1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	SENATE 2015 SPECIAL SESSION
11	NOVEMBER 5, 2015
12	4:00 p.m.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Transcribed by:
21	CLARA C. ROTRUCK
22	Court Reporter
23	
24	
25	

## TAPED PROCEEDINGS

2.2

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. Members and guests in the gallery will please rise for the opening prayer to be given this afternoon by Senator of the 15th district, Senator Stargel.

SENATOR STARGEL: Please pray with me.

Dear Heavenly Father we thank you for this opportunity that we have to come together,

Lord. We thank you for the opportunity that we have to serve in this body and to be able to make decisions for the State of Florida, Lord.

And I pray that each of us as we take that position would hold it in the highest regard,

Lord, and we look to you for the wisdom that we need to make the decisions day to day.

Lord, as most Moses led the people to the children of Israel he did not call the equip

Lord but he equipped those who he has called, and as in says in Jeremiah 29:11, I know the plans I have for you declares the Lord, plans to prosper you, to not harm you, plans to give you hope in the future and, Lord, we need to look to that future, we need to look to the opportunities that we have here.

2.2

There is no authority except that which is established by God as it says in Romans 13:11 and we have an authority to be here today, put here in a place to complete a task. And Lord I pray that you help us do that to the best of our ability.

Lord be with the Floridians in the state, those who are suffering and those who are having joy, Lord, I pray that you would be with all of our service people who are protecting this country abroad, keep them safe. They are fighting an evil like no other evil like we have ever seen before and I pray that you would give them the strength and the ability to move forward and keep them and protect them.

And Lord as we move forward today I pray that you be would be us so we would do things that would be honoring and to glorify you.

In your name we pray, amen.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Please remain standing, the pledge will be led today by the Senator of the 25th, Senator Abruzzo.

(Brief pause.)

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senators, before we begin I would like to recognize Senator Smith for a moment of silence, the Senator of the 31st, Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President.

Yesterday the Broward County community lost a
great person from our community, Fran Payne.

Back in 1969 Fran started working with Jack and
Jill Nursery which was a child care center in

Broward County, and through the years she grew
this child care center into a place where the
families got a lot of help.

They got a reading library there, she developed a clothing bank, she did job placement. she would often call around trying to get the electric bills paid from the parents. She stood only about five foot, weighed less than 100 pounds, but she was a giant in the community. She took this little nursery that was just there for child care but

made it a center to help the entire family. 1 She served for decades in Broward County 2 and yesterday she got her reward and went home 3 to meet her creator, and I would ask for a 4 5 moment of silence for Fran Payne, a giant in 6 Broward County. 7 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senators, please 8 rise. Amen. 9 Thank you, Leader Smith. We will now 10 continue with the order of business. Are there 11 reports of committees? 12 SENATE CLERK: None on the desk, 13 Mr. President. 14 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there motions relating to committee reference? 15 16 SENATE CLERK: None on the desk, 17 Mr. President. 18 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there messages from the Governor and other executive 19 20 communications? 21 SENATE CLERK: None on the desk, 22 Mr. President. 23 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there messages 24 from the House of Representatives? 25 SENATE CLERK: None on the desk,

1 Mr. President.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there matters of reconsideration?

SENATE CLERK: None on the desk, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Read the conference, conference committee report for CS SJR 2-C.

SENATE CLERK: The Honorable Andy
Gardiner, President of the Senate, the
Honorable Steve Crisafulli, Speaker of the
House of Representatives. Dear Mr. President
and Mr. Speaker: Your conference committee on
the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on CS
for SJR 2-C, first and gross same being, a
Joint Resolution of Apportionment.

Having met and after full and free conference do recommend to the respective Houses as follows. One, that the House of Representatives recede from its Amendment One, Bar Code 328937. Two, that the Senate and House of Representatives adopt the conference committee amendment, Bar Code 351550 attached hereto by reference made a part of this report.

Signed, Senator Bill Galvano, Co-Chair, signed, Representative Jose R. Oliva, Co-Chair.

The reading of the report, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: The Senator of the

26th district, Senator Galvano, you are

recognized to explain for an explanation and a motion.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. Members, this is the conference report as you just heard. The substance of this report is essentially the 9079 map that we discussed on the floor yesterday.

Since we adjourned yesterday we went into a conference process. On behalf of the Senate we had asked that the staff of both Chambers take a look at the base maps to see if in fact in South Florida we could improve the metrics.

We also looked into the issue of diminution. We looked at the Lake County issue that was raised as well as other issues with regard to the changes put into the map. Today I held with Chair Oliva another conference session in which we had the map drawers from the House explain in detail and take questions with regard to how they put together the 9079 map that was the House product, and to provide non-partisan justification for the changes.

We then heard from them along with our own staff, Jason or Jay Ferrin as well as counsel with regard to the request that was made of them last night. Having reviewed that the conferees, Chairman Oliva and myself recommended that the configuration that was proposed based on it having the highest scores with regard to the metrics and having satisfied the diminution issue, we recommended to this Chamber and Mr. President I move the adoption of the conference report.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there questions on the report? Senator Legg for a question.

SENATOR LEGG: Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator Galvano, first I want to commend you on your hard work. This is obviously a laborious task.

During today's conference committee there was several questions about some of the counties that I have the honor of representing, and some of the methodology that the House used to adjust some of the boundaries. And correct me on any of this, but I have a series of questions if you don't mind me walking through so I understand some of the issues.

So on the six base maps that were produced, four of the six base maps had one of the counties that I represent, Pasco County, as whole. That was not the map that we sent over to the House, and they took adjustments to some of the lines.

I believe the Chairman used the word, some nips and tucks that he did to some of the Tampa Bay regions. So I want to have some clarification on some of the nips and tucks.

On the base map, on the map that they sent over they have adjusted some of the lines, and correct me, what -- what lines did the Court require us to follow? My understanding of the courts, they required us to use roadways, waterways and major lines of demarcation.

Could you provide some clarification of what the Court has asked us to use for lines in order to draw lines?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 26th, Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Yes, thank you,

Mr. President. What you are referring to are
the Tier 2 requirements which are broken down
into compact districts and then following

political and geographical lines. Within the base map methodology and the methodology that has continued to be used and approved by the Court you have a feasibility component. So when you balance compactness with the following of political geographical lines you still have that feasibility. So to the extent it is feasible that is what you do.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Legg for a question, follow up.

SENATOR LEGG: Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator Galvano, in the adjustments that they made to the Senate map as it regards the Tampa Bay area, they made some adjustments and they did not follow the normal lines from my understanding of the rest of the state.

They did not follow normal roadways.

Could you provide some clarification on what they did follow and the adjustments that we sent over?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 26th, Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. First of all, I think normal

lines is not a term that you would use. To cut

referring to is the northeast boundary of
Pasco, and that gave me pause as well when I
looked at it. In fact, we spent what, no less
than four or five hours on it with counsel and
I got with Jay about it, as well as today in
committee, and the explanation that was given
with regard to this does fall within the
existing methodologies.

2.3

It was an effort according to the map drawers to capture some population. What they used as a boundary were census blocks, lines drawn by the census. Part of that line, that census block line actually coincided with the power line that was really the census block line that was being followed, because when I said power line, how many power lines are we actually following.

So in that particular area you had that being followed, census block lines are used elsewhere in the map.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Legg for a follow up.

SENATOR LEGG: Thank you. Thank you,
Mr. President. So, and again, I want to make

sure. So they, because I heard in committee that they used power lines and that kind of made me question.

2.3

My understanding is that in the rest of the state they did not use power lines, because there is quite a few power lines in this state, but they did use census blocks which deviated from the maps, all six maps that we -- that the -- the joint committee or the joint product was produced, they deviated from that.

But it also deviated if I am not mistaken from all of the Plaintiffs' maps as well as lines. So how did they learn what was -- how did they learn to use that? What gave them, what was the justification for them to deviate from the base map which from my understanding in the congressional maps they did not want to deviate from?

