

>> ALL RISE.
HEAR YE, HEAR YE, HEAR YE, THE
SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA IS NOW
IN SESSION.
ALL WHO HAVE CAUSE TO PLEA, DRAW
NEAR, GIVE ATTENTION.
YOU SHALL BE HEARD.
GOD SAVE THESE UNITED STATES,
THE GREAT STATE OF FLORIDA, THIS
HONORABLE COURT.
>> LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THE
SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA.
PLEASE BE SEATED.
>> GOOD AFTERNOON, WELCOME TO
THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT.
CASE ON THE DOCKET THIS
AFTERNOON IS THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN
VOTERS V. DETZNER.
COUNSEL?
>> MR. CHIEF JUSTICE, JUSTICES,
GEORGE MEROS OF GRAY ROBIN BONN.
IT IS MY PRIVILEGE TO REPRESENT
THE FLORIDA HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES IN THIS CASE.
THE FLORIDA HOUSE HAS PASSED AND
PRESENTED TO THIS COURT A
REMEDIATIONAL CONGRESSIONAL MAP THAT
ALL PARTIES CONCEDE IS
CONSTITUTIONAL.
IT DID SO IN THE SUNSHINE
PURSUANT TO THE DIRECTIONS AND
SUGGESTIONS OF THIS COURT AND
GAVE THE APPELLANTS EVERY
OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT THEIR
MAPS INTO THE CRUCIBLE OF THE
LEGISLATIVE PROCESS.
APPELLANTS CHOSE NOT TO DO SO.
IN RESPONSE, APPELLANTS CREATED
A DEMOCRATIC-LEANING
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 26 BUT
DOES NOT EVEN ATTEMPT TO
SHOW THAT THAT DISTRICT COULD
PERFORM FOR AN HISPANIC IN
A DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY.
THAT DISTRICT IS
UNCONSTITUTIONAL, THAT DISTRICT
DIMINISHES.
FROM APPORTIONMENT ONE IN 2012
UNTIL THIS DATE, THIS COURT HAS
REPEATEDLY SAID A FUNCTIONAL

ANALYSIS MUST BE A COMPLETE PRODUCT, ONE THAT EVALUATES NOT ONLY POPULATION FIGURES, BUT ESSENTIAL ELECTORAL PERFORMANCE PROCEDURES INCLUDING PRIMARY ELECTIONS.

>> NOW, WHICH DISTRICT ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT, 26?

>> CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 26. AND I WILL BE DESCRIBING THE APPELLANTS' DISTRICT AS CP1.

>> AND SO WHAT DO YOU CONTEND IS THE REAL PROBLEM WITH 26?

IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT IS A COMPACT DISTRICT AND MEETS ALL THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE TIER II REQUIREMENTS, SO WHAT'S THE, WHAT'S THE PROBLEM WITH IT?

>> YOUR HONOR, THE PROBLEM IS IT DOES NOT MEET THE MOST FUNDAMENTAL TIER I REQUIREMENT, AND THAT IS THE MINORITY POPULATION WILL BE ABLE TO ELECT A CANDIDATE OF ITS CHOICE.

[INAUDIBLE CONVERSATIONS]

>> I'M SORRY?

>> WHAT MINORITY POPULATION ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT?

>> I'M TALKING ABOUT THE HISPANIC POPULATION.

CD25, 26 AND 27 HAVE BEEN HISPANIC-PERFORMING DISTRICTS SINCE 2002.

AND WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN THIS DISTRICT AND, OF COURSE, WHEN YOU LOOK AT DIMINISHMENT, YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT THE BENCHMARK DISTRICT.

THE BENCHMARK DISTRICT WAS DISTRICT 18, AND IN THAT DISTRICT THAT WAS A REPUBLICAN-LEANING DISTRICT.

BUT, CLEARLY, CP1 IS A DEMOCRATIC-LEANING DISTRICT IN ALL THREE MEASURES, 2008, 2010, 2012.

THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE WON AND BY 11.6 IN 2012.

>> WE JUST GO BACK TO, FIRST OF ALL, YOU SAID SOMETHING WHICH

WAS IT'S UNDENIABLE THAT THE HOUSE PLAN-- AND WE'RE HERE, OF COURSE, THERE ISN'T AN ENACTED LEGISLATIVE PLAN.

>> CORRECT.

>> AND I REALIZE THERE'S AGREEMENT ON CERTAIN DISTRICTS, BUT THERE ARE DISAGREEMENTS-- I DON'T KNOW IF YOU'RE GOING TO SPEND ANY TIME ON THE HOUSE VERSUS THE SENATE WHERE THERE'S DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE TWO OF YOU.

BUT AS TO THE CHALLENGED DISTRICTS WHICH ARE THE SOUTH FLORIDA DISTRICTS, 20-27, AS TO 26 AND 27, I THOUGHT THE CHALLENGERS WERE SAYING THAT 20-27 AS DRAWN BY THE LEGISLATURE WAS STILL UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE THEY HADN'T REMEDIED THE PROBLEMS THAT WERE POINTED OUT IN APPORTIONMENT SEVEN.

WE'RE BACK HERE IN RELINQUISHMENT.

SO WHEN YOU SAY THAT EVERYONE AGREES THAT THE MAP THAT THE HOUSE DREW IS CONSTITUTIONAL, I'M NOT SURE THAT I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING.

>> WELL, AT TRIAL, YOUR HONOR, THE APPELLANTS TRIED TO SUGGEST OR TRIED TO ASSERT THAT THE MAP DRAWERS IN DRAWING DISTRICT 26 VIOLATED TIER I STANDARDS INTENTIONALLY TO MAKE A REPUBLICAN DISTRICT.

>> OKAY, SO I--

>> BUT THAT WAS NEVER ASSERTED HERE, AND WHAT THEY HAVE BEEN SAYING FROM THE BEGINNING IS THAT THEIR CP1 IS BETTER THAN OURS, AND IT WILL PERFORM.

>> WELL, ISN'T THE-- BUT THE KEY IS THAT IN APPORTIONMENT SEVEN, THIS COURT AFFIRMED THE TRIAL COURT'S RULING THAT THE ENTIRE MAP AND THEN AFFECTED DISTRICTS WERE DRAWN WITH

PARTISAN INTENT.

>> CORRECT.

>> IT WAS-- THE CHALLENGERS ASKED THIS COURT TO DRAW THE WHOLE MAP, AND WE DECLINED, AND ALSO SPECIFICALLY SAID WE'RE NOT GOING TO REQUIRE ALL DISTRICTS TO BE REDRAWN.

>> RIGHT.

>> BUT AS TO 26 AND 27, THERE WERE TWO PROBLEMS.

IT WASN'T JUST THAT HOMESTEAD WAS SPLIT.

WE FOUND AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL INTENT TO FAVOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

SO WHAT I'M HAVING TROUBLE WITH THE HOUSE'S POSITION HERE IS THAT IF WE WERE JUST ON A BLANK SLATE, IF THIS WAS 2022, BUT WE'RE OPERATING HERE THAT IF IT'S NOW WHEN IT WAS REDRAWN-- AND JUDGE LEWIS SAID IT WAS REDRAWN WITH A MINIMALIST APPROACH-- THAT IF IT WAS REDRAWN CAN, IT ACTUALLY FAVORS REPUBLICANS EVEN MORE THAN THE ORIGINAL 26, 27.

