1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	SENATE COMMITTEE ON REAPPORTIONMENT
11	AUGUST 17, 2015
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Reported by:
21	CLARA C. ROTRUCK
22	Court Reporter
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 SENATOR GALVANO: Good afternoon, let's call to order the Senate Committee on 3 4 Reapportionment. Administrative assistant 5 please call the roll. 6 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Galvano? 7 SENATOR GALVANO: Here. 8 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Braynon? 9 SENATOR BRAYNON: Here. 10 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Bradley? 11 SENATOR BRADLEY: Here. 12 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Gibson? 13 SENATOR GIBSON: Here. 14 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Lee. 15 SENATOR LEE: Here. 16 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Montford? 17 SENATOR MONTFORD: Here. SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Simmons? 18 19 SENATOR SIMMONS: Here. 20 SENATE SECRETARY: Quorum present. 21 SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, again, good 22 afternoon, members. As you know, we have had a lot of 23 24 discussion over the last week with regard to

Senate Bill 2-B, which is the base map that was

25

provided at the beginning of the special session that we are in now, that is 9065.

Today I would like to go into the amendatory process on the base map, and once we have gone through the amendatory process, then have a vote on Senate Bill 2-B so that it can be ready for the Florida Senate.

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

Before we go into the amendatory process I did want to remind the members that we are in a remedial session and we have talked about laying some predicates in terms of the changes to the lines that are proposed in or adopted, and those predicates involve just making clear to the committee so that we have a record who was involved in the drawing, reviewing, directing or approving of the proposed change, what criteria was involved to lead to the decision. And it will be helpful when staff is here to help with this as well to cite whether or not it makes the map more compliant with the constitutional requirements, and in our case it will mostly center around Tier 2 requirements, what data sources were used in the creation if other than My District Builder or District Builder, and I am not sure that that will be

the case in any of these amendments. And make clear whether or not political performance of non-minority districts was examined, because that is a -- is prohibited under our Constitution. If it is a minority district of course you are going to look at performance to make sure that it still does comply with Federal law.

2.2

If a functional analysis was performed with regard to minority districts, and again, just in general how the amendment complies with the constitutional requirements that we are dealing with.

So if you keep that in mind as you are presenting and be prepared to answer questions in that regard as well.

So before we go into the first amendment which is Bar Code 100902, being the Gibson/Simmons amendment, and the map number is 9050, I am going to open it up for any further questions from the attorneys or staff or to the attorneys or staff regarding the base map.

I think we have covered it pretty well, but if there is something lingering out otherwise we will move right into the

amendatory process.

2.2

Any further questions? Yes, Vice Chairman Braynon, you are recognized for a question.

SENATOR BRAYNON: Thank you. I know we talked a little bit about the combining of some of the amendments and all of that. Is that encompassed in the separate amendments which ones were combined and which one isn't, and as we go over them is it possible for that to be covered in the description that this is a combination of 9004 and 9048 or so forth?

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, sir, and a that is a good point. Towards the end of committee last time we met it was suggested that maybe we have a one composite map, but in working through the practicalities of that and the desire of individual members to sign their name to certain aspects of the map, it ended up that we didn't have one, but there are some amendments that incorporate other amendments, specifically the Lee amendment and the Detert amendments incorporate one another.

But we will make that clear and I am glad you brought that point up. Okay, well, let's start with amendment Bar Code 100902.

This is the Gibson/Simmons amendment on the map is S009C9050, and I will recognize Senator Gibson for comments, followed by Senator Simmons. And again, we all understand how complex this is and staff is here to answer any technical questions that need to be answered.

Senator Gibson, you are recognized.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I will tell the members I watched a movie last night for the first time on HBO that dealt with a court order where the counsel persons from, I think it was Yonkers, were required to build additional affordable housing, and the Judge, in one of the scenes the Judge said, well, if you don't vote to build it and you don't build it and you vote against the, I guess the referendum, you can be fined \$500 a day and locked up. So I certainly hope that that is only on TV and not the case today.

SENATOR GALVANO: That I am aware of.

SENATOR GIBSON: And with that I will explain. I explained the amendment last week wherein the map does go east and west, but it dips just a little bit south in Alachua County.

And the map really attempts to enfranchise more people who would otherwise have no real voice in the districts where they will be placed.

The map also, rather than diminish the BVAP to 45 percent, increases it to 46.6 percent, particularly given that for all practical purposes the BVAP is what it is in the base map, because it includes the prison population in it. Also there is no packing in the map because the surrounding districts will only perform to elect a Republican candidate.

Additionally, the map keeps more of Leon County together as we heard some testimony that Leon County was extremely split in the base map. I also believe that this map more conforms to Tier 1 which has to be considered as opposed to the base map where more -- it leans more towards a diminution rather than an inclusion.

And I believe that I will tell you -- I will tell you that the Romo -- no, I am sorry, the Reock is .13, and the Convex Hull is .46, which is, though the square miles are tighter in this map than they are in the base map the scores are not quite as close to one as those

in the base map.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you. Chairman Simmons, would you like to add anything to what has been said?

SENATOR SIMMONS: Yes. Thank you, Mr.

Chair, and thank you, Senator Gibson for

working so hard on this. And again, I want to

thank staff for -- for the diligence that they

have had in dealing with this issue and the

hard work that they have done and excellent

work.

When Senator Gibson and I spoke about this issue obviously the concern that exists is the compliance with the Fair Districts, the requirement that in a Tier 1 analysis that there cannot be a diminution of the ability of minorities to elect the candidate of their choice, which is, as I understand it from the cases, simply lifting that analysis from the Voting Rights Act which prohibits us from -- from diminishing the ability of, in this case, African-Americans to elect the candidate of their choice.

So what has happened is that the

Legislature based upon the finding of the Court, not that as I understand it, the Congressional District number 5 in a north/south configuration was in fact if we were looking at this before the finding of improper intent, that somehow or the other it was bad, a bad district. There certainly was a discussion about intent that apparently occurred in the 1990s or 2002, but I myself have a hard time understanding how that is relevant when there was a three Judge panel that drew this, this map.

2.2

But the important thing is, of course, is that we have a -- a very strong desire to comply with the, with the ruling by the Florida Supreme Court, and since under this remedial analysis the Legislature was not able according to the Supreme Court to carry its burden of proof. So we are not on the standard that it is a clean slate. We are on a standard that the Legislature has the burden of proof of justifying a north/south district, and the Florida Supreme Court said that that was not acceptable but at the same time the proposal for doing an east/west district must, of

course, still comply with Fair Districts and must comply with the Voting Rights Act, the Federal Voting Rights Act.

The result is is that the map that staff has put together which is one that has a --

SENATOR GALVANO: Are you referring to the base map?

SENATOR SIMMONS: The base map. I will call it the base map of 45.1 percent black voting age population. Interestingly enough, what that district has is 206 miles long compared to 143 miles long for the prior Congressional District 5 in a north/south configuration, and we are talking about 3,911 square miles.

So we are talking about trading one set of challenges for an even greater set of challenges. We are talking about the difficulty that any candidate might have, no matter who that candidate is, of traveling from Jacksonville to Gadsden County. And so -- and into Tallahassee, and we are about covering almost 4,000 square miles compared to somewhere a round half of that.

So this is a challenging situation for any

candidate, and it is certainly a massive extension of this -- of this district from 143 miles to the now 206 miles.

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

And so when Senator Gibson and I looked at this the issue was what about the constitutional requirement that there not be a diminution in the ability of African-Americans to elect a candidate of their choice. And from my perspective, dropping from the 48.11 percent that the Trial Judge had agreed was acceptable for the BVAP, the black voting age population, dropping it down to 45.12 percent is -- is a question as to whether that is going to comply not only with what the Fair District Amendment provides for, but in fact, complies with the Voting Rights Act, and the Supreme Court, the U.S. Supreme Court's 2015 decision in Alabama Legislative Black Caucus versus Alabama, in which the U.S. Supreme Court made clear that we are talking about the ability to elect a preferred candidate of choice, not a particular numerical minority percentage. And the example that the U.S. Supreme Court used was dropping from 70 percent to 65 percent would not effect the ability of black voters to elect their

preferred candidate.

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 am concerned and I think anyone would be concerned here to explain the rationale behind Senator Gibson's and my presentation of this, is that the -- the base map is the Romo A map. There is a Romo B map, and the Romo B map does get up into the 47 percent black voting age population, and somebody said, well, what difference does it make, let's look at the performance because on page 84 of the Florida Supreme Court decision they actually discuss the issue of, in place as I see it, a significant basis on the fact that they say that the black candidate of choice is still likely to win a contested Democratic primary since black voters constitute 66.1 percent of registered Democrats and the Democratic candidate is still likely to win the general election since the Democratic voters out number republicans 61.1 percent to 23 percent.