But also from the maps that we have produced to create this new nip and new tuck as they called it.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 26th, Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,
Mr. President. Again, what was explained today

in the conference committee was that when an additional city was kept whole on the northern end of the district to the southern end, population had to be captured, and I raised the issue.

2.2

I said doesn't it make it less compact and overall surprisingly it -- it did not. And so the answer from a methodology standpoint was that to the extent feasible they continued to first balance compactness and then follow political geographical lines, but then incorporated the census blocks into it.

And it is my -- my understanding that the use of census block lines is not a regular thing that you see replete throughout a map, but it is not extraordinary to the extent that it may fill a gap where feasible.

The other issue that came up with regard to that in my mind was, you know, why something looks like that, because I have had the pleasure, I have spent a lot of time in court on this, and, you know, Tier 1 is easy to talk about, but it is very difficult to prove it up unless you have some corresponding Tier 2.

So my concern was, why do you have this

little loop. Why? Is there something, something that may be behind it that goes beyond just Tier 2. And that is why today in conference I made very clear and I asked very specific questions with regard to incumbency and the recognition of incumbency addresses by the staff when they made these changes, and who influenced the drawing of these lines.

2.2

What came across on the record, at least from my perspective, was satisfactory in that regard. The difficulty with these amendments is once you enter that world then you are now, if I are going back and adjusting those lines, then you are calling the question in on the -- on the back side.

So I understand where you are coming from with regard to that specific section. That is why I wanted to make sure today we vetted it out and got the explanation that we did.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Legg for a follow up.

SENATOR LEGG: Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Senator Galvano, for that clarification, because I do know this came over from the House and you were trying to find

1 justification for it.

So I am trying to reach because the constituents in my county are starting to get concerned. First, we were in four of the six maps we were a whole county, now they are broken up into three areas. Now we have extraordinary, not following roads, not following lines, not following a specific pattern.

So I can go back to them and say with confidence that this is part of the normal process of map drawing is creating census blocks that do not follow roads but follow -- that follow power lines and census blocks.

That is a perfectly, a perfectly legitimate reason to split neighborhoods, communities and not follow roads. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: We will phrase that as a question.

Senator Galvano, you are recognized.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. And if anyone in this Chamber

has identified a normal method of map drawing I

would welcome it. This is the most ambiguous

discipline that I have ever encountered.

Having said that, you can always make a map
better.

I think that is probably the biggest challenge that we have with the Plaintiffs. We could do the best possible job that we want to here in the Legislature and as soon as our product comes out, it comes out with a score card.

And if there is a hiatus as there normally is in time between the score card and going before the Court, and you don't have to go through the rigors of Chamber to Chamber and committee and conference, you can have a product that is put together and drawn to beat the scores.

So we are always in that particular world. So I -- at this point it is very little that is extraordinary in the process. The law is clear that you are not tasked with achieving the best possible map, but a constitutionally compliant map.

And the justification that was offered today and the review that we did internally to corroborate that justification was enough in my

mind to satisfy that we did have a compliant map in this section.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 34th, Senator Sachs, you are recognized.

SENATOR SACHS: Thank you very much,

Mr. President, and I know it has been

extraordinarily difficult, and thank you, Chair

Galvano.

My question concerns Palm Beach County which is pretty near and dear to my heart and of which I know a lot about.

We sent a map to the House that configured Palm Beach and the contiguous counties of Martin and Broward in one way and we received a map back that had a completely different configuration.

And my question, and since we are accepting, at least the conference committee has accepted this map from the House, my questions go to this, and I know that we, that I hope that this is a matter of the judicial record that we are keeping right now.

My question is this. I am sure it is.

The map that has been presented to us for a

vote today has a configuration that is listed

in a different number than the original map we sent over, and that is for the record District 28. In District 28 links a number of cities in one district, Mr. Chairman.

2.2

For example, it lists, it pairs together the city of Boca Raton, which I have by the way lived in and represented for many years, and which has a median and this is today's statistics from Forbes magazine, a median income of \$92,000.

With the cities that border the lake, one of them is Belle Glade, and Belle Glade has a population which is 32.9 percent below the poverty level. The issues of these cities, both of which are paired in this new map, in this new district, do not meet I think the constitutional muster, and pursuant to the Supreme Court ruling it is -- we have the burden of proof of showing that these are constitutionally compliant.

Do you know, Mr. Chairman, what factors went into changing the map that the Senate had passed specifically with Palm Beach County which it is difficult because it is the largest county, with the changes, drastic changes that

are now indicated in the map that we are asked to vote on today?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Yes, thank you,

Mr. President. The changes in the South

Florida area, the genesis of those changes was

a review of the Plaintiffs' map that came to

the Senate and the House. On the cusp of our

vote earlier or last week I guess it was we

received a Plaintiffs' map.

As I stood on the floor I recommended that it would be a wise decision to take a look at it and sort of understand it. Just as a footnote I was actually very pleased. You know, we had invited them to join us in committee like we did in the congressional redistricting, it didn't happen, you know. Finally we started to get some feedback. Feedback has continued and I anticipate it will continue further. So that was the genesis.

With regard to Belle Glade and Boca Raton, at that point you are getting into what President Lee once referred to as Tier 3, into communities of interest.

Once we are past the Tier 1 requirements

2.2

then we go into a Tier 2 world in which compactness and political geographical lines become paramount. And when it was explained today that was in general the thought process that the House had, and it did improve compactness significantly in the region.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Sachs for a follow up.

SENATOR SACHS: Thank you very much,

Mr. President. Chairman, when the conferencing

committee met on behalf of the Senate, it was a

very open and transparent process and it

produced a map that was part of our

constitutional obligation.

In fact, Justice Pariente refers to the sense that pursuant to the Florida Constitution it is to the Legislature that we are to draw our maps, but for the fact that they may be deemed to be unconstitutional will the Court step in, but it is to our obligation.

And when we met as a redistricting committee, although I wasn't on it, I was watching it, it was open and transparent and we produced a map. We voted on the map, we sent it over.

Plaintiffs produced a map in the 11th hour and that was, I guess it is their prerogative party in a case, but I don't know what changed that, that map would be superior to what we -- we formed as -- as a Senate in our redistricting committee.

What was it? What am I missing here?

What factor is missing specifically and I don't need you to go -- but specifically to this one large county that would change our map so drastically that we would pick up a completely different configuration?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. And you are hitting on a couple of things, one that I am glad you brought up, because with regard to the Plaintiffs' map in general I will convinced there is partisan intent, okay, and that is a Tier 1 challenge.

So what occurred and then specific to this region and some other regions was not to just adopt the Plaintiffs' map, but to not just discard it either.

They took the time to return our invitation with a map, the staff took a look at

it and if there were opportunities to improve the metrics based on what was there that still kept the rest of the state at or above the same level, then that is what was looked at and incorporated into.

And I -- and just one more thing on that.

I was sharing or I shared your concerns, too,
and that is why the initial Senate request on
conference was why don't we just go back to the
base maps, that we knew they were sterile. See
if you can plug these in and then justify the
metrics.

But, you know, I cannot deny when the numbers come back and I have had opportunity to question on them and they improve the metric.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Additional questions, additional questions? Seeing none we are in debate.

Senator Flores for a question.

SENATOR FLORES: Thank you very much. I am sorry, I just have a couple of questions, because, as you know, those of us in -- from South Florida have had a series of concerns, particularly as it relates to the minority districts both in the African-American

1 community and the Hispanic community.

So a question first on what just to be clear, what we are asking today is to vote on the House map that was passed yesterday, right?

I just want to make it clear.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Yes, thank you,

Mr. President. Yes, the substance of map 9079.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Flores.

SENATOR FLORES: Thank you, Mr. President.

I know it happened rather quickly so -- so we just wanted to make clear.

so does that mean that as we move forward as this map passes today, that it will then -- will it be the House attorney that is arguing on behalf of this map that is moving forward or will it be our attorneys? And there is a reason why I am asking that.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you are recognized.

SENATOR GALVANO: Yes. First of all, I want to clear something up. That didn't happen quickly at all. The South Florida configuration probably dominated the lion's share of my efforts with regard to this map.