HOW DO WE DISREGARD THAT?

YOU'RE JUST JUMPING OVER AS IF WHATEVER HAPPENED BEFORE DIDN'T EXIST.

>> NO, YOUR HONOR, I BELIEVE NOT.

WHAT I'M SAYING IS THE COURT AND THE ACTIONS OF THE LEGISLATURE AND THE ACTIONS OF THE HOUSE WAS TO TAKE THE EXPRESS DIRECTIONS OF THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT AND SAID KEEP HOMESTEAD WHOLE.

>> BUT THAT WASN'T, THAT WAS THE OBVIOUS DEFECT.

>> RIGHT, RIGHT.

>> BUT THE PROBLEM, THE REASON THAT IT WAS TO BE REDRAWN IS IT WAS WITHDRAWN WITH INTENT TO FAVOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY. THAT WAS THE FINDING OF THE, OF THIS COURT BASED ON THE TRIAL COURT'S FINDING.

SO WHAT WE EXPRESSLY SAID, AND THIS IS WHERE THE PROBLEM IS, NOW THAT THE BURDEN HAS SHIFTED--

>> RIGHT.

>>-- AND YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT, THAT-- THIS IS-- THEN THE BURDEN SHIFTS TO THE LEGISLATURE TO PROVE THAT IT IS A BETTER CONFIGURATION, THAT IT DOESN'T VIOLATE TIER II.

AND WHAT THE TRIAL COURT FOUND IS THAT THE CP1 OVER, FOR 20-27, WAS MORE COMPACT, IT HAD LESS CITY SPLITS, IT HAD LESS COUNTY SPLITS, AND IT, AND THEREFORE, AS TO 26 AND 27-- BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT SPECIFICALLY-- THAT THE LEGISLATURE DIDN'T MEET THEIR BURDEN OF JUSTIFYING A LESS COMPACT CONFIGURATION. ISN'T THAT WHAT THE TRIAL COURT FOUND?

>> YOUR HONOR, I THINK THERE ARE TWO QUESTIONS THERE.

LET ME ANSWER THE FIRST.

THE FIRST QUESTION IS WHAT DID THE LEGISLATURE NEED TO DO WITH REGARD TO REDRAWING 26 AND 27 IN KEEPING HOMESTEAD WHOLE?

WHAT THE MAP DRAWERS DID WAS KEPT IT WHOLE WITHOUT ANY REGARD WHATSOEVER TO POLITICAL PERFORMANCE AND CHOSE THE MOST COMPACT OF THE TWO CONFIGURATIONS--

>> BUT THEY ONLY, THAT'S THE WHOLE PROBLEM.

THEY TOOK-- AND IT'S SO OBVIOUS WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE MAPS AND THEN YOU LOOK AT THE BULLARD AMENDMENT-- IS THEY WENT UP THE ROAD, AND THEN WHEN IT GOT TO THE PREDOMINANTLY BLACK AREAS OF PERINE AND TWO OTHER MUNICIPALITIES, THEY WENT IN, GRABBED THE BLACK DISTRICTS AND THEN WENT BACK UP. AND AS EVEN THE BULLARD

AMENDMENT SHOWS, YOU CAN GET EQUAL POPULATION WITHOUT HAVING TO TAKE THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN POPULATION OUT OF 26 AND PUT IT INTO 27.

>> BUT, YOUR HONOR, IF WE WERE IN A POSITION OF SAYING THAT, OKAY, THERE'S A BLACK POPULATION HERE AND THERE'S AN HISPANIC POPULATION HERE AND WE NEED TO DO SOMETHING WITH THOSE POPULATIONS, WE WOULD BE VIOLATING EVERYTHING THIS COURT HAS SAID TIME AND TIME AGAIN ABOUT NOT DRAWING DISTRICTS WITH KNOWLEDGE AND PUTTING CERTAIN MINORITY POPULATIONS HERE OR MINORITY POPULATIONS THERE. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD OTHER THAN THE EFFECT WHICH THIS COURT SAID IN REAPPORTIONMENT ONE AND CONTINUED TO SAY, THERE IS NO EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD THAT THESE MAP DRAWERS DREW THAT CONFIGURATION IN ORDER TO IMPROVE REPUBLICAN PERFORMANCE. THEY HAD NO IDEA.

AND IF WE WERE TO HAVE TO GO BACK NOW AND SAY, WELL, WE NEED TO MAKE IT MORE DEMOCRATIC BECAUSE THE COURT FOUND OTHERWISE, WE WOULD BE VIOLATING THE VERY TIER I--

>> BUT WHEN YOU DO RETROGRESSION ANALYSIS, YOU GO RIGHT INTO THE DEMOCRAT AND REPUBLICAN PERCENTAGES.

YOU KNOW, ONE QUESTION I HAVE, BECAUSE YOU'RE GOING TO BE OUT OF YOUR TIME--

>> RIGHT.

>>-- IS EVERYBODY IN TALKING ABOUT RETROGRESSION FOR SOUTH FLORIDA AND THE HISPANIC DISTRICTS DO NOT ADDRESS THE VERY FIRST PRONG OF THE SECTION FIVE AND THE SUPREME COURT CASES WHICH IS THAT THE LANGUAGE MINORITY OR MINORITY HAVE TO

VOTE COHESIVELY.

AND PROFESSOR LICHTMAN IN HIS REPORT TALKED ABOUT HOW THE HISPANICS IN SOUTH FLORIDA DO NOT VOTE TO COHESIVELY.

THEY VOTE-- THERE'S DEMOCRATS REGISTERED, THERE'S REPUBLICANS, THERE'S INDEPENDENTS.

SO IS THE-- DON'T WE FIRST HAVE TO LOOK AT VOTING COHESION BEFORE WE GET INTO THE LEGISLATURE'S ASSERTED RETROGRESSION ANALYSIS?

>> NO, YOUR HONOR.

VOTER COHESION IN THAT INSTANCE, I THINK YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT A SECTION TWO ANALYSIS AND WHETHER IT MEETS THE GENERAL STANDARDS. THIS IS ABOUT DIMINISHMENT. AND THE FACT THAT THERE IS NO COHESION IN VOTING BETWEEN HISPANICS AND AFRICAN-AMERICANS IN--

>> NO, I MEAN ALL HISPANICS.

IF THERE ARE NOT-- UNLIKE AFRICAN-AMERICANS, THERE'S NOT ALWAYS AFRICAN-AMERICANS ALMOST ALWAYS VOTE FOR THE DEMOCRAT OF CHOICE.

IN HISPANIC SOUTH FLORIDA NOW, YOU'VE GOT HISPANICS THAT ARE VOTING REPUBLICAN, DEMOCRAT AND INDEPENDENT OR NOT REGISTERED FOR EITHER PARTY.

>> THE UNREBUTTED TESTIMONY AT TRIAL IS THAT HISPANICS WILL VOTE IF THERE IS NOT AN HISPANIC ON EITHER PRIMARY, THEY WILL VOTE ETHNICITY OVER PARTY FOR THE HISPANIC CANDIDATE.