Interestingly enough, I think that -- that that does not address the circumstances behind the numbers. And oftentimes in looking and throwing around numbers people forget that numbers can be significantly misleading if you

do not know the circumstances behind those numbers. Certainly, as I have math major I am intrigued by numbers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I can tell you that to me someone would ask why is it that the BVAP for the east/west configuration in the base map is 48 -- excuse me, is 45.12 percent and when you look at the performance figures in a primary, then it jumps up into the high 50s or low 60s percent. the answer is probably, although I don't have the information because I don't know that any of us has it as yet, but the fact of it is, is that in north Florida as in probably other places that there are certain number of white Democrats that have bailed out of the primaries, the Democratic primaries and they vote in the -- in the general elections and they vote for -- and they vote Republican, and particularly in north Florida.

We have heard all of those stories about that is exactly what has happened, and I don't think that is considered by the analysis that is contained on page 84 of the Florida Supreme Court's decision. And based upon that, because each one of us needs to justify what we are

doing and justify why we are doing what we are doing, the answer I have is that the reason that Senator Gibson and I came up with this is that in fact this newly extremely difficult district for anyone to run in unless they have got a lot of money to be able to travel 206 miles from end to end, 4,000 square miles, 3,833, I believe. Something like that. That is somewhere short of 4,000 square miles of territory to cover, which certainly is a difficult campaign for anyone.

But also the numbers that I see don't in fact, and I am talking about the numbers that are reflected here when you start reducing the black voting age population, you start reducing that down to 45.12 percent and you ignore the fact that the reason that has justification for reducing that from 45 -- from 48.11 percent BVAP down to 45.12 percent BVAP is that African-Americans perform better in a Democratic primary, I believe completely ignores the circumstance that in many of these instances the reason they perform so well in a primary, a Democratic primary is because the white Democrats are not participating, and that

is the reason for the increased performance.

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

That is supported, by the way, by the fact that when you look at 2012, numbers that African-Americans perform better with -- in Presidential election and the reason why they perform better is probably did turn out better, about four percent as I understand it better in But the fact of it is, is just this area. looking at raw numbers and trying to suggest that the person as suggested by the Florida Supreme Court that, and I will quote, "and the Democratic candidate is still likely to win the general election since Democratic voters out number Republicans 61.1 percent to 23 percent," I think is, belies the fact that that is just not the case and you can look at the -- look at the numbers to -- as to who wins to see that that is not the case.

The point of it is is that that is one of the reasons. The second reason that Senator Gibson and I have looked at this is because the BVAP of 45.12 percent does not take into consideration that approximately 17,000 of the voters are in fact incarcerated. And if you look at the numbers that between seven and

8,000 of those are African-American, those are African-Americans who cannot vote. And so that is not a -- that is an illusory, an illusory analysis to suggest that those individuals are capable of voting.

So with those two considerations, Senator Gibson and I sat with -- with Jay Ferrin and we on the record recorded, actually drafted this -- this map, a new Congressional District 5 which I -- we took the Romo map, the Romo A and took a portion of the Romo B because Romo B actually has an appendage that goes, if you will look, Senators, you will look down into Bradford county and it goes down into Alachua.

SENATOR GALVANO: It is on the screen as well.

SENATOR SIMMONS: Okay, thank you. Goes down to Alachua County. Romo B actually extends its appendage all the way down to Marion County, all of this for the purpose of being able to capture a couple of percent of the African-American population. Therefore, increasing it to as Senators you can see, you can see that we are able to increase the black voting age population to 46.6 percent in this

map.

2.2

The issue is, should we be doing this?

This does decrease the -- the idea of compactness as looking at it from the particularly the Convex Hull analysis. We all have to ask the question is, that is a Tier 2 standard, it is not a Tier 1 standard, and are we going to out of esthetics go ahead and jeopardize the ability to elect a candidate of choice for those who are minorities in Congressional District 5.

The result of it is, is that as I stated last week, it doesn't take anyone with a great imagination to figure out how an African-American can be deprived of his or her ability to be elected in Congressional District 5 given the numbers that exist here.

All it takes is two African-American candidates with a white candidate running in a primary, and then even if an African-American were to win, then what would happen is, is that in a district that performs with Democrats voting Republican, so long as there is a Republican candidate that is a strong candidate, that you would find that this would

be a challenging district.

The end result of it is, is that Senator

Gibson and I drafted with tremendous assistance

from Jay, this map. We smoothed out some of

the lines around Tallahassee so that we

actually, you know, did not have an unwieldy

northern boundary in the Tallahassee area for

District 2.

This map does not, Senators, it does not change any of the configurations of districts other than 2 and 5 and 3. I think that is correct, is it not, Jay?

MR. FERRIN: Yes, sir. That is correct, sir.

SENATOR SIMMONS: We have not incorporated the -- the other changes that existed that other members of the Senate have presented in their amendments, and we acknowledge that that is going to be a challenge here and maybe what we should do and what Senator Gibson and I should do is withdraw this map at this point in time until there has been and deal with it on the floor, if that is appropriate, after everyone else has gone ahead and dealt with, for example, Sarasota County and also I believe

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

21 and 22.

And so the end result is that with -- with the agreement of Senator Gibson which I ask here that we withdraw it without prejudice to us since we are in court proceedings, you know, a little bit of humor there for those of us -that we withdraw it without prejudice but also explain to each of you that we are seriously concerned.

We are seriously concerned about the adoption of an east/west configuration that does not extend into what I would call Romo A minus or B plus or Romo B, which would provide African-Americans a better ability to elect a candidate of their choice. And yes, it is true that it will not be as visually esthetic as the other, but at the same time that, Senators, is the reason why we are doing what we are doing.

SENATOR GALVANO: It is my understanding that you are concurring with his withdrawal

without prejudice?

Thank you.

I concur without SENATOR GIBSON:

prejudice.

SENATOR GALVANO: Okay, well, I appreciate

the work that went into it and the basis for doing it and how you did it and why you did it, and I also appreciate you recognizing the unique circumstances, and I have used that word a lot since we convened last Monday, the unique circumstance that we are in, especially with regard to CD 5 where we have an opinion from the Florida Supreme Court that is instructive on many levels and very specific with regard to the Senate or Congressional District 5.

In fact they have a safe harbor exemplar for us to grapple with. And so certainly as we go through the process the opportunity still exists to -- to look at this issue, but for this committee's purposes we will show that withdrawn.

I do know the Vice Chair had a question and so I would like to on a limited basis, the Vice Chair -- okay, okay, thank you, sir. Senator Montford. Okay, you have a question on the process?

> SENATOR MONTFORD: Yes.

Yes, you are recognized. SENATOR GALVANO: SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to make sure I have in my mind the

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

process that we will be using today relative to the amendment and to what we -- what we are expected to come out of here with today.

One, one recommendation, an amended base map, if you will, walk me through that process again.

SENATOR GALVANO: Absolutely. We have a Senate Bill, Senate Bill 2-B which incorporates the base or discussion map as we call it. We are going through the amendments that have been filed by the members today. We have five amendments and one substitute.

The first amendment is the one we just discussed which, and let me make clear for the record we will show that withdrawn, that is 100902. As the amendments go on in the order they go on, the end product that comes out of this committee will then be the product that goes to the floor for second reading and final consideration.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Follow up.

SENATOR GALVANO: Yes, sir.

SENATOR MONTFORD: So if -- will we vote on each amendment as they are -- as they are presented, would we have voted on this

amendment today and then go to the next one,
vote on it, and if so, if we are doing that,
how would it all fit together so that I might
vote for one amendment and be opposed to
another one? How -- I am still trying to get
some clarification.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Senator

Montford. If you are asking me whether in the sequence of amendments a later amendment impacts an earlier amendment, the later amendment is going to prevail.

So when staff incorporates, and actually they are all maps, they are all maps, and there may be an opportunity if you have for example some changes to CD 5 in the northern part of Florida and all you see is an example, a Detert amendment down in the southern part where both of those can -- can come together, but if a later sequenced amendment modifies an earlier sequenced amendment, the later will prevail, and that is just how it works.

Okay, let's take up the Montford amendment then, Bar Code 820214, and that is map 9052.

Senator Montford, you are recognized to explain your amendment.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I would like to take just a moment to thank, to publicly thank President Gardiner for placing me on this committee. It has been a most informative and educational experience and you, Mr. Chair, as always you conduct business, an it is a pleasure to deal with and the staff as well. I can't say enough about Jay and he was here this weekend and every night last week as we all know and just did a wonderful job.

Senator Gibson watched HBO last night. I had a far less entertaining experience. I watched the replay of this committee meeting, specifically Senator Simmons and why in the world I would be up at midnight watching you, Senator Simmons, with your presentation during the week but it was entertaining and I learned -- I learned something from you again last night.

And if I may, as an introduction to my amendment, the first time I heard about a congressional district running north and south from Jacksonville to across north Florida, I didn't take it too seriously.

This was several weeks ago, and I thought

well, that -- that will never happen, but, of course, of course it did, and I have some of the same concerns that Senator Simmons and Senator Gibson have -- have expressed. I am not overly concerned though about the districts, quite frankly.

My Senate district, I have 11 counties, two time zones. If you got a good aid that can drive well, you can get a lot of work done, and you gain an hour if you go west, and you lose it coming back, of course. So the distance, itself, doesn't overly concern me, but I do appreciate Senator Simmons, Senator Gibson, your bringing that point up.