To the extent that we had lawyers reviewing, I kept saying, no, I don't want -- I need to know, I need to know unequivocally because I am not going to be putting a map or approving or recommending a map that has concerns that I have heard, in particular diminution.

2.2

So that was a -- one of the longer processes. In fact, the main instruction in conference was with regard to that, and then going so far this morning as to going back to expert and say from FIU to look at this and make sure and answer us that it wouldn't.

You asked an interesting question about the procedure from here. If -- if this product passes and it becomes a legislative product based on what I understand from the comments that Judge Lewis has made and how I have read the discussions in the courtroom with Judge Reynolds, then we have -- have something that will be given at least some deference.

We still have to prove and justify
non-partisan for it. And so it is my
understanding that the Legislature as attorneys
from both the House and the Senate will go
forward in the Court proceedings and present

1 this map.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Flores for a follow up.

SENATOR FLORES: I had a different question, but now that you mention deference I want to clarify that, because I believe that the Judge, Judge Lewis in his Order said very clearly that a legislatively produced map would actually have no deference, and I wanted to clarify as to whether or not that is what was said in court proceedings because I think it was rather clear it was those words exactly.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. No, I am referring to a

dialogue specifically with Judge Lewis, with

attorney George Meros and when Judge Lewis

said, look, you don't have that, you don't have

a legislative product. So don't -- don't come

in here and argue as if you do have a

legislative product.

The implication being that if you did have a legislative product then you have something that has at least come out of the process.

That -- at that point the Judge was free to

look at what was before him, just as Judge
Reynolds would be if in fact we don't have a
legislative product.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator -- as many questions as you would like. Senator Flores for a follow up.

SENATOR FLORES: Thank you very much. But the Court documents did say that the legislative, legislative map would have no deference, that is real, right, that really happened?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: What you are referring to is the remedial nature of what we have.

Deference in terms of a presumption, it would not have a presumption of correctness. We would have to prove up the justifications for our lines as opposed to having a presumption.

Just like what had occurred when the Supreme Court issued its Order on July 9th. It does not mean that there is not some elevated recognition if you have a legislative product. It is a product that still has to be justified but it is a -- would be a legislative product and the Court could take note of that.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Flores for a follow up.

2.2

SENATOR FLORES: Thank you very much,

Mr. President, for your indulgence and Chair

Galvano as well.

I got off on a tangent but I was asking for the House maps for a reason. As I was watching at some point earlier today Mr. Meros, the House attorney was called on specifically as it related to the question of retrogression in the three Hispanic seats in Miami-Dade County.

And I believe that he said that his, his opinion was that a Hispanic could still be elected as the Hispanic of their choice because while perhaps the functional analysis and demographics or rather functional analysis as far as election results showed that a Democrat might win in one of the seats, that his opinion was that individuals and Hispanics would rally around the Hispanic to ensure that that Hispanic won.

And I wasn't sure if that is what he said, but I think I heard that is what he said, that his opinion was we were just going to --

Hispanics were just going to rally around each 1 2 other to make sure a Hispanic wins. 3 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 26th, Senator Galvano. 4 5 SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, 6 Mr. President. I think he said something of 7 that, that nature. I think his testimony was 8 more legal, and frankly I didn't want to rely 9 on the lawyers for that aspect, having heard 10 the concerns and that is why I wanted both 11 House lawyers and Senate lawyers to go back and 12 consult with an expert who can say, who has 13 testified in this case and who has been 14 recognized and qualified as an expert that in fact there is not retrogression. 15 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Diaz de la 16 17 Portilla of the 40th, you are recognized. 18 SENATOR DE LA PORTILLA: Thank you, Mr. President. But Senator Galvano, that 19 20 expert didn't testify before the committee 21 today, did he? 22 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano. 23 Thank you, SENATOR GALVANO: 24 Mr. President. No. 25 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Diaz de la

1 Portilla for a follow up.

2.2

2.3

SENATOR DE LA PORTILLA: Mr. President, thank you. And in fact, that same expert testified in Court regarding different numbers and a different issue in the congressional districts that there was diminution, didn't he?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. I am not sure exactly what you are referring to in the Court proceedings. But let me tell you how he plugged into these proceedings.

We had, first of all, after looking at the South Florida issue last week we adopted your amendment, which I thought was a good amendment and I told the body that as well. When the map came back over there were concerns raised and that is why I wanted to go to the base map process.

And so in consulting with counsel and staff and looking at the numbers, my request was not to have someone come and testify before the committee, but honestly, Senator, to do what I could to vet out that issue, and, you know, I may have even been looking to hear back

that there was -- was a problem, but I just 1 2 didn't, I just didn't get that. But yes, he has testified, he has probably testified on 3 different issues. 4 5 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Diaz de la 6 Portilla for a follow up. 7 SENATOR DE LA PORTILLA: Thank you, 8 Mr. President. Now, in terms of the map that 9 this Senate voted on, 9124, last week, passed 10 out of this Chamber, that map was a map that 11 was vetted by our lawyers and found to meet constitutional muster, isn't that right? 12 13 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano. 14 SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Mr. President. 15 Yes. 16 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Diaz de la 17 Portilla. 18 19 20

21

22

23

24

25

SENATOR DE LA PORTILLA: And in fact,
Senator Galvano, in looking at the map that
this Chamber approved, that this Chamber
approved last week, just last week, the Tier 2
metrics, Reock, Convex Hull and Polsby-Popper
were an improved version over the base map,
isn't that right?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: 1 Thank you, 2 Mr. President. And I love having lawyers in the Chamber. You can't handle the truth. 3 that is -- that is correct. 4 5 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Diaz de la 6 Portilla, you are recognized for a question. 7 SENATOR DE LA PORTILLA: Thank you, 8 Mr. President. And Senator Galvano, the map 9 that we have before us today is exactly the 10 same map that we refused to concur with 11 yesterday, right? 12 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano, you 13 are recognized to respond. 14 SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, 15 Mr. President. Yes. Yes, and the reason was 16 as you recall I said I still wanted to do, I 17 thought we should vet further in the South Florida issue. 18 PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Diaz de la 19 20 Portilla, you are recognized for a question. 21 SENATOR DE LA PORTILLA: And maybe, thank 22 you, Mr. President. And maybe Senator Galvano, 23 you can help me here procedurally since you are 24 so much more experienced than I am with the

legislative procedure here.

25

2.2

But if we would have brought that map up yesterday, meaning the House map that is before us today, which is exactly the same as what we had before us yesterday, if we would have brought it up yesterday would we have been able to offer amendments or try to amend it at some point yesterday as the conference?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano to respond.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,
Mr. President. Yes, however, there were no
amendments that had been filed at that time.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Diaz de la Portilla for a question.

SENATOR DE LA PORTILLA: And so the map that we have, thank you, Mr. President. And so the map that we have before us today is exactly the same map as yesterday, except today, and again correct me if I am wrong, because I am not an expert on, you know, procedure here, we can't offer any amendments to a conference report, right?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano to respond.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

1 Mr. President. Correct.

2.2

2.3

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Are there any further questions? Senator Diaz de la Portilla, you are recognized for a question.

SENATOR DE LA PORTILLA: Thank you,
Mr. President. Now, I heard a lot, you know,
today from Mr. Meros. He is one of the House
lawyers and from the House staff.

And it seemed that, you know, all of a sudden compactness which is a Tier 2 requirement, you know, kind of jumped the gun and become a Tier 1 requirement as the end all be all.

But did the Courts at any point say that the exercise here was to draw the most compact plan possible, or did they give us some parameters as far as how compact it needed to be?

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

SENATOR GALVANO: Yes, thank you,

Mr. President. And a footnote on your last
question as our esteemed Rules Chair reminded

me a two-thirds vote could amend a conference
report. The Tier 2 has never exceeded the Tier

1.

I can assure you, Senator Diaz de la

Portilla, that the investigation that I was on
was to make sure that we were Tier 1 compliant
specifically with the diminution.