AND SO TO THAT EXTENT, THAT'S UNREBUTTED TESTIMONY, I WOULD SUGGEST.

AND, UNFORTUNATELY, I'M OUT OF TIME.

>> I GIVE YOU TWO MINUTES-- I WILL GIVE YOU TWO MINUTES FOR REBUTTAL SINCE WE HELPED YOU USE IT UP.

>> MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT,

RAOUL CANTERO FOR THE FLORIDA SENATE.

TO FINISH ANSWERING JUSTICE PARIENTE'S QUESTION, THE ISSUE OF VOTER COHESION IS RELEVANT TO A SECTION TWO ANALYSIS, AND A SECTION TWO ANALYSIS REQUIRES THAT A DISTRICT BE A MAJORITY/MINORITY DISTRICT IF, NUMBER ONE, THERE IS A MAJORITY/MINORITY POPULATION WITH REASONABLE COMPACTNESS. WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT A SECTION TWO VIOLATION HERE, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT A SECTION FIVE VIOLATION.

AND SECTION FIVE REQUIRES THAT ONCE YOU HAVE A MAJORITY-- I MEAN, A MINORITY--PERFORMING DISTRICT, YOU CANNOT DIMINISH THE OPPORTUNITY OF THE TO MINORITY TO ELECT A CANDIDATE OF THEIR CHOICE.

AND SO IT'S TRUE THAT THEY DON'T VOTE COHESIVELY.

I THINK IT'S PROBABLY ABOUT TWO-THIRDS/ONE-THIRD PARTY AFFILIATION IN DADE COUNTY, BUT THAT'S IRRELEVANT TO THE DIMINISHMENT ANALYSIS.

>> I THINK MY CONCERN HAS BEEN THAT THE RETROGRESSION-- AND IT IS SECTION FIVE, AND IT'S IRONIC BECAUSE WE'VE GOT WHAT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HAS DONE WITH FIVE AND MAYBE FOUR, BUT YET WE HAVE IT IN OUR CONSTITUTION.

>> RIGHT, YEAH.

>> IS THAT IT JUST SEEMS THAT, AND THIS IS WHAT THE TRIAL COURT FOUND, IS THAT THE ANALYSIS, THAT IT HAD TO BE DRAWN THAT WAY IN ORDER TO AVOID RETROGRESSION WAS WHAT SOMEONE MIGHT SAY IS A POST HOC RATIONALIZATION. AND I THINK THAT'S WHAT THE TRIAL COURT WAS CONCERNED ABOUT. NOBODY QUESTIONS THAT THERE ARE-- AND CERTAINLY WITH DISTRICT FIVE, NOBODY IS ARGUING

AS REDRAWN AS APPROPRIATE BUT THAT THERE WAS CONCERNS ABOUT SECTIONS TWO AND FIVE AND MAKING SURE IT BOTH STAYED A MAJORITY/MINORITY DISTRICT AS WELL AS THEIR CANDIDATE OF CHOICE.

BUT AS TO 26 AND 27, MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT WHEN THE BASE MAP WAS DRAWN BY THE MAP DRAWERS, THEY WERE JUST BASICALLY DECIDING ARE WE GOING TO PUT POPULATION, MAKE HOME THEY WOULD WHOLE, WHAT ARE WE, YOU KNOW, WHERE ARE WE GOING TO TAKE THE POPULATION FROM. AND THEY REALLY DIDN'T SAY, WELL, WE CAN'T DO IT OTHER WAYS BECAUSE THAT WILL CAUSE RETRODEPRESSION.

>> WELL, YOUR HONOR, TWO ANSWERS TO THAT.

ONE IS JUDGE LEWIS SPECIFICALLY FOUND ON PAGE 10 OF HIS ORDER, AND I DO NOT FIND FROM THE EVIDENCE THAT STAFF MAP DRAWERS HAD A CONSCIOUS INTENT TO FAVOR OR DISFAVOR A POLITICAL PARTY OR INCUMBENT.

SO THERE'S NO FINDING THAT THAT DISTRICT WAS DRAWN WITH ANY IMPROPER INTENT.

THE ONLY QUESTION IS WHETHER THE PLAINTIFF'S CONFIGURATION STILL HAS A DISTRICT PERFORMING FOR HISPANICS OR NOT, AND THAT WAS MOST OF THE DISPUTE BELOW AND WHAT THE TRIAL COURT FOUND WAS, YES, IT'S MORE COMPACT AND IT STILL PERFORMS MORE HISPANICS. WE DISAGREE WITH THAT.

WE THINK NOW IT'S BECOME A DEMOCRATIC-PERFORMING DISTRICT WHICH IN ITSELF IS NEUTRAL. HOWEVER, IT HAS TO BE A HISPANIC DISTRICT.

AND IN THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY, HISPANICS MAY PICK UP ONLY 2.8% OF THE PRIMARY TURNOUT IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, THEIR THE

THIRD-- THEY'RE THE THIRD DEMOGRAPHIC BEHIND WHITES AND BLACKS, AND THE EVIDENCE WAS THAT THEY COULD NOT NOMINATE A HISPANIC DEMOCRAT AND THAT A DEMOCRAT WOULD WIN THE GENERAL ELECTION.

SO IT DIMINISHES THE ABILITY TO HISPANICS TO HECHT A CANDIDATE OF THEIR CHOICE-- TO ELECT A CANDIDATE OF THEIR CHOICE. THE SECOND ANSWER I HAVE TO YOUR QUESTION IS THIS IS NOT A REDO OF THE MAPS.

THIS COURT, AND I'M QUOTING FROM PAGE 102 OF THE SLIP OPINION, WE HAVE INSTEAD INSTRUCTED THE LEGISLATURE ON WHICH DISTRICTS MUST BE REDRAWN AND PROVIDED PRECISE GUIDELINES AS TO THE DEFICIENCIES IN THESE DISTRICTS. THE GUIDELINE THAT THE COURT PROVIDED REGARDING DISTRICT 26 WAS SIMPLY TO KEEP HOME TED WHOLE.

>> I KNOW.

BUT WE SAID ALSO, AND THIS IS THE CRITICAL PART, THAT WHERE THE BURDEN IS BECOMES IMPORTANT. BECAUSE IF YOU HAVE A TIER II DEFICIENCY WHERE IT'S LESS COMPACT, IT SPLITS MORE CITIES, IT MAYBE INEXPLICABLY TAKES AFRICAN-AMERICANS THAT DIDN'T FOLLOW A PARTICULAR LINE, YOU KNOW, THERE'S A TURNPIKE, THEN IT GOES TO, YOU KNOW, IT GOES TO DIFFERENT ROADS AS IT GOES UP--

>> RIGHT.

>>-- THAT THE BURDEN OF JUSTIFYING THAT CONFIGURATION FALLS ON THE LEGISLATURE.

>> AND THE COURT SPECIFICALLY FOUND--

>> WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT IN.

>> YES.

AND THE COURT SPECIFICALLY FOUND WE FULFILLED THAT BURDEN. NO IMPROPER INTENT IN THE WAY WE DREW THE--

>> NO, BUT THAT'S THE TRIAL COURT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT.

>> YES.