And then when we all sat down and really started putting pencil to paper with staff in terms of how, how we can address the concerns that we had, and especially after our first committee meeting, Mr. Chair, when you -- when you led us through the presentation from -- from our legal staff which was exceptionally informative and then with our own staff as well, it became clear to me and I believe I have got this right and I would hasten to ask, Mr. Chair, if you will correct me if I am wrong

on this, that I believe our legal counsel said that the Supreme Court said we will move east to west, start in Jacksonville and you will move west.

I believe the term was that they blessed the Romo A or the base plan that we have now. And quite frankly, if you -- if you look at the -- at the counties, the BVAP of the counties between Jacksonville and moving west, Nassau is 6.4, St. Johns at 5.4, Duval is 27.7, which is less than I thought it would be. Then you get to Baker which is 14.3, you get to Hamilton which is 34.8. Columbia, the piece of it in our map is 17.2. Madison 37, Jefferson 34, Leon 29, Gadsden 53.

So being an old math, former math teacher it didn't take me long to figure out that if you are going to start in Jacksonville and you are going to get a BVAP that is acceptable, you would have to get to Gadsden county and you cannot get to Gadsden going through Leon.

So it was a -- it was an eye opener if you will for me to realize that based on the Supreme Court having blessed Romo A or the base plan, that Leon County would not remain whole.

Now when I say Leon County I want to hasten say we are really talking about the Leon County region. As I have said before, Leon County serves as the educational hub, if you will, the medical hub, certainly the employment hub as well. So the lines around Leon County, quite frankly, are shared in many more ways than we would expect in terms of the region, but with getting all -- with those realities and the Tier 1, the Tier 2, the Voting Rights Act and all of that put together in a recipe, then this is a recipe that says to me you have got constraints you have got to deal with. Leon county and the surrounding areas will not remain whole.

and so you don't go east -- you have to go east and west and when I asked the question to the staff, does that mean you cannot go south, and I think it was suggested that that would not be a good idea. But one of the concerns that -- that I have is, and Senator Simmons and Senator Gibson, highlighted that, is the BVAP scores of the proposed plan is down to, I think it is 45 and so that, that gives me pause.

Now, one of the things I have learned that

staff clearly explained to me again this weekend, they were very good about it in saying even though you have all of these, the prisons in this area, what the Supreme Court and the experts look at is the performance, not numbers, but performance.

So those, that is taken into consideration when -- when the performance score is done. So I, again though, I am still concerned that the BVAP score for the proposed map, Romo A, I believe dampens the opportunity for minorities to select a candidate of their choice. So I sat down with staff to how do we raise, how do we raise the BVAP score, how do we -- how do we get it up from the 45.1 that the Supreme Court blessed, and be able to get, you know, just better opportunity without being, without it being questioned about our trying to pack a district as well.

So the staff, with my direction, if you will, came up with something that I don't want to speak for Jay, but I don't think he would be overly enthusiastic about my map, even though he was very nice about saying that.

It took me a while to figure out what he

said, but I am not sure he is really enthusiastic about it. But with that being said, you know, I look at the map that you have here and my -- my Reock score will improve slightly, the Convex Hull score drops from 71 to 39, and so on. So it is not, it doesn't score nearly as well as the base map.

So that, again, that even though that doesn't score well, what it does do is it brings up our BVAP to 47.9 percent, which is slightly better than the Simmons/Gibson plan, slightly better, but it is considerably better I think than -- than the 45.1.

So if I may, I know somebody else will point this out, it does split more counties, it does split more cities, and that the square mileage is very, very similar to the base plan and so on. So to put it in a nutshell, Mr. Chair, and members, I believe that, well, I know that my amendment here raises the BVAP score much, much closer to what I think is reasonable and acceptable and does not over extend that so -- so that it would cause, it would over extend it to the point where it would cause a problem.

Now, if you look at the map just like it is there, some would say it is not nearly as compact as it needs to be. Some would say, well, you just took just the north part of Leon County, and some, you know, some would say there would be other criticisms of it, but I think the selling point for this amendment is that it raises the BVAP score to me to a much more acceptable level.

So Mr. Chair, if I may, that is the explanation of my amendment and I will be glad to try to answer any questions that you or other members may have.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Senator

Montford. Members, do we have any questions of

Senator Montford, and feel free to defer to

staff on a technical issue, Senator.

Senator Gibson, you are recognized for a question.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you. Thank you,
Mr. Chair. Is your amendment exactly Romo B?

SENATOR GALVANO: You are recognized.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

No, but correct me, Jay, if I am wrong, I

believe we took Romo B and massaged it a little

bit.

SENATOR GALVANO: Mr. Ferrin.

MR. FERRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And Senator Montford, you are correct in some aspects. We -- I used the Romo B's configuration in Duval County which actually had 66,000 less population than the base map does in Duval, and that actually led to kind of a chain of changes where CD 4 comes -- doesn't go as far south into St. Johns. CD 6 doesn't on go as far west into Lake County, and then there is some other changes to District 2 and 3 as a result of all of that.

So yes, it was loosely based on Romo B.

Romo B uses I think has Bradford county in CD 5
as opposed to Union. So there are some
differences, but that was the basis for which
we started and that was the instructions that
you gave to me as well.

SENATOR GALVANO: Further questions?

Chairman Bradley, you are recognized for a question.

SENATOR BRADLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And this, I will direct this question to staff,

to Jay. How does this amendment effect the

compactness of CD 3 when you look at the base map compared to the power tool that would be put on top of CD 3?

SENATOR GALVANO: You are recognized.

2.2

MR. FERRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The -- from the scores' perspective, CD 3 in the base map is .71. I believe it is the highest scoring Reock score we have in the base map, and the corresponding Reock a CD 3 in this configuration is .58. The Convex hull for the district likewise goes down from .89 to .76 and Polsby-Popper goes from .53 to .18.

So it makes CD 3 significantly less compact in terms of the scores.

SENATOR GALVANO: Further questions?

President Lee for a question.

SENATOR LEE: Thank you. Just to ask the obvious question. The base map which was essentially drafted on the basis of the Supreme Court's direction with respect to CD 5, is that correct?

MR. FERRIN: That is correct.

SENATOR LEE: So as a Tier 1 district the goal there is to make sure as best as possible that that district will continue to perform for

African-Americans, is that correct? 1 2 MR. FERRIN: That is correct. SENATOR LEE: And the conclusion of the 3 Court, among other conclusions that they may 4 5 have made was that, that in their view the 6 black voting age population necessary to 7 achieve that objective could be lower than it 8 had been in previous maps, not to mention 9 east/west, is that correct? 10 MR. FERRIN: That is correct. 11 supported the idea that 45.1 is sufficient. 12 SENATOR LEE: Okay, thank you, sir. 13 SENATOR GALVANO: Further questions? 14 Chairman Simmons. 15 SENATOR SIMMONS: I have a question for 16 legal counsel. 17 SENATOR GALVANO: Absolutely. 18 SENATOR SIMMONS: And that is what 19 happened to Romo B with respect to the 20 presentation to the Florida Supreme Court by 21 the Plaintiffs? What ultimately was the result 2.2 relating to Romo B, and why was it not something that was discussed as well? 23 24 SENATOR GALVANO: Attorney Cantero. 25 Thank you, Mr. Chair. JUSTICE CANTERO:

don't recall, and the Supreme Court, the

Plaintiffs were relying on Romo B, I think they

mostly, they said they relied on an alternative

map. They relied on Romo A and I believe my

recollection is after we presented remedial map

9057 at the hearing before Judge Lewis they

also relied on a Romo A type map, not Romo B.

SENATOR GALVANO: Follow up, yes.

SENATOR SIMMONS: When the Plaintiffs presented Romo B, did they present it as being a compliant map? Did they state that it was compliant?

SENATOR GALVANO: You are recognized.

JUSTICE CANTERO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yes.

SENATOR GALVANO: Further questions? Vice Chair Braynon, you are recognized.

SENATOR BRAYNON: Thank you. This will go to either Jay or Senator Montford. Looking at District 3 and how this drop down here splits District 3 kind of into -- and caused it to have an appendage that goes along side of District 5, along 75, if you see where I am pointing at.

So right here, this appendage right here.

What was the reason for keeping this appendage here versus putting some of it -- putting some of it into this district and moving it up and putting some into here, and not creating this, I guess you would say appendage which effects the compactness of District 3? Is there a geographical reason or maybe a -- some reason why that needs to stay like that?

SENATOR GALVANO: Mr. Ferrin. Senator Montford, if you would like to respond.

SENATOR MONTFORD: No, that is all right.

SENATOR GALVANO: Okay, Mr. Ferrin.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Let me --

SENATOR GALVANO: I thought you were wanting to be recognized.

SENATOR MONTFORD: That is okay. Again, the goal here was to bring the BVAP up to a level that I personally felt comfortable in that would be effective, and that, and correct me, Jay, if I am wrong, that was a way to bring up the BVAP in 5, and -- and I, you know, I will be the first to admit, you know, it doesn't look good, and when you look at that it looks, it just, the appendage is stuck down there.