With regards tower question on compactness. As I said to Senator Legg, the Courts have never required the best map or the most compact map, and when we opened this session or when the first Bill came out, as I explained, the Courts have recognized that compactness can in fact diminish as you incorporate other Tier 2 or Tier 1 requirements.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 14th District, Senator Soto for a question.

SENATOR SOTO: Thank you, Mr. President.

During our submissions for the congressional maps there was the map that was passed by this Chamber and then a second map that was drawn subsequent to this session that was presented.

Is there any scenario you anticipate where a map other than what was passed out of this Chamber or not will be presented to the Trial Court?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. If you are asking about from this body, that scenario was one in which we had gone back and forth with the House and I thought there was an opportunity to further conference or further come together and you are referring it to 9066.

If we are able to pass a map out of the Legislature then that will be the Legislature's map.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 14th, Senator Soto.

SENATOR SOTO: Thank you, Mr. President.

In the event for some reason that we are unable to pass a map out, would you anticipate other maps being drawn after session that would potentially be submitted to the Court?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 26th, you are recognized.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. Absolutely. I think for sure

you are going to have more Plaintiffs' maps

coming in. So like I said, there is an

implicit or not implicit, an explicit tactical

advantage in a situation like we are in in this type of litigation where we are returning to a Court after going through our exercise and that is what I was describing about the Plaintiffs could come back and try to beat our metrics and submit those, those maps and argue them.

I mean, we had nine already before the session started and we picked up another three.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 14th, Senator Soto for a follow up.

SENATOR SOTO: Thank you, Mr. President.

Do you anticipate any additional maps after

session coming out from the Senate or from the

House?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 26th, Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. No, because I think Jay by that

time will have gone as far away from this

building as possible. No, I don't anticipate

that.

I guess it is possible that someone can put together a product. I know Senator Clemens has become quite adept at using My District Builder, but I don't -- I don't anticipate

that.

2.2

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Additional questions?

Additional questions? President Gaetz of the

1st for a question.

PRESIDENT GAETZ: Thank you very much,

Mr. President. Senator Galvano, we have heard
eloquently from Senator Detert the other day
about how the drawing of lines in one way or
another affects real people living in real
neighborhoods, real communities and obviously
we have heard from Senator Sachs as well today.

Is it not the case that the exercise we now find ourselves in has -- that in that exercise there is absolutely no relevance to the make up of communities, to the make up of neighborhoods, to the logic of what we have called communities of interest, and that instead what we find ourselves in is, in fact, after we deal with Tier 1 issues, basically a Tier 2 geometric exercise in which succeeding efforts to draw additional maps can make marginally better geometric sense without any reference to the effect that those maps have on communities, on neighborhoods, on people, and on the real life and political lives? And by

that I am not talking about politicians, but the lives of people who engage in the civic process as Citizens.

2.2

2.3

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 26th Senator Galvano.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. And, yes, you are right. The

community of interest aspect is not a Tier 2

nor Tier 1 component. And you heard, we heard

from Senator Hays on this issue as well, and

that is the world we find ourselves in.

Having -- having been living intimately in this world I have concluded that the amendments to our constitution pulled the soul out of map drawing and pulled the soul out of districts and instead you have situations like Senator Sachs has described where people who have different goals, dreams and desires are collected into, into one boundary simply because a scientific test like Polsby-Popper or Reock or Convex Hull, phrases they will never understand or want to understand.

Frankly, I don't uphold them because of those objective geometric tests.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: President Gaetz for a

follow up.

PRESIDENT GAETZ: Thank you,

Mr. President. And so for those of us who from time to time are seekers after common sense,

would you suggest that, that we are -- that we are going to be disappointed if we look at the conference report or we look at any other map and we try to divine what we would consider to be the common sensical way for communities to be considered together as opposed to a mathematical score card.

And my point, Senator Galvano, and ask you to respond to this is, isn't it a fact that no matter what we do on this floor or what our colleagues do on the House floor, that someone else paying no attention to the realities of how people work and live and worship and relate to each other, can come up with a statistically marginally better map based on geometric scores without reference to the realities of where and how people live?

And so the seeking after perfection here can go on and on and on to infinity, and no matter what map we come up with, isn't it a fact that someone on the outside can say, well,

if we, if we, if we move some lines around, but notwithstanding the realities of what is going on inside people's real communities and real lives, that we can come up with a slightly better geometric score?

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 26th.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President. And not to belabor it, but you are correct, and that is what I was talking about, the score card and the tactical nature of the world we are living in. Again, I think we have pulled the soul out of map making.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Okay, further questions? Further questions? Seeing no questions we are in debate. Is there debate on the report?

Senator of the 38th, Senator Garcia in debate.

SENATOR GARCIA: Thank you, Mr. President, and I have to rise in opposition to -- to this had conference report.

And why I do this, when, first of all, let me start off when the House attorney got up and made a comment that said to the effect and I am paraphrasing here, that if Hispanics can in one

of the districts can potentially choose maybe one of their candidates, all of the Hispanics are going to rally behind against -- rally behind that Hispanic candidate whether Republican or Democrat.

2.2

Obviously this gentleman has no idea how Dade County works and has no idea how Hispanics think, has no idea that Hispanics are not all the same, you know.

South America, have you seen how many countries are in South America in the Caribbean and in Central America? And to have someone get up and make those comments to me are very insulting, number one.

Number two, let me tell you what happens in Dade County. When my parents and Flores' parents and Diaz de la Portilla's parents came to this country they fought. They fought to ensure that they had a voice, not only in Washington, but here in the state Legislature.

And now by the numbers that are coming back they are diminishing that voice, and, yes, folks will argue, folks will argue your, no, no, we are not diminishing the right of Hispanics to vote.

We are not diminishing the right of
Hispanics to have a seat for them. But let me
tell you, the truth is they don't know Dade
County. And the way you see these maps drawn
they have diminished that right.

So -- so you can know from all of the Hispanic seats in Miami-Dade County, I am the safest one. So it is not about Renee Garcia. It is not about Hialeah. It is about those people that chose, voted for us to fight for them.

So I tell you this, how can I, Senator

Rene Garcia, go back home to Miami-Dade County

and forget about my constituency?

How can I go back to my father and tell my father, look, my father in the eyes and tell him, dad, I am sorry, I gave it my shot, I tried. I tried but I went along with the current and we lost a Hispanic seat.

Folks, I can't do that. And I appreciate,
Senator Galvano, you have done an excellent job
and I think that the amendment that we offer on
this floor addressed some of those issues. I
do believe that amendment was constitutional,
and to have the House of Representatives strip

that amendment back and revert it back to the original map is insulting.

2.2

It is insulting not to this Chamber but to those Hispanics back home who had that seat and our job is to protect the voice of those Hispanics back home and that is why they are called protected seats.

Unfortunately we haven't done our job, and that is why I am going to have to vote against, with a heavy heart, Mr. President, it is a heavy heart that I have to say that I have to vote against this map and I urge all of you to do the same and vote this map down. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate?

Senator Detert in debate.

SENATOR DETERT: Thank you, Mr. President, and I wasn't going to speak about this, and it is very hard for Republicans to vote against their own leadership when we don't want to.

But I think we have given Senator Galvano a task.

I think because of the guidelines, the methodology and all of the letters of the alphabet, it is like we handcuffed Senator

Galvano with his hands behind his back, threw him in the English Channel and told him to swim the channel, and then we are going to be shocked that that didn't work out for him or us.

This -- sometimes you make these decisions and there are parts that you don't like and you are willing to gag down those because there is more good than bad. But in this one I cannot go home and I can't even go home and explain to my community how this happened and why this happened and who drew the maps.

Everybody in my community is talking about this and they are like, who drew that map? I don't really know. So if the Supreme Court wants to draw the map at least I will know who drew it. I -- the people that sued us forced us into it.

When we did those maps in 2012, I never had one complaint, and as I said last week, Senator Benacquisto and I split Charlotte County. We serve Charlotte County to the best of our ability, even though it is not her county or my county, it is the one in between, and I think we have served our public and we

certainly got to know them. I have spent eight years knowing my constituents.