>> I THOUGHT THAT THE BURLLED, WE COULD GO BACK AND SEE EXACTLY WHAT IT SAYS, BUT THE BURDEN OF JUSTIFICATION WAS THE BURDEN OF TIER II COMPACTNESS, THAT THAT WAS, THAT THEY HAD TO JUSTIFY IF IT WAS LESS COMPACT AFTER THEY REDREW IT, THAT THEY HAD-- THE BURDEN SHIFTED TO THE LEGISLATURE TO ESTABLISH THAT.

>> YES.

BUT IN THIS COURT SAID THAT YOU'RE NOT REQUIRED TO MAKE THE MOST COMPACT DISTRICTS POSSIBLE. IT HAS TO BE COMPACT.

THERE WAS NO FINDING BY THE TRIAL COURT, AND I DON'T THINK ANY ARGUMENT BY THE PLAINTIFFS THAT THIS WAS NOT A COMPACT DISTRICT AS DRAWN.

THE ONLY ARGUMENT WAS, WELL, THEY CAN DRAW IT MORE COMPACTLY. BUT THIS COURT HAS SAID THAT'S NOT A CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT.

THEY HAVE TO GO TO THE MOST COMPACT DISTRICT POSSIBLE.

>> DO YOU WANT TO-- I KNOW WE DIDN'T, MR. MEROS DIDN'T HAVE A CHANCE, BUT I KNOW ONE OF THE-- SIX OF THE DISTRICTS ARE, THERE'S A DISPUTE BETWEEN THE HOUSE AND THE SENATE THAT REALLY DOESN'T INVOLVE THE CHALLENGERS.

>> YES, YOUR HONOR.

>> YOU GOING TO DEVOTE--

>> I WOULD LIKE TO, YEAH, SURE.

[LAUGHTER]

>> I GUESS WHAT I WANT TO KNOW IS IF WE LOOK AT BOTH MAPS FOR THE CENTRAL FLORIDA, SOUTHWEST FLORIDA DISTRICTS AND THEY BOTH LOOK FINE, AT WHAT POINT DOES POLICY COME IN?

YOU ARGUE IN YOUR BRIEF ABOUT WHAT YOU TALL TIER III CONSIDERATIONS-- CALL TIER III

CONSIDERATIONS WHICH ARE
COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST.
HOW DOES THIS COURT EVALUATE THE
SUPERIORITY OF THE HOUSE VERSUS
THE SENATE IF THEY'RE BOTH
COMPLIANT WITH TIERS I AND II?

>> I DON'T THINK YOU NEED TO GET
TO ANY TIER III EXCEPT FOR THE
FACT-- THE ONLY DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN THE HOUSE AND SENATE
MAPS, 9062 AND THE HOUSE MAP,
9071, IS WE KEEP DISTRICT 16 THE
SAME AS IT WAS IN THE PRIOR MAP.
AND THAT WAS A DISTRICT THAT WAS
NEVER CHALLENGED.

AND THAT GOES TO REALLY THE
OVERLYING CONSIDERATION HERE
WHICH IS THIS COURT DID NOT
REQUIRE AN ENTIRE REDO OF THE
MAP.

AND SO IF WE CAN KEEP MAPS THE
SAME AS THEY WERE BEFORE WITHOUT
HAVING TO REDRAW THEM, I THINK
THAT'S A CONSIDERATION.

>> IS THE, IN THE-- AS I'M
SEEING THESE 27 DISTRICTS, IT
LOOKS LIKE DISTRICT 1 WAS LEFT
THE SAME, AND WAS IT DISTRICT 18
AND 19 WERE LEFT THE SAME.

>> YES.

>> YOU'RE SAYING-- I THOUGHT
THE HOUSE SAID, NO, DISTRICT 16
NEEDED TO BE REDRAWN.

THE SENATE'S SAYING, NO, IT
DIDN'T.

>> NO.

THIS COURT NEVER REQUIRED IT TO
BE REDRAWN.

>> BUT THE HOUSE DEFENDED ON
SAYING IT DID NEED TO BE
REDRAWN?

>> IT DEFENDS IT ON THE BASIS
THAT BY REDRAWING IT, IT MAKES
THE REGION MORE COMPACT.
BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT THIS COURT
REQUIRED.

AND THE COMPACTNESS DIFFERENCES
ARE MINIMAL.

AND, AGAIN, THIS IS NOT A RACE
TO SEE WHO CAN DRAW THE MOST

COMPACT MAP.

>> WELL, CERTAINLY IN THAT ONE.
SO YOU'RE SAYING THAT THE WAY WE
SHOULD COME DOWN IS BECAUSE
DISTRICT 16 DIDN'T NEED TO BE
REDRAWN, WAS NOT THE SUBJECT--
WAS NOT AFFECTED BY ANY OF THE
NEARBY MAPS.

>> YES.

WE SHOWED HOW IT COULD, WE
SHOWED HOW 13 AND 14, WHICH WERE
REQUIRED TO BE REDRAWN, COULD BE
REDRAWN WITHOUT HAVING TO REDRAW
16.

THOSE WERE THE ONLY MAPS, THE
ONLY DISTRICTS IN THE TAMPA BAY
AREA THAT THIS COURT REQUIRED TO
BE REDRAWN.

AND THEN THERE WAS DISTRICT FIVE
WHICH GOES DOWN INTO ORLANDO.
SO IT AFFECTED THE WHOLE CENTRAL
FLORIDA AREA.

THE OTHER DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
9062 AND 9071 IS THAT WE HAVE
FEWER, FEWER SPLITS TO
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY.

AND THERE WAS A CONCERN THAT
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY WAS CUT UP
INTO SEVERAL DIFFERENT PIECES SO
THAT THERE'S POPULATION OF
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY IN, LIKE,
FOUR DIFFERENT DISTRICTS.

WE MADE IT SO THAT 99.1% OF THE
POPULATION OF HILLSBOROUGH
COUNTY WAS IN TWO DIFFERENT
DISTRICTS, AND WE THINK THAT IS
A CONSIDERATION.

AGAIN--

>> SO ARE WE CHOOSING AGAIN--
NOT WE, THE HOUSE.

THERE'S TWO SENATE MAPS.

ARE YOU TODAY ADVANCING WHAT'S
CALLED THE GALVANO MAP OR THE
MAP THAT WAS, OR THE FIRST MAP?

>> IT DEPENDS ON YOUR POINT OF
VIEW.

>> NO, I WANT YOUR POINT OF
VIEW.

>> NO, NO.

IT DEPENDS ON YOUR POINT OF VIEW

IN THIS SENSE: IF YOU THINK THAT YOU'RE LOOKING AT HOW YOU CAN REDRAW THE MAPS WITH MINIMAL EFFECT ON DISTRICTS THAT DIDN'T HAVE TO BE REDRAWN, THEN WE THINK 9062 DOES THAT BECAUSE IT KEEPS DISTRICT 16 THE WAY IT USED TO BE.

IF YOU SAY, WELL, NO, THE REAL CONSIDERATION IS WHICH IS THE BEST MAP, WELL, 9066 KEEPS MORE COUNTIES WHOLE THAN ANY OF THE MAPS PROPOSED AND PROBABLY ANY MAP IN THE HISTORY OF CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING.