But as we all know, I mean, that is why we went east and west. That is why an eye and serious considerations of the BVAP that is why we are -- we are drawing lines a lot of the way we are and that is why we went, staff went south there.

SENATOR GALVANO: Mr. Ferrin, do you want to add to that?

MR. FERRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think one of the ways to look at this is potentially not as District 3 having the appendage, but District 5 having it. So District 3, if you, you know, in the base map it was a pretty compacted circular shaped district in that general area of Marion, Alachua, Union, Bradford, Putman, Clay Counties.

And so in trying to redraw 5 in that manner, I mean, it -- it creates a protrusion in 5 to try and keep the circular shape of the district to help keep some of its compactness scores the same.

If you try to reconfigure and put CD 3 into I guess it is Levy County, Dixie county, Gilchrist, some of those areas, you can

potentially do that. It would probably split more counties, the population shift, I am not sure exactly how -- how it would play out in terms of whether or not you could take all of Dixie County there, moving -- moving up.

So I think that was a decision based on let's try and keep the general layout of CD 3 and we will just make the protrusion where necessary and push it over in Marion County. That is where the shift was. It certainly could be attempted in another manner if you were to try it.

SENATOR GALVANO: Okay, further questions?

Seeing none do we have public testimony

relative to this particular amendment? No,

none by card. Anyone in the audience with

regard to this particular amendment?

Seeing none we will go into discussion and debate. Do you want to be recognized -- do you have a question? That is because yours was withdrawn. Testimony, debate? President Lee.

SENATOR LEE: Well, assuming we are going to proceed forward with this, let me just say this, both with respect to the Simmons/Gibson amendment which was withdrawn, and this

amendment.

2.2

I think we are, I think that the Court has given us some direction here specifically with respect to this Tier 1 district, and I agree with what Senator Simmons has said, that by reducing the black voting age population in that district you are taking a big risk. The court is taking a big gamble with a Tier 1 district that they could somehow thread the needle or turn what really is as much an art as it is a science into a pure science, and that they can predict that with a much lower black voting age population they can achieve the same outcome, and I think that is really dangerous.

I hope they are right, but I think that is really dangerous, and I think ultimately that maybe the -- that decision may be up to a Federal Judge at the end of the day as to whether or not they agree. And I could layout scenarios wherein you have the maestro incumbent Congresswoman Brown run from the Duval area, you have an Al Lawson or something like that, as much as that might be seen as heresy in the African-American community, those kinds of things happen all the time, run from

the Leon County area. And all of a sudden you have split the black vote and -- and, you know, a non African-American Democrat comes right up the center and becomes the nominee, and there are all kinds of things that can happen that are anomalies with these things and I think that is why you maintain some cushion historically with respect to these black or Hispanic voting age populations as you try to craft these access districts.

2.2

So as much -- but as much as I think what they have done is really dangerous, that is on them, you know, we are in a remedial process. They have come to this conclusion. They are going to have to answer for the scalpel that they have taken to this map to try to craft out in their infinite wisdom the exact percentage necessary to elect an African-American in this area.

And I am very hesitant to touch it. I -it is a Tier 1 issue, and to me it rises to a
different level of concern as I go to try to
manipulate this, and as much as I agree with
the conceptually with the efforts of Senator
Gibson, Simmons and Montford in both of these

iterations, you know, I am troubled by the compaction issues that are created as a result of them, and the extent to which the Court has been, you know, really, really specific with respect to these Tier 1 standards.

2.2

So I am in a bit of a quandary because I also have some counsel sitting behind me that is concerned that this is a constitutional map as well. So it is a bit of a Hopson's choice, but it would be very, very difficult for me to support those changes to the map in light of the direction we have been given by the Court as much as I believe that when history is written should the base map ultimately get adopted with regard to District 5 we may all live to regret it.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, President Lee. Chairman Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I agree with Senator Lee's comments and his analysis. When it comes to CD 5, the Florida

Supreme Court has decided to draw it themselves. And I am kind of a fan of the Pottery Barn theory, you break it, you own it.

And you know the Court's version of CD 5

is by going east/west is less compact than 1 It is from one to the other is 2 north/south. So as described earlier 3 much longer. 4 candidates trying to run in this district are 5 going to have to go farther, they are going to 6 be less responsive to their -- their 7 constituents because of the length than they 8 would under the north/south configuration, but 9 that is what the Legislature decided, and the 10 Legislature adopted a map that was prepared by 11 Democrats, the record is clear. The Court 12 adopted that map that was prepared by Democrats 13 and the reason why the Plaintiffs, the reason 14 why that is Romo A is because the Plaintiffs 15 want more Democrats to be elected to Congress 16 and by going east/west that allows more 17 Democrats to be elected in the grander scheme 18 of things.

And the Court decided to go ahead and go along with that by embedding it in their decision. So it is theirs. We follow the Court's guidance and we move forward and I am going to not support this amendment.

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

SENATOR GALVANO: Senator Gibson.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I believe that Senator Montford's map is about people. It is not about party, and I don't think we are here to do things for a party. His map increases the BVAP just as the Gibson/Simmons amendment did in an effort not to diminish the potential for a constituency to elect a candidate of its choice.

2.2

His map also, like the Gibson/Simmons amendment, attempts to make Leon County more whole. And people live where they live, and so I understand the appendage, and I think we talked a little bit about history at our last meeting, particularly as it relates to minorities, people were forced to live where they live, lived, and naturally as we find relatives come and settle where relatives live, friends come and settle where friends live. So it is not an unusual circumstance for that to happen in Florida.

It happens in the entire United States of America. And so I see Senator Montford's map as an attempt to help people and not party. It is unfortunate that we have been told what to do by the Courts as opposed to being able to listen to our various constituencies as we did

I believe previously.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

And so I think the map does the right service to the right people. It is just unfortunate that it is a little less actually of a good Reock and Convex Hull score than even the Gibson/Simmons amendment.

Thank you.

SENATOR GALVANO: Vice Chair Braynon.

SENATOR BRAYNON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. have to -- I have to disagree with my good friend Chair Bradley. I think the inverse is true about what the Supreme Court thought. don't believe that the Supreme Court thought that they were drawing, they could draw a map to help the Democrats. I think they, what they did say was that we drew a map to help the other side, and they are asking us to remedy that, and that is why we are here, and this is the second time that we are here, because the Courts have found that we drew a map and we drew a District 5 that helped Republicans. they are asking us to draw one that helps I quess to steal the words from Senator Gibson, that is more about people than is about parties.

Now, whether we agree with the Supreme Court, which I have very much heard through these proceedings that we do not, that most of us do not, that is their finding and that has been their finding twice. I think that when we talk about what they are asking us to do, I think they gave us a parameter.

I think that as we stray from that parameter we end up trying to either come back here a third time or allowing or basically forfeiting our right to do just that, to draw the map. And I, so I think that is really what we are -- what -- that is really the crux of it. I think we continue to look at it. If we look at it from the prism of they are trying to help someone and look at it from what they actually wrote, which was that we, we did something wrong in trying to help someone else, then I think you can -- you request move forward with a little better, I think you can understand what is happening a little better.

And the second thing I wanted to talk
about was the concept of I think Senator
Simmons touched on it, Justice, or counsel has
touched on it that an African-American a

winning a Democratic primary and then not being able to finish out in the general because the white population in north Florida will not elect an African-American Democrat, white Democrat.

I did not know that. I think that I would -- I would ask if -- if in closing if a -- because I am not a white Democrat from Florida, if one would talk about that a little bit and kind of expound on that and how that is a reason why we need a BVAP, a VAP to be so high in District 5.

So if Senator Montford, if you could talk a little bit about that and how you see that playing out here in north Florida I would be very interested in seeing why that would force us to have to put higher numbers in here because we don't believe that the African-American can come through the primary.

SENATOR GALVANO: Chairman Simmons in debate.

SENATOR SIMMONS: I would like to respond to Senator Braynon. I said that, and I am quoting from page 84 of the Supreme Court decision. It 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."

2.2

I did not say that, that white voters would not elect an African-American. I said that the white voters are voting Republican and they are going to vote Republican down the line as is indicated irrespective of whether you are black or you are white.

What I am saying is the end result is that African-Americans have a significant possibility of being not represented by the candidate of their choice as a result of voting patterns, and that I disagreed with the conclusion that simply because a, you know, there are more Democratic voters than there are Republican voters, particularly in northern Florida, that -- that Democrats always vote Democratic.

The end result is the same. The end result is that the opportunity for an African-American to be elected in -- in Congressional District 5 as configured in an east/west may not be as suggested here in page 84. The end result is that, that there would

be in my view a diminution in the ability of

African-Americans to elect a candidate of their

choice.

SENATOR GALVANO: Chairman Bradley for a brief debate. You have debated once already. I will let you have a comment as well.

SENATOR BRADLEY: I was just going to point out with regards to CD 5, this isn't our first time here. We sat here for many hours, and took a Trial Court came where they discussed the fact that CD 5, the BVAP was too high and it needed to be lowered, and we listened to our lawyers, we listened to staff.

