for me to see, but for them to see. Many maps were rejected because they did not fall under the criteria of what that portal wanted; not what the Constitution wanted. We can argue that point if you want, but hey, we did not have a meeting on it. It was not – they were rejected. Why? I do not know. How the maps were picked – listen to this one, are you ready? I am going to give you some insight: I do not know. They were picked. I do not know. They just decided that hey, this is the map we like. I do not know. Was it a big hat they picked it out of? Was it a group got together? I do not know. In fact, I can tell you that after the conversation we had on a Zoom call, even the other members did not know how it was picked, because the maker of the map – it is all very interesting – the maker of the map said, I wish I had enough time. I did not have time to do the work I needed. So I do not know what that means. I do not know where that came from.

So let us talk about the citizens' map, because we are not talking about the citizens' map today. We are talking about the gerrymandered, amended map that you have on the floor, not the citizens' map. The citizens' map could not even pass our committee. Now, this is not for the room. As I always say, sometimes I have got to talk to the believers out there. This is for the believers, the ones that believe in good government. This is

not for the folks standing within the halls. This is for the believers that believe that we are going to do the best thing for the people. This is for you all. That map could not pass. It needed gerrymandered, gerrymandered to come to the floor because it did not have the votes within the committee to even pass.

So please do not call it the citizens' map anymore. The citizen, this is not the map that they put. The map they did – which again, I do not know how it came up with it – could not pass. This is the partisan map that is being put on the floor – which by the way, I talked to my Senate colleagues and they do not know about the map either because no one reached out to them. They have to read in the paper like we do.

So rather than calling this – I am going to just finish up – rather than calling this the 8-8-1, again, let us get the 411, call 911, vote, and outvote this thing down. Bring the emergency crew in and let us do it right this time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Representative Brett Miller, on final passage.

Mr. B. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman previous and his comments that he made. I would just like to add that this bill, HB 2146, like any bill on the House floor, could be amended, and if the gentleman previous felt that this bill was deficient, he or any member here could have offered amendments. You will note that there are no amendments on this bill that were offered. If there were faults with the bill, then certainly amendments could be offered.

This bill presents a citizens' map that was vetted throughout the Commonwealth with input from many people, and I would urge a "yes" vote on HB 2146.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The gentlewoman, Representative DeLissio, is recognized on final passage.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to share that I came in – my first year I served in office was in a redistricting year in 2011, and I found the process to be opaque, nontransparent, and really everything I had heard about redistricting and gerrymandering coming to life in 3D before my eyes: elected officials dividing up the spoils, if you will, to decide who their voters would be in their districts. So for the past 11 years, I have been a proponent of an independent redistricting commission, which is true redistricting reform. I have held 112 town halls and addressed this topic in 50 of those town halls – 51, actually – and in 12 of those 51 town halls, I focused exclusively on this topic, because this is a foundational issue. It is a keystone issue for our Commonwealth, and if we do not get it right this time, we are going to live with our mistakes for the next 10 years, as my district has lived with the mistakes of the previous 10 years.

I object to the use of the word "citizens." Citizens had nothing to do with the process. They may have had some input, and as far as I am aware, in the County of Philadelphia, there was one hearing during a weekday at a time of day when many people were not necessarily available to attend in a location that was not easily accessible. So I do not doubt that there was citizen input along the way, but this was not a citizen-driven process. This was an elected official-driven process. So I have advised my constituents, as recently as last Tuesday when I held a special town hall to talk about the preliminary maps that have been

released by the Reapportionment Commission and the pending congressional map and its process, that they should not confuse the two. Anybody can label anything a quote, unquote, "citizens' map."

When we have a process in place in this Commonwealth that is citizen-driven, that is made up of folks who do not have a vested interest in holding that public office for which they are drawing the maps, then we will be entitled to say that it is truly a citizens' map. And we have only to look to the State of Michigan who started this process about 5 or 6 years ago and in fact put an independent redistricting commission in place and in fact has come up with fair districts.

These maps are not that, and I will be a "no" vote. And I urge every citizen out there to pay strict attention; in fact, I know tens of thousands of our citizens are paying strict attention and will hold us accountable for our votes today.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

Just as a reminder to the members, it is generally a custom before returning to the prime sponsor and then the leaders to wrap up debate that we try to recognize any members that also wish to speak. Seeing none seeking recognition, I will return to the prime sponsor and then the leaders, in that order.

The gentleman, Representative Grove, is recognized on final passage.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As we debate this bill to develop congressional maps for the Commonwealth, I would like to point out that no member of this legislative body has introduced a map; no other member introduced a map in the entire legislative branch. This is it. One map was introduced. That map, as pointed out by my colleague, was amended once. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have not filed a single amendment to this bill.

Further, I also find it interesting that all four political caucuses of this branch and the Governor have intervened to submit maps to the Commonwealth Court, to the Commonwealth Court, but the Governor at the same time does not want to discuss maps with us, and nobody else in this entire legislative body has filed a map. It is very interesting.

I also am very proud of, actually, the work of the committee and this map and our citizen mapmaker, because today you heard no complaints over the actual map itself. The complaints were on the process, which let us review the process one last time. Ten years ago, there was a blank map that was sent to the Senate. It was amended in the Senate, with a map sent to the Governor and signed into law. That was the process. Our process this time involved public debate, public input throughout the entire process to the point of selecting a map drawn by a citizen, but yet that process was not good enough. I will accept that, Mr. Speaker, but I am very thankful that people recognize that the map we have in front of us is worthy of their vote to the extent that nobody has offered an amendment or critiqued one line in this map, and I would like the record to reflect that.

With that, I hope my colleagues can vote "yes," because while you may not like the process itself, you have the opportunity to vote for a citizens' map for the first time in Pennsylvania history, a map that is an 8-8-1 map, and something I think the residents of Pennsylvania can be very proud of.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I close. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman, the majority leader, on final passage.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think the State Government chairman did a great job. We have heard from both the minority and majority State Government chairmen. I know that they put a lot of work into this bill; 13 public hearings on a bipartisan committee, and many of those members both Republican and Democrats at that. I do want to make sure those who are listening, whether here or outside of here, are knowledgeable that this is required by law – actually, the Constitution; pardon me – that the legislature do this. And while we do have a citizens' work map before us, which today's technology allows us to have better interaction to do those things, every member of this chamber has an opportunity to draft a map, as can public citizens. So think about it. We could have 203 maps before us right now. Out of 203 members, anyone could add amendments to make changes or improvements that they see just to do so. But we are here today on January 12. We have a target deadline to have this done by the end of January, and before us are not 203 maps, but 1 map, a map that we need to get done and get the process moving and get it to our sister chamber.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my comments in asking and thanking the State Government Committee, both Republicans and Democrats, for producing a product, taking advantage of the fact that citizens were able to help draft this, something we were not able to do in the past without some of the technology we have today, and vote unanimously in favor of moving this bill out of the chamber and over to the Senate.

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. Agreeable to the provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and nays will now be taken.

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Oberlander.

Ms. OBERLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman, Representative Harris.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The electronic board is accurate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—110

Armanini	Gleim	Maloney	Rossi
Benninghoff	Gregory	Marshall	Rothman
Bernstine	Greiner	Masser	Rowe
Boback	Grove	Mehaffie	Ryan
Bonner	Hamm	Mentzer	Sankey
Borowicz	Heffley	Mercuri	Saylor
Brooks	Helm	Metcalfe	Schemel
Brown, R.	Hennessey	Metzgar	Schmitt
Causar	Hershey	Mihalek	Schroeder
Cook	Hickernell	Millard	Silvis
Cox	Irvin	Miller, B.	Smith
Culver	James	Mizgorski	Sonney
Davanzo	Jones	Moul	Staats
Day	Jozwiak	Mustello	Stambaugh
Delozier	Kail	Nelson, E.	Struzzi

DelRosso	Kaufert	O'Neal	Thomas
Diamond	Kauffman	Oberlander	Tomlinson
Dowling	Keefer	Ortitay	Topper
Dunbar	Kerwin	Owlett	Twardzik
Ecker	Klunk	Peifer	Warner
Emrick	Knowles	Pennycuick	Wentling
Farry	Labs	Pickett	Wheeland
Fee	Lawrence	Polinchock	White
Flood	Lewis	Puskaric	Williams, C.
Fritz	Mackenzie, M.	Rader	Zimmerman
Gaydos	Mackenzie, R.	Rapp	
Gillen	Major	Rigby	Cutler,
Gillespie	Mako	Roae	Speaker

NAYS—91

Benham	Driscoll	Krajewski	Rabb
Bizzarro	Evans	Krueger	Rozzi
Boyle	Fiedler	Kulik	Sainato
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Lee	Samuelson
Briggs	Frankel	Longietti	Sanchez
Brown, A.	Freeman	Madden	Sappay
Bullock	Galloway	Malagari	Schlossberg
Burgos	Guenst	Markosek	Schweyer
Burns	Guzman	Matzie	Shusterman
Carroll	Hanbidge	McClinton	Sims
Cephas	Harkins	McNeill	Snyder
Ciresi	Harris	Merski	Solomon
Conklin	Herrin	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cruz	Hohenstein	Mullery	Sturla
Curry	Howard	Mullins	Vitali
Daley	Innamorato	Neilson	Warren
Davis, A.	Isaacson	Nelson, N.	Webster
Davis, T.	Kenyatta	O'Mara	Welby
Dawkins	Kim	Otten	Wheatley
Deasy	Kinhead	Parker	Williams, D.
DeLissio	Kinsey	Pashinski	Young
Delloso	Kirkland	Pisciottano	Zabel
DeLuca	Kosierowski	Quinn	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the bill passed finally.

Ordered, That the clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, there will be no further floor votes. We will, however, begin rule 17 speeches, for those who submitted their names. They may proceed to the well of the House and will be recognized after general housekeeping.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Representative Harris, rise?

Mr. HARRIS. To correct the record, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You are in order and may proceed, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On HB 232, amendment 3363, the gentlelady, Representative Hanbidge, would like to be voted in the negative.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman and those remarks will be noted in the record.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that the following bills be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations:

HB 232,
HB 1351,
HB 1760, and
SB 731.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to.

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that the following bills be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar:

HB 105;
HB 199;
HB 285;
HB 324;
HB 333;
HB 624;
HB 1594; and
HB 1960.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to.

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that the following bills be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar:

HB 1009;
HB 1599;
HB 1600;
HB 1601;
HB 1603;
HB 1605;
HB 1606;
HB 1607;
HB 1608; and
HB 1609.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to.

BILLS TABLED

The SPEAKER. The majority leader moves that the following bills be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar:

HB 1009;
HB 1599;
HB 1600;
HB 1601;
HB 1603;
HB 1605;
HB 1606;
HB 1607;
HB 1608; and
HB 1609.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to.

STATEMENT BY MR. ECKER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Ecker, is recognized under rule 17 for his speech on scholarship displacement.

Mr. ECKER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I rise to talk about a topic that is near and dear to my heart: our fire departments and our volunteer firefighters who selflessly serve our communities. As a former junior firefighter, I have witnessed firsthand the tireless work these brave men and women give every day, and I am proud to have sponsored two bills to help further aid our fire departments.

Since taking office, I have been approached by more than a few of my fire companies in my district that have lost out on untold amounts of money because they hired a third-party professional fundraiser. Current law states that charitable organizations soliciting contributions must annually register with the Department of State's Bureau of Charitable Organizations. The use of a third-party professional fundraiser is as simple as just hiring a company to send out mailers, which can automatically trigger the requirements for an independent audit or review of financial statements.

My HB 1973 would extend to fire companies an existing Department of State exemption that allows fundraising activities carried out by members or volunteers of charitable organizations to not be subjected to these costly audits. This would even apply if they chose to hire a third party, for example, a third party to help them send out some mailers. Residents' donations are further protected by existing audits that fire companies must perform.

In addition, very shortly I will be introducing another bill to help our junior firefighters to be completely trained before they turn the age of 18. Currently junior firefighters are restricted to performing certain tasks until they turn 18 to complete their training. My legislation would allow 17-year-old junior firefighters to attend and complete the Interior Firefighting Module course, which includes live burns and vehicle rescue training. Junior firefighters need to have this in order to move forward with their fire service. However, junior firefighters would need to have the permission of their parent and the fire chief to go through this training. The Interior Firefighting Module would be required to be under the supervision of a credentialed State fire academy instructor, and the vehicle rescue training would need to be under the supervision of a credentialed vehicle rescue technician instructor. Safety is very important. However, once the junior firefighter turns 18, he or she would already have the necessary training to be an interior qualified firefighter.

Our volunteer fire departments are run by our friends, family, and neighbors, and provide a vital service to our communities. We must assist them where we are able. I am happy to do my part by sponsoring this legislation to support their operations, and I hope that as we go through the redistricting and maps are finalized, we see these communities are also kept together. Our firefighter communities are a very strong community of interest that we must be aware of. This is more important than ever as we have seen so many local departments band together to create regional departments to serve their wider communities.

I ask for your support in getting these bills passed through the House and signed into law.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

STATEMENT BY MS. DELOZIER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative DeLozier, on redistricting for her allotted time.

The gentlewoman is in order and may proceed.

Ms. DELOZIER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

From the beginning of the redistricting process, I have been concerned about the direction that we have been taking with the Legislative Reapportionment Commission. While already starting behind schedule with the lack of census data, the LRC never focused its time drawing the constitutional maps, but rather on unconstitutionality by skewing the process.

Let us start from the beginning. The beginning was marred in a lot of delays. We had chairman selection, census data delays, and issues with prisoners. After days of hearings that tried to find a consensus on a chairman to lead the commission, the members of the commission could not agree on who would lead this body. When that process failed to reach an agreement on the candidate, the Supreme Court picked Mark Nordenberg, a former Pitt chancellor, to lead the commission. While the commission's work of drawing constitutional districts at that point I would have thought would have started immediately, it was frustrating to see so much time be spent on other issues.

To me, one particular concern was the move to deal with and address prisoner reallocation. For weeks the commission heard testimony, exchanged information, and deliberated on how to change the way prisoners are counted. The proposal to reallocate prisoners was problematic for a number of different reasons. First, this is a move that has never been done in any other State without express authorization from the State legislature. The Legislative Reapportionment Commission is not a legislature, and Chairman Nordenberg was never elected. However, in voting to approve the reallocation proposal, he used a partisan analysis to give himself the authority to make the law from the commission. This concerns me.

Second, not only did it treat similar populations – those in group quarter settings – differently, but it also treated like populations within prisons differently by counting some in the prison and then counting some elsewhere in the State. As I have said before, the proposal adopted by the commission to reallocate some of the prisoners back to where they lived prior to incarceration does not take into account places like Camp Hill SCI (State correctional institution) in the 88th District. Every single State inmate gets processed through Camp Hill SCI. It is a

large working city right in the middle of the 88th District. This is a population that largely no longer is accounted for in that district, but this is only in the State map. They are counted in the Lower Allen Township in the congressional maps, which is confusing, as well as, in my opinion, unconstitutional. Not counting inmates in Lower Allen Township does not take into account the community resources, first responder time, and State relationships needed to make that prison work. It does not take into account the services, including monthly phone calls and letters that local officials and legislators receive from inmates and families asking for help. The local relationships with Camp Hill SCI, the staff at the prison, and the Department of Corrections allow the local community to provide services to the inmates. Those are services that the 88th District in Lower Allen Township provides to them – not the district in which they lived before they committed the crime. But that is where some of them are now counted in the State map.

On top of that, after the proposal was adopted, it took over 2 months to get the new data from the Department of Corrections – one more delay. This took time away from the critical role of the commission in drawing the constitutional maps. Given that time crunch, when the data was finally approved, it was unfortunate that the LRC chairman said that he wanted to spend less time preparing the preliminary maps than the process of finalizing the prisoner reallocation. When the process was concluded in about 45 days of drawing time, members on the commission, members of this General Assembly, and the general public were left without a preliminary product that was developed with unknown criteria, with shifting explanations as to what was a priority, and inconsistent application. Since then the commission's work has still been clouded with the process and criteria – what was going into the maps – and being cloudy on the issues of what was actually prioritized.

Seeing how this process started, it is disappointing, but not shocking, to me that the preliminary product ended up where it has and not making much sense for the communities in central Pennsylvania. As for the shifting criteria, representation—

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will please suspend. Your time has run out. If you could quickly wrap up.

Ms. DELOZIER. Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

The issues of communities with fire companies, libraries, and sports teams are separated. It is often said that we have to have a process that is a good process in order with a good product. Unfortunately, this process was marred with many, many hiccups, and I think the end process was not what the people of Pennsylvania need.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

STATEMENT BY MS. GAYDOS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman, Representative Gaydos, on redistricting.

As the gentlewoman approaches the microphone, I would simply remind all the remaining members that one, there is a 5-minute time limit, to contain your remarks within those 5 minutes, as well as being mindful that the House rules still apply when referring to individuals outside the chamber, to refer to them as their general position and not by name.

You are in order and may proceed.

Ms. GAYDOS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When I look at the preliminary House map that was approved by three of the five members of the Legislative Reapportionment Commission, I see a number of concerns. The most troubling thing for communities like mine and other communities across Pennsylvania are the splits. While there are many statistics out there that show the number of municipalities split may be less than the current maps, what the metric does not show is whether those splits are "absolutely necessary," and that is a definition as required by the Pennsylvania Constitution. It also does not address the impact of those splits and the splitting of communities of interest. Frankly, not all splits are created equal.

A couple of things that I have learned being a State Representative is that our communities are not always defined by government boundaries, and that the communities define or should be the ones to define their government and not the other way around. Communities can be defined by roads, bridges, and common travel routes; conversely, rivers or counties are not always convenient community boundaries for many of our communities. Communities for us mean shared public services like water, sewer, police, fire, parks, and school districts, or simply where people live, work, play, or worship together.

Focusing on what unites us, not what divides us, is the strength of our representation. Keeping communities of interest together makes for stronger communities and enables State Representatives to be more efficient advocates, stewards, or champions for the communities represented. This is not a Republican issue and it is not a Democrat issue. This is a community issue.

Last week I attended the Policy Committee hearing in McCandless in the western suburbs of Allegheny County. I also watched the comments being presented to the Legislative Redistricting Commission, and as a citizen, I also presented my specific concerns. As a legislator, I put an exclamation mark on the concerns of the constituents who wrote in to me and to the commission asking for help to voice their opinions. Community after community representative came in and testified – that is Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and perhaps even people who are not even registered to vote but are concerned citizens. These folks expressed concern that the preliminary maps split their community apart in ways that they, as a community, did not understand. They testified about their concern about losing their voice, and this story has been repeated again and again and again about the preliminary map.

We understand that the job of redistricting is not easy and making maps is not easy, but the people of Pennsylvania deserve to know more clearly what exactly defines "absolutely necessary," and that is that definition as the Constitution requires. If it is not fully defined or is subjective, then should it not be up to the community to decide what is absolutely necessary? Removing a community center, a handicap park, or a market center from the rest of the community it serves – is that "absolutely necessary"? Splitting a cluster of 11 small, tiny boroughs and municipalities that share public services and meet monthly as a single community to coordinate those services – is that "absolutely necessary"?

I attended last week's hearing of the commission to discuss the southwestern region with three of my other colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, and to carry the messages from our communities. While I was thankful to be able to make a presentation, will the commission hear the voices of our communities? I should hope so.

In Allentown, we heard testimony that there were splits in the community that diluted Hispanic voters. Was that necessary? Communities simply want to know and want to understand more clearly why their communities were split. Simply put, it is imperative that community representation makes sense and is understood by the constituents it serves and it is in the best interest of those who are represented.

As the commission works towards a final map, I hope to see some of these changes made and voices heard, communities of interest restored, and consistent, not convenient, explanations.

Mr. Speaker, we ask the chairman and the commission to please hear the voices of the good people of Pennsylvania. I encourage all Pennsylvanians to review the map and submit concerns about it, particularly as they relate to communities of interest, to the Legislative Reapportionment Commission at redistricting.state.pa.us. Please voice your opinions and be heard. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the lady.

STATEMENT BY MR. HAMM

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Hamm, on redistricting.

Mr. HAMM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to discuss a tale of two redistricting processes. Two redistricting processes where one was of, by, and for the people, and one that was for partisan gain. I want to talk about two processes that were so diametrically opposed to one another that it seems strange that they are even put under the same umbrella of redistricting.

The first, Mr. Speaker, is the congressional redistricting process that the House just concluded. That process was the most transparent congressional redistricting process in Pennsylvania history. It included 13 public hearings that discussed the process of redistricting, legal requirements of the process and product, and 10 hearings held across the Commonwealth, held in person on communities of interest. It ended with the selection of a citizen-submitted map as the preliminary product, that was then changed based upon feedback from the mapmaker, the committee, and the public at large. That map, which passed this chamber today, is now on its way to the Senate. It was not a perfect process, but it was one we can and should be proud of.

The second process is the one with the Legislative Reapportionment Commission. That process had the trappings of transparency, but folded into the shadows after its public hearings concluded. The product created by this chairman, working with the Democrats, was purposely crafted by his team in closed-door discussions based upon metrics not known to the public. But we should not be surprised that a process run by the current minority party and the legislature would be so faulty. In fact, in October, the leader of the House Democratic Caucus was asked how they plan on winning a majority in this chamber in 2022. Her answer was one word: redistricting. The map that was produced for the House was, as the LRC chairman admitted, drawn using House Democrat submissions because he found them more persuasive. Maybe it is that fact, and that fact alone, why explanations for why the map looks the way it does fail to hold any weight.

However, at the beginning of last week's public hearings, the chairman spent 40 minutes defending why the maps look the way they do. His arguments failed to carry any connection to reality. One purported justification put forward by Chairman Nordenberg

is that the preliminary map reflects population changes. That cannot be true when the fastest growing county in Pennsylvania loses representation, as this proposed map would provide for. It was said this map was drawn to be more competitive. That cannot be true when the Princeton Gerrymandering Project grades the competitiveness factor of this map as an F – an F for failure – for how polarized the new districts are. It was said that this map was drawn to increase minority representation in the General Assembly. That cannot be true, because as was testified to at last week's hearings, it dilutes Hispanic voters across Pennsylvania to protect Democrat incumbents. It was said that this map was drawn to reflect the proportional vote share. Proportionality is not a metric found anywhere in our Constitution or law on redistricting. However, one area that is found in our law is not splitting counties or municipalities unless "absolutely necessary." Across this preliminary map, we see splits that are not absolutely necessary and can only be explained by openly partisan reasons or for unconstitutional reasons.

Mr. Speaker, no matter which way you slice it, the preliminary State House map is a partisan gerrymander. Many different definitions are thrown out to define what "gerrymandering" is. Call me old-fashioned, but I like to use the dictionary. There you find "gerrymandering" defined as "manipulating the boundaries of an electoral constituency so as to favor one party or class." If that can only be done by the party in power, then let us count who is in power on the Legislative Reapportionment Commission. You have the Senate minority leader, a Democrat; you have the House minority leader, a Democrat; and the chairman, a registered Democrat appointed by a Democrat Supreme Court. That is a three-person Democrat majority on this commission.

But let us continue to let the numbers speak for themselves on how this map is a partisan gerrymander. The Philadelphia Inquirer – not a bastion of conservative thought or opinion – ran an analysis with the Princeton Gerrymandering Project using a million different map variations. That analysis showed Pennsylvania's natural political geography amounts to Democrats being able to obtain 93 seats if neutral constitutional redistricting criteria are used. Various analyses conducted of this map show the number of Democrat seats that can be obtained under this preliminary product as high as 106 seats. This map was crafted using unconstitutional, nontraditional redistricting criteria to create a partisan advantage for Democrats beyond Pennsylvania's natural geography.

Mr. Speaker, this map was created by Democrats to empower and grow Democrat strength in this State legislature. I hope that the commission sees this problem and will work to quickly address it before this shameful product becomes final.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

STATEMENT BY MR. STEPHENS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman, Representative Stephens, for his allotted 5 minutes on congressional redistricting.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to just discuss some priorities as it relates to the 151st Legislative District, and some of the communities that are contained within it, as it relates to the legislative redistricting process and the congressional redistricting process. I really just want to lay out some of the priorities that I think are

critical as we move forward on those two fronts, understanding that they are two different processes: one involving the Redistricting Commission and one involving this body and the Senate and the Governor.

There are some consistent themes that I think we need to adhere to, and that is one of ensuring that communities, as our Constitution dictates and the courts have repeatedly upheld, must remain whole. They should not be split unless, quote, "absolutely necessary," and I think that is a critical component that we need to keep in mind. In particular, in Montgomery County, Horsham Township is facing a number of critically important issues that involve both State and Federal government; whether you are talking about clean water issues that the DEP (Department of Environmental Protection) and EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) have been involved with, or public health issues – there is currently a public health study ongoing in Horsham Township being conducted by the Pennsylvania Department of Health and funded by the CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) – whether you are talking about transportation issues concerning the redevelopment of the Willow Grove Naval Air Station, which is a federally owned property surrounded by State-owned roads. A recent study indicated those roads will need about \$500 million worth of improvements in order to sustain the redevelopment of that 860-acre piece of land.

For all of these reasons, in addition to others such as communities of interest like school districts, we should do our best to ensure that we are following those school district boundaries as best we can to keep our school districts as whole as possible. Looking at the ethnic diversity within our communities; Horsham Township, Montgomery Township, and others in the area are home to a large and growing number of Korean-Americans and Indian-Americans, and it is important that their votes not be diluted, that their votes remain intact and they continue to have a strong voice, both here in the Pennsylvania Legislature and in Washington, DC, through their member of Congress.

And so those are the priorities that I think we need to embody as we move forward on these processes: avoiding splitting municipalities unnecessarily and maintaining those communities of interest and ensuring that those communities that have the most at stake when it comes to State and Federal issues are kept whole so that they can have one consistent and unified voice, whether it is in Harrisburg in the State legislature or in Washington, DC, in the United States Congress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

That concludes our rule 17 speakers for today.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all remaining bills and resolutions on today's calendar will be passed over. The Chair hears no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the good gentleman, Representative Williams, who moves that this House do now adjourn until Monday, January 24, 2022, at 12 m., e.s.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 1:36 p.m., e.s.t., the House
adjourned.