IT KEEPS 50 COUNTIES WHOLE. AND IN APPORTIONMENT ONE, THIS COURT NOTED THE IMPORTANCE OF KEEPING COUNTIES WHOLE AS OPPOSED TO OTHER CONSIDERATIONS, BECAUSE IN THE, AROUND THE STATE, IN THE HEARINGS AROUND THE STATE, THE FLORIDIANS HAVE SAID THAT IT WAS VERY IMPORTANT TO KEEP DISTRICTS WITHIN THEIR COUNTIES.

AND YOU CAN LIVE IN-- EVERYBODY LIVES IN THE SAME COUNTY, BUT SOME PEOPLE DON'T LIVE IN ANY BE MUNICIPALITY.

THEY LIVE OUTSIDE MUNICIPALITIES.

AND MUNICIPALITIES' BOARDS CAN'T CHANGE WHEREAS COUNTY BORDERS DON'T CHANGE.

WE THINK THAT RELICENSE ON HOW MANY COUNTIES CAN BE KEPT WHOLE IS THE CONSIDERATION, AND THAT WOULD POINT TO 9066.

AND MY TIME HAS RUN OUT.

THANK YOU.

>> [INAUDIBLE]

YOU'LL GET A COUPLE MINUTES AS WELL.

>> DAVID KING, I REPRESENT THE COALITION PLAINTIFFS.

THE APPELLANTS IN THIS CASE.

THIS COURT AND THE TRIAL COURT

FOUND THAT THE LEGISLATURE

VIOLATED THE CONSTITUTION, DREW

MAP, THE CONGRESSIONAL MAP, THAT FAVORED THE REPUBLICAN PARTY. THE CONSEQUENCES OF THAT WAS THAT THE LEGISLATURE HAD TO GO BACK INTO SESSION AND MEET AND DRAW MAPS THAT RESPONDED TO YOUR SPECIFIC DIRECTIONS.

SOME TEN DISTRICTS HAD TO BE REDRAWN.

THEY DID THAT.

THEY COULDN'T AGREE.

AND SO WE CAME BACK TO THE COURT, YOU SENT US BACK TO THE--

>> WELL, LET ME ASK YOU THAT QUESTION.

>> YES.

>> BECAUSE THEY COULDN'T PASS A MAP, DO YOU THINK THAT AS TO THE DISTRICTS WHERE THEY DO AGREE WHICH ARE THE SPECIFICALLY LET'S TAKE THE SOUTH FLORIDA DISTRICTS, 20-27.

DO YOU THINK WE AS FAR AS-- ISN'T THAT THE EXPRESSION OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT, THAT THEY AGREED ON 20-27?

>> THEY HAD NO DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN 20, BETWEEN 20 AND 27.

>> OKAY.

SO THE FACT THAT THERE BUDGET, THAT THE LEGISLATURE DIDN'T END UP PASSING A MAP DOES NOT, SHOULD NOT AFFECT BE OUR ANALYSIS AS TO YOUR ATTACK ON 20-27.

>> WELL, TECHNICALLY THEY DIDN'T PASS A MAP.

>> I UNDERSTAND THAT.

>> THAT THEY BOTH AGREED ON. BUT I AGREE WITH YOU, YOUR HONOR.

YOU CAN CERTAINLY SAY THAT THEY AGREED ON THOSE EIGHT DISTRICTS. BUT THEY'RE WRONG.

I MEAN, THEIR AGREEMENTS MAKE NO DIFFERENCE IN THIS--

>> NOW LET ME ASK YOU THIS AS TO ONE OF THEIR COMPLAINTS IS THAT WHEN WE GAVE DIRECTIONS AS TO

WHAT TO DO IN GOING BACK, WE ANTICIPATED THAT THE MAPS THAT THE PARTIES WERE INTERESTED IN SEEING ADOPTED WOULD BE SUBMITTED TO THE LEGISLATURE. YOU WOULD AGREE THAT NEITHER YOU NOR THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS SUBMITTED MAPS DURING THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION.

>> NO.

WE DID NOT SUBMIT A MAP--

>> SO DIDN'T YOU SEE THAT THE DIRECTIONS IN THE OPINION WERE FOR THOSE MAPS TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE LEGISLATURE?

>> YOUR HONOR, WE WERE WORKING AS HARD AS WE COULD ON OUR MAPS. AT THE SAME TIME, WHEN WE REALIZED WHAT THEY HAD DONE AND THAT THEY HAD FAILED TO DEAL WITH THE PROBLEM YOU EXPOSED FOR THEM IN DISTRICTS 26 AND 27, WHEN THEY TREATED IT LIKE IT WAS A TIER II PROBLEM RATHER THAN A TIER I PROBLEM, WE WROTE THEM A LETTER, AND WE EXPLAINED-- WE SENT THEM A TWO-PAGE LETTER EXPLAINING WITH GREAT DETAIL WHAT THE PROBLEM WAS, WHAT THEIR FAILURE WAS IN THAT RESPECT AND WHY THEY OUGHT TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT.

NOW WHAT OCCURRED FROM THAT WAS THAT THEY DIDN'T EVEN SHOW THE LETTER TO THEIR MAP DRAWERS. AND THEY USED THE LETTER TO SUGGEST THAT WE WERE ACTING IN A PARTISAN WAY.

SO THEY PUMMELED US WITH THAT LETTER.

SO AT THAT POINT IT DIDN'T SEEM TO MAKE MUCH SENSE TO TRY TO SEND A MAP WHICH WE ULTIMATELY DEVELOPED DURING THE TIME BETWEEN THE END OF THE SESSION AND THE TIME WE HAD TO FILE IT IN THE TRIAL COURT.

SO THAT'S HOW WE PROCEEDED IN THAT SITUATION.

THEY KNEW WHAT OUR COMPLAINT WAS

ABOUT 26 AND 27.
AND THEY CHOSE TO IGNORE IT.
THEY CHOSE TO TREAT IT AS THOUGH
IT WAS A TIER II PROBLEM.

>> THE MAP YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT
IS THE CP1 MAP THAT WAS ADOPTED
OR RECOMMENDED BY THE TRIAL
COURT, RIGHT?

>> YES, SIR.

>> LET ME ASK YOU ABOUT THAT
PARTICULAR MAP.

WHAT IF THAT HAD BEEN DRAWN BY
THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY ITSELF?
WOULD THAT HAVE CHANGED THE
ANALYSIS BY THE TRIAL COURT IN
HERE?

>> I DON'T THINK IT WOULD, YOUR
HONOR, BECAUSE IN THE FIRST GO
AROUND WE HAD MAPS THAT WERE
DRAWN BY THE ROMO PLAINTIFFS
WHICH WERE THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY,
AND THOSE MAPS-- PORTIONS,
DISTRICTS FROM THOSE MAPS HAVE
BEEN INCORPORATED INTO THE
LEGISLATURE'S 9071.

IN FACT, THAT'S DISTRICT FIVE.
SO I DON'T THINK IT MADE--
LOOK, THE SITUATION IS THEY
CLAIM WE'RE PARTISANS.

WE-- THEY CLAIM THAT WE'RE
PEOPLE WITH UNCERTAIN MOTIVES
LURKING IN THE SHADOWS JUST
WAITING TO CHANGE WHAT THEY'VE
DONE.

WE PRESENT A MAP.