There was no allegations that I am aware of that anyone involved in this process last year was motivated in any way that was suggested earlier by partisan intent, and we did what I think is the legislative prerogative, which is we took the CD 5 that they said had a BVAP too high and we lowered it and we modified CD 5, but kept a north/south configuration, and that was then approved by a court.

And so to be clear, they didn't -- the Florida Supreme Court could have simply said,

go back and try again on CD 5 because your BVAP remains too high, but they didn't do that.

They went further and they said redo the whole thing, take it completely from a north/south to an east/west and did so in a way that I suppose it could be coincidence in someone's mind, not mine and others may think it is coincidence.

2.2

They did so in a way that completely matches a partisan map that evidence shows was prepared by Democrats and that is the record.

And I appreciate Senator Montford's attempt to putting forth a modification. I understand his motivations are pure, and I understand what he is looking to do, is to try to make this more acceptable from allowing the African-American community to elect a candidate of their choice.

I feel hamstrung and am quite comfortable moving forward with the -- with the base map when it comes to CD 5.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Chairman

Bradley. Okay, before Senator Montford closes

let me just bring it in.

First of all, I appreciate the intent of your amendment and what you were trying to accomplish. I would ask the committee not to

support it. I do have some Tier 2 concerns with regard to visual compactness, scoring compactness as well as the splits in both counties and cities.

2.2

Having said that, with regard to the opinion of the Supreme Court we have been given a very specific instruction. They have and our lawyers have told us this and corroborated it yet again that the CD 5 proposed by the Court which is in the base map is an example, an exemplar, if you will. The Court has also made very clear to us whether or not we agree that 45.1 percent is sufficient to meet the threshold for their interpretation.

So unfortunately we are dealing with a situation and a medial process where the Court has given us a safe harbor and basically has drawn a line in the sand, albeit a 206-mile line across north Florida, it is a line in the sand nonetheless, and to adhere to the advice of counsel, unless we accept that we run the risk of having the Court reject it.

So with that I would ask that you not support the amendment to Senate Bill 2-B and I will recognize Senator Montford to close and

convince us otherwise.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for that encouragement and support. But I do want to make a couple of points, if I may. I think we do have to look at voting performance and I have been through eight campaigns personally in this county and two in this area of north Florida, 11 counties.

So I -- I think I have a pretty good feel for north Florida. So I think the voting performance is an issue. It is not necessarily a science, but it is something you have to contend with.

The second thing though, and sometimes they may the elephant in the room, is that is that many years ago when -- when that First District 5 was drawn, I said to myself, what in the world are they doing. And then as time goes through I learn from some of my colleagues and others, why it did, and it was because of historical housing patterns that exist today in this state, in this country, because of historical events, what has occurred over the last 200 years. That is why people live where they live in many cases.

And I would suggest to you, and I thought about it this weekend, if we were to draw these lines based on where people worship, these lines would be one heck of a lot different.

You think our neighborhoods are segregated, let's look at places of worship.

So if you were to pause and start drawing these lines about where they worship rather than where they live, you can't have compact, as compact districts as one, one might would like. It is not that simple. So what, the constraints that we have and I won't belabor what they are, make some of us feel very uncomfortable. Some of us will be in an awkward position trying to defend whatever we come out of this committee with and what eventually we decide on the Senate floor.

But I, Mr. Chair and members of this committee, I clearly understand the concerns that you have, all of you have and especially our ability to move forward and get through the judicial system.

So with that, Mr. Chair, and my colleagues on this committee, I respectfully withdraw this amendment.

SENATOR GALVANO: Show amendment 820214

Montford map 9052 withdrawn. Thank you,

Senator. I appreciate it.

Now we will take up 903908 by Lee, it is map 9046. Mr. President, I believe you intend to withdraw that amendment.

SENATOR LEE: That is correct, sir.

SENATOR GALVANO: Show that amendment withdrawn. Now let's take up 882640, Bar Code and it is Lee 9048 and we will go into the substitute amendment, Bar Code 202492 by Lee, map 9054.

President Lee, you are recognized to discuss the substitute amendment.

SENATOR LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And -- and as I said last week as we were working through this, 9046, which has been withdrawn, and 9048 for which we now have a substitute, 9054, which is the substitute amendment that we are on, did a great job sort of showing you the progression of -- of how we got to this substitute amendment. And it sort of began with my own personal knowledge of the way the citizenry feels back in eastern Hillsborough County about the history of how these maps have

been drawn and the priorities that have been set.

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

We -- I heard from Senator Joyner in discussion that she had some interest in trying to improve the performance of Senate District I read in the newspaper that some folks down in Sarasota, Manatee, had an interest in trying to re-establish the communities of interest that exists down there in Congressional District 16, and I set out to try to take a look at all of those priorities because on the record our staff was very honest in saying that once they got to Tier 2 standards not only did the Supreme Court, not only does the Constitutional Amendment say that none of these Tier 2 standards with respect to compactness, honoring political subdivision boundaries, et cetera, took precedence over one another, but that there was actually a myriad of ways these maps might have been drawn to achieve very similar scores.

And -- and so we set out to try to see if we couldn't address some of those priorities that existed based upon the knowledge of the way communities operate and not do any damage

to the maps. And so in 46 and in 48 we attempted to improve the coalition performance of Senate District 14 a bit.

2.2

Senator Joyner, I inferred from the questioning and her comments on the record did not like the tangential impacts that occurred to the map as a result of that. And so in order to achieve what she wanted to achieve we were going to have to draw something that went down the west coast, west coast of Hillsborough County, if you will, in a way that would have created some obvious visual compact issues which would have been fine, I suppose, if we were operating under a Tier 1 standard, but that district was not given that level of priority by the Court.

So we essentially in the substitute amendment went back to the original configuration of Congressional District 14, I believe. We consolidated south and eastern Hillsborough County and in order to improve the compactness scores took the Polk portion of Congressional District 15 and drove it north to the county line which allowed us to move Congressional District 9 to the east and out

of, I guess, move it to the east and improve the compactness scores there.

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

And I think essentially what happened over the weekend, Mr. Chairman, is sort of what I -what I offered in open discussion on Thursday, and that is that, you know, we are trying to react to maps that have taken, you know, probably hundreds of manhours to develop in the form of a base map working in concert with House staff over the course of a few hours in a compressed schedule with other members having issues they would like to see taken, staff take a look at as well. So in the spirit of trying to maintain I quess as much of the base map in compactness and what-have-you as we could and without doing any damage, if you will, to the -- what would I call that, the expectations that had been set with respect to the base map by people who had viewed it, we set out to try to achieve some of these goals and objectives.

We did it all on the record and we did it in a way that I think actually improves the city splits by two cities and with relatively similar compaction scores. We have not looked at a single shred of performance data. This

has been done entirely with our Staff Director
Jay and myself and then he worked, as far as I
know he worked on his own over the weekend to
try to achieve the objectives that we talked
about on the record, which is really to improve
the compactness score that comes, I think, the
compactness score that comes out of Amendment
48, 9048, into Congressional District 9 by the
adjustments that are made in 9054.

And I will defer to staff at your pleasure, Mr. Chair, to kind of walk the committee through the Reock and Convex Hull as opposed to a visual compaction scores, kind of walk through those at your pleasure, and I am prepared and happy to answer any questions the members might have. And to the extent that I have missed, you know, articulating a process that we -- we went through to get there to the satisfaction of the committee I am happy to reiterate any portion of it.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, President

Lee. I am going to recognize Jay Ferrin to

discuss some of the scores. And I would also

after that would like to hear from legal

counsel because unlike CD 5 we have not heard a

lot of feedback on this, on this proposed change and I would like to get a brief comment from counsel as well.

Mr. Ferrin, you are recognized.

2.2

MR. FERRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Senator Lee, you did a good job explaining what we did here. We did go back to the District 14 that was in the base map in part because it allowed us to keep Tampa whole. I think there was probably some concern that the prior iteration of CD 14, while statistically a little bit more compact than the base maps, it did not create a situation in which there was a Tier 1 priority that would probably justify splitting the city of Tampa.

So we returned to that, and then the exchange between Districts 15, 9 and 17 was basically a clockwise rotation where District 15 pushed up and took in the population north of Lakeland between Lakeland and the northern Polk County border, and that allowed District 9 to push further east in the northern part of Polk and push further west in the southern part of Polk which resulted in District 9's compactness being significantly more visually

and metrically superior to what it was in the prior amendment. Likewise, District 17, its compactness scores improved some because it ends up filling in more area in the area.

In regards to city splits, making this change also, well, back to the original amendment, the underlying amendment. The changes to CD 10 and 11 allowed us to keep Groveland whole there, the city of Groveland which was previously split. Restoring Tampa in CD 14 reduced the city split from the base amendment, and then the Polk County area in this iteration is drawn with no cities split.

We were able to keep Lakeland whole in
District 15, Auburndale whole in District 9 and
then Winter Haven is whole in District 17. So
it does reduce the overall city and county
splits, and from a statewide perspective the
compactness scores are pretty much the same as
they are in the base map. The base map has a
statewide Reock score of .43. A statewide
Convex Hull score of .76 and a statewide
Polsby-Popper of .35. This amendment has a
statewide Reock score of .43, Convex Hull was
.76 and Polsby-Popper is .34. So barely a

slight change in the scores there.

2.2

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Mr. Ferrin.

Justice Cantero, do we have any red flags or issues with regards to the opinion of the Court?

JUSTICE CANTERO: Well, in looking at the changes that are done to the base map, I think as far as the compactness scores as -- I am not going to repeat what Jay just said, but to me it is kind of a wash. It certainly doesn't detract from the base map. They don't diminish the compactness scores. Some districts are less compact, others such as 11 are more compact.

I think District 16 is a separate issue because even though District 16 is less compact than in the base map, I think the reason for that is a little different. The reason for District 16 in 9054 is it returns that district to the way it was in 9057.

It is basically the same district it was then, and that was not one of the districts that the Supreme Court directed the Legislature to redraw. So I see nothing wrong with keeping District 16 as it was in 9057.

There is, I always look for an increased benefit to any amendment to the base plan, and I think in 9054 the increased benefit that we see is the keeping two more cities whole than we did in the base map. So the base map kept a total of 386 cities whole, and in 9054 we keep

388 cities whole.

So in my view it is a legally defensible amendment. One can never predict what a court will do and in this Supreme Court we have certainly seen some surprises in the last couple of years, but it is certainly a change that I feel comfortable defending on Tier 2 grounds, and I don't see any evidence that there was any -- that it was drawn with any improper intent.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you. Other members, we are going to have questions and you can draft them to President Lee, and President Lee, if you would defer to staff or counsel, it is your prerogative.

Questions? Okay. Well, there are no questions. Do we have public comment specifically with regard to the substitute amendment or even the underlying -- no, we

don't.

Okay, members, we will go into discussion and debate then. Discussion and debate.

Seeing none -- yes, Senator Gibson, you are recognized.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I guess this is more commentary and fortunate for Senator Lee, and I just, as you look at the geography of our state and, you know, it just causes you to wonder how easily we can change certain areas that don't necessarily have a minority impact and it is all good, and we can change -- we can't change or we have to change those areas in the state that do have minority impact and we are extremely restricted.

And so I am just, I guess I am mulling that part over and maybe Senator Lee can help us figure out how we can deal with east/west, up north. Thank you.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you. In debate? Vice Chair Braynon.

SENATOR BRAYNON: Thank you. I think when I was looking at this before I talked about the split of Orange County versus the split of

Hillsborough, Hillsborough County, and in the base map they are split evenly. There is one seat that is wholly incorporated in Orange County and three seats that have a portion of Orange County.

In Hillsborough there is one seat that is incorporated wholly in Hillsborough County and three seats that have a portion of Hillsborough County. Now it looks like we have three seats in Hillsborough and no seats that are wholly incorporated in Orange County. So I guess maybe if we can go -- we can, in the close, President Lee, if you can, I guess it is just a choice and it is a prerogative.

It would be my assumption, but I will let you clarify in the close, but that kind of gives me a moment of pause that a huge county like Orange County now has no Senate, no congressional seats that is wholly incorporated.

SENATOR GALVANO: Chairman Bradley, you had a question, I believe.

SENATOR BRADLEY: I do, and perhaps it would be okay if President Lee would just address this in his close along with what Vice

Chair Braynon has asked him to address in his close.

And that is if you could talk about, if you have met with any political consultants regarding political performance of this map.

Have you -- who have you spoken to besides our staff and that sort of thing just to make sure the record is clear on that, President Lee.

Thank you.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Chairman Bradley, and I think you hit on that, but I appreciate you highlighting it for us.

Senator Montford.

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You know, quite frankly, I -- I spend most of
my time in north Florida, and I haven't had as
much time probably as I should have to really
get down into the nitty gritty of this.

What I would ask Senator Lee to do,

President Lee to do if you would in your

closing is, one, I guess what is really the

big, the change here and is there -- has there

been any public response to this at all? I

mean, has anybody said anything that would

bring concerns about this particular amendment

that we need to be concerned with?

SENATOR GALVANO: Okay, before I recognize

President Lee to close, Senators, I would

support this amendment, mainly because it does

not negatively impact Tier 2 compactness. It

actually improves as the city and county

splits, and based on counsel there is not a

problem with the -- this amendment in the legal

opinion rendered by the Florida Supreme Court.

President Lee.

SENATOR LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First let me dispense with the request that have been made by my colleagues and to comment in closing. I spoke with my wife about this on Saturday when I was running late for a family event that we had to engage in because Jay had been feverishly drafting this what has become this substitute amendment and wanted to make sure that it was, you know, worth the time and so I had to sort of explain myself there.

Beyond that, you know, what you read in the newspaper is what people know. I -- my intentions couldn't have been more accurate, more consistent with what I described on Thursday and again today, in that it is really

a confluence of events that began with a history of frustrations that have been expressed, again, not just with respect to this map, but with many, many previous maps going back to the reapportionment in '92, as to how Hillsborough County has been addressed.

And if the opportunity ever presented itself, it seemed to me like there would be, would be, you know, the proper representation of my constituents to try and improve the connectivity if you will in the congressional basis in eastern Hillsborough County. So on my own I probably wouldn't have just waded into that, but I also had some conversation or heard the conversation on Thursday with what Senator Joyner was trying to achieve.

I was aware of where she was trying to go.

I also had read in the newspaper what

ultimately became the amendment filed by

Senator Bradley which I was able to see which

addressed Congressional District 16 that had -
was sort of, I don't know, collateral damage,

if you will, because it was never even

mentioned in the Supreme Court ruling as an

issue. And I thought, well, you know, maybe

there is an opportunity here. I had no idea where it might take me, and I sat down with -- with Jay and we recorded a -- well we had a brief meeting around noon, I believe it was, last week, I don't know, days all come together, I guess it was Tuesday when I first learned about this. We had a brief meeting and we recorded it and that was probably Wednesday when we -- when we met.

2.2

Then we met Wednesday night late into the evening and early Thursday morning to craft what became 46 and 48, 9046 and 9048 and in the conversations that we had Thursday at the committee meeting, now that I am getting my chronology correct here, it was then that I said well, look, I -- we are operating under pressure, we don't want to dis-effect people, we don't want to create issues, legal liabilities for our map.

We don't want to let parochial issues outweigh the performance of the statewide map. I hadn't the first foggiest idea about how any of this is going to effect performance. I am under the impression and the understanding that as a Tier 2 issue that is not something we

should be thinking about or talking about or looking at.

I felt like some of the inquiry with respect to my attempted amendment seemed to be based and perceived impacts to performance by others, but I don't know what is going on in their heads and I certainly have not had the desire, the interest or made any attempt or have received any phone calls or anything adverse to this map or in commentary about its performance or in concert with anyone other than Jay. And so hopefully that answers the questions.

I, you know, the Orange County issue that
Senator Braynon raises, I can't really speak to
exactly, you know, how this affects the Orange
County area except to say that, you know, from
a visual standpoint it looks like, and I could
look if I here on the fly, but it looks like,
you know, from a population standpoint Orange
County has a congressional seat that the
population of Orange County will ultimately
drive. So Hillsborough County is substantially
better than Orange County geographically, and
-- and in population.

2 3

1

4 5

6

8

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

So -- and again I don't know the history of Orange County from maps going back to the early '90s, but I know the history of eastern Hillsborough County and I would just suggest to you that in response to our Staff Director's comments that there is a myriad of ways to draw these maps, that we have chosen to draw them in a slightly different set of priorities, if you will, albeit against the back drop of the same compactness and geographical boundary standards that were contained in Tier 2 and we felt bound and obligated to honor as in any amendment that was drafted, and as a result that would essentially improve the performance of this map in terms of Tier 2 by two city splits.

So I would appreciate the indulgence of the committee and I would be just profoundly remiss if I did not in my closing, and I know you all have said the same thing and experienced the same thing. What a remarkable experience it has been having an opportunity to work with our Staff Director and watch them move these pieces of puzzle around on the board to try to make sure that we were achieving goals without doing any structural damage, if

you will, to the Tier 2 standards. So that hats off to Mr. Ferrin. Thank you, President SENATOR GALVANO: Lee, having closed. All those in favor of adopting Bar Code 202492, Lee map 9054 signify by saying yea. (Chorus of yeas.) SENATOR GALVANO: Opposed nay. A VOICE: No. SENATOR GALVANO:

SENATOR GALVANO: Show it adopted. Okay, now we are on amendment Bar Code 864766 by Bradley. This is map 9042, and this is the substance of the 16th Congressional District, 16 change that was in the previous.

SENATOR BRADLEY: Withdrawn.

SENATOR GALVANO: Okay, show 846766
Bradley 9042 withdrawn.

We are now back on the Bill as amended and we do have some public testimony. Let me begin with Todd BonLarron who is from Palm Beach County, Legislative Affairs Director. How are you? Good to see you again.

MR. BonLARRON: Fine, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for a couple of brief comments. First, Todd BonLarron, Legislative

Affairs Director for Palm Beach County. I would refer back to the testimony of many from our community who appeared before your committee last week and those that have submitted written comments to the committee over the past few weeks for some of the specifics of the issues that had been brought up in regards specifically to District 21 and District 22.

2.2

And would just note that, you know, our community under the base maps that have been proposed will no longer have two of the four congressional seats in Palm Beach County that we currently have with a majority of their voting constituencies within Palm Beach County.

I think that that representation has been very important to us historically. The base maps would reduce that to one of the four congressional seats in Palm Beach County with that majority and we would like to maintain at least the current district distribution in terms of that broader representation.

The current alignment that we have and I am not talking about the base maps, but the current seats as they are have north to south

districts for 21 and 22. One which creates a coastal district, bordered on the east side all of the way down by the Atlantic ocean and on the other side municipal boundaries along some transportation corridors, and then we have another western district which more closely aligns some of the historical development in Palm Beach County, and those are configurations that are supported by much of the testimony that you saw and heard from last week in those comments.

2.2

And while the Supreme Court opinion was very specific about some of the districts, particularly the ones that you discussed today in the amendatory process, it was much less specific to Districts 21 and 22 which means that it could be possible for the Legislature with some modifications keep that north/south configuration so long as there is appropriate justification for the layout of those maps.

While we didn't have an amended drafted for you today to discuss in greater detail those issues, we want to go on record that we continue to have some concerns with the base maps in terms of that configuration and look

forward to working with you to address those as you move forward in your deliberations.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you for being here. Thank you for your time. Councilman Brown, Jacksonville City Council. Good afternoon.

COUNCILMAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and committee. As stated, my name is Reginald Brown, City Council, Jacksonville, Florida. I am here for a couple of reasons.

One, in support if we are not going to keep -- if this is an Order that we make the changes to District 5, Congressional District 5, then I am definitely in favor of an amendment. You know, we have to look at the goal. What is the goal?

If it is truly to ensure that minorities in particular have presentation, then that is where we should start. You know, I heard the Justice talk about being able to defend whatever position we take. Well, if the goal is to ensure that minorities have representation, then I think that is where our defense should start at. And we have to ask

ourselves, how did we get here.

I heard you all talk about the residents. At some point that particular practice of having minorities in certain communities has just become a way of life. I think all of us can probably look anywhere, not just the state of Florida, in our nation, and identify a minority community and that is just the way it is. That is the world we live in.

And I think that as we review the elements of a candidate of choice, I would like to remind us that it is our responsibility to ensure fair districts. And it is not -- it is not an option that we have. That is something that we have an obligation to do.

I listened today to the conversations about voting populations and extending from east to west picking up a population that not even within our own boundaries in our county they can vote. Convicted felons can't vote. So why would we include them in our population as we put these districts together? I am not sure the intent of that, whether it is intentional or not, the impact is still the same. These folks can't vote. So they are not

going to have an impact on the election.

I even heard, it was Senator Montford talk about going from east to west or north to south and the question is, can we go south and I am not -- wasn't really clear on that, but he did say it wasn't a good idea. But I can tell you that if going south is going to create justice then it is always a good idea.

The impact areas, communities where the opportunity is not afforded, I just want to talk about that. I am in north Florida. We have four counties, Clay County, Nassau, St. Johns and Baker County. Yes, they are very compact, but I can tell you that the minority communities are without representation of their choice.

This is information that you can research. So when we look, when I was looking at the map and going back to the origin of why we are here, it was developed that way, that little sliver, if you will, in order to pick up minorities because the intent was to make sure minorities have representation.

So I $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$ -- I say to this body and I applaud the work that you are doing here, I have gone

through a similar process on the local level, and I can tell you that the challenges we face in Duval is that when we look at tri-county elections, not a Democrat nor a minority win.

When we look at tri-county elections, when we look at at large seats in Duval County, whether it is by design or not, intentional or not, I can tell you that very rarely will you find one in this century that there was a Democrat elected to that seat.

We talked about the fact that white Democrats usually vacate voting for the Democratic candidate in the general election. Well, that is the only way we can lose some of these seats in Duval County, because if you look at, and I will give you two seats in particular, Councilman Crescimbeni At Large, a Democrat, and also Councilman Hazouri, right, both white male Democrats, not a problem. I say to win at large seat. The one time that we did have a Democrat African-American to win an at large seat was when -- and quite frankly, not to take anything away from that particular candidate, but because the more of that particular individual was so challenged, folks

decided to stay home, and that is just the way it is.

2.2

You know, we -- the whole purpose of creating the at large seats was to, when we consolidated our -- if you would like to consider it a consolidated city when the city still had three municipalities within a consolidated government, that doesn't meet the muster there, but it was too -- give the entire city the out-layers of the counties to have representation.

I guess I will close with this. Is that we in Jacksonville, we are depending on you, this body, to make sure that we have representation, whether we go east or west, whether we go north or south, I believe, and you can look at Baker County, you can look at Clay County, St. Johns and you can look at Nassau County and you can see that never in history have minority communities have had representation. And if we strategically intentional or not impact District 5 in such a way that the minority community cannot have their candidate of choice, we can -- we will continue to go down this road what I call of

unrest.

2.2

Our nation, our state, our cities are depending on you. I have had the opportunity of serving in the United States Army for over 20 years as a warrant officer, and I can tell you that I never thought that I would come to this day when I have to put my uniform on once I get to the installation, because people are disgruntled and it is because of our actions.

Even myself on a local level, when we stop listening to taxpayers, when we stop listening to constituents, when we know for a fact that compact districts is going to take away the candidate of choice, we know this, I think it is time we, as they say in football, drop back and punt and really look at what we are doing and provide the people, the taxpayers, with fair representation of choice.

Thank you all.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Councilman, and thank you also for your service. We appreciate it.

Any further public testimony? Further public testimony? We have no further cards. Okay.

Debate, comment, discussion, anyone?

President Lee.

SENATOR LEE: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair, and I will be brief. First to the Councilman, we hear you, we appreciate you being here and I think you have heard today that we have a lot of reservations about the constraints in which we are operating specifically with respect to Congressional District 5. We all understand where you are coming from and all we would ask of you is that you and the folks in your community beg our indulgence.

We -- we -- everybody reports to somebody. I know there are Voting Rights Act issues out there being challenged at the Federal Court level, and I am afraid that ultimately that is where these issues are going to have to be addressed because they are just outside our purview at this point if we are going to get a map out of here that reflects, as our lawyers have interpreted the Supreme Court. I mean, it is not going to take a lot of lawyers to interpret this, it is pretty plain spoken in some of these areas about what our direction is with respect to this these Tier 1 issues. So I

1 as

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ask that you beg our indulgence and we appreciate you being here though, very much, in representing your community.

Mr. Chair, I would just like to, in support of this map, thank you, sir, for your patience and the methodical nature in which you have managed your responsibilities here at the committee level. I know your legal background prepares you well for this, but you know, there were a lot of land mines and there are probably some more out there ahead of us, but to this point there are a lot of land mines in the committee process and you have been dealt a very challenging hand to figure oath how to set up a process that allows for legislative input, lacks prejudice to the Legislature to put its thumb on the scale here, and at the same time creates the sort of openness and transparency that we have been asked to honor.

And so, you know, I want to tell you that I personally believe that you have managed that exceedingly well, and I am grateful for the way you have conducted the committee deliberations.

I think that from a work product here, though I know it is not, you know, maybe to

232425

everybody's satisfaction that we could have
maybe gone further certainly in this
Congressional District 5 issue for the reasons
that we have stated. We have not done that,
but you know, I would just, you know, I
couldn't feel better given the circumstances we
are operating under by the way the committee
has attempted to look at the map
comprehensively and see if there aren't
opportunities for improvements here and there,
and I am grateful for that. I wanted to have
that on the record, sir.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, President Lee. Senator Gibson.

SENATOR GIBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and certainly thank President Gardiner, too, for reappointing me to this committee for the past three years I guess we have been at this.

SENATOR GALVANO: The gift that keeps on giving.

SENATOR GIBSON: I know, and it doesn't have a bow on it, that is the problem with it.

No sparkle, no nothing. So I am just, you know, in case you haven't noticed, I have been pretty much a renegade most of my life, and

today I guess I have to temper it a little bit, even though I don't want to.

The thing that I don't want to happen though is, and I know I have another chance to still raise a little ruckus and be a renegade still, but I don't want the Supreme Court really to have the final say. And so in -- in our committee process we are -- thank you, Senator Joyner, we are getting the final say in this committee to produce a product to give to our full body who may even have some other ideas that may be helpful for some of the things that even I am struggling with.

And so I want to thank you for your professionalism and particularly your patience in this -- in this process and letting us take our -- take our time. That was really critical I think, because one of my notes in one of my debates said that, you know, we were rushing through the process and you slowed it down and I appreciate that very much.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you.

SENATOR GIBSON: And I appreciate Jay who had a lot of patience, too, and that he can still smile is a miracle to me. So today I

will support this committee's map and I reserve the right without prejudice to disagree on the floor if we don't get to something that I feel comfortable with. Thank you.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Senator Gibson. Senator Montford.

2.2

SENATOR MONTFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And once again I want to thank you for your -how you have handled this committee meeting.

It has been encouraging and certainly has been
an open process, and again, you have done a
magnificent job and again I want to thank the
President for allowing me to serve on this
committee again.

I am going to support this map, the base map, and that is 180 degrees from where I thought I would be when we started this process. But it makes me uncomfortable that we have taken one part of Florida, the Supreme Court has taken one part of Florida and somewhat treating it differently and when I — when I heard our counsel the first day say that this particular map, Romo A, was the, you know, that is what the Supreme Court would look favorable on and there were other conditions.

But when you look at it, if I am not mistaken, we were put in a position of accepting Romo A base plan and then starting in south Florida and then moving north. Again, it just makes me feel uncomfortable that in Florida we are -- we are treating one part of Florida different than the rest, and that gives me great pause.

And when you look at the Tier 1 requirements, the Tier 2 requirements, the Voting Rights Act, the housing patterns that are historical in the state, then we are left with very little alternatives, if you will, especially here in north Florida. So again it gives me -- it gives me great concern.

I am looking forward to a vigorous discussion and debate on the floor, but I will support this, Mr. Chair, and again, thank you for your leadership.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Senator Montford.

Chairman Simmons, you are recognized.

SENATOR SIMMONS: I think that Senator

Bradley was before me, so if --

SENATOR GALVANO: Chairman Bradley, you

have been yielded to. You are recognized.

2.2

SENATOR BRADLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to echo Senator Gibson's comments

regarding the process. I am very satisfied

that all seven members of the committee were

able to fully express their concerns about

every bit of the map from -- from Pensacola to

Key West and that makes it a stronger product

in the end, because I feel like every person

had their -- had a full understanding.

Each of us had a full understanding of the impact of each little decision, how it rippled across the state and all of that is really a tribute to you and your leadership as the Chairman, our Vice Chairman, Senator Braynon, and as well as Jay Ferrin and his staff.

Thanks, thanks to the whole team for the work that has been done on this.

I did want to -- I would be remiss if I did not say that I am disappointed that we received a letter from the League of Women Voters in Common Cause on Friday alleging an intent violation that there was ill intent in the preparation of the base map, and then they are not here today to address that.

I know that they, you have said before, that they are certainly welcome to come, they are invited to come. I am sure that they are watching these proceedings and there has been such effort made to make this process open and transparent even down to going to the very tedious work of explaining the different iterations of the map from beginning to end and why certain decisions were made each step of the way.

There can be no doubt that that, the purity of the process with regards to how that base map came into being, and if someone has evidence otherwise then bring it forward. We are here. That didn't happen, and that is very disappointing.

I am looking forward to supporting this -this good work of this committee, and look
forward to doing so in on the floor as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Chairman Bradley.

Chairman Simmons, you are recognized.

SENATOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I want to thank you in another way and that

is the way you have conducted these proceedings, the absolute admirable way that you have done this. The openness, the true transparency, the inclusiveness that you have had and the fact that you did slow things down so that we could assure that there was within the time frame that has been allotted to us, a sufficient amount of time to have a complete and thorough analysis of all of this.

2.2

And I want to thank Senator Gibson for our working together without reaching any decisions, except those decisions that are recorded with Jay and I want to thank, I want to thank Jay and the staff for -- for the wonderful job that you have done. I mean, this is, it has been incredible to work with you and to see the abilities that you have to do that which is right.

And it is unfortunate that, that
potentially the conduct of a few has impacted
the rights of so many and brought us here. I
think many people have unfortunately painted
the Legislature with a broad brush, and the
fact of it is, is that we are here, it is
something that I think a lot of us didn't want

to be in Tallahassee at this time of the year but that is okay. We are here and we are doing the job and we are doing it right.

I am concerned about the result of what the Florida Supreme Court has done with respect to the ability of minorities, particularly African-Americans to elect the candidate of their choice. I believe that the analysis that has been done is unfortunately incorrect with respect to the east/west district that has been adopted or at least stated that we are going to have to follow.

The fact of it is, is that we -- we know that the Tier 1 analysis is in fact an analysis that from the beginning was going to be that there should not be a diminution in the ability of minorities to elect the candidate of their choice.

I am concerned and I hope I am wrong, but
I am concerned that the complexion of our
Legislature, because this is the prelude to the
years to come, that the complexion of our
Legislature will have -- will be changed by
this and the complexion of our Congress will be
changed by this, because we are a rich

diversity here in our Legislature, and truthfully there are people who have been elected who would not otherwise have been elected. That is just a fact of life.

2.2

And I am afraid, I am really afraid that the rich diversity and the culture that is reflected in our Senate and in our Legislature and now in our Congress will be diminished because it is not enough that a person has just a right to vote. It is a right to have representation in that body that makes the decisions.

And so I am going to support this, I am going to support this Bill. Again, I appreciate the hard work that has been done by everyone collectively under the leadership of both Chair Galvano and the President, because this is a good product, one that is free of the influences that supposedly got us here, although I have questions about our rights of free speech and our rights to petition our Representatives.

I want to make sure that they are preserved. I want to make sure that they are continued. But we are where we are and we are

here with good leadership, excellent leadership with a rich diversity among us.

So with that said, Mr. Chair, I will be supporting this. Thank you.

SENATOR GALVANO: Thank you, Chairman Simmons, and members thank you all for your comments and remarks and I appreciate them very much. I also appreciate President Gardiner having put this committee together, having appointed the members to it that he has done and shown us the leadership to make sure that we would have a committee such as this with the parameters that have been assigned to us.

I certainly want to thank our legal counsel. They have done a great job in working with us and advising us and helping us fill in some of the blanks with regard to the Court's opinion. And I echo what each of you have said with regard to our Staff Director, Jay Ferrin. He has done an unbelievable job in meeting the demands of this committee. And the reason he had demands is because each of you members have taken the time to look at the map, look at the issues, ask the questions, and I believe that each one of you has given of yourself and been

in earnest in trying to make this a better product and to meet the requirements of the Court.

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

You know, we are in a country where we can disagree with the opinion of the Florida Supreme Court as many of us do. But we also live in a world of checks and balances, and while we disagree we also must respect the decision. And I am confident that the process that we have engaged in to this point has respected that decision. The way we have approached the map that will come out of this committee, including the discussion on the amendments and the adoption of the amendment has in my opinion been in concurrence with the directives of the Florida Supreme Court and we are fulfilling what we said that we would do when we were sworn in, that is to uphold the Florida Constitution and that as I said also means to respect the interpreters of that Constitution.

So I am confident that we have a good product going to the floor out of this committee, and again, I thank you for your efforts in that regard and feel like that it is

truly a committee product. 1 2 Having said that, Administrative 3 Assistant, would you please call the roll on 4 Senate Bill 2-B as amended. 5 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Bradley. 6 SENATOR BRADLEY: Yes. 7 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Gibson. 8 SENATOR GIBSON: Yes. 9 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Lee. 10 SENATOR LEE: Yes. 11 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Montford. 12 SENATOR MONTFORD: Yes. 13 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Simmons. 14 SENATOR SIMMONS: Yes. 15 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Braynon. 16 SENATOR BRAYNON: Yes. 17 SENATE SECRETARY: Senator Galvano. 18 SENATOR GALVANO: Yes. And by your vote, members, we will show Senate Bill 2-B reported 19 20 favorably as a committee substitute. 21 We have a question from Senator Gibson. 22 It may be moot at this point, but go ahead. 23 SENATOR GIBSON: No. Well, it is not moot 24 to the process, I don't think, and maybe I 25 should have asked earlier, but as we leave --

SENATOR GALVANO: It is okay. 1 2 SENATOR GIBSON: In terms of, because I want to make sure, you know, I don't get fined 3 \$500 a day or locked up or anything like that. 4 In terms of now filing an amendment and 5 6 discussing and I need some guidance. 7 still need to go to Jay and have him turn on 8 his recorder, what --9 SENATOR GALVANO: Yes, that is --10 SENATOR GIBSON: Please help me with this. 11 SENATOR GALVANO: That is a valid 12 question. We are still within the remedial 13 special session on the map. So the procedures 14 that have been established have not changed. We will have, of course, the amendment filing 15 16 deadlines for second reading which will be on 17 Wednesday. 18 If you intend to work further with staff, 19 the same suggested reporting requirement is in 20 place. 21 Okay, seeing no more business before this 22 committee, Vice Chairman Braynon moves that we 23 adjourn. (Whereupon, the proceedings were 24

25

adjourned.)

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	
4	
5	I, CLARA C. ROTRUCK, do hereby certify that
6	was authorized to and did report the foregoing
7	proceedings, and that the transcript, pages 01 through
8	91, is a true and correct record of my stenographic
9	notes.
10	
11	Dated this 21st day of August, 2015, at
12	Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida.
13	
14	
15	CLARA C. ROTRUCK
16	Court Reporter
17	Commission No.: FF 174037
18	Expiration date: November 13, 2018
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	