2.2

Now because of a few lines I should go meet people who don't know me and I don't know them, not that I am even running for reelection but I think the configuration of this map doesn't make sense to anybody I have met and unfortunately I am going to have to vote no today and I regret doing that, because of the hard work of Senator Galvano, and because frankly it is our side that had to do it this year. So it is kind of a sad day in the state of Florida. Sorry.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: In debate, further in debate? Senator Evers in debate.

SENATOR EVERS: Thank you, Mr. President.

Members, you know very few times do I try to

stand up and talk on the floor, but frankly, I

feel that this is one of those times that I do

need to.

We have got a small town up in the panhandle, it is my town. There is a farm-to-market road that runs outs of Alabama, that runs toward Highway 90 down below. That farm to market road splits that little town.

It leaves my farm center, it leaves the pharmacy, the school, the water system in Senator Gaetz's district.

It puts my strawberry patch, the parts house and the grocery store, it puts it over in my district. You know, but if you go north about five miles, that road was crossed and there is another community up there, the Blackman community, it is whole, and they crossed that farm-to-market road to make it whole.

Now, if you go south and you hit Highway 90 down there, you take a left on Highway 90, you go approximately three quarters of a mile, you cross Yellow River bridge. That is a river that they crossed.

I know in other areas, you know, well, we couldn't cross the river, but in that particular area, yes, we could cross the river. So it sort of makes it confusing. In fact, it is as about as clear as mud.

You know, with the limitations that we have put on, with the limitations that we have -- I didn't vote for the constitutional amendment. Why? Because I didn't feel it was

the right thing to do for the rural communities and it was going to dilute the vote. couldn't support it.

But when it passed and it was in the Constitution, guess what, I took an oath that I would uphold that constitution, and that I intend to do, and with the changes that have been made in this map I firmly feel that the map is unconstitutional.

You know, Senator Gaetz, you are going to pick up some great, great constituents over there, my brother and my son. And if I get to speaking in farm language, because Senator Galvano, I am not a lawyer, I am just a farmer and I try to speak with common sense, and I am not as articulate as Senator Gaetz. get confused I will defer to Senator Gaetz to explain what I just said.

And if y'all can't get it I am going to ask my friend here, Sheriff Charlie Dean to fully see that you all get the whole story. But, you know, as you head up north and you go through that, at the end of the day it is my town.

Senator Gaetz will do an absolute

2.2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

wonderful job representing the eastern side of my town. Actually, I only -- I am only one mile inside of my district, but, you know, after looking at it and being elected to come here and do what was right for the state of Florida and for the people that elected me.

You know, Senator Galvano, you should have took one of the Plaintiffs' maps in that section and went right down the county line and cut me totally out and put me in Senator Gaetz's district. I think he would represent me well.

I don't have to be in my district, but at least my town would be whole. And what is worse, you cross through Eglin Air Force Base that has a whole bunch of bears and deer.

There is not any people that live there, and you go down into Ft. Walton, Mary Esther in those areas and you start weaving around and start separating the lower portions of those cities and communities down there.

Will they get representation? Absolutely. But instead of separating the north and the south, why couldn't we have just separated one or the other, put them all whole.

You know, Senator Gaetz I thought had done an excellent idea on my district when he just said, okay, everything north of I-10 and south of I-10. That is a main thoroughfare, but folks, we are talking about a farm-to-market road.

Charlie Dean will tell you a farm-to-market road was a road that was put in back in the '20s so farmers could get their produce and stuff from the field to the market. That is all Highway 189 is, a farm-to-market road.

You know, with the exceptions that I see that were drawn into this map in different districts and different areas, I can't support this map. I can't go home and explain to my folks why I allowed this to happen.

Mr. President, I don't really want to vote against the map, but I don't have an option today, because I have got to go home, hopefully in the next hour. I have got strawberries I need to plant, but what I am saying is this, you treat all districts the same. You treat all residents in the state of Florida the same, and you don't use a farm-to-market road, you

don't use a light line, John Legg, you don't use a light line to carve out a district.

2.2

With that I am sorry to oppose the Bill, but it is what I got to do today. Thank you.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate?

Senator Hays in debate.

SENATOR HAYS: Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator Detert, I think you hit the nail

squarely on the head. Today is a sad day for
the people of Florida.

There may be some other debate, but thus far I have not heard anybody today talking about the good points of this map. The only reference to good has been the Herculean effort that our Chairman Galvano has done. And sir, I tip my the hat to you. I have told you privately how much I respect your efforts.

But members, it wasn't just us, it was the people of Florida who tied his hands when they passed the constitutional amendment that was well intentioned, but poorly written and poorly advised.

You -- correct me if I am wrong, but I find it impossible to draw a map that does not favor nor does it disfavor an incumbent or a

community or anything else. It is contradictory, Mr. President, and I think there is a bigger, bigger message that the people of Florida need to hear than just this map today, and that message is be exceptionally careful and know the implications of your vote before you vote for a constitutional amendment.

2.2

The founding fathers set up our United
States Constitution and the Florida
Constitution was patterned after much of that
great document, and nowhere in my reading of
either of those documents do I find any
reference to congressional districts or any
legislative districts being drawn to suit a
group of numbers.

And that is all in the world we have done, is check the numbers, check the numbers. And as to Senator Gaetz's point, the people of Florida deserve better than being treated like a bunch of numbers.

They live and work and play and worship and congregate and various other activities as people, not as a group of numbers. And I think this numerical map may satisfy somebody's numerical criteria, but Senator Galvano spoke

1 it very well.

2.2

This process has removed the soul from map drawing and it has de-personalized it. I think it is a sad, sad day for the people of Florida and I am going to vote against this Bill and I would urge you to vote against it as well.

Thank you Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate? Further in debate? Senator Sachs in debate.

SENATOR SACHS: Thank you very much, and I will be very brief. We really have a unique opportunity to draw lines that reflect the merging demographics of our state.

We have got everything in this state and I love the state of Florida because it has small farmers, it has got big farmers. It has got communities of people.

And the one area that I know most about is going to be very difficult for the people of one area in this new district to have a representative who can also represent the people on the other side, and what I am talking about is those folks on the coast who drastically always need funding for beach re-nourishment and it is an issue that must be

a top priority for anyone of us who represent a beach community, and it has been one of my top priorities for years.

2.2

And yet you have some of the lines which are will stretch out to communities which have other interests, completely different. So what we need to do is we need to seize the opportunity to make sure that the lines that are drawn represent the people, so that when people vote for representatives, whether it is in the House or the Senate, or for Congress, it is for people who will fight for their interest, not for people who will fight for an interest within a line or within a specific geographic area, but for a community of interest, a community of people.

So I think this has been along process. I think we are all tired. I think that we have tried our best, but I don't think we have achieved that which is so, so important to this great opportunity, and that is to draw lines that accurately reflect the emerging demographics, the emerging people of our great state. Thank you, sir.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate,

further in debate? Senator Abruzzo in debate.

SENATOR ABBRUZZO: Thank you,

Mr. President. Like so many on this floor today I have to start out by commending Chair Galvano.

I watched him when I first came into the Legislature in 2008, when he chaired the first ever Seminole Compact Committee and many said he could on the get it done and he did. That was arguably one of the most difficult times in the Legislature when we just had the economy crash and he was the Rules Chairman in the House and had to usher through some of the most difficult pieces of legislation up to that date and he got it done and he did.

And then when he came here to the Florida
Senate, when President Gaetz had an aggressive
education agenda, he Chaired the committee and
got the agenda through and he did. And now as
Senator Detert said with your hands tied you
got handed one of the most difficult tasks any
of us could ever imagine and you have handled
it with such intellect and a calm demeanor that
has held us altogether as a Senate. So thank
you, Chair Galvano.

You know, I do have to talk a little bit about Palm Beach County for the record. And I understand what Senator Sachs is saying, but I currently represent the Glades, Belle Glade, Pahokee and South Bay. That district, District 25 which I am so honored to be here stretches all the way to the coast through Palm Beach Gardens, to Juno beach, to Jupiter and has some of the wealthiest pieces of property in Florida.