THE MAP IS VERY APPARENT AND
CLEAR ON ITS FACE.

IT'S WHAT IT DOES OR DOES NOT
DO.

>> WHEN YOU PRESENT THE MAP,
DOES YOUR CLIENT HAVE ANY KIND
OF BURDEN OF PROOF OR BURDEN
THAT IT MUST SHOW IN THIS
PROCEEDING AT ALL?

?

>> NO, SIR.

I THINK THE COURT MADE IT PRETTY
CLEAR THAT THE BURDEN OF PROOF
IS ON THE LEGISLATURE.

THE LEGISLATURE HAS THE BURDEN.

>> WELL, WHAT WE'RE DEALING WITH HERE IS NOT A LEGISLATIVE MAP. IT'S GOING TO BE A COURT-DRAWN MAP, RIGHT?

>> YES, YOUR HONOR.

>> SO, AND THE TRIAL COURT ADOPTED YOUR MAP, BUT YOU HAVE NO BURDEN AT ALL WITH RESPECT TO THE MAP THAT THE TRIAL COURT ADOPTED OR RECOMMENDED?

>> WELL, I THINK IN THE INTERESTING POSTURE THAT WE'RE IN, THAT'S THE CASE.

AND--

>> DOESN'T THE TRIAL COURT AT LEAST HAVE TO MAKE SURE OR TO LOOK AT YOUR MAPS TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY ARE CLIENT WITH BOTH TIER I AND TIER II?

>> YES, YOUR HONOR.

AND I THINK THE TRIAL COURT DID THAT.

WE HAD AN EXPERIENCED TRIAL JUDGE WHO OBSERVED OUR MAP DRAWER, LISTENED TO HIS TESTIMONY, FOUND HIM LOGICAL, STRAIGHTFORWARD AND PERSUASIVE AND ALSO FOUND THAT HE WAS NOT MOTIVATED BY ANY PARTISAN INTENT IN THE SITUATION.

>> WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE-- FIRST OF ALL, THE TRIAL COURT REQUIRED EVERY PARTY THAT WAS SUBMITTING A MAP TO DISCLOSE EVERY PERSON INVOLVED IN THE DRAWING, REVIEWING OR APPROVING THE PROPOSED REMEDIAL MAP. THE HOUSE, WHEN IT RELINQUISHED, REQUESTED ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS, SAID AND PARTIES SHOULD SUBMIT MAPS.

WHAT IS THE FACT-- AND, AGAIN, IT'S INTERESTING TO ME AS FAR AS MOTIVATION.

YOU HAVE 21 AND 22.

YOU HAVE BEEN CONSISTENT IN THAT THOSE DISTRICTS SHOULD BE DRAWN HORIZONTALLY AND BE COMPACT. THE DEMOCRATS DURING, WHEN THAT WAS SUGGESTED DURING THE SPECIAL

SESSION, DEMOCRATS SAID YOU CAN'T DO THAT, YOU'RE GOING TO BE PITTING TWO DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENTS AGAINST ONE ANOTHER. BUT THE COALITION, I MEAN, TO ME IT'S INTERESTING THAT THE COALITION DIDN'T GO AND SAY, OH, MY GOODNESS, WE'RE PITTING TWO DEMOCRATIC INCUMBENTS, YOU BETTER CHANGE IT.

YOU STAYED WITH WHAT WAS IN YOUR VIEW THE MORE COMPACT CONFIGURATION WHICH IS WHAT THE COURT WAS CONCERNED WITH IN DRAWING 21 AND 22.

>> THAT'S CORRECT, YOUR HONOR. THE STACKED CONFIGURATION ACTUALLY CAME OUT OF OUR MAP PROVIDED BY THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS BACK DURING THE ORIGINAL SESSION IN 2012.

WE FOUND IN DISCOVERY THAT THE LEGISLATURE, ALEX KELLY, THE MAP DRAWER, HAD RECOMMENDED THAT, BUT IT HAD BEEN SLAPPED DOWN BY THE SENATE, AND THEY HAD NOT BEEN WILLING TO INCORPORATE IT. WE PUT IT-- WE ARGUED FOR IT IN OUR MAP, WE ARGUED FOR THAT CONFIGURATION.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY DIDN'T THINK THAT WAS A GOOD IDEA.

>> WELL, NEITHER DID A LOT OF THE PEOPLE IN SOUTH FLORIDA DIDN'T THINK IT WAS A GOOD IDEA.

>> BUT IT WAS A MAP THAT WAS COMPACT, AND IT PERFORMED MUCH BETTER.

IT ALLOWED US TO GET RID OF AN APPENDAGE THAT DELVED DOWN INTO 21.

AND AS WE CHANGED THE DISTRICTS BETWEEN 20 AND 27, THE ENTIRE MAP PERFORMED MUCH BETTER FROM A CONSTITUTIONAL STANDPOINT AS FAR AS COMPACTNESS.

EXTRAORDINARY DIFFERENCES IN 22, 23, 24 AND 27 IN COMPARISON TO THE WORK OF THE LEGISLATURE.

IN ADDITION, IT RESOLVED THE

ISSUE, THE TIER I ISSUE AS FAR AS 26 AND 27 IN A NONPARTISAN WAY.

SO WE CONCLUDED THAT THAT-- AND THE TRIAL JUDGE LOOKED AT OUR WORK VERY CAREFULLY AND CONCLUDED THAT HANDS DOWN CP1 WAS A BETTER TIER II MAP THAN ANYTHING PRODUCED BY THE LEGISLATURE.

SO WE DON'T DISAGREE WITH THE TOP 19 DISTRICTS IN 9071.

WE INCORPORATED THOSE INTO CP1. THEY WERE, THEY APPEARED TO BE SATISFACTORY SOLUTIONS TO THE OTHER PROBLEMS THAT YOU FOUND. WE CONCLUDED THAT 26 AND 27 NEEDED TO BE DEALT WITH, THAT 21 AND 22 SHOULD BE DEALT WITH IN THE WAY THAT WE DID AND 25 HAD TO BE CHANGED.

AND IN CHANGING 25, WE WERE ABLE TO INCORPORATE HIALEAH COMPLETELY WITHOUT SPLITTING HIALEAH WHICH SEEMED TO BE A SUPERB ACCOMPLISHMENT THERE IN THAT WE GOT THE CITY SPLITS DOWN TO 13.

OUT OF 410 CITIES IN FLORIDA, ONLY 13 END UP BEING SPLIT IN CP1.

NOW THEIR ARGUMENT THAT THEY SAY, WELL, BUT OKAY, THAT'S FINE, BUT THE COST OF WHAT YOU'VE DONE IS RETROGRESSION, AND IT'S A VERY NUANCED SUGGESTION OR ARGUMENT.

IT'S THAT THE HISPANIC DEMOCRAT IS GOING TO BE DISADVANTAGED AND DISENFRANCHISED IN THIS SITUATION BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO CONTROL THE PRIMARY.

BECAUSE YOU'VE ONLY GOT 22.8% TURNOUT IN THE 2010 DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY.

NOW, IT'S UNFORTUNATE WE DON'T HAVE ANY MORE RECENT PRIMARY INFORMATION, PRIMARY DATA.

WE'VE JUST GOT THE 2010 PRIMARY

DATA.

BUT, YOU KNOW, THE INTERESTING THING WAS THAT IN THE ENACTED MAP, 9047, 9057-- THEY ACTUALLY ACTED IT TWICE-- DISTRICT 26 HAD A DEMOCRATIC TURNOUT OF 22.7 HESS THAN CP1 DISTRICT 26.

>> BUT ISN'T, ISN'T THEIR POINT THAT THE DISTRICT HAS SHIFTED FROM BEING A DISTRICT THAT LEANS REPUBLICAN TO A DISTRICT THAT LEANS DEMOCRATIC?

SO THEN THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY BECOMES REALLY A FOCUS OF THE ANALYSIS, OR IS THAT, IS THAT WHAT THEY'RE SAYING?

I REALIZE YOU DISAGREE WITH THEM, BUT THAT IS WHAT THEY'RE SAYING, ISN'T IT?

>> THAT'S WHAT THEY'RE SAYING, BUT UNFORTUNATELY FOR THEM, THE FACTS DON'T SUPPORT THAT.

BECAUSE IF YOU LOOK AT DISTRICT 26 UNDER 9047, IN 2008 IT WAS 50.1 REPUBLICAN.

IN 2010 IT WAS 50.2 REPUBLICAN.

HOW CAN YOU SAY YOU DON'T CONSIDER THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY IN THAT SITUATION?

BUT IN 2012 IT WAS 53.3 DEMOCRAT.

AND WHAT WAS THEIR POSITION?

>> BUT ISN'T THE, DON'T THEY, DON'T THEY LOOK AT THE PERFORMANCE OF THE DISTRICT AND WHO'S WON IN PARTICULAR YEARS? AND IF YOU LOOK AT THAT, IT DOES SEEM THAT THE DISTRICT IN YOUR MAP LEANS DEMOCRATIC.

>> WELL, YOUR HONOR, IF YOU LOOK AT THE PERFORMANCE, YOU FIND THAT IN 2012, THE YEAR THAT DISTRICT 26 AND THE ENACTED MAP LEANED 53.3 DEMOCRAT-- WHICH WOULD SEEM, ACCORDING TO THEIR POSITION, TO WIPE OUT THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE DEMOCRAT IN THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY-- IT JUST SO HAPPENED THAT THAT YEAR

WITH ONLY 22.7 TURNOUT, I MEAN,
THAT WAS THE TURNOUT FIGURE
WE'RE GOING ON, THE DEMOCRATIC
HISPANIC WON DISTRICT 26.

THE DEMOCRATIC HISPANIC WON THE
PRIMARY HANDILY, OVER 20% OVER
NEXT CHALLENGER--

>> LET ME ASK YOU THIS AS WE GO
INTO RETROGRESSION, AND THIS
REALLY WAS FOR BOTH SIDES.
IF RETROGRESSION ASSUMES THAT
THERE IS, FOR SECTION FIVE
ASSUMES THAT THERE IS A
CANDIDATE OF CHOICE, A CANDIDATE
OF CHOICE ASSUMES VOTER
COHESION.

YOUR EXPERT, LICHTMAN-- AT
LEAST IN HIS REPORT-- SAYS THAT
IN ANALYZING THE SOUTH FLORIDA
DISTRICTS, THAT THERE IS NOT
HISPANIC VOTER COHESION WHICH IS
VERY DIFFERENT FROM ANY AN IS
SIS AS TO AFRICAN-AMERICAN
DISTRICTS.

BUT YOU DON'T-- NOBODY--
AFTER, I MEAN, IT'S IN HIS
REPORT THAT WAS INTRODUCED IN
EVIDENCE--

>> RIGHT.

>> BUT, I MEAN, IT SEEMS THE
BASIC QUESTION OF RETROGRESSION
FOR HISPANIC DISTRICTS THAT IS
NOW, YOU KNOW, WE HAVE HISPANICS
THAT ARE REPUBLICANS, DEMOCRATS,
INDEPENDENTS, NOT PARTY
AFFILIATED--

>> RIGHT.

>>-- HAS TO FIRST INCLUDE
COHESION.

>> AND--

>> IS THAT, DO YOU AGREE OR
DISAGREE WITH THAT?

AM I OFF ON THE CANDIDATE OF
CHOICE IS NOT NECESSARILY THE
SAME AS HISPANIC VOTING-AGE
POPULATION?

>> WELL, THERE'S A GOOD EXAMPLE
OF THAT, BECAUSE SENATOR BE
MARGOLIS WANTED DISTRICT DOWN
THERE AS A NON-HISPANIC

CANDIDATE.

WHEN SHE WAS, THE HISPANIC
CANDIDATE OF CHOICE.

>> SO I'M ASKING YOU, WHY ISN'T
THAT PART OF THE QUESTION AS TO
WHETHER THIS WHOLE RETROGRESSION
ANALYSIS UNDER SECTION FIVE IS
ACTUALLY, IT'S WE'RE JUMPING
ONTO SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T EVEN
HOLD WATER IF THERE ISN'T A
CANDIDATE OF CHOICE?

AND THERE ARE CERTAINLY FEDERAL
DISTRICT CASES THAT ARE TALKING
ABOUT THAT WITH RESPECT TO
HISPANICS AS, YOU KNOW, LANGUAGE
MINORITY.

>> RIGHT.

MAYBE WE DIDN'T DO AS GOOD A JOB
WITH THAT, YOUR HONOR, AS WE
SHOULD HAVE.

MAYBE IT WASN'T AS OBVIOUS AS
SOME OF THE OTHER ISSUES THAT WE
RAISED.

FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN YOU TALKED
ABOUT PROFESSOR LICHTMAN, HE
POINTED OUT THAT IN 29 ELECTIONS
THAT HE STUDIED, THE HISPANIC
CANDIDATE, HISPANIC CANDIDATE OF
CHOICE WON ALL 29 IN THE DADE
COUNTY AREA IN THOSE DISTRICTS.
SO WE EXAMINED THE ELECTION
HISTORY.

AND I MIGHT POINT OUT THE
CONTRAST AS TO THE LEGISLATURE'S
APPROACH.

THEY PUT ON PROFESSOR MORENO,
AND THEY PUT ON DR. LIU.
PROFESSOR MORENO DIDN'T EVEN USE
THE RIGHT STANDARD FOR
RETROGRESSION.

HE TALKED IN TERMS OF OUR
DISTRICT DIDN'T PERFORM AS WELL
AS 9071, THE DISTRICT THEY WERE
PROPOSING.

THAT'S NOT A RETRODEPRESSING
APPROACH.

THEY ALSO-- DR. MORENO TALKED
IN SPECULATIVE TERMS.

HE SAID IT WAS A POSSIBILITY
THAT THE DEMOCRAT MIGHT NOT

PREVAIL IN THE PRIMARY.
SO THAT THE TRIAL COURT FOUND,
AS FAR AS PROFESSOR MORENO WAS
CONCERNED, THAT HIS TESTIMONY
WAS SPECULATIVE, IT LACKED
PROBATIVE VALUE AND THAT IT WAS
SHORT ON SYSTEMATIC, SCIENTIFIC
ANALYSIS OF ACCEPTED STATISTICAL
DATA.

AND SO THEN WE TURN TO DR. LIU.
DR. LIU SAID HE WAS GOING TO
ESTABLISH THAT THERE WAS NO
COHESION BETWEEN HISPANICS AND
AFRICAN-AMERICANS.

WHAT HE DID DO WAS STUDY TEN
ELECTIONS THAT WERE SELECTED--
I GUESS THAT WAS THE BEST TEN
ELECTIONS THAT THEY COULD FIND
FOR HIM TO STUDY.

AND WHAT HE FOUND FROM THAT WAS
THAT THE HISPANIC CANDIDATE IN
THOSE ELECTIONS WAS NOT DEFEATED
BY ANY COALITION OF
AFRICAN-AMERICANS AND
NON-HISPANIC WHITES.

IN FACT, THE ONLY ELECTION WHERE
THE HISPANIC CANDIDATE DIDN'T
WIN WAS WHEN A YOUNG LAWYER IN A
NONPARTISAN ELECTION TOOK ON A
SITTING COUNTY JUDGE.

HE ALSO, DR. LIU, CAME THROUGH
WITH A VERY FINE PIECE OF
EVIDENCE FOR US WHEN HE SAID
THAT IT DIDN'T MAKE ANY
DIFFERENCE WHETHER THE
AFRICAN-AMERICANS SUPPORTED OR
OPPOSED THE HISPANIC CANDIDATE
OF CHOICE IN DISTRICT 26, THAT
THE HISPANIC CANDIDATE OF CHOICE
DID NOT NEED THE
AFRICAN-AMERICAN VOTE TO BE
SUCCESSFUL IN DADE COUNTY.

THAT WAS ANOTHER INTERESTING
ASPECT OF HIS TESTIMONY.

SO THE TRIAL COURT, IF YOU LOOK
AT THE EVIDENCE IN THE TRIAL--
>> WAS HE, WAS HE TALKING ABOUT
IN THE PRIMARY OR IN THE GENERAL
ELECTION?

>> HE WAS TALKING ABOUT IN

DISTRICT 26 AND THE PERFORMANCE
IN THE GENERAL ELECTIONS.
THERE WEREN'T VERY MANY
PRIMARIES TO LOOK AT IN DISTRICT
26.

BUT THE ONE PRIMARY THAT
EVERYBODY DID FOCUS ON WAS THE
ONE THAT THE HISPANIC DEMOCRAT
WON IN 2012.

>> WHO WAS-- THAT WAS WHO?

>> THAT WAS GARCIA.

>> AND THEN, 2012, WHO WENT ON
TO WINSOME.

>> AND THEN, SHOWING THE
VOLATILITY OF DISTRICT 26, IN
2014 THE INCUMBENT HISPANIC
DEMOCRAT WAS DEFEATED BY THE
HISPANIC REPUBLICAN.

>> BUT THERE WAS ALSO-- I MEAN,
THIS IS WHY IT'S VERY HARD WHEN
YOU LOOK AT ONE OR TWO
ELECTIONS.

I MEAN, THE PLAYERS THERE I'M
NOT-- THERE WAS A PARTICULAR
CANDIDATE THAT I THINK HAD
ISSUES THAT WERE NOT TO DO WITH
HIS BEING HISPANIC OR NOT, BUT
SOME ISSUES CONCERNING THE
ETHICS.

SO, YOU KNOW, I GUESS-- ARE WE
EVER GOING TO GET TO A POINT
WHERE, YOU KNOW, WE LOOK AT, AND
AS THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HAS
SAID, WE LOOK AT WHETHER
MINORITIES AND, CERTAINLY,
ETHNIC AND-- WELL, I SHOULD SAY
LANGUAGE MINORITIES ARE GOING TO
BE SUPPORTING THE BEST
CANDIDATE, NOT NECESSARILY
THEY'RE HISPANIC, THEY'RE GOING
TO VOTE REPUBLICAN OR THEY'RE
GOING TO VOTE DEMOCRAT.

THAT'S WHY I THOUGHT THIS VOTER
COHESION MADE SENSE, BECAUSE
YOU'VE GOT A REAL CHANGE IN THE
SOUTH FLORIDA DISTRICTS OVER THE
LAST 20 YEARS AS TO HOW
HISPANICS ARE VOTING.

THEY'RE NOT JUST VOTING
REPUBLICAN ANYMORE, THEY'RE

VOTING DEMOCRAT SOMETIMES, AND
THEY'RE VOTING, YOU KNOW,
THEY'RE GOING BOTH TO DEMOCRAT
AND REPUBLICAN.

>> AND THE MOST--

>> ISN'T THAT TRUE?

>> THAT IS ABSOLUTELY TRUE, YOUR
HONOR.

>> SO WHEN WE'RE FOCUSING ON TWO
ELECTIONS, AND THEY MAY BE
ABERRANT, DON'T WE HAVE
TROUBLE-- WE'RE TRYING TO SAY,
WELL, THEY JUSTIFY THEIR
DISTRICT ON A RETROGRESSION
ANALYSIS, IT SEEMS DIFFICULT
ANALYSIS FOR THEM TO MAKE
ESPECIALLY WHEN IT WAS ALREADY
PRECLEARED IN 2012.

>> EXACTLY.

THEY SOUGHT PRECLEARANCE OF
9047.26, THAT FROM A
DEMOGRAPHICS AND A METRICS
STANDPOINT IS ALMOST ESSENTIALLY
THE SAME AS OUR CP26.

HISPANIC VAP FOR DISTRICT 9047,
68.9.

FOR OUR DISTRICT, 68.3.

REGISTRATION OF HISPANIC
DEMOCRATS, 55.5, 54.7.

TURNOUT AT THE PRIMARY, HISPANIC
TURNOUT AT THE PRIMARY FOR
DEMOCRATS, 22.7, 22.8.

THE GENERAL ELECTION, 32.8,
32.6.

HISPANIC DEMOCRATS, 42.6 UNDER
CP-- UNDER THEIR MAP.

UNDER CP1 IT'S 42.5.

SO THEY PRECLEARED A DISTRICT
ALMOST EXACTLY THE SAME AS OUR
DISTRICT AND TOOK THE POSITION
THAT IT DID NOT RETROGRESS.

>> WE DON'T REALLY KNOW WHAT--
I MEAN, THEY JUST PRECLEAR IT.
THEY DON'T GIVE THEIR REASONS,
DO THEY?

>> RIGHT.

WELL, THEIR TESTIMONY AT THE--
I MEAN, WE HAD A MARRIAGE TRIAL
ABOUT THEIR MAP.

>> NO, I MEAN THE DOJ DOESN'T

GIVE--

>> NO.

THEY DON'T SAY-- I DIDN'T MEAN TO SUGGEST THAT THEY DID.

BUT THE SAME-- AND IT'S INTERESTING.

THE SAME EXPERT THAT TESTIFIED IN THIS CASE, DR. MORENO, THAT OUR MAP RETROGRESSION, WAS THE SAME EXPERT THAT TESTIFIED ON BEHALF OF 9047 AND 9057 AND SAID IT DIDN'T RETROGRESS.

SO I WOULD SUBMIT THAT THEY, THE TRIAL COURT WAS RIGHT WHEN HE SAID THAT THEY DID NOT MEET THEIR BURