1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	THE FLORIDA SENATE SPECIAL SESSION B FLOOR DEBATE
11	
12	AUGUST 19, 2015
13	VOLUME I
14	PAGES 1 - 159
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Reported by:
21	CLARA C. ROTRUCK
22	Court Reporter
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

SENATE SECRETARY: All unauthorized persons will please leave the chamber. All Senators and guests in the gallery, please silence all electronic devices. All Senators, please indicate your presence.

A quorum is present, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: The Senate will be in order. Senators and guests, and the guest in the gallery will please rise for the opening prayer to be given today by Senator Altman.

SENATOR ALTMAN: Please bow your head.

This is a day the Lord hath made, to God we thank you for this wonderful day here in Tallahassee, this summer day, not unlike the summer day in Philadelphia 227 years ago when our Founding Fathers gathered to ratify our Constitution, and in that Constitution they mandated that we apportion our state every 10 years.

A lot of things have changed since then, air-conditioning, Lord, we thank you for air-conditioning, motor cars, cell phones, but the greatest change and the most meaningful change is the way that we look, the way members

look. God, with your blessing the miracle of Philadelphia has become a reality. We are diverse, men, women, ethnic groups, black, white, brown.

We truly have met the dream of a true republic, a representative democracy, and dear God we thank you for that. We thank you for your blessings and we ask for your guidance that we can continue because ironically the greatest challenge we have here today is to preserve this great democracy, preserve this great Union, a diverse group of individuals that truly represent all people, all walks of life.

We pray this in your name. Amen.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Our Pledge will be led today by our Majority Leader, Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Join me. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: We will now continue with the order of business. Are there reports

1	of committees?
2	SENATE SECRETARY: None on the desk,
3	Mr. President.
4	PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there motions
5	relating to committee reference?
6	SENATE SECRETARY: None on the desk,
7	Mr. President.
8	PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there messages
9	from the Governor or other executive
10	communications?
11	SENATE SECRETARY: None on the desk,
12	Mr. President.
13	PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there messages
14	from the House of Representatives?
15	SENATE SECRETARY: None on the desk,
16	Mr. President.
17	PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there matters of
18	reconsideration?
19	SENATE SECRETARY: None on the desk,
20	Mr. President.
21	PRESIDENT GARDINER: Take up the Special
22	Order Calendar and read the first Bill.
23	SENATE SECRETARY: Committee substitute
24	for Senate Bill 2-B, a Bill to be entitled An
25	Act Establishing the Congressional Districts of

1 the State.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 26th District, Senator Galvano, you are recognized on your Bill.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. Good morning, Senators. The

Bill before you, Senate Bill 2-B, is the

congressional map that has come out of the

Senate Committee on Reapportionment.

As you recall when we were here a week ago, Monday, to convene this special session we talked about going into a remedial process in order to comply with the requirements of the Florida Supreme Court that came out in an opinion on July 9th.

We started our process with a base map
that was the product of staff with counsel
without members or public or any other outside
influences, and as I told you at that time,
that map was a base map and I referred to it as
a discussion map before the members to discuss
that and make decisions going forward with that
as a base.

The reason why we were able to do that is because the Court in its opinion was very

instructive. It opined with specificity with regard to many of the districts. So it gave us an opportunity to get a head start. I am very pleased to report that the committee took its role in earnest. We had meaningful meetings, all of the members were engaged and we discussed the map in great depth and certain proposals were brought forward, vetted, discussed, voted upon and some adopted.

And so the map that I present to you today as Senate Bill 2-B is not the -- the base map as was proposed at the onset of our session, but instead the product of the Senate Committee on Reapportionment. And so there are some changes.

Frankly, those changes, Senators, improve the Tier 2 aspects of what was the base map and have now elevated the standards, if you will.

In this map that is before you, unlike the base map, you have two more cities that are kept whole, you have four less city splits, you have one less impacted county, and the compactness scores remain the same essentially and we have not diminished any Tier 1 requirements, and so we have this good product going forward.

With regard to the map, itself, you will recall the Court was very specific as I mentioned in what it ordered us to do with certain districts, and there were eight districts that were in play, Congressional District number 5, Congressional Districts 13 and 14, 26 and 27, 21 and 22, and 25.

And so I am going to walk through in general terms what is accomplished in the Bill before you, and then we can get into questions, Mr. President, and also I know there are amendments that are pending. So let's start with Congressional District 5.

As you recall when we were here last year at this time making adjustments based on Judge Lewis' Order, we modified what was then Congressional District 5 that ran north/south. The Florida Supreme Court in reviewing this had district, frankly after Judge Lewis had reviewed it and approved it, said, no, we are not going to allow you to continue to have a north/south configuration, and very clearly said, and I think I will read you the exact language, said, "We hold that District 5 must be redrawn in an east/west manner." And so

really there is no question but -- no question as to what the Court intended for us to do.

Further within its opinion it referenced the Plaintiffs' map, one of the iterations, as exemplar and basically for us created a safe harbor which, based on the Court opinion, gives us the comfort that will be the configuration will be approved. And so that is where we are with Congressional District 5 that you see on the maps behind you and also the map has -- has been distributed for you.

With regard to Congressional Districts 13 and 14, the Court said they must be redrawn to avoid crossing Tampa Bay, and they were redrawn to avoid crossing Tampa Bay, and as a result in this map what we have are districts that are now more compact and they split fewer cities and counties.

In fact, the only city that is split is
Clearwater where District 13's boundary crosses
the peninsula into Pinellas County.

District 14 keeps the entire city of Tampa whole. District 13's compactness scores are higher in the enacted plan as well as District 14.

are the districts in the Palm Beach area that were drawn vertical side to side. The Court said these districts must be redrawn and you have to achieve a greater Tier 2 compliance and for those of you who -- who don't recall, the Tier 2 is the following of geographic boundaries, the following of jurisdictional lines and the compactness of the districts which we look at visually, and also there are tests for the compactness, the Reock and the Convex Hull are the two tests that we rely on primarily.

With regard to District 21 and 22, these

Anyway, with regard to these districts, the staff as well as the committee looked at the configuration and in order to achieve that Tier 2 compliance that the Court requested, the vertical nature side by side of these districts has now changed to a stacked nature.

These are now more compact and there is one fewer district crossing the Broward line.

With regard to District 25, the Court said District 25 must be redrawn to avoid splitting Hendry County. This was done. Hendry County has been kept whole and the base map, the base

map all of it is in 25 and it preserves the minority voting strength in both it as well as neighboring District 20.

With regard to Districts 26 and 27, here the Court said these districts must be redrawn to avoid splitting Homestead. Again, as you can see on your maps, this was done.

Approximately 30,000 people were moved in this to 27 when Homestead was made whole, and then in order to comply with Tier 2 we followed the geographical boundary of the turnpike in the northwest section of that district.

So those are primarily the changes that the Court had recommended and what you see in this map before you, that is Senate Bill 2-B, ultimately 22 of the 27 districts have been modified as a result of addressing the infirmities identified by the Court in the eight districts in play. The good news with regard to that is in doing so, we were able to achieve overall a much higher compactness and to reduce the number of county and city splits that are in the -- in the map.

And Mr. President and Senators, that is an overview of our Bill.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Okay, members, we have four amendments on the desk, but are there questions for Senator Galvano before we go into the amendatory process?

Senator Braynon for a question.

SENATOR BRAYNON: Thank you,

Mr. President. This is a question on procedure. With the amendments that we have, and I know on the committee we talked about how some of our amendments were going to be combined and we combine them to come to a final product.

What is the process for the four amendments that we have here should they get adopted to create one map and how they may effect each other?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. And Senator Braynon, as you recall when in committee this is a complex business because oftentimes in the way an amendment sits in the queue is going to impact the prior amendment.

As I understand the amendments that are pending before us, we have one in 21 and 22.

There is a CD 5 amendment and then also I think
Senator Bullard has a 25 and 26 amendment. The
likelihood that they will impact each other is
still -- is still there, and if that does
happen the last adopted amendment I would
assume unless the Rules Chair has a different
opinion, would end up being the map, itself.
But to the extent that they can exist without
impacting each other, then you would adopt them
all into a single map.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Montford, you are recognized.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you,

Mr. President. Mr. Chair, first of all, thank

you for your leadership on this committee. The

staff was exemplary.

The question I have, your answer may have an impact on how I will vote on the amendments that we are looking at. You use terms in describing the District 5, the terms from the Court as safe harbor, exemplary. They would perhaps would look favorably on the Plaintiffs' map as has drawn for Senate 5, CD 5. Does that mean, is that another way of saying you don't have a choice?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you are recognized.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. It reminds me of when you are

at a carnival and you win a prize and they say,

well, you can choose anywhere from here this

way, but you can't choose anywhere from here

this way or down below and then you are left

with basically very little choice there in the

middle.

To answer to your question is, yes. In my opinion and based on the recommendations of counsel, while we might be able to tweak something, if we want to be comfortable that what we are sending to the Supreme Court will get approved, then we will take them at their word that this district as drawn in this map is exemplar and will perform at the 45.1 threshold that they say is enough.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Montford, you are recognized.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you,

Mr. President. Regarding 45.1, the BVAP score

45.1 and they are of the opinion that the

minority population in that district can indeed

1 elect someone of their choice?

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you are recognized.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. Yes, that is the opinion of the

Court. And CD 5 has an interesting history

with regard to the BVAP score because as you

recall in the original enacted plan we -- the

score had gone up over 50 percent, it was 50.1.

The Court came back and said no, you don't,

that wasn't necessary.

So in the vertical configuration we knocked it down to 48.11 which we discussed on the floor about a year ago, and the Court in this opinion has -- in addition to saying you must, we hold you must draw east/west, said that in their analysis the 45.1 is sufficient to perform and would be upheld.

 $\label{eq:president_gardiner} \mbox{\sc President Gardiner: Senator Montford for a follow up.}$

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you,

Mr. President. Final question. Was there any
other congressional district in Florida, any
other part of Florida treated this way? In
other words, were they this specific, the

Supreme Court, this specific in any other part of this state?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

2.2

Mr. President. CD 5 had the most specific instruction, and you know, for the lawyers in this room, actually the non lawyers at this point, when a district is literally part of the holding and you are told you must do something, it is different than saying you must redraw and here is some suggestions like we saw in 21 and 22.

There was some specificity with regard to Homestead and Hendry County, but this one the Court really focused in on said you must do this and then gave an example of what they would approve.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Additional questions?

Senator Gibson for a question.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. President.

In terms of the ability of minorities to elect
a candidate of their choice, does -- does the,
I guess functional analysis and the basis of
the diminution in BVAP, does that go to whether
or not a group can elect someone in a primary

or they can elect someone in a general? 1 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you 2 3 are recognized. 4 SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, 5 Mr. President. The functional analysis looks 6 at both aspects, and then looks at the voting 7 age population as well. 8 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Gibson for a 9 follow up. 10 SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. President. 11 So in the Court's ruling where it says it must 12 be drawn east to west, does it use the term 13 wholly, w-h-o-l-l-y, wholly drawn east to west? 14 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you 15 are recognized. 16 SENATOR GALVANO: No, it does not. 17 it says is we hold and I am going to quote, "We hold that District 5 must be redrawn in an 18 19 east/west manner." 20 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Gibson for a 21 follow up. 22 Thank you, Mr. President. SENATOR GIBSON: 23 I think you used the term tweak in your 24 response to Senator Montford and maybe I didn't 25 hear it in relationship to being able to tweak

CD 5 or tweak something else, if you recall.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

2.2

Mr. President. The point I was making to Senator Montford was he was asking about the configuration that we have in this particular map, which is the Romo Plaintiffs' suggested CD 5.

The question was how specific was the Court and what did this have to absolutely be the district. The answer to that is, no, the Court didn't say you must adopt this exact configuration, but the Court did use this configuration as an example and one that based on their analysis would be approved and based on the input from legal counsel and the discussion we had in the committee we viewed it as a safe harbor.

Is there -- is it impossible to conceive of a district that is not exactly that that maybe is tweaked one way or another? Yes, that is possible, but when staff looked at it and the committee looked at it we kept coming back to here is what the Court will approve, here is

what they have instructed us, let's go forward in this manner.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Gibson for a follow up.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you for allowing me to serve on the committee as well. I have had an interesting time.

In terms of the Reock and the Convex Hull scores, I know we spent a lot of time on the --with legal testimony setting up the process, but I don't remember talking about the weight of each, which has come into play as we have tried to develop the various districts. And so are they weighted the same?

Is one more important than the other? How do we -- why do we have the two, and then how is it that one has primacy over another, I guess, or it appears that way?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President, and I also thank you for having Senator Gibson serve on the committee. She was a great asset to it. That is a great question, because, and I may get this number wrong, but I

believe there are roughly 20, 21 different independent tests that can be used to gauge compactness. In addition to what we call visual compactness, you just look at a district and decide whether it is compact.

2.2

I am not aware that Reock or Convex Hull have priority one over the other, but they are two standards that the Court has depended largely on that and historically we have within the legislative process and frankly the challengers and the experts depend on them, and they approach the districts in two different ways.

The Reock is to the fit the district into the smallest possible circle and then -- then divide the percentage of that where Convex Hull as I think our Attorney Levesque described it as a rubber band which makes sense. You put a rubber band around the district and you see what it fills in.

They have to be used in unison because you could have a district that is two inches wide and 200 miles long, and it will have a perfect Convex Hull score. So then in that instance you are going to need the input or the data

from the Reock score, and the same analogy can be made both ways. But one doesn't have priority over the -- over the other. They are just part of this inexact science.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Gibson for a follow up.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. President. So in terms of the Constitutional Amendment, if you know, in the body I guess of the amendment or the wording of the amendment to the constituents of the state of Florida, are all of these parameters sent out in the Constitutional Amendment so that all of our constituents understood that we would be using these scores and have to draw tight little boxes in order to come up with a congressional map?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you are recognized.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. If you are referencing the

test, itself, no. That is not -- it talks in

terms, the Tier 2 standards refer to it as

compactness in general and following

jurisdictional lines and following geographical

boundaries once the Tier 1 requirements have been complied with.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Hays and then Senator Dean.

SENATOR HAYS: Thank you, Mr. President.

And Senator Galvano, I would like to thank you and your committee members for your hard work on this very complex issue.

I need some help when I get back to the district explaining to my constituents how -- how did we really make any difference in what we had? I mean, from looking at the map, all we have done is swing a north/south district around to the west and make it run east and west, and it still is a gerrymandered district.

And my taxpayers ask me, Alan, why are you wasting your time and wasting our money being in Tallahassee and coming up with a map that -- that still is it has a 200-mile long district.

Can you -- can you give me some reason? I mean, some of them have even suggested that in the Supreme Court's direction they are violating the Constitution, itself. So I am not a lawyer, so help me explain to my constituents, if you will, please.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you are recognized.

2.2

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. We are in a unique circumstance in this session, in this map drawing process.

As you recall we were here a year ago. We were here after the Trial Court had issued an order and instructed us to adjust two districts, and we did that. And frankly, as I stand here today I think we did a good job on that and complied with what the Order was and so did the Trial Court believe that we did as well, and that involved the north/south configuration of Congressional District 5.

And by the way, that district was drawn by a Federal court in 1992, to comply with Federal law. So it wasn't some gerrymandering idea that emanated from the legislative process.

For whatever reason the Supreme Court of Florida, despite the fact that no one offered an east/west configuration in either chamber, said you must draw CD 5 east/west. And so we find ourselves in a remedial session where we are under a time constraint. The Court said, you must go back, you must redraw, you have 100

days to do it, and you are going to go back and have a court hearing if challengers so desire, and by the way, we have identified eight districts that need to be redrawn and CD 5, this is how you are going to redraw it.

2.2

The others, this is what you are going to do in terms of redrawing it. So I would say to your constituents, sir, I would say as a co-equal branch of government we are performing our duties with respecting the Florida Supreme Court's ability to interpret the Florida Constitution.

You don't have to necessarily agree with it, but it is the Order we are under and that is what our committee and what this Senate and what this Legislature is trying to accomplish.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Hays.

SENATOR HAYS: Just a thought and then I have a question, but a thought is that it doesn't appear to me that we are being treated as co-equals when -- when the Supreme Court says you will draw it east and west, they are telling us what to do, and all we are doing is acquiescing to their direction, but that is perhaps a discussion for another day.

what I

part of

if I ar

split:

2.2

My question is, my question is concerning what I see a disturbing trend in the central part of this state, we have several counties, if I am reading the map correctly, that are split into as many as three congressional districts. Lake County where I live is one of them, Orange County looks like it may have four congressional districts, Polk County has three.

I find this disturbing and my question is, if there is an opportunity for tweaking and perhaps a better question would be, why in the compilation of this map did we not put forth more effort to try to follow county lines and not have so many counties divided into so many different districts? To me if you have one county split into three districts, it is -- it is somewhat counterproductive.

Many of those parts of the county are going to feel like mere appendages in that congressional district. Can you address that for me?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. Overall we have significantly improved the -- on the number of county and

city splits, and by improve I mean that we have less. That is certainly a component of what the committee and this Legislature are trying to accomplish. That is a Tier 2 component and it is a priority in this map and actually even from the base map we have improved on that. So it is not -- it is not a trend.

2.2

Why this is a complex undertaking and in our -- as much as a science is because we have to start with Tier 1, and Tier 1 involves, as well as Federal law, the ability of minority populations to elect a candidate of their choice in certain districts.

And so once you plug in those districts like, for example, Congressional District 5, you have a ripple effect that goes on. So then, then the Legislature along with staff, is tasked with trying to put the Tier 2 components together that don't prioritize one over the other.

The constitution says if you are compact then don't worry about jurisdictional lines or geographical lines, nor the reverse. And so all of that comes together and unfortunately you are left with county splits and city

splits, but it was a priority, Senator Hays, and you are right to bring it up, but it was a priority.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Dean, you are recognized for a question.

SENATOR DEAN: Thank you. Senator

Galvano, thank you for the explanation. I want
to go back to the fact in '92, that someone in
another Supreme Court venture figured out how
we would gerrymander that District 5.

Many times I read in the local papers that we are the culprits, we didn't write that, we didn't prepare that and I appreciate that clarity.

Further questions that I have concerning not only some points that Senator Hays had a while ago about 9 and 10, if that compactness is where we are looking at it in terms of an east/west application, I can clearly understand 13 and 14, but what about that part of 15 that is in Polk County and then the extension of that goes over into the edge of Orange County in 9?

I don't question how you arrived at that because I understand you had to get your

numbers somewhere, but what was the rationale behind that and in terms of what we will be facing with another map probably today or tomorrow, and that the extension of the jurisdiction of 15 as it goes east and west?

Just give me some explanation on that, please, sir.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you are recognized.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. With regard to District 9 it

includes central Orange County, all of Osceola

and eastern Polk. If you recall from not last

year, well, actually last year we addressed the

issue, but at one point we sought to make this

a Hispanic performing district, and the Circuit

Court determined that that wasn't -- the

creation of a Hispanic district in this area

was not required and did not justify the

configuration that we had.

So when we went back on 9 as you see it, the idea was to be as Tier 2 compliant as we possibly could, and that again being the compactness and the jurisdictional and geographical lines. And like I was explaining

to Senator Hays, it is not an exact science and these districts when you are moving populations and trying to find, it would be great if everybody lived in one cluster, but in order to reach the populations, that is why you see some of this -- this configuration.

2.2

And this was also an area that during the committee we had an amendment on to reduce some other city, city splits, and to keep Tampa Bay whole.

District 15, that was redrawn as a result of the reconfiguration of 13 and 14. The reconfiguration of 13 and 14 occurred because the Florida Supreme Court told us we had to reconfigure them, said we could not cross over Tampa Bay any further. So it -- it encompasses eastern and southern Hillsborough County, and it had to pick up population and in doing so picked up 174,000 people in Polk County.

So it is, as you point out, a little, a little less compact but it also splits less cities and it keeps Auburndale whole which are part of the Tier 2 components. But again, all of these impact one another.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Additional questions?

Okay, Senators, where we are is the amendments were drawn to the Senate Bill, but in the meantime the amendments have now been drawn to the House Bill as well. So I think the intent would be is that we will get in the proper posture and we will take up those amendments.

Senator Galvano, are you comfortable with moving through a series of motions to get us in the proper posture?

SENATOR GALVANO: I am as soon as the script arrives.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Okay, how about if I, we can work through this. The Senator of the 26th District, Senator Galvano, moves that HB 1-B be substituted for CS SB 2-B. Is there objections?

Read the House Bill.

SENATE SECRETARY: House Bill 1-B, a Bill to be entitled, An Act Establishing the Congressional Districts of the State.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: The Senator of the 26th District, Senator Galvano, is recognized to explain the Bill. And actually I think, well, Senator Galvano, you are recognized to do that, but then we can go right into the

amendatory process which is your delete everything and then we would go to the additional amendments that have now been filed to the Senator Galvano strike all amendment.

Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO:

Mr. President. Senators, what we have, I have described and what we have had a Q and A on is exactly that, delete everything amendment. So unless there is something further I think we have covered it.

Thank you,

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Okay, take up and read the first amendment.

SENATE SECRETARY: Bar Code 876908 by Senator Galvano, delete everything after enacting clause and insert amendment.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Okay, this is the substance of Senator Galvano's amendment which we have discussed and taken questions on. My intent would be at this point to take up the amendments to the amendment, take up and read the first amendment to the amendment.

SENATE SECRETARY: Late filed Bar Code 918370 by Senator Detert, deletes lines 50 through 6,621 and insert amendment.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Detert, you are recognized on your amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR DETERT: Thank you, Mr. President, and I am going to withdraw my amendment based on the fact that Senator Galvano's delete all map would include my amendment. So if his passes I am fine, so I withdraw the amendment.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Okay, show that amendment withdrawn. Take up and read the next amendment to the amendment.

SENATE SECRETARY: Late filed Bar Code 418552 by Senator Bullard, delete lines 50 through 6,621 and insert amendment.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bullard, you are recognized.

SENATOR BULLARD: Thank you,

Mr. President. Senators, this would simply

move or make whole a traditional

African-American voting block in south

Miami-Dade County. Just to put it in laymen's

terms, if this amendment does not pass, what

ends up happening with this particular voting

block is that they would wholly be in their

County Commission district, wholly be in their

State Representative's district, wholly be in 1 2 their State Senator's district, but then be split between congressional districts. So this 3 4 simply fixes and addresses that problem of 5 making sure that this non-municipal 6 predominantly African-American voting block 7 remains whole in one congressional district 8 versus being split between two. 9 That is the amendment, Mr. President. 10 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there questions 11 on the amendment? Senator Braynon for a 12 question.

SENATOR BRAYNON: Thank you,

Mr. President. Do you know how many people is
in this voting block that you were talking
about?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bullard to respond to the question.

SENATOR BULLARD: Thank you,
Mr. President. Approximately 35,000.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there additional questions on the amendment? Senator Gaetz, President Gaetz, you are recognized for a question.

SENATOR GAETZ: Thank you very much,

Mr. President. Senator Bullard, do you have any reason to believe and, if so, what would be your reason that your amendment would be more acceptable to the Supreme Court than the amendment that is before us sponsored by

Senator Galvano?

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bullard to respond to the question.

SENATOR BULLARD: Thank you,

Mr. President. Thank you for the question,

Senator Gaetz. I would look at it in the

historical reference points, right. Since 1992

when this particular African-American voting

block was first able to elect a candidate of

its choice by being wholly contained, we have

seen diversity.

The first Congress person that was represented in the area was then Congresswoman Carrie Meek. The maps then were redrawn again. That African-American voting block was split and we saw really a diluting of the voting power of that particular group because it was split then between the two congressional districts.

Since the redrawing of the maps in 2012 or

2010, 2012 after the census we have seen them now wholly put back into a congressional voting block and we have seen although volatility, but the ability for that group to then elect a candidate of its choice in the midst of the volatility between electorate years. So I think the Supreme Court would definitely believe this would be helpful.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: President Gaetz.

SENATOR GAETZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I am not a lawyer, but based on my reading of the Supreme Court's ruling, while I find your argument compelling, arguments like that made previously by the Legislature appear not to have been viewed as compelling by the Supreme Court. So let me try my question a different way.

Do you have any reason to believe that the Plaintiffs in the lawsuits against the Legislature would be more inclined to support your amendment than to support some other approach that would be more pleasing to them, and therefore, the Supreme Court?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bullard.

SENATOR BULLARD: Thank you,

2.2

Mr. President. When we are talking about the specific congressional district maps that are in play, 26 and 27, by eliminating in essence that substantial portion of African-American voters it may be viewed, it may be viewed by the Court that an incumbent is being protected, and rather than do that you get to kind of kill two proverbial birds with one stone.

You get to maintain a voting block with its consistency in one voting district while also not being viewed as trying to protect an incumbent. So it is kind of gets at both issues.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: President Gaetz for a follow up.

SENATOR GAETZ: My final question,
Mr. President, thank you for your indulgence.
So with respect then, Senator Bullard, that
would be your opinion, but it would not, your
opinion is not informed, is it, by any
communication from the Plaintiffs in this case
that they would be pleased by your amendment?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bullard, you are recognized.

SENATOR BULLARD: No, it is not. It is

informed by the fact that I am a voter in this particular district.

2.2

2.3

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Additional questions?

Senator Montford for a question.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you,

Mr. President. Senator Bullard, I applaud your

efforts. The question I have for you and it

will be for the other members, too,

Mr. President, is unlike our Senate districts

which you have some variation of population, it

is my understanding from the staff that you

have a deviation of one, you can't go two

either way or one over that.

Is that the case with your amendment?

Have you looked at the population numbers and are you indeed down to one when you compare your amendment to the -- to the base map?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bullard.

SENATOR BULLARD: If I am understanding you, let me know if the answer to the question answers your question, Senator Montford, and thank you, Mr. President.

In looking at the population variation in between the two maps, what I found and what we were able to do in drawing up the amendment is

keep a traditional sort of contiguous group in a non-municipal setting in the northeastern portion of the map whole, while still allowing the, again, traditional African-American voting block in the middle of the map to be -- to remain whole. So it -- it fixes, it fixes a myriad of problems that are created by the map in its current existence. PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Montford for a follow up question. SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you. Thank you, 12 Mr. President. And Mr. President, it may be

directed to our Chair, if that is all right. And that is, if I am wrong, let me know, but wouldn't, whatever amendment we are considering today, the result of those districts have to be no more than a deviation of one in those districts, am I correct?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bullard, will you yield to Senator Galvano?

Senator Galvano, you are recognized to respond to the question.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Mr. President. You are correct.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there additional

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

questions?

2.2

SENATOR GALVANO: For a question.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you are recognized for a question.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. Senator Bullard, on

August 17th, I received a letter as did

Chairman Oliva, and frankly, sir, it was a

scathing letter that I was offended by because

it impugned the professional staff that we have

here in the Senate, the same staff that

throughout this entire process has been found

unassailable by each aspect of the judicial

proceedings.

But my question to you is, did you in fact write this letter or was that language provided to you to affix your signature to? Because it addresses specifically these two districts, 26 and 27, and given the remedial process that we are in and the gravity of the Tier 1 requirements in our Constitution, I would like to know where this was generated and how it came to come to me.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bullard to respond.

SENATOR BULLARD: Thank you,

Mr. President. Yes, the letter was drafted by me, Senator Galvano. I do apologize if you we felt any sort of slight from the letter. It was not meant to impugn or personalize it to you or Representative Oliva, but the reality is that the particular districts in question had become accustom, accustom to a certain level of voter participation from its African-American population, and the maps prior to this amendment and prior to the drafting of that letter, were not reflective of the sort of commitment to voting excellence that these particular areas have had.

Just to put it in simple terms, when you carve out that particular block of folks, over the last 20 years three of those voting precincts have represented three of the top 10 voting precincts in the state of Florida in terms of voter participation.

And so I have a commitment to that -- to that district because it is in fact mine. I have a commitment to that community because it is the community that has brought three Bullards to the State House and State Senate.

And so my commitment to making sure that those voters are protected was that. So I, if it came off as fiery, it is because it comes from a passionate place, absolutely, but it was in no means, but by no means was it meant to, you know, vilify or make it seem as though the process had been skewed in any way, shape or form. However, I have a commitment to those voters and to make sure that they are protected and that is why I am here.

I mean, I am supposed to be reporting to school today. So I wanted to make sure I am here to defend those voters.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further questions?

Senator Galvano for a follow up question.

SENATOR GALVANO: Yes, thank you,

Mr. President. And I appreciate that, that you
have apologized, but it is not me. As a member

of this body I put myself out there, I am

subject to criticism. I have my what I pursue

and what I don't pursue, and that is part of
the process, you know, this is a full contact

sport.

What I take exception to is when professional staff is accused of, give me the

exact, having a goal that appears to be overt 1 2 and damaging and that the professional staff's activities need to be condemned. 3 If there is anything that occurred in the 4 5 Reapportionment Committee that anybody in this 6 chamber has an issue with, the buck stops right 7 here, not with professional staff. 8 Having said that, you make reference to we 9 in the letter and I just want to know if you 10 can clarify who we is. 11 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bullard. 12 SENATOR BULLARD: We would refer to the 13 I happen to be a voter in that 14 particular appendage in question, and when I 15 say, "we", I mean the communities, the 16 surrounding communities that would have been 17 impacted by the change. 18 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there additional 19 questions? Additional questions? Seeing none 20 we are in debate. 21 Is there debate on the amendment? 2.2 there debate? 23 Senator Braynon in debate. 24 SENATOR BRAYNON: Thank you, 25 Mr. President. I think one of the things that

Senator Bullard talked about is -- was glossed over very quickly and it is the historical background of the area that we are talking about. And I think when we talk about the letter that Senator Bullard wrote, we talk about Senator Bullard not, you know, forsaking his school duties so he could come up here, it is because of the historical importance of this area, the historical importance of the things that have happened to the people that live in this area and how there has been a history of -- of them being under-represented or not having an opportunity to elect the person of their choice.

2.2

And in maps previous to this one in the past I would say two decades we have recognized that history and we have drawn them into districts that they can -- that they can vote for the person of their choice, and now with this slight change that happened in the base map because when we got, what you have to understand is in the original map, so let's go before the base map, in the original map, it went right up US 1 and US 1 was the line and it followed the line.

And then when we drew this base map US 1 deviated, they deviated off US 1, picked up this neighborhood and came back in. So you have to understand the appearance, you have to understand the history and that will lead you to where, and let me tell you something that was said yesterday, is that appearance and perception is a big part of this.

Intent is a big part of it. Those things lead the Court to think of intent. And so the appearance here could appear to be something else, but I am sure that is not what we are doing and that is why Senator Bullard has submitted this amendment for us to correct that and to correct the historical, the historical I guess bad things that have happened to this community and make sure that they are made whole.

And I applaud Senator Bullard for his effort and work in this community and I 100 percent support this amendment.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate?

Further in debate? Senator Galvano in debate.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. And while I understand where
Senator Bullard is coming from, I would ask the
body to vote down this amendment. What we were
dealing with here was a directive from the
Court to keep Homestead whole. And you are
talking about two districts that historically
have been Hispanic performing districts.

2.2

And so in doing that, in moving the population from Homestead back into 26, the committee thought to balance the Hispanic population and then move into a Tier 2 application which followed a geographical boundary up into the north and to the west being the turnpike.

If we adopt the Bullard amendment, because of the Hispanic population shift that would move one to the other, I would suspect that the Court in its review would find that we have in fact packed District 27. So I would ask that you vote this down.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate? Further in debate? Senator Clemens, you are recognized in debate.

SENATOR CLEMMONS: Thank you,
Mr. President. I don't think we have any

evidence that, that we have packed any
district. So I don't think that that would be
anything that the Supreme Court would find
considering that no one has shown any evidence
that that was Senator Bullard's intent with

this amendment.

2.2

So I am not sure that that is something we should be considering unless we can show some sort of intent on Senator Bullard's part, and he can speak to this when he wraps up whether or not he was intending to pack anybody into any district. But what he is intending to do is to keep a minority district, a minority community whole and I think that makes sense.

His amendment comports with what the
Supreme Court has asked of us in terms of
keeping Homestead whole and also accomplishes a
goal of keeping a minority community whole at
the same time. It is an amendment that
approves the map and I would ask for your
support for it.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate? Further in debate?

Seeing none, Senator Bullard is recognized to close on his amendment.

SENATOR BULLARD: Thank you,

Mr. President. Thank you, Senators. You know, I am a history teacher by trade, so pardon me if I am jumping into it a little bit. Prior to 1990, the south Miami-Dade communities had never elected an African-American to the State House, State Senate or the County Commission, let alone Congress, and this has nothing to do with the ability to elect an African-American Congressperson by any stretch.

What it does, however, do is recognize
that the communities in question that are being
split by the current map as it stands now have
been a consistent voting block since 1990.
That 1990 voting block you saw, then
Representative Darrell Jones, who later became
State Senator. You then later see State
Representative Larcenia Bullard who then became
State Senator, Larcenia Bullard, you then saw a
County Commissioner, an African-American County
Commissioner elected to that area 1994.

All because this particular voting block, although not municipal, have sort of a like mentality because they are historically predominantly African-American south Miami-Dade

communities that go in order. And as to my colleague from Orlando, this is the area that represents her feeder pattern for the then segregated school that she went to, Mays Senior High School.

2.2

So that group has been very consistent in being able to elect a candidate of their choice in a number of different areas. So it just seems very obscure and overly problematic that that particular community, that voting consistent community would be split now between two different very distinct congressional districts, thus not giving those -- that consolidated group of voters the opportunity to select a candidate of their choice or at least play a role, a significant role in electing a candidate of their choice in their congressional district.

So I would hope that as we go through this process and that as you consider which button you are going to press or how you are going to vote or what you are going to say, yea or nay, that you would consider the historical ramifications of voting this particular amendment down versus where this district has

been on the last 20 plus years.

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bullard having closed on his amendment, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

PRESIDENT GARDINER: All opposed.

(Chorus of nays.)

PRESIDENT GARDINER: No, show it not adopted. Take up and read the next amendment.

SENATE SECRETARY: Late filed Bar Code 236730 by Senator Clemens, delete lines 50 through 6,621 and insert amendment.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Clemens, you are recognized on your amendment.

SENATOR CLEMENS: Thank you so much,

Mr. President. My amendment deals with

specifically the issues with Districts 21 and

22. Those of you who were here for the

committee meetings last week and this week are

probably aware of this issue because there were

numerous groups that came up from south Florida

to testify about this issue presenting a lot of

evidence as to why this district should be

drawn differently than the way it was drawn in

the base map. And so that is what my amendment speaks to.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I want to first read from the Supreme

Court decision as it relates to this district

so that we understand as a body what the

direction of the Court was, because in many

cases the Court directed that this be redrawn a

certain way.

In this case they did not direct that. there is a little bit more flexibility for the Legislature here in order to be able to deal with this issue. So the Supreme Court case reads as thus. "Because the Legislature has not justified its enacted configuration of these districts we conclude the districts must be redrawn. We do not, however, instruct the Legislature must necessarily redraw the districts in a stacked horizontal configuration. Indeed the challengers have conceded that a vertical configuration could perhaps pass constitutional muster. And their alternative maps introduced at trial did in fact configure these districts in a vertical manner. Accordingly we leave it for the Legislature to determine how to redraw these

two districts with the understanding that Tier 2 compliance could be improved and given the shift in the burden the Legislature must be able to justify its redrawn configuration of these districts."

2.2

So as you can clearly read in that, the Supreme Court did not say we had to stack these one on top of each other. What they said is we have to improve Tier 2 compliance which is exactly what my amendment does.

So looking at the actual amendment, itself, and what it does, it, there was a small portion of population from a strange appendage that lies in the center of Palm Beach County and moves it to the southern portion of District 20, which makes Districts 22 more compact and leaves the compactness measures of 21 at about the same.

So I am going to get into what those compactness scores actually end up being so that you are familiar and if anybody wants a copy I have several copies of what those compactness scores are back here in terms of what the effect.

So in District 20 -- 21 in terms of the

compactness there is a slight increase over the enacted plan in the Convex Hull and a slight, very slight increase in the Polsby-Popper over the enacted plan. And in District 22 there is a slight increase, .04 increase in the Convex Hull and a .03 increase in the Polsby-Popper.

So the compactness of the districts is better than the enacted plan as it stands right notice, but not quite as good as SB-2 which Senator Galvano is presenting.

So the question would be, well, if the compactness scores are not quite as good as the plan that we have before us that Senator Galvano is presenting, why would this be a better plan? And it is because Tier 2 requirements aren't just about compactness. They are about splitting cities as well, cities and counties. And my plan splits three less cities than the plan that we have before us.

So we are talking about an amendment that compactness-wise isn't quite as good as the one that Senator Galvano is presenting today, but in terms of city splits, reduces the number of city splits in the state by almost 14 percent, which is a significant number.

So I would argue that Tier 2, Tier 2 reasoning really applies equally to both compactness and the city splits and we have a map in front of presented by Senator Galvano that is a bit better on compactness, but is deficient in terms of city splits. Conversely, my amendment is a little bit worse in compactness, but significantly better in city splits. They are both Tier 2 requirements.

So keeping that in mind, then why is one better than the other? Well, I am not going to argue that one is necessarily better than the other, but what I will say if one is better in one area and the other is better in a different area, then it is really up to the Legislature, and what I would ask is that the Legislator take into account the numerous testimonies that we heard from people in both Palm Beach and Broward County last week and this week saying that they would prefer a map of the order of the one that I have submitted rather than the one that, that is currently in front of us.

We heard from the Palm Beach County, I am sorry, the Palm Beach County Mayor, we heard from the Palm Beach Mayor, we heard from the

Broward County Mayor, that they would prefer to see a map similar to the one that I have drawn, and taking into account that each map has similar deficiency or deficiencies that are different than each other, I would argue that my map would be the one that we should -- we should now adopt.

2.2

That is my presentation, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Questions on the amendment? Senator Latvala for a question on the amendment.

SENATOR LATVALA: Senator Clemens, I certainly sympathize with the issue that has been brought forward with this. I have a real simple question though.

This is, as I recall the process, an amendment has to be a total map, and maybe I don't know whether I should ask you the question or Senator Galvano, but it has to do with your amendment.