2.2

It also encompasses Wellington which I have represented since I have been in the House and also has some of the wealthiest people not only in Florida, but in America. And I don't believe that having an economically disadvantaged community lumped in together with wealthy communities is a disadvantage or something out of our equation whatsoever.

I don't believe that we should be talking about segregation here on the Senate floor. I think it is disingenuous at best and I will tell you that the Glades community which have been targeted and a lot of things have had so much help through this Senate, whether it was Senator Latvala or Senator Negron or the Palm

Beach County Delegation has fought to revitalize that community.

2.2

2.3

You know, in this current maps that

Senator Galvano has before us today, it does

stretch down to Boca Raton, but at the end of

the day we are not going to be supporting this

map, because this map is not the right map.

It is not what Florida looks like. It is not indicative of our communities, and I want to just take this time to get on the record since the Plaintiffs' map was used as a basis for the map we are about to vote on today.

The Glades community which I speak about is cracked. They take out Pahokee from Belle Glade and South Bay, and that is my one big issue with the map drawing, that that community should stay together as whole. That is a tri-city area and they should not crack an African-American community to put certain votes in different districts.

So I am very concerned with the Fair

District or the Plaintiffs' map and I am glad

that at least in this map they keep it whole

and I hope that continues whether we have

amendments or whether the Court is forced to

1 draw it.

And that said, again, thank you, Chair Galvano, but I will be voting no today.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate, further in debate? President Margolis in debate.

PRESIDENT MARGOLEZ: You know, I was sitting here thinking that in order to make people that are happy here today, and why aren't they happy?

Well, I have represented the same people for 40 years. Forty years is a long time in a lot of places. I mean, I haven't been in the Senate for 40 years, but I have gone from to the House, to the Senate, to the County Commission, back and forth for many, many years. The same district, the same district for 40 years.

This year if this passes I am going to have to move because one little piece of my old district is in another corner of what was drawn for me. And so I am going to move so I can have some friends. So I can know the people who I am once again going to represent, and I think everybody is sitting here feeling the

1 same way.

2.3

They, you know, you have to move, you have to do all kinds of things, and it is -- it is really to me it is -- it is really tough to sit here and listen to it and I understand it, guys.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate?

Senator Bean in debate.

SENATOR BEAN: Thank you very much,
Mr. President, and good afternoon, Florida
Senate.

You know the standard speech is going like this. Love on Galvano and trash the maps and let me try a different approach although I am going to include love in Galvano, that is what I am going to do first of all, because we already have given the analogy that we have tied his hands and then him in the English Channel, but let me tell you with a swimmer Bill Galvano is because I think he is — he has done masterfully in a process that ties everybody's hands, how about that. It is the process given.

We were given a process and we don't like that process. I didn't like the process, we

all didn't like the process. We are used to doing things the comfortable way, the way we have done it in the past and that is the past and now this is the present.

So what did this masterful swimmer do, the Mark Spitz of the Florida Senate do? He drew a map that divided 19 million people and it is going to be impossible to please 40 Senators to divide those 19 million.

But let me ask you to rethink your no vote, because when -- I am thinking it may be the Senator maybe, maybe he will address it, but I don't see the alternative.

I see us punting, if you vote no then you are saying, you know what, the Legislature is done with this process, as ugly as it is, an let's just give it to the Judges. Let's give it to the Judges and I say that is not our role. Our role is to get it done.

It was hard to draw these maps and I know we had open meetings and forums and anybody could do it, and I attended and I watched on TV how it was done. And yes, I can complain that my district office in Jacksonville may have to be moved because it is now outside of the

boundaries. But you know what, there is two ways of looking at things.

I listened to my good colleague from the

-- from the 1st District, Senator Evers, and he

complains about the town that is now split, but

how blessed they are. They are going to have

two Senators, how about that. A little town to

have two Senators, look for big libraries and a

new Council on Aging, whatever town that is,

because two people are going to be fighting for

them now and that is a great thing.

I know Palm Beach County, Senator Clemens will tell you he laments that they are losing representation. So members, rethink your no vote. This map that is before us, you can pick it apart all different ways, but let me tell you, it is our duty, we did it, we had a process, we didn't like it, but that is our process.

So let's do it, let's do our job as the Legislature and draw these maps rather than punt. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Stargel in debate.

SENATOR STARGEL: Thank you,

2.2

Mr. President. I haven't spoken much during this process and I guess my tolerance level is kind of the same as Senator Bean's and sitting here listening.

2.2

We can please all of the people some of the time, we can please some of the people all the time, but you are not going to please all the people all of the time, and that is the task that we are here today.

I think Senator Brandes was the one who said that we are 40 Somalian warlords, and each person is trying to negotiate for their own.

I am a State Senator. I am not a Polk
County Senator. I currently represent Polk,
Osceola and Orange, and the new map I get to
meet the people of Lake that were divided from
the Lake district with Senator, Senator Hays.

But I am a State Senator and I represent the people of the state of Florida, and whatever people happen to be the 400,000 or whatever it is that is in my district I will represent them while keeping in mind all of the districts of the state of Florida.

I am not going to do some things specific to just me that is going to be bad for people

who live down south. So we are elected to a process here to be State Senators and part of that process came the job of drawing a map, and yes, we have some, some amendments that made that a very difficult process, and I was not sitting in all of the meetings because I trust the people and the Chairman and the attorneys and the committee members on that committee to come up with the best map that they could, and to negotiate the best deal that they could.

2.2

Unfortunately, it is not just us, we have partners across the aisle that we need to work with, and my understanding is we have done the best we can to come up with the best product from the two of us. And I am not willing to say we can't do this job and someone else needs to do it for us.

So even though people may not like the map and I can't, I honestly have said I will grow where I am planted. I didn't even really pay attention. If I get elected, I do, and if the people who are drawn into my district don't want me to be their representative, then somebody else -- their Senator, somebody else will -- they will get somebody else to

represent them.

2.3

That is the way this process works, but this process does not work with us saying it is too hard of a task, we can't do it, and we are going to let someone else do our job. So with that I would ask that you vote for this map.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator of the 7th, Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY: Thank you,

Mr. President. You know, Tip O'Neill once

famously said that all politics is local and I

see that today. I have heard not just today

but all through this process, particularized

complaints and concerns about the effect of

this line or that line on a particular area.

And what I would ask is for everyone to pause and realize that this job that we have is unique. It is different than anything we have ever done and frankly it is bigger than any much these local communities that we are talking about today.

What literally is at stake here is are we going to give up the power to redistrict and just hand it to the Courts and say, you know what, this is too big of a job for us. We are

not going to do it anymore. We are just going to hand it over to seven unelected Judges who have been the subject of critique by many in this Chamber over the years.

2.2

But frankly, folks, you know, I know it is not perfect, but I sat through three weeks of testimony on the committee with our Chairman, listened to the experts and I understand that it seemed mechanical and it seemed to lack heart, but we are in a position where the constitution requires us to treat this in a mechanical fashion.

You heard the colloquy between President
Gaetz and the Chairman about what type of
process, the nature of the process that we are
in. I was listening very closely to those
questions and answers because it true, we are
in many ways taking the heart out of the
process but that is what is demanded of us.
That is the job we have been given and whether
you agree with the amendments or not, that is
what the amendments demand at this point in
time as we find ourselves in this remedial
process.

We have a job to do. We have a job to do.

Is this perfect for your particular area? I don't know. That frankly is besides the point at this point in time. What I urge because I will tell you having sat through these meetings, this is a constitutionally compliant map under any standards.

No Tier 1 violations, no Tier 2 violations. So if you vote no you are voting no on a map that passes muster, that is a constitutionally compliant map. And if you are doing it because you are concerned about some localized concerns, I would urge you to reconsider and look at the greater good.

We talk about separation of powers, we talk about what our job is, what the job of the judiciary is. Here is a chance to do your job. We were sent here to do this job and if you vote no you are giving up a sacred traditional historic job of this legislative body.

I have heard today could be a sad day. To me that is the definition of a sad day. I urge you to support this map.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senator Gaetz in debate.

PRESIDENT GAETZ: Thank you,

Mr. President. Tip O'Neill also said, I am against any deal I am not part of, and I have seen a bit of that today.

2.2

I -- I would agree with those who have criticized this map. It is not only not perfect, it has -- it has many, many, many flaws. And, you know, I am certainly not nearly as good a vote counter as Senator Latvala who I think is the best one in the Senate, but I can tell that this conference report is in trouble.

That is a profound statement, and, you know, remember, we had a Fair Districts

Amendment that passed and that amendment was internally inconsistent. Maybe it was designed to be internally inconsistent and unworkable.

Maybe it wasn't. Maybe it was bad drafting or maybe it was very cleaver drafting.

But the fact is the people of Florida

voted for it because we had at the time unfair

districts, we had unfair districts. We had

districts that made no sense at all in many

places in the state, and people in my area

voted for -- for the Fair Districts Amendment

because they saw what happened with an

unfettered Legislature that had no guidelines, that -- that did literally what it wanted to without any kind of standards or criteria.

2.2

But what we wound up with was an internally inconsistent amendment. The whole series of discussions, of debate and analysis that Chair Galvano has led us through demonstrates that here we have an extraordinarily rationale man trying to make sense out of an extraordinarily irrational circumstance, just as Senator Detert indicated.

But Senator Detert has a saying on her wall, in her office, it says, "Don't let the perfect become the enemy of the good".

Well, this isn't perfect. I don't know that it is very good, but I do know this, that if we vote no we put this whole process into the hands of those who will not do it better. They will not do it better. We put it into the hands of those who created the internal inconsistencies purposefully, or accidentally, and we put it into the hands of Judges who notwithstanding their criticisms of our actions have said directly and indirectly that they are not experts in map drawing. They expect to

have a proposal placed in front of them that meets constitutional standards.

2.2

If we leave the field, if we, if we just give up, if we say because it doesn't meet our standards because it isn't good enough, because it has a lot of bad problems, then we have put this whole issue into the hands of people who have created the inconsistencies, who have created the mutual exclusivities that lead us to be so frustrated today.

We put it into the hands of people who then will only have arithmetic formulas and geometric metrics to work with. And I agree with my colleague, Senator Evers, he knows that neck of the woods in North Florida much better than I do, but I think that some of the lines that we have been forced to draw go through places where with a four wheeler you couldn't get through.

There are no, there is no logic to the way that some of those areas have been separated, but there will be less logic if we leave the field and put this solely into the hands of those who created the inconsistencies in the first place.

I believe the burden lies heavy now upon those of us who felt that that was the best way to amend our constitution. And so I don't disagree with any of the criticisms of the conference report.

I think it is far, far from what we could have done and what we should have done if common sense would have ruled, but when common sense did rule to some extent at least, as Senator Detert indicated, we had a product that seemed to work for our communities. We thought it was constitutional but it was hurled back in our faces.

And so with great respect for Senator

Galvano and what he has done, I think he has
been put in an impossible situation, and with
admiration and no disagreement for the critics
who have laid out the problems with the
conference report, I can't abrogate my
responsibility, leave the field and put this
into the hands of those who wanted this kind of
situation to develop in the first place. I
think that is the wrong thing to do.

So it is not a the matter of a half a loaf, Senators, or even a third of a loaf, it

may be, it may be a few crusts, but at least I believe that Senator Galvano has taken from this process as much as he could that was common sensical and attach it to a formula that in many cases defies what we know as the realities of our communities.

2.2

So some say with a heavy heart they will vote no. I with a heavy heart will vote yes.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate, further in debate? Senator Flores in debate.

SENATOR FLORES: Thank you very much,

Mr. President. Much has been said in debate in
the last couple of debates of the job, of our
job as legislators and how it is your job to be
here today and to write this map and how if we
don't, well, then we have given up that job.

Well, members, I am afraid to say that unfortunately we gave up that job some time ago, and we gave up that job in two ways.

Allow me for a moment to read from you the stipulation agreement which was agreed to by the Senate and it states, and it was agreed to by Judge Reynolds and it states very clearly that no deference shall be afforded to the Legislature's decision in drawing Senate

district boundaries.

And so members of the committee got together and talked about all six of those, and

The Senate gave up its job when it agreed and said that no deference, that means none, shall be afforded to the map that may or may not come out of this process. So we can sit here and say that it is very sad that we gave up our job, but unfortunately our job was given up by those who agreed to this statement.

So then we came to this process and this process was to come up with a map, and so what did we do? What was our job. Our job then at that time was to give our job to some very wonderful people, some of whom are sitting here today and they are wonderful, great people and I would not want to have your job, Mr. Ferrin.

But we gave our elected job to Mr. Ferrin and to his colleagues and his counterparts across the hall, and we gave our elected job to them. And then they came and they said we have six great maps, they are great. They have no legislative input. They have no -- they do not have our job, it is their job, and so there were six of those.

then one member of the committee, the Chairman of that committee, said we are going to choose one of those. One member out of 40 said this is the one that we are going to vote on, and that is what our job. And again, that map was a map that did not -- was not the product of any elected member, again, sorry, Jay.

And so that is what happened, and then we moved forward, we know we had an amendment, there was an amendment that had some legislative input. We went to the House, we had a negotiation and then two things happened.

One is that the House came up with a map that did not -- that also did not have legislative input. It was input by the Coalition Plaintiffs, wonderful lovely people, but they are not the ones who have our job and they got up and they -- and so we gave some of them -- and then that map came back here and what the Senate is saying today is that the recommendation is to produce a map that has the input of staff members and of Coalition Plaintiffs.

Members, I cannot understand how it is our legislative job, how we are fulfilling our job

by passing a map that does not have input by anybody who's job it was elected to do that.

So first I object to this map because of the process, because this process has been flawed from the beginning and the problem isn't our problem. Some of us will come and go, we will be here next year, we won't be here next year. That is not the problem.

The problem is that Legislatures that come after us, be it Republican, Democrat or whatever they will be, will look to the decision made today and will see that we gave up our job, not today, but we gave up our job months ago.

Secondly, I object to this map because of the product, because as wonderful as those fine gentlemen are who came up with this, with this map, the product is flawed and I can only speak to the area that I represent, that I represent with coincidentally everybody that is in the back row here today.

And what our constituents have asked us to do is to be their voice, to be their voice and not to be their Republican voice or Democrat voice, to be their female voice or their male

voice, to be their voice for the diversity of the communities that we represent in South Florida and for the diversities of communities that we represent across the state of Florida.

2.3

When you look around the room today, this room today looks different than the Legislature in 2002, different than the Legislature looks like in 1992. Why is that? Because our state looks different, and that is who we are here. Our job, my constitutional duty is to be the voice for those members.

And as Senator Garcia so eloquently placed, said and I know sometimes, some folks may get tired of hearing us talk about the struggles of those who came before us, but it is because it is our families who gave up their lives so that the people who are sitting here can have their voice.

And we can't sit here and say, listen, just to go along to get along we are going to vote for this map. We have been going along to get along for so long and we can't do it anymore.

So today when the vote comes up I would agree perhaps we know what the outcome is going

to be, but what I think will be very telling, is that more likely than not every minority in this Chamber will vote against this map. And what does that mean?

2.2

What that means is that since we have abdicated our job the Courts will interpret what that means.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Further in debate, further in debate? Senator Galvano to close.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you,

Mr. President, and thank you, Senators, for

your time through this process and frankly the

debate today.

I thought it was good debate and I think the issues that have been raised by you on the floor, the concerns about your communities and the people that you represent, I agree with you. I think you are right.

That should really be a consideration when you put together district lines on a map.

Unfortunately, that is not the world we are in, and the debate that we heard in this Chamber is really less about the conference report than about the Fair District Amendments.

You know, Senator Garcia, I hear you, so I

took all the additional time to run all the traps, and when we talk about where you hit the wall, it is not because staff or it is not because the committee or the conference decided, it is because the Supreme Court of Florida in Apportionment 7 said, this is the threshold if you want to meet constitutional compliance don't make the argument that any diminution is going to impact that compliance.

Senator Detert, I agree with you, but if we were to go into Court and say we took into consideration the fact that we don't really know these people in this district or these people don't know these people, then we are flying in the face of the constitutional amendments that we were sent here to uphold.

What I do disagree with you on is we do know who will draw these maps if we don't pass a map and it is not the Supreme Court, it is going to be the Plaintiffs. Let's call it like it is, it says as Senator Gaetz had referenced.

Senator Evers, the same thing. I wish we could put in a brief to the Court about your communities and the people that interact with one another and the little towns that make a

difference in the panhandle and how they would like to have the same representation because they have the same dreams and goals and desires and hopes for their families and their futures, but we cannot.

We were told to get out of the world where subjectivity matters, Senator Sachs, where it matters that the people of Belle Glade maybe have different agendas than the people of Boca Raton. We are told to get out of that world and get into the scientific world where numbers and configurations and wrapping the rubber band around the district is more important than the people who live inside that district, and that is the reality.

Senator Abruzzo, the same thing. You are recognizing that there are human elements to configuring lines on a map, and that human element, it is important to me, it is important to all of us, but again it was ripped away from us when these amendments went on to the constitution.

And as far as the staff involvement, it became even more important when the process became that much more sterile. And naturally

we have staff involved in pretty much I think everything that comes to the floor.

2.2

And I am going to stop right here to take a moment and recognize Jay Ferrin for the work that he has done, not just with me and the committee, but with every member who has -- has come to him to try to live in this world that I am describing is so difficult to live in.

And frankly our legal counsel have tried to interpret the ambiguity that continues in the application of these amendments. Make no mistake, the Circuit Court has disagreed with the Supreme Court and vice-versa. There is no easy, easy remedy here.

We have a job to do, a job that is difficult on the best day, but let's put it in perspective. We are here as part of a litigation. So that job has become that much more difficult, and we have been given the opportunity to go back in now with the benefit of some additional information and with 20/20 hindsight the opportunity to go back and draw a map so that we as a Legislature could put it forward and the deference is in presenting the legislative product that becomes the first

proposal before the Court, and if the legislative product being the first proposal before the Court is justified, both on a Tier 1 and Tier 2 basis, then it is game over.

If we don't produce a legislative product then it is game open and then whatever flies around there. To your point, Senator Soto, we may have other maps that come in and we become absolutely vulnerable to that post session map with a better metrics if we don't send something forward ourselves.

That is the reality that we are living in, and that is why it is so important to meet that reality. The debates that we have heard here today about the impact on the people within these districts, I hope they continue. I hope they continue to perhaps one day impact the way we draw maps in general and constitutionally, but if I am going to fulfill and if you are going to fulfill the job that President

Gardiner has asked us to fulfill and present a map to the Court that meets the constitutional requirements and is constitutionally compliant and will withstand the scrutiny of 14 days of discovery that starts in maybe 48 hours, I know

I am going to be deposed, let's call it what it is, and maybe some of you, and these are the type of things that I think about when we go through this process and try to keep it as clean as possible.

And one thing we have learned going through and I mentioned this last week, is that the process that we have established at least with the initial base map has got us away from what brought us here in the first place as Tier 1 concerns.

I remind all of you again, the Supreme

Court of Florida signed off on the map, signed

off on the districts that you represent. It

wasn't until the Tier 1 became an issue that

Tier 2 then became an issue, and that is when

it spiraled down.

Well, frankly I think we fixed it here.

We really did. I felt like as we went through, what, several hours of joint committee, another several hours of individual committee, we set up our random numbering, we came back, back through and looked at what was something that could withstand constitutional muster and brought it to the floor and sent it to the

Senate, I thought we were -- or to the House, I thought we were in good shape.

I recognize that the Plaintiffs submitted a map. If the House looked at that map and improved the metrics based on that map, it is not something they did on their own or sua sponte, Senator Diaz de la Portilla, it is something that I thought was a worthy exercise.

So when that map came back and they were able to go through and improve the metrics because that is what counts frankly these days, I thought it was something that was important, and I am not going to bore you with the numbers because we are so far past that.

I don't think anybody really cares about that in this Chamber right now. But at the same time like you, my skepticism remained high. That is why we met and had staff undertake what it did, that is why we spent an inordinate amount of time looking into the South Florida issue, looking at the law, looking at Apportionment 7, having the review, bringing in an expert to try to make sure that we were not in fact impacting that region the way that I had heard concerns about.

Senator Hays, same thing with your area.

I wanted to understand it just as much as you,
but understand it, Senator Legg, in the context
of Tier 1 and Tier 2 and all the while being
cautious that we were not responding in a way
that the Court, which will give great scrutiny
to this product, can deem that we were in some
way moving the needle from a partisan
perspective.

This product falls within those four corners. Is it the best possible map? No.

Can you go and make it better and better? Yes.

Is it an exact science? No. That is why you can infinitely improve the map. But is there a science component that is required of us? Yes.

And I believe we have met that, and certainly in the process we have met the Tier 1 component.

Now, as Majority Leader I am pretty good at counting votes, too, President Gaetz, but I am also confident that we have reasonable people in this Chamber. And then when you back away from the subjectivity that each of us have when you approach this process, and let's be honest about that, who was ever in this Chamber

handed a map during this process where your eyes didn't go straight to your district.

Whether you wanted it to or not, that is the vein of the Fair District Amendments, but in being reasonable and looking at the big picture and reminding ourselves of where we are and what we are truly trying to accomplish here, I think that you might reconsider and support this conference report, and I ask you to do that. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Senators, we have to get in the proper posture here. So before we actually unlock the board and we vote, without objection show the report adopted. That puts us in the proper posture to vote.

On the Bill as amended by the conference committee report, the secretary unlock the board and Senators will prepare to vote.

Have all Senators voted? Have all Senators voted?

Secretary, lock the board and announce the vote.

SENATE SECRETARY: Sixteen yays, 23 nays, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT GARDINER: Based on your vote

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the Bill, the conference report fails.

Senators, before we adjourn I want to

acknowledge and thank Senator Bill Galvano.

Senator Galvano, there will be very few regrets

that I have when I leave this body and I feel

very comfortable about what we tried to do

today. But one of the regrets that I will have

is I won't be here to serve with you when you

are President of this Chamber.

You have shown a willingness to take on probably one of the most difficult challenges to ever face this Senate, and with that I am very, very proud of you and for that I thank you.

Senators, we have completed our work and now it is time to get back to our work and get back to policy and get back to the things that we care about.

We are going to adjourn today and we will allow the clock to sine die run out by 3:00 tomorrow. That was the agreement, but upon our adjournment I can assure you you probably should head home.

We did our best, we did our job, and the Courts will now have their time. With that

24 25

Senator Simmons, you are recognized. SENATOR SIMMONS: Mr. President, for a motion. PRESIDENT GARDINER: You are recognized. SENATOR SIMMONS: Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn upon the call of the President. PRESIDENT GARDINER: Without objection the Senate is adjourned. (Whereupon, the proceedings were adjourned.) 

1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF FLORIDA )
3	COUNTY OF LEON )
4	I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript
5	is of a tape-recording taken down by the undersigned,
6	and the contents thereof were reduced to typewriting
7	under my direction;
8	That the foregoing pages 2 through 85 represent
9	a true, correct, and complete transcript of the tape-
10	recording;
11	And I further certify that I am not of kin or
12	counsel to the parties in the case; am not in the
13	regular employ of counsel for any of said parties; nor
14	am I in anywise interested in the result of said case.
15	Dated this 9th day of November, 2015.
16	
17	
18	
19	CLARA C. ROTRUCK
20	Notary Public
21	State of Florida at Large
22	Commission Expires:
23	November 13, 2018
24	Commission NO.: FF 174037
25	