Does your, the bottom line is, does your amendment include the good points or the good amendments that Senator Lee and Senator Detert have included, because that will make a real big difference on where I am coming from on

this?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Clemens, you are recognized.

SENATOR CLEMENS: Thank you,

Mr. President. That absolutely was my
instruction to staff, to include the amendments
that have already been adopted. I have to tell
you, the amendment is about that thick so I
didn't go line by line, but I would ask staff
whether Senator Galvano or Jay would be able to
speak to that. But as far as I know, that was
the way that I asked for it to be drawn and I
believe that is the way it was drawn.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Additional questions?

Additional questions? We are in debate. Is there debate on the amendment? Senator Ring in debate.

SENATOR RING: Thank you, Mr. President, and Senator, my friend, Senator Clemens, we spoke this morning and I told him I would have to stand up and oppose this amendment obviously on regional issues. The, you know, the folks in Broward County is split north and south between 595, and forever northern Broward outside of the minority district has lacked

representation. The representation has been in Palm Beach.

This seat I think creates fairness by giving northern Broward representation.

Senator Clemens', you know, amendment again kind of takes that away which the base map hopefully would have provided. So I am going to again stand up and just oppose this amendment and ask people to vote it down.

Thank you.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate?

Further in debate? Senator Galvano in debate.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. And I appreciate, Senator

Clemens, where you are coming from, and we did

have testimony from that area of the state in

committee. The challenge that we had was while

the Court didn't say specifically that you have

to draw them stacked, the Court did make that

reference and said, you know, here, have at it,

they don't have to be like this, but, you know,

see if you can figure out another way, and that

was the challenge.

Because in looking at these two districts from a Tier 2 perspective, unless you start

impacting Tier 1, you don't get there in the vertical configuration, and unfortunately in your configuration you have taken the arm that was in District 20, which is a minority district, and moved it into 21, I believe. And what that does is, yes, it reduces the number of city splits, but you have also at the same time taken a majority/minority district and brought it below 50 percent, and frankly, that is going to be problematic going forward, not just at the state level but frankly at a federal level because of the Federal Voters Rights Act and I believe that would be violative of that act.

So if you are to maintain that performance in District 20, then you are below on both compactness and splits. So unfortunately I am going to did the Senators to vote down this amendment because it does impact the Tier 1 requirements of our State Constitution.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate?

Senator Latvala.

SENATOR LATVALA: Thank you. Since
Senator Galvano raised this point in his
debate, I am wondering if I could ask him a

question about what he just said. 1 Okay. The question 2 PRESIDENT GARDINER: 3 to? 4 SENATOR LATVALA: Senator Galvano. 5 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Okay, you are 6 recognized for a question for the sponsor of 7 the Bill. 8 SENATOR LATVALA: Thank you. The question 9 deals with, you know, as I understood your 10 argument against the amendment, it had to do 11 with the fact that it would diminish the 12 minority population in a minority district. 13 My question to you is, have we done a 14 functional analysis which is the essence of 15 their ability to continue electing a minority, 16 and what was the result of that? Did that show that this amendment would, in fact, inhibit 17 18 their ability to continue electing a minority in that district? 19 20 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano for a 21 response to the question and we will get back 2.2 in debate. 23 Thank you, President SENATOR GALVANO: 24 Gardiner. A great question. Yes, a functional

analysis was performed and it would still

25

perform at the 48 percent, but what -- what we are doing in this particular instance with District 20 is that you actually have a majority/minority district that we are now bringing below the majority, below the 50 percent and based on conversations with counsel we believe that is going to be problematic from the Federal Voter Rights Act.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: In debate? Okay.

Senator Latvala and then we need to get back into debate. Senator Latvala, you are recognized.

SENATOR LATVALA: Thank you,

Mr. President. I think when this point was

raised in debate, I think it is important to

continue the line of debate that he has raised

here to get to the validity of that.

Did I hear the words, still perform at 48 percent? In other words, does the functional analysis show a reduction in the performance or does it show that the performance would still be the same even with this amendment by Senator Clemens?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

2.2

Mr. President. Yes, you did hear the words, still perform in my answer. With the reduction in the -- in the number to 48 percent you still have performance.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate? Further in debate? Senator Clemens, you are recognized to close on your amendment.

SENATOR CLEMENS: Thank you so much,

Mr. President, and I appreciate the question

and since we went there and you graciously

allowed a couple more questions, I am going to

start off my debate by first addressing that

particular issue, because it is an important

issue, the one that Senator Galvano raises and

I don't want to minimize it in any way.

I do have, again, if anybody is interested in seeing a sheet that describes what happens to this district, in terms of the BVAP and in terms of the actual functional analysis that Senate Latvala was asking a question about, and after the changes that I am talking about, the — the functional analysis shows that in, for instance the 2010 primary turnout, these are voters that actually turned out in the 2010 primary. Of the Democrats who were black, that

number is at 59 percent, so that is a significant number obviously.

2.2

This is a district that went 81.5 percent for President Obama in 2012, and in this district in the primary almost six out of every 10 voters was black. I think that the Supreme Court has shown and has said that that is the key here, that is the crux, the functional analysis. BVAP is an important figure, but the functional analysis, how a district actually performs is the more important number.

So, yes, my amendment does take the BVAP from 50 down to 48, but the functional analysis still shows that minorities will have an opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice. The Federal Court in Martinez determined that a BVAP of 46.9, quote, "will afford black voters a reasonable opportunity to elect candidates of choice and probably will in fact perform for black candidates of choice."

So that is a 46.9 in CD 5 which is in the map that Senator Galvano is proffering here. We have a 45.1 BVAP. Again, in this district is a 48 BVAP.

So what I have in front of you here and

what you have in front of you is a district, a series of maps that draws districts slightly more compact than the ones that are enacted right now, that meets the Tier 2 requirements of dividing less cities, going down statewide from 22 to 19. So three less cities statewide that will be divided.

And finally comports with the wishes of all the constituents that have come up here over the past couple of weeks from both Broward County and Palm Beach County in order to be able to say, we would like these districts to stay at north and south rather than having them divided with an east/west line.

I think I have done a pretty good job of proffering an alternative and I would love for the Senate to be able to approve this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Okay, Senator

Clemens, having closed on his amendment, all
those in favor signify by saying aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

(Chorus of nays.)

PRESIDENT GARDINER: All opposed?

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Show it not adopted. Take up and read the next amendment.

SENATE SECRETARY: Late filed Bar Code 267580 by Senators Gibson and Simmons, delete lines 50 through 6,621 and insert amendment.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: The Senator of the 9th District, Senator Gibson, you are recognized.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. President. And let me first thank staff. Mr. Ferrin has been a delight to work with, very patient as I mentioned in our committee, and very amenable, and I appreciated that and I know Senator Simmons did as well. I think last Wednesday we were back and forth about three times to the capital because -- because of Mr. Ferrin's willingness to draw and record all of our efforts. And Senator Lee mentioned that he spent three hours with Jay on one sitting and I think we spent three back and forth, back and forth to draw this map.

And let me also thank Senator Simmons, my partner in progress and in the struggle by the way, to try to -- to do what I think and I believe that he thinks is right for the

constituents in CD 5, current CD 5, and certainly for the CD 5 that is drawn in the base map.

2.2

And so I also just want to mention that CD 5 is the most reconfigured district in the entire map. And some would say that that was necessary because it snaked down to Orlando, but it is not about the snaking or the squaring or the rounding of any district. It is about the people who live within that district and their ability to elect a candidate of their choice, and probably in debate I will elaborate a little more. So I will get on with the explanation of the amendment.

And so the amendment attempts to really enfranchise some constituencies who, because of the reconfiguration of CD 5 currently, who currently reside and are able to vote in a largely minority district, this enfranchises those folks who kind of fell out, not kind of fell out, who fell out of a largely minority district.

And so the map now includes a tweaking, if you will, of the east/west mandate by the Court to going just a little south to pick up Alachua

County and Union County.

2.2

It increases the BVAP from the current base map of 45.1 percent to 46.5 percent, in an effort to reduce the impact of diminution in that, in the base map. The map is also smaller in square miles, even though the Reock score is — the Convex Hull score is 46, which is less than the base map, or not as close to one as in the base map. However, the Reock ratio remains the same at 12.

The map also, we heard from constituencies from Leon County, namely Tallahassee, that Tallahassee was being split in the base map.

And so this map reduces that impact to the city of Tallahassee because we pick up more constituents in the Alachua and Union County area, and I believe that this map is more parallel to the Voting Rights Act and does not subordinate Tier 1 requirements to Tier 2.

And I will yield to Senator Simmons for any further explanation if that is okay,

Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Okay, on the amendment, Senator Simmons, is your desire to weigh in on the amendment, withdraw the

amendment? What is the pleasure?

SENATOR SIMMONS: The pleasure,
Mr. President, is to having explained it
sufficiently by Senator Gibson, that there be
questions asked and then I would like to help
in the closing argument regarding it.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: We are in questions. Senator Bradley for a question.

SENATOR BRADLEY: Thank you,

Mr. President. And I want to first thank my
good friend, Senator Gibson and my good friend,

Senator Simmons for your excellent work that
you both did on the committee. I really
enjoyed that time. I thought it was, Senator

Gibson had made the comment that the process
was -- was a good process. Everybody had their
say.

We went from the beginning to end and learned exactly how this map was built by staff and no stone was left unturned, and everybody had their questions asked and answered.

With regards to this amendment, Senator Gibson, and maybe this would be best to go to staff, anytime you move a line as we know it affects other districts, and I am looking at

District 3 which my recollection under the Galvano map, District 3 is the most compact I believe in the entire state of Florida. It is almost a perfect circle. And then that is no longer the case if this amendment were to be adopted because that area that Senator Gibson described regarding Union County and part of Alachua, that would take District 3 into a situation where there is an appendage almost created.

2.2

So my question for staff or for Senator

Gibson is, did you compare District 3 under the

Galvano map, its compactness, to District 3

under this amendment?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Gibson to follow up on the question.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. President.

And I don't have the functional analysis for

District 3 on the amended map. So I would have
to ask staff that question.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Bradley, you are recognized to respond.

SENATOR BRADLEY: I, and to be clear,
Senator. Thank you, Mr. President. To be
clear, Senator Gibson, my questions are not to

functional analysis, but they are to compactness, and --

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Gibson, you are recognized for a follow up question.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. President.

I don't think I have that one. This is -under Senator Galvano's plan, the Reock for

District 3 is 71 and the Convex Hull is 89.

Under the Gibson/Simmons' map, the Reock is 54

and the Convex Hull is 81. Very close.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Members, are there any further questions?

Senator Montford, you are recognized for a question.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you,

Mr. President. Senator Gibson or Senator

Simmons, the question that I have is the

amendment that I presented the other day was

very similar to this. It was a little more

aggressive. It went down not only into

Alachua, to Marion County as well.

And in the opening day of our committee meeting I asked counsel, the Supreme Court directs you to go east and west, can you go east and west and a little bit south. I

believe their answer to that was we would be on thin ice if we do.

2.2

My question is, does this one more time put us in jeopardy with the Supreme Court when we present it back to them? I know that is a judgment call, but I know you have considered, you discussed it with staff and I wander, my question is what is the reaction of staff and our Chair in terms of, and counsel, whether or not we would be at jeopardy of this map being completely thrown out because we have tweaked District 5 too much?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Gibson, you are recognized to respond.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. President.

I am sorry, did you ask me if staff has said we are in jeopardy or the Chair has said we are in jeopardy, I would yield to the Chair I guess on that answer.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you are recognized to respond to Senator Gibson's deferral.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. And I think I heard the
question. You were asking about the concerns

that we had with deviating from the CD 5 that is in the map before you, correct?

2.3

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Montford.

SENATOR MONTFORD: That is correct because one of the reasons that was given in opposition to the amendment that I presented the other day which was similar but more aggressive, was that we are running the risk that the whole map will be thrown out, and I am hoping that this map is less risky, excuse me, this amendment is less risky so that we can encourage support of this amendment.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano,

Leader Galvano, you are recognized to respond.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. And to answer your question,

yes, we do move out of a safe harbor into a

risk scenario if we are to adopt this, this

amendment. And then, of course, we have

already seen some Q and A on the ripple effect

impacts as well.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Montford, you are recognized for a question or is your question to the Bill sponsor or to the Leader?

SENATOR MONTFORD: To the sponsor.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: You are recognized for a question.

2.2

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Senator Gibson, I applaud you for your efforts

and Senator Simmons in moving up the BVAP. I

have serious reservation again about the BVAP

of the current map and your efforts to move

that up should be applauded.

I believe if we are not mistaken you are moving up like two points.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Gibson, you are recognized to respond.

SENATOR GIBSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there any further questions for the amendment sponsor? Are there any further questions for the amendment sponsor? Seeing no further questions we are in debate. Is there any debate on the amendment?

Senator Montford, you are recognized in debate.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would encourage the members of this body to support this amendment. One more time, it is a good indication of where we need I believe to use our judgment because we are well in-tuned

with these maps. We are well aware of the implications of it. I have serious reservations about the current BVAP score of the proposed map.

This amendment will, will increase it by two points. So I would encourage your favorable consideration of this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Is there any further debate? Senator Thompson, Senator from the 12th, you are recognized in debate.

SENATOR THOMPSON: Thank you,

Mr. President. Senators, I would urge all of
us to support this amendment this morning,
because it gives us an opportunity to have
people who have been locked out of the
political process to have greater opportunity
to participate.

When this amendment was introduced in committee, Senator Simmons talked about the complexion of our Legislature, and his desire as I believe is the desire of all of us to have a Legislature, to have a Congress that reflects the diversity of the state of Florida and not to see that diminished. This amendment would

mean that we would adopt a map that would give us additional opportunities.

2.2

I have been a proponent of Fair Districts because I believe that Fair Districts means that in addition to the incumbents that we have in Congress now who represent these minority districts, we would have additional individuals. And in committee I asked about the representation of African-Americans in Congress and the response was what I knew that it would be, and that is for 23 years we have had three African-Americans from Florida in Congress, stagnant, 23 years.

And so this map would give us the opportunity to have, in addition to rather than instead of. We know that the configuration on the base map for Congressional District 5 takes in a lot of prisons, and while those individuals who are incarcerated are counted in the voting age population, they cannot vote because they are incarcerated. And even if they were to be released today they would be unable to vote. Many of them would have to wait five years, seven years before they could even apply.

Florida is one of the few states in the nation that has this kind of permanent disenfranchisement. And so by coming south we have an opportunity to have, in addition to rather than instead of.

I think the current configuration of

Congressional District 5 runs the risk of

taking us back to a point where we have none,

and Fair Districts was designed to bring about

in addition to rather than instead of.

We have a very effective competent individual representing us in Congressional District 5, and I think that legislative service is about bringing the resources to your community and the incumbent has done that, and without this amendment the map would disadvantage and we are not supposed to draw districts to disadvantage out incumbents. And so I ask that you support the Gibson/Simmons' amendment this morning.

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate? Further in debate? Leader Galvano, you are recognized in debate.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Mr.

President. And I, too, appreciate the genesis of this amendment. I appreciate that both our Rules Chair, Senator Simmons and Senator Gibson have put effort into this and the concerns raised as were raised by Senator Montford. I am though going to ask that you vote down this amendment, and the reason I am going to ask that is because we are in a remedial process.

I said that many times, but the reality of that cannot be lost at any step of the way. We are here because the Court has given us specific direction to go back and fix infirmities that it has found and we have to justify what we have done and have to get reviewed again with the hope that we will be approved or the product that the Legislature puts forward will be approved.

And in this one instance with regard to CD 5, whether or not any of us agree with it, whether we disagree with it being east/west or the configuration, itself, the Court's opinion is very specific and instructive, and is a safe harbor with this very controversial district. This was still the same district we came back here last year to deal with. So I think you

put the product in product in jeopardy if we go too far out of the -- out of the lines.

And then I will get into the ripple effect, I think Chairman Bradley brought it up in his Q and A and that is something you have to take into consideration as well. So unfortunately I am going to ask that you not support this.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate? Further in debate?

Senator Gibson, you recognized -- Senator Simmons.

SENATOR SIMMONS: Someone asked me why I was doing this, and the answer is, is that it truly is more than academic. It is, it is personal. You know, I grew up on a farm, both of my parents were public school teachers, and to move from the farm to go to Ohio at times because they didn't pay teachers hardly anything in Tennessee at that time.

I know that for me Saturday was just another work day and vacations were what other people took. So while my -- my views on this are in fact academic. They are also personal and I also know I look around and I see Senator

Thompson and Leader Joyner and Senator Gibson, and Senator Braynon and Senator Soto in the rich diversity that we have here in this chamber as well as in the House of Representatives, as well as in the -- as in the Congress.

And I will tell you this, you don't lightly change the system that has assured that individuals who are citizens not only have the right to vote, but they have the right to participate and be a part of this process as the members here are. So I take it with real, real sensitivity and personal interest when -- when we talk about changing the way that we are going to permit individuals, citizens to be a part of this process, a real part of this process, not just voting, which is important, of course, but in fact to be here.

And so Fair Districts, what does Fair
Districts say? Fair Districts says that we are
not to diminish the ability of minorities to
elect the individuals, the candidates of their
choice. Just like the Voting Rights Act, the
Federal Voting Rights Act, that legislation
that, that permitted the inclusion rather than

exclusion of minorities in this process. So I have never taken the position that the Fair Districts does anything other than to assure the continued ability of minorities to elect the candidates of their choice.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

What I saw when I saw the Supreme Court decision, and as many of you know, I am one of the strongest advocates for our judicial system, in our Supreme Court which I highly respect, and the members of the Supreme Court, and I take it that their decision was based not upon the fact that they would go ahead and adopt an east/west pattern for Congressional District 5 simply because they wanted to do that, but in fact, because we are as Chair Galvano has said, in a remedial process, and therefore, the Legislature has the burden of proof under these circumstances and since the Legislature has the burden of proof, we are to give sufficient evidence that should not be an east/west configuration as the Plaintiffs have alleged in the underlying litigation.

Well, the fact of it is, is nothing changes the fact that we are supposed to assure that minorities have the ability to elect the

candidates of their choice. The question is the execution of that plan and supposedly Congressional District 5 does that. As prepared and as drafted, we are trading a north/south configuration for an east/west configuration and we are diminishing I believe the ability of minorities to elect a candidate of their choice.

2.2

And in so doing we have traded under the existing base map and map that is presented to you, a map that has not 143 miles in length, as the north/south configuration had, 143 miles from Jacksonville to Orlando, trading it for 206 miles of length, another 60 miles of length.

Now, what is a resident, a voter, a constituent in Jacksonville going to do if there is a Congress person representing them headquartered in Tallahassee. It is a long drive? And what about the size of that district? This is the old Congressional District 5, less than 2,000 square miles, and this new one, almost 4,000 square miles.

And remember, we are not here for visual esthetics, we are here for, as Senator Gibson

has said to you, it is to assure the enfranchisement of people who have been historically discriminated against. That is what we are here for.

In other words, we are here as she said to do the right thing, and I applaud Senator Gibson for what she has done and she and I have worked together and she has done an admirable job in this.

And I also thank staff, Jay, for the excellent job that he has done in assuring that what has been created here is done the right way. And I want to say to you that when you go ahead and take a district that you are going to change a few points and treat it as if it is not something special, the difference between 48.11 percent black voting age population and reducing it to 45.12 percent as this map does, take every percent seriously and sensitively because what you are doing is you are not just talking about a couple of percent, you are talking about lives.

You are talking about the future, and then you take into consideration, well, what do you

see wrong with this east/west configuration.

First and foremost, I see that the analysis by our Supreme Court on page 84 is just simply incorrect.

2.2

I respect it, but just like the Trial

Judge, I can respectfully disagree with it, and
to take the position that simply because, as is
stated on page 84 of their opinion, because
they talk about the minority participation in,
in the district. Now there is a reason why
there is a high minority participation in this
district, this new district. It is because in
north Florida the Democrats oftentimes vote
Republican and don't show up for a primary.
But then the Supreme Court says and the
Democratic candidate is still likely to win the
general election since Democratic voters out
number Republicans 61.1 percent to 23 percent.

Well, the simple fact of it is, is that doesn't take into consideration that many voters simply have voted Republican irrespective of them being Democrat. And so the numbers and to give numbers like that fails to in fact consider the circumstances.

I will tell you another thing that is

wrong, another thing is wrong is it takes into considerations that there is 17,000 individuals incarcerated in prisons in this district, and approximately 50 percent of them are

African-American and they can't vote, and you know what that does? The analysis that Senator Gibson and I saw is that what is going to happen is that that actually reduces the black voting age population by one to one and-a-half percent.

2.2

So we are not talking about 45.12 percent, Senators, we are talking less than 45 percent and every one of those percentage points is critical. The fact of it is, is that, Senators, I am concerned. I am concerned about the rich diversity of our population, of our citizens not being reflected in the elected bodies that we have. And so I don't take lightly the fact that this new district reduces the amount, the number of those who are able to elect a candidate of their choice. And so it is personal to me, it is academic to me, and I will tell you this, it is personal to you. It is personal to all of us.

Now, at the same time you have heard what

Chair Galvano has said, and he is right, he is absolutely right. His position is in fact I believe one that has the merit and that is that we are on, we are hanging by a thread right now. If we go ahead and we adopt this, then we, we risk the entirety of this and the other good things that this map has, being challenged and lost.

And so let me say this. We are at a crossroads. We have lost a lot of ability here to assure that we have the complexion in our legislative bodies that we ought to have, and with that I am going to -- I am going to defer to Senator Galvano.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate?

Senator Gibson, you are recognized in debate.

Yes, I apologize, you are recognized to close on your amendment.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Senator Simmons, for all of our work together, and certainly I appreciate all of your comments and also recognize the constraints in which we have been placed.

On the other hand, I also recognize that, and I have a little bit of history here where

Josiah Walls was the first African-American to get elected to Congress in 1871, and it took
116 years for another African-American to be elected to Congress from the state of Florida,
116 years.

2.2

That is a very long time for people to wait to be included in a process and make sure that their interests were incorporated in how the laws were developed in this state and how the dollars that we send or they sent back then, went to Washington and came back to this state for the needs of the people of this state.

And this morning my good friend, Senator

Detert and I, were having a discussion about

the lay of the land in general. We weren't

talking about lines, because we couldn't do

that without the recorder on, and the

discussion turned to race as I guess we have

discussed throughout this process, and race is

important and it is important that we recognize

that and embrace that as an issue in this

discussion.

And so after we were finished talking,

Senator Detert, I thought about the movie that,

I think most people in this chamber might remember, Guess Who is Coming to Dinner.

You are too young? And the shock and awe of an interracial relationship, and there is shock and awe today. Not in my family, because I have a very blended and diverse family, thank God, but everybody doesn't think like that.

Everybody is not accepting no matter how much we want to believe that times have changed, in some places they haven't.

We can take down all of the Confederate flags in the world, but until we change the heart and mind of people we are not really doing anything, and such is the case with the drawing of the map.

I have seen how a Democrat or even a

Republican for that matter can work their tail

off and still not win the support of certain

ethnic groups. It is just a matter of fact.

It is just a part of history. And so I believe

this amendment is an opportunity to create

inclusion. It is not to create divisiveness.

We have enough of that.

So I am wholeheartedly giving all I can to make sure that we end up with a district that

even though it is 81, not 87 Convex Hull which is not that far removed for the district that you spoke about, the impact that a new CD 5 with a little tweak to the south would create inclusion and attention to the cultural impacts that sometimes minority communities go through.

The health disparities, the income disparities, all of those things that sometimes it takes a representative of kind to understand those things and then drive legislation and physical priorities to a particular district.

And so I understand where this amendment is going, but I do believe in it and I would ask you for your favorable support.

Thank you.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Gibson having closed on her amendment, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

PRESIDENT GARDINER: All opposed.

(Chorus of nays.)

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Show it not adopted.

We are back on the strike all amendment by

Senator Galvano, which is the substance of the

committee product. Are there additional

questions on the Galvano amendment? Excuse me, Senator Galvano amendment?

2.

2.2

Is there debate on the Senator Galvano's amendment? President Gaetz of the 1st District, you are recognized in debate.

SENATOR GAETZ: Mr. President, will I be allowed to ask a question?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: I apologize,

President Gaetz, absolutely, you are recognized to ask a question.

SENATOR GAETZ: Thank you very much,

Mr. President. Senator Galvano, thank you for
all your work and the work of our professional
staff under extraordinary circumstances.

And my question has to do with sort of the bicameral nature of our Legislature. Our colleagues and partners in the House of Representatives have taken action on a revised congressional redistricting map.

They have approved the base map in, one must observe was a grudging obedience to the Supreme Court. If we approve the amendment which has been filed under your name, what -- what sense could you give the Senate that there would be good faith on the part of both the

Senate and the House to accept some or all of the changes in the base map which are encompassed in the amendment that bears your name?

2.2

And I am standing sensitive in asking this question to the admonitions of Senator Latvala on more than one occasion that we are the Senate and that we need to speak from a basis of analysis that we develop here. So I am not asking for you to tell us that we ought to kowtow to anyone else, although apparently we are kowtowing to someone here, otherwise we wouldn't be here, but what basis do you believe there might be for a good faith negotiations between the two chambers on this matter, or are we making a statement?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano to respond to the question.

SENATOR GALVANO: Yes, thank you,

Mr. President. And I appreciate President

Gaetz, you bringing that up. First of all, let

me tell you, this is not just theater. We had

a meaningful committee process that involved an

analysis of the base map, and frankly the

adoption of much of it, just like the House has

done. But as part of our committee work we were able to achieve a product that in fact is better on Tier 2 than the map that we began with as a discussion point.

2.2

And so having achieved that improvement I have no reason to doubt that there will be a good faith discussion between the chambers and it is my intention and I was going to say this in close, that when we complete our work here today to reach out to Chairman Oliva and invite him in a public setting to sit down with myself and counsel and staff, and frankly since it public, anyone else who wants to come and be there, and discuss the differences so that we might explain how the amendment that was put on which was a blended amendment during the committee process, improve the map.

I believe our product that we have before us today is compliant with Tier 1 and Tier 2 of the State Constitution, abides by Federal law and is something that we should stand by and be proud to send across the hall.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: President Gaetz for a follow up question.

SENATOR GAETZ: Thank you very much,

Mr. President. Chair Galvano, I know that you don't have the gift of prophecy, maybe you do, but I would like to ask you as well based on your scholarly and extraordinary study of the Supreme Court's ruling and your masterful, and your height, and your masterful dedication of this process, that is the part where we say, but.

However, notwithstanding that, Chairman Galvano, do you believe that the -- that the amendment that, that is before us today will satisfy the Supreme Court and will satisfy the Plaintiffs in this case who appear to have in all cases the ear of the Supreme Court?

The Plaintiffs based on my analysis and my reading of the popular press have already criticized the base map and said that is not acceptable. And so therefore have -- have you come to any kind of conclusion that you might share with us as we vote as to whether or not you believe that those who will now make the policy in this state, which is the Plaintiffs in this matter, will be satisfied with your proposal?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano to

respond.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. President Gaetz, what I can

tell you and the rest of the Senators is that

we entered this session with a high level of respect for the opinion that the Supreme Court offered, and I say respect for it based on the

8 way our system of checks and balances work.

I am not saying necessarily in agreement, but what that respect meant was that we were going to undertake the process as we felt like within the opinion it was laid out, and there were discussions with Chairman Simmons. The legal counsel gave us some advice and then of course, as you mentioned, I have spent a great deal of time looking at the opinion myself.

So to begin with I feel like we have conducted ourselves in a, through a process that the Supreme Court or a Circuit Court as the case may be, is not going to be able to find fault with.

We have been transparent, we have taken extraordinary steps of even recording meetings between staff and members as distasteful as that might be to some or all of us here. And

so having taken these extraordinary steps I believe that we -- we have achieved a process that is far different than the process on which the Court found violations in Tier 1.

2.2

The next step was to look at the opinion and determine what instruction the Court had for the specific districts, and that is why the Presiding Officers, rightfully so, sent staff into a meeting with attorneys to go through the opinion and create a basis for us to begin our real discussion and the real actual decision-making on the map, and I went through in the opening today the certain aspects of the eight districts that were raised by the Court, the instructive opinion that we got.

We heard just a few moments ago on CD 5, how there are other ways to approach, but again, in reference, in deference to the opinion of the Court we are approaching the remedial plan a certain way.

So, yes, I have confidence in the remedial plan. If I didn't I wouldn't waste everybody's time here today to go through it and to present it and to push it forward. Can I predict what the Court will do? I wish I could. My hourly

rate will go way up.

2.2

And as far as the Plaintiffs are concerned, the Court was responding specifically to the challenges raised by the Plaintiffs. I should hope that they will look at this map in good faith and look at it against the back drop of the opinion and look at it in terms of how we have come back here and engaged in a process that I just described and recognize that this -- this is a product that is, is constitutional and acceptable.

Whether they do that I do not know.

You know, President Lee said we are on a hamster wheel of sorts and that may be the case, and these types of redistricting issues are replete with challenges and sometimes it goes on and on and on. But I do believe if anyone analyses what we have produced and how we produced it with an objective view, they are going to find that we fulfilled the requirements of the judicial branch.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: President Gaetz for a follow up.

SENATOR GAETZ: Final question,
Mr. President. And I take nothing away from

the Plaintiffs. They have been brilliant, they have out lawyered us, of course it always helps with the Referees are wearing the same color jersey as the opposing team.

2.2

2.3

But my final question, Chair Galvano, is this. In all of the efforts that you and professional staff and your committee and the House and its committee have made, have the Plaintiffs in this case come forward ever and said, here is what we will satisfy us, ever?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you are recognized.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. The Plaintiffs have put maps

forward. They have not appeared before the

committee. They were invited to appear before

the committee, and they did send a letter in on

Friday, this last Friday. We responded to that

letter and invited team to have further input.

But if you are asking me if there was testimony and presentation before the committee from the Plaintiffs, the answer is no.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Okay. We are in debate. Is there debate on the amendment? Is there debate? Senator Braynon in debate.

SENATOR BRAYNON: Thank you,

Mr. President. This is my, I think this is my third time debating on this map. This is my third time talking about the redistricting process, and I made some comments and I have — I have made some votes and, you know, I am going to say that my opinion or I guess that is what we are calling it, my opinion has things that I think are wrong with maps or things that I think are wrong with the process has been confirmed three times.

I am 3 and 0 with the Supreme Court. So I am going to proffer my opinion again and it may be somewhat of a, maybe look into a crystal ball and as Senator, President Gaetz said, maybe it is they are wearing the same team jersey, but I am going to proffer my opinion.

And my opinion is that I would really, really, really, really like us to look again at Senator Bullard's amendment. Senator Bullard's amendment, and again, it is important that we think about the past rulings and about intent, and what happened -- it is not at times they talk about what it leads to, to form your intent. But whether you agree or disagree with

what the Court said, that is what they have been saying.

2.2

And what the change in this district does is it draws out, it comes off of a main highway and draws out a huge African-American community. And why do you do that?

Well, the reasons were given, right, but what other reasons could we have? Well, you know, it is important that you understand that we are not supposed to take into account, and again, maybe I am helping us to defend or helping us to understand what is about to happen in the Court.

You are not supposed to look at performance, at political performance unless it is a voted VRA protected seat, both of these seats are. So therefore we do get to see their performance, we do see their performance and you are not supposed use it, but you can't see it, right. So that kind of, that kind of frames it to say that you actually, you actually do know how they perform.

So now we take home -- so the Court orders is to take Homestead out, and all of a sudden we pick this community and we draw them into

II

it.

What is our intent? What is our intent and what is the Court going to think our intent is? Now, we can say what we want, but I am just, I am telling you and we even, it has been proven time and time again in front of the Supreme Court, if they believe our intent is something other than what it is we are saying because we have made very good legal cases for what our intent was to draw these maps before, and they have come back and said, but we think your intent was this.

And I am telling you, there is another way to draw to find population that does not come off of a main highway, encompassing an entire African-American community, to put population back into, what was that, 27. So I really think that is, that is where we are going to go ayre, and if we don't go back and look at that we are basically setting ourselves back up to do this all over again, or worse case scenario because I have heard people talking about this, is advocate our duties and let the Court draw it.

That is, that is my opinion, and I have

been through this a few times and I am 3 and 0.

I hope not to be 4 and 0, but I can never -
you can never say I didn't tell you. So I -- I

-- I really think you need to relook at that as

we go through discussions with the House.

Thank you, Mr. President.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further debate? Further debate? Senator Galvano, you are recognized to close on your amendment.

Senator of the 19th district, Senator Joyner in debate.

SENATOR JOYNER: Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Well, just real quick, Senator Joyner. Is there any further debate before I recognize the Minority Leader and then, Senator Lee. You are recognized.

SENATOR LEE: Yes, thank you,

Mr. President. And I want to thank you for

allowing me to participate and sit on this

committee, and allow me to spend two additional

weeks of my summer in Tallahassee. It is

always where I wanted to be in August.

But this committee worked really hard on your behalf, Mr. President, and under the direction and supervision of Senator Galvano,

and we came up here for a reason. We had -- we had maps drawn in tandem, base maps drawn in tandem by House and Senate staff, Jay Ferrin and two staffers from the House on the 20th floor of the Capitol working with our lawyers and the Supreme Court ruling in their hand, drew a base map and we were called into special session to look at that. If Senator Galvano said it once he said it 15 times, that this map was a base map for discussion purposes, a discussion map. It was not intended to be a final product, and I know my leadership well enough in this chamber to know that if I was called up here simply to rubber stamp something that was drawn on the 20th floor by staff they have told me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I could have gotten a lot of work done here, back home over the Internet in my business as opposed to paying attention and trying to understand the concerns of my colleagues, read the news clips, see the feedback we were getting from back home and various parts of the state and try to see if we couldn't find a way, a better way to build a mouse trap. If I had known our job here was

simply to come up and rubber stamp a map that was drawn by three staff people, all of which are proven to be extremely talented and done a marvelous job in creating a starting point for us, but that was not what I was told. That is not what we were told.

2.2

I know that is not what Senator Galvano thought and I know that is not what our President thought. And so, you know, for me to -- to hear that we are somehow foreclosed from considering amendments when I listened to some of the debate at the other end of the hall, I don't know what direction they received from their membership, but I know that no one has ever told me that.

And the person that was in the center of what became this amendment I want to tell you, that there is zero institutional pride, ego, pride of authorship or anything in what we have done here.

Very simply, I heard loud and clear from

Senator Detert through the newspaper, not from
a conversation I had with her or any phone call
or e-mail, but through the newspaper reporting
that went on down in her area of the state that

there was some concern about what happened to Congressional District 16.

That resulted in Senator Bradley having an amendment that was being drafted and ultimately offered in committee to reverse course on the base map with respect to Congressional District 16 which further effected Hillsborough County.

I heard from Senator Joyner who on the record in committee expressed concerns about the coalition nature of Congressional District 14 and was there a way to improve that district's performance from a coalition standpoint, while not doing any damage to the compactness.

I came here with frustrations going back to the early '90s, about how Hillsborough County had been a donor county, not just one congressional district, districting, but consistently had been a donor county to other counties as congressional districts converged in my county but the representation lived somewhere else. Frankly the base map improved on that condition.

And so I saw as many of you do when you sit in committee, wow, there is some concerns

coming out of one area, there is some concerns back home from my history in the community, and listening to Senator Joyner, maybe it makes sense to sit down with our staff and see if there is a way to resolve some of these differences.

Again, operating against the back drop
that we are free to come up with amendments.

So I am handed the Constitutional amendment
that says all of these districts are Tier 2
standard districts. Your challenge, Senator,
is to build a better mouse trap, but to improve
the map along the way because the burden of
proof is going to be on you.

Now, I would like to take credit for the total credit for the work product, but the truth is that our staff has forgotten more than I will ever know about redistricting. But when push came to shove, when we worked through Amendment 9046, it had compaction issues.

We developed 9048. It was better on compaction but still it had compaction issues and city split issues. And then an idea came up that resulted in Amendment 9054 that was adopted in committee and has now become

overlaid on the base map, and we have four less city splits in this map, four less city splits. That means we kept two cities together more than in the base map.

2.2

We have one less county split than was in the base map and our compaction scores are better depending on where you set your priorities in terms of looking at these two, but they are certainly no worse. We have produced a better map.

Now, other people might disagree with that, but all I can do is look at the Constitution which says you got to keep cities and counties together where you can and you have to focus on compaction and none of those are priority over the other and every metric we have improved on the base map.

And I want to thank the committee, thank the Chairman, thank the Senators for allowing us to make use of our time up here and not be sent up here to rubber stamp something, that is not what we do. And I realize we are in a remedial process and I realize that we have to be very cautious about how far we go, but as our staff said in committee, once you overlay

on to the map, the Tier 1 district issues that have to be addressed, and address the things that were specifically referenced by the Supreme Court in its Order, there is still a blank canvas out there that has to be filled in by this Legislature, and how you do that is going to set priorities on the basis of those Tier 2 standards and there are going to be districts that when you push on the balloon one place they pop out somewhere else and there are going to be winners and losers, there is going to be effected parties and we tried as best we could on a practical basis to minimize that as much as possible because I know that every time you push on a reapportionment map it pops out somewhere else and some -- you may pick up some other objection.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So every effort was made to try to minimize the collateral impacts of the map that we came up with by virtue of the concerns that were expressed in committee, and I know we are headed into a reconciliation process of some form, and I just wanted to make it abundantly clear again, I have immense respect for the other parties that are participating in this

from the Joint Committee standpoint, my colleagues in the House, and whatever their view of the world might be with respect to our map, but we need, we were instructed to look at this in the context of performance as to 1 and 2, as to Tier 1 and Tier 2 only. Not to look at who votes how or what districts people might be in, but to respect county, city boundaries, respect geographical boundaries, respect these compactness scoring methods that after been identified, the geometrics, if you will, of 12 compactness.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Respect visual compactness and essentially draw maps in the dark. And I think when the record is reviewed and I know it will be, and I hope it will be, that people will see that the process that we followed to get from point A to this moment in time on the Senate floor was entirely in the open, was entirely focused on Tier 1 and Tier 2 issues as contained in the Constitution, and nothing, nothing else.

Now, if our map is not as compliant constitutionally as the alternative map that is being offered by the House of Representatives, then let's have that conversation, let's come

to the conclusion. But let's not let this come down to a pride of authorship question or for goodness sake, suggest that we were all sent up here simply to adopt and rubber stamp a map that was drawn by three people on the 20th floor that is going to effect 20 million people that we were all elected to represent.

2.2

Now, some will say, well, you know, this is not our first bite at the apple and that we are only here because some mistakes have been made. Well, I think there is probably a third of this Senate that wasn't here when these maps were originally drawn, maybe more, because there was election in 2012, and we had one of the largest freshmen class in history.

We have had elections since then when
Senators Hudson came in, and I know I wasn't
here, but I have heard loud and clear how we
got to this remedial process. I understand
where we are at. I have seen the Court's
reception or their ruling as to our process,
and have made every effort myself to do exactly
what they have asked us to do, but not come up
here and take two weeks out of my summer simply
to sit here and pretend that my job has been

relegated to the staff of the Florida

Legislature and that I have no function but to
hit this red or green button.

That is not the way we operate, but if it is the way we operate then there is some good news because we have another special session coming, and we have a full session coming, and perhaps, you know, we could just come up here in March of next year in the last week and just see what staff has produced and then we will just hit red and green buttons until we can get out of here.

That is not the way we operate here, and I know my leadership well enough to know, we might produce a better work product actually now that I think about it, but I know my leadership well enough to know that they just didn't waste my time, that this was supposed to be a meaningful process and I think as a result of the work product that we have all collaborated together to create we have built a better mouse trap.

And I just think it is important as we move in this reconciliation process that we -- that this body know that the process that we

followed was honest, it was consistent with our mandate from the Court. There was integrity, there was transparency, every conversation was recorded. This was an objective approach to try to build a better mouse trap. We have accomplished that, and I feel very, very confident after talking with our lawyers and Senator Galvano that we have a more constitutionally compliant map as a result of the work of this Florida Senate than what we were presented with to begin with.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Thank you, President Lee. Senator Montford. Senator Montford, in debate.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you,

Mr. President, and I will make this very brief.

I want to thank you, Mr. President, for

assigning me this committee. If I had not been

on this committee I don't think I would have

understood nearly as well as I do today the

constraints, the limitations, the parameters in

which this committee had to work, but I will be

remiss if I didn't express some concerns that I

have.

It concerns me that, that we take one part of Florida, north Florida, and we are treating it differently. The instructions that I got finally dawned on me after several hours of discussion, that basically we were instructed to take District 5, the Romo A and put it in place and start in south Florida and move up. To me that is treating this area of Florida different.

We are unique in north Florida,

Tallahassee, Leon county and surrounding areas,
we are different in a lot of ways.

Tallahassee, Leon County is the hub of medical
services, it the hub of educational services,
if you will. Certainly it is the employment
center of most of north Florida, and I
understand the concern about the distance, but
we have people driving to Tallahassee almost
100 miles one way.

My Senate District is two time zones, 11 counties, thank goodness I get along with my counterpart in the House. We ride together, it is like a Pony Express sometimes. He drives a while and I drive a while until we get to where we are going. But it concerns me that we have

taken one part of Florida and treating differently.

It concerns me that Florida State University under this map and all the amendments and Florida A&M University will be represented by two different Congress people. It concerns me that Florida State University's campus divided in two congressional districts. It concerns me that we once again in this particular part of Florida is being treated differently, and that gives me, that gives me a great of deal of concern. But considering the constraints that we have, considering the limitations we have been given, considering the fact that we also know that we are entered into the same process with our own Senate districts I am a realist and understand that we have got to move forward with this.

So again, Mr. President, I thank you for the opportunity to serve with Senator Galvano and this committee.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate?

Further in debate? Senator Joyner, you are recognized in debate and then Senator Galvano.

SENATOR JOYNER: Thank you, Mr. President.

2425

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.2

First I would like to say that this has been indeed an enlightening process. And initially I did inquire about increasing the BVAP in Congressional District 14, but I receded from that position because I wanted to know the totality of what the state would look like with reference to the congressional districts and since, if you push this way you pop somewhere else and without any assurance that that would not do harm to someone else, I stood back from my request.

A lot has been said this last week and a lot of it dealt with what we are here doing today, looking at the map, making sure that we send back a constitutionally approved map as dictated by the Florida Supreme Court. But I have been so ashamed of the comments that some of my colleagues have made about the House, about the Florida Supreme Court, both in this chamber and the other chamber.

I have listened at the Florida Supreme

Court has been accused of overreaching, as they have been accused of wrongdoing in violations of their oath. I watched to utter embarrassment that some have demanded and thank

God it was no one here in the Senate, that the Justices be brought before the Legislature by subpoena to explain their actions.

Some even suggested that they be impeached. It is time to stop. It is really time to stop it and that is what we need to do. We are not here because of any impropriety by the Florida Supreme Court. They do not need to explain themselves. They have sent us literally hundreds of pages explaining themselves. So it is time we listened.

It is time we acted in conformity with the oath that we took. It is time we stopped acting petulantly. This is not the time for hubris, it is the time for our humility.

Frankly, it is time for someone to apologize to the citizens of this great state.

The voters overwhelmingly passed the Fair
District Amendment. How often do 63 percent of
Floridians agree on anything in an election?
And what they agreed on was that we should draw
lines without advancing the interests of a
political party or an incumbent. The Florida
Supreme Court, a separate independent branch of
government, created by the Constitution and

entrusted and instructed to interpret the law and yet we disagree with their opinions, but who are we to assail them at the level with which we did. There has been talk, reform them, change them and who knows what that was.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Joyner, if you could, in your reference to some say, could you please clarify the intent or who said that, because I am not aware of any of those comments that have come from any of the Senators in this chamber?

SENATOR JOYNER: I said earlier that it didn't come from the Senate. There was statements made by Senators not agreeing with the Supreme Court, and I acknowledge that we have that right not to agree with them.

That is the freedom of speech that we are all accorded, but to assail them just because they did their job is like assailing us because we do ours. And I just think that it is inappropriate for us to decide that we are the ones who should decide how they should rule.

If that is the case then why, why a separate branch? But we as the Legislature traveled around the state of Florida declaring

to anyone that would listen that this was a

transparent, a non-partisan process, except

that it wasn't as evidenced by the opinion and

what came out in the Court.

2.2

On page 27 of the Supreme Court opinion states that partisan operatives exchanged maps with legislative staff through non-public e-mails and secret Drop Boxes.

Page 23, on line 5 said that the operatives were paid and working for the Republican party of Florida. In fairness, decades ago I can envision that the Democratic led Legislature of the State of Florida also had partisan operatives doing the redistricting process, but except back then we did not have the Fair District Amendment embedded in the Constitution.

So there is no equivalency. What was done this time was wrong and it was in violation of our Constitution according to the Florida

Supreme Court. The evidence produced and is shown in the record says that e-mails were destroyed, and of course, we did what we all do when seeking to have adequate representation, we lawyer up. And we, the Legislature, spent

millions of dollars to effect, and the lawyers sought to make sure that the discovery was done and to keep what they saw in their minds as being detrimental to their clients to keep it from coming up, but -- and from being discovered.

But the League of Women Voters and common cause would dog it. So they carried the burden of bringing truth to power so that we could find out if our Constitution had been violated. And let me say most proudly, I am thankful of the Supreme Court of the State of Florida that they were willing to stand up and defend the rules of law no matter how many accusations were hurled their way because that is their job. Just as it is ours to make the law that so many people say why did they pass that damn law.

Well, we didn't consider it bad when we passed it. Whatever these myriad of laws that we pass, we are all subject to being at a level out that by those who send us here. And then my or colleagues across the hall, they think they casting stones is somehow a smart strategy, but they need to be reminded that

that same opinion shows incriminating e-mails as it relates to a former Speaker and others.

Sanctimony is ironic as it is
hypocritical, but the fact that this body has
chosen to admit its wrongdoing, that is -- that
is a great start. The truth is we need a whole
lot more reconciliation, and I heard today that
that is what we are going to do.

Nobody involved in any of this has been disciplined in any way or reprimanded, and some of those who benefited to carry out this is still working for us. This is America, and the lawyers who were a part of the process, they are still in business. We have spend millions in taxpayer dollars defending the indefensible, in my opinion, lawyers are not supposed to enable bad behavior, they are supposed to advise them and I find them equally culpable for the mess that we are in today.

So let me do something that has not been done yet by anyone in the process. I would like to apologize to the people of the state of Florida. Even though I know I had nothing to do with what was discovered with respect to the e-mails and the Drop Boxes and all of that came

about as a result of discovery that brought us here, the people of this state need to know that at least one person in this body has regrets for what has happened, and I am sure that many of us share that with me.

The people have a right to be angry, and I am sorry that this body did not comport themselves consistent with our obligations as Senator leaders, and today I will vote against this map because although the vast majority of it is much better than what preceded it, it is still inexplicably shifts black communities in Richmond Heights and West Perine from District 26 to District 27.

This is an important issue, and in my judgment we have not sufficiently responded to the concern as enumerated by Senator Bullard with respect to this one piece of this puzzle, this map that we have come back to produce upon direction by the Florida Supreme Court. I know we can do better.

We are the best that there is in this state. We have come to this time and this place and all of the discussion has been good here today, and, no, I did not offer any maps

to change anything. Senator Bullard made it clear that he was going to deal with my major concern and that was 26 and 27.

I have that right to look at the cumulative effect of what we have done and to select any portion of it in reaching my decision as to whether I will or will not support the map here today, and I have enumerated that as we each will have that opportunity when we decide either to press the red or the green button.

That is the beauty of this system. We each have that right and I respect everyone's right to do what it is that they feel that is best for the people of the state of Florida and I have expressed how I feel about it, and I respect each and every one of you and how you arrive at your decision and we each do that differently, least we would be just poles of each other if we all just automatically followed what one thinks as opposed to our own thoughts. And today I have manifested my thoughts in my oral expression with no malice in my heart.

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you are recognized to close on your amendment.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. Mr. President, let me start by
thanking you, sir, for putting together the
committee. As President Lee said, you gave no
prescriptive instruction other than to do the
best job that we could do in complying with the
Constitution of the State of Florida, and
reacting to the opinion issued by the Supreme
Court. And that is what we did, and we put our
efforts towards producing a product that was
unassailable against that back drop.

And as I said during the line of questions from President Gaetz, that didn't necessarily mean that we agreed with the Supreme Court of Florida. The Supreme Court of Florida frankly the opinion I disagree with. Judge Lewis had a different opinion than the Supreme Court of Florida. Democratic Congresswoman Corrine Brown has brought a challenge in the Federal Courts because she disagrees with the way that the Florida Supreme Court has made its decision.

So our efforts here today are not to

somehow affirm or corroborate or prove the

world that we are in legally. Instead, it is a

question of respect for the fact that in our

system at this point the Supreme Court of

Florida is the interpreter of our Constitution,

and has interpreted the congressional maps in

the way that it has and has put forth an

opinion with very specific instructions with

regard to eight districts, and your committee

sought to abide by that opinion and that is

exactly what we have done.

2.2

Our staff which has been unbelievable, by the way, Jay Ferrin, I can't believe the work that you have done and the patience that you have had and the time you spent working with each and every one of us.

Our staff, together with House staff, did
a great job in capturing for discussion
purposes the essence of the opinion and
relating it to the certain districts involved.
But as you say, President Lee, the real process
began last Monday when we came in here and we
as a Legislature, as the ones who are elected
to make the decisions, began to deliberate and
discuss and review and consider what it was

that needed to be put into a congressional map.

And I am very pleased with the way the committee conducted itself. I didn't feel at any point in the process that we were there on a perfunctory basis. Every day the questions came from not just the committee members but people who were not on the committee who were invited to attend and given the opportunity to question and have a discussion with us, and it was thorough and it was meaningful and it was detailed and went into a lot of depth. And as part of that process the elected Senators on that committee brought forth amendments.

They brought forth amendments that were stand alone. We had discussions about combining certain amendments. Staff was sent on many tasks to go back and review and along with our legal counsel that has also been tremendous through this process, and eventually we produced a product that was not the base map, as good as the base map is, but in fact, more objectively constitutionally compliant than the base map.

We actually improved on the Tier 2 aspects in terms of splits to cities and then populated

split to a county, and again, members, it was genuine. The Bill that you are about to vote on represents a map that is more constitutionally compliant, has greater Tier 2 compliance than any map from this Legislature or filed in the judicial proceedings, and for those of you who don't know when I say filed, the Plaintiffs have also put forth maps in the proceedings.

This map beats them all, and this map beats what came out from across the hall as well, and it is a product of many hours, but a product of the elected members of this body.

With regard to the specific districts, I understand as I said earlier, Senator Bullard, and Vice Chairman Braynon, I call him Vice Chairman, he is the Vice Chairman, he did a great job. The argument being put forth on 26 and 27, but frankly we were talking about two Hispanic performing districts that had a specific instruction to restore Homestead whole which was done and at that point it went into the Tier 2 process and the population that was — was picked up was on the northwest side bordering the turnpike.

Simple compliance with the -- with the Constitution, and to have adopted the amendment that was put forward would not maintain that compliance in my opinion.

So I ask you all to support this map, to vote yes. Regardless if you have some reservation, Senator Gibson, I know you have reservations, Senator Montford and Chairman Simmons with record to CD 5. That fight is not over.

No, that is part of the challenge that has been brought in the Federal Court, but right now we are dealing with the Florida Supreme Court and we have a very specific instruction and a safe harbor opportunity. It is my goal as I am sure it is the goal of everybody in chamber to get this map passed, get through the judicial process, because by the way, we are still part of a Circuit Court proceeding.

The Supreme Court said we relinquish this to the Circuit Court, Circuit Court, while you have it, here is what is going to happen.

The Legislature is going to be back in and redraw and you are going to come back and decide whether it is a good product. So for

all intents and purposes we are still in an open legal proceeding as I speak with you today, and I am ready for that to be over.

I am ready for us to have gone through a process like we did, taking it on the chin by taking extraordinary steps that frankly offend me as a co-equal branch of government, as a member of the Florida Senate, because I do believe we have a greater level of autonomy than the opinion sets forth, but I am ready for us to be over and to have produced something that is not going to continue to be challenged and challenged and challenged, and I cannot think of any aspect of the last two weeks that is susceptible to a meritorious challenge.

Now, there may be those out there including the Plaintiffs who want to just keep on going and churning and because it is good political fodder and that is the reality of it, but if we are being responsible and if they are being responsible they will recognize the extraordinary steps that we have taken.

And with regard to the substance, the same thing. We have gone line by line through that opinion, and by the way, it is not a short

opinion, and with each reference the Court makes to a specific district we have taken the time to try to understand exactly what they are saying, and where it was a gray area, Chairman Simmons, you know this, where it was a gray area we erred on the more instructive conservative side of the Court. We gave the Court the benefit of the doubt, because we are ready to show that this is done right, it is 10 constitutional compliant, constitutionally compliant and we are ready to move, move on 12 with it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So I am confident that we have achieved that. Hopefully all of you are confident that we have achieved that, and while there remains some differences between the chambers, I hope to work those out. As I said earlier, I am going to invite Chairman Oliva in a public setting to sit down with us so we can have a full discussion as to what those differences are, and it involved one particular part of the state.

It is not that large of a caesium that we shouldn't be able to work this out, have a final product voted out by both chambers and on to the final judicial review. So I would expect that you would see that later this afternoon, Mr. President, if my invitation is accepted.

So again I thank all of you for your time today, your consideration, the amendments that were filed, and just know if you hit the green button you are hitting the button for, again, the most objectively constitutionally compliant map that has gone through this process, or frankly through the judicial process.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano,
having closed on, has deleted everything as to
the enacting clause amendment to the House
Bill, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

PRESIDENT GARDINER: All opposed? Seeing none, show it is adopted.

Senator of the 26th District, Senator

Galvano, moves that the Bill be read a third

time by the required two-thirds vote. Is there
objection? Seeing none, show the motion
adopted. Read the House Bill.

SENATE SECRETARY: House Bill 1-B, a Bill

to be entitled An Act Establishing the Congressional Districts of the State.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senators, we are now on the -- on third reading on the House Bill, House Bill 1-B as amended with the Senator Galvano amendment.

Is there additional debate? I know we went through it pretty good on the amendment, but I would certainly entertain if there is additional ones. If not then before we close there has been a lot of people to thank, but as your Presiding Officer I want to thank Senator Galvano.

So much of what you have seen is the product of Senator Galvano and his ability to bring all sides together. It is not without notice that the product before you passed out of committee unanimously. Individuals working together and to look at the issues that they faced and that would not have happened if not just for the Senate, but for Senator Galvano. So Senator, thank you for your leadership on this very, very difficult issue.

And I also want to recognize and thank Jay Ferrin. There is not a person that, you know,

two weeks ago Jay actually had a hair do like
Senator Latvala, but it is worn on him a little
bit, but while the committee did the work, this
individual was thrown into something that I
can't imagine the amount of time that he has
had to put in, and I know at one point last
week Reynold Meyer said, whatever we do we need
to let Jay get home and get some rest, and that
shows the amount of time and the passion that
he has for this process. So, Jay, thank you,
thank you for stepping up for the Senate on
this one.

And then finally before we close I want to thank our legal team and their advice, George and the team. I joke quite often and for those of you that will be blessed to preside over this incredible chamber, and I joked to President Gaetz that nobody told me that I would be the managing partner of the largest law firm in Florida, and there is some truth to that when you not only look at this issue but the many issues that the legislative branch can get caught up in the legal matters. So to George and the team thank you for everything that you have done, and this is as I said, and

as Senator Galvano said, this is a product that 1 2 we can be proud of. We indicated last week, Senator Galvano 3 4 did and I did in memos to you that the base map 5 was a starting point and at the end of the day 6 that the legislative branch would see fit to 7 make changes and we did and we feel very 8 comfortable with those. 9 So with that Senator Galvano, are you 10 ready to close, you had your fill? 11 Secretary will unlock the board and members 12 proceed to vote. 13 Have all members voted? 14 Secretary, lock the board and announce the 15 vote. 16 SENATE SECRETARY: Twenty-eight yeas, 17 eight nays, Mr. President. 18 PRESIDENT GARDINER: By your vote the Bill passes. Take up reading the next Bill. 19 20 SENATE SECRETARY: None on the desk, 21 Mr. President. 22 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Simmons, for 23 what purpose do you rise? 24 SENATOR SIMMONS: Mr. Chair, 25 Mr. President, to make a motion.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: I think before you do
that I do have two of our colleagues I need to
recognize. I apologize, Senator Simmons, if
you could take a seat for a second.

Senator Bullard, did you have an announcement?

2.2

SENATOR BULLARD: Thank you,

Mr. President. I would like to ask for a

moment of silence.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Will all Senators and guests in the gallery please rise. I think you are still recognized, Senator Bullard.

SENATOR BULLARD: Thank you,

Mr. President. As we all know, school is

starting in many of our counties and we are

starting next week and as a teacher one adage

that always impacts us is the one that says a

parent should never bury a child.

Many of the teachers feel the same way about their students. The class of 2004 was significant for me because it was the first time I had seen my ninth graders matriculate all of the way through high school. And yesterday one of the members of that class, of the class of 2004, unfortunately had to succumb

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Brief pause.)

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Thank

Thank you, Senators.

to a four-year battle with breast cancer at the ripe age of 29.

So I just wanted to take a moment, Senators, to recognize the life, the short life but the impactful life of Mrs. Sandy Sheppard who graduated twice from Florida A&M University, was a resident here in Tallahassee, Florida even though her family still resides in my district, and also was employed with two different state agencies, and leaves a husband and two living children. And understanding why the work that we do is so critically important here in the state of Florida we think about things like the cancer research that we fund here, understand that it has a real impact and the idea that a young lady who has meant so much to so many unfortunately lost her life and lost her battle yesterday at the age of 29 should be recognized. So I just want to recognize Mrs. Sandy Sheppard.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Will all members and guests, please bow your heads for a moment of silence.

Senator Soto, you have an announcement as well.

You are recognized.

2.2

SENATOR SOTO: Mr. President, a moment of silence for a hero from central Florida. I rise today to ask the Senate to observe a moment of silence and pay tribute to

Ms. Mildred Zapata. Ms. Zapata was born on

January 9th, 1939, in Mayaguez Puerto Rico, to

Jose Vidal Zapata and Adela Vasquez. At the time of her passing on August 9, 2015, she was a respected community liaison, volunteer and organizer for several different organizations that benefited the Hispanic communities and promote the Hispanic culture throughout the United States.

Mildred was the founder of several organizations such as Casa de Puerto Rico Organization and Demarcas organization. Ms.

Zapata's experience as a Board member and Vice President of the New York Puerto Rican Day Parade, later became the founder and President of the most famous contribution which is the Puerto Rican Day Parade of Florida that we have held in Orlando for the last 24 years until 2013.

As founder and President of the Puerto Rican Day Parade of Florida Mildred has been able to hand out scholarships for Hispanic students, share Free Kings day with under privileged children and senior citizens and worked with the Center for Drug Free Living, and Orlando Fights Back.

She was more recently awarded the J. C.

Penney Golden Rule award which acknowledges

exceptional volunteer service to a community

for at least 10 uninterrupted years.

Therefore, I ask the Senate to observe a moment

of silence to Mildred Zapata's efforts and

achievements to our community.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Please bow your heads in a moment of silence.

(Brief pause.)

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Thank you. Is there additional announcements?

President Gaetz, you are recognized.

SENATOR GAETZ: Thank you very much,

Mr. President. It is appropriate that on this

floor today there was a great deal of

discussion about equal rights and civil rights.

The civil rights movement lost an extraordinary

leader the day before yesterday when Julian Bond, my part time constituent died in Ft. Walton Beach.

Julian Bond was one of the great leaders of the civil rights movement in this country, and he as well was at one time a Senator from the State of Georgia, he was a Georgia State Senator. And Julian and his wife vacationed and lived part time in Destin and he and I often saw each other at his favorite haunt which was Harbor Docks restaurant in Destin, and he was always amused when I insisted on calling him Senator, because probably being a Florida or a Georgia State Senator was what he did in his life but it was probably one of the least of the honors that he accumulated in his extraordinary career as an advocate.

We would call each other Senator across the restaurant and then both laugh. But today it is with great sadness that I tell you that Senator Julian Bond, one of the great leaders for Equal Justice in America has died in my district. He is a credit to all Americans who believe in the causes for which he gave and dedicated his life, and I ask, Mr. President, a

moment of silence in memory of Julian Bond.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: All members please bow your heads.

(Brief pause.)

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Thank you. Senator of the 12th District, Senator Thompson, you are recognized.

SENATOR THOMPSON: Thank you,

Mr. President. Senators, I ask for a moment of silence for Ms. Eugenia B. Thomas of Miami.

Ms. Thomas was the State President of the PTA and devoted her life to children. She is honored in the Miami area with a K-8 school that is named for her, the Eugenia B. Thomas school.

She was instrumental in reviving Virginia
Beach which was the segregated beach in Miami.
She and her husband, Lawson Thomas, did a lot
in the Overtown Miami area, and Lawson Thomas
was the first African-American Judge in Florida
since reconstruction. And Eugenia Thomas was
very special to me because she is family.

Her son, John Thomas, is married to my oldest daughter, Latrice Thomas. So we have suffered a great loss with the passing of

Eugenia B. Thomas and I ask for a moment ever silence for her.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senators, please bow your heads.

(Brief pause.)

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Thank you. Are there additional announcements? Just a couple of things, members, just from a scheduling standpoint. I am going to take a motion from Senator Simmons here in a minute that we adjourn until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning or upon the call of the Chair.

If you have seen our activity today I don't think the House actually comes in until 10:00 tomorrow or maybe 9:30, but my guess is is that while we will say at 10:00, we most likely will not be in here at 10:00, but we will be in sometime tomorrow, so stay tuned. Keep an eye out for where we are.

Senator Galvano mentioned that he is going to request a public meeting today for the sides to begin the dialogue in regards to the differences between the two maps. Upon, when that time is set if it is accepted we will have a two-hour notice on that so that each of you,

if you choose to, can attend, and we would 1 encourage you to be a part of that discussion. 2 So I would stay tuned, hopefully we will 3 4 come out of that meeting with something that 5 the chambers could work on together and be very 6 proud of. 7 So Senator Galvano, am I forgetting 8 anything or is that consistent with where you 9 think we are? 10 Okay. All right, Senator Simmons, for 11 what purpose do you rise? 12 SENATOR SIMMONS: Mr. President, I move 13 that the Senate adjourn until 10:00 a.m. on 14 Thursday, August 20, or upon the call of the 15 President for purposes of holding committee meetings and conducting other Senate business. 16 17 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Without objection the Senate is now adjourned for the day. 18 (Whereupon, the proceedings were 19 20 concluded.) 21 22 23 24

25

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	
4	
5	I, CLARA C. ROTRUCK, do hereby certify that I
6	was authorized to and did report the foregoing
7	proceedings, and that the transcript, pages 01 through
8	136 is a true and correct record of my stenographic
9	notes.
LO	
L1	Dated this 20th day of August, 2015, at
L2	Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida.
L3	
L4	
L5	CLARA C. ROTRUCK
L6	Court Reporter
L7	Commission No.: FF 174037
L8	Expiration date: November 13, 2018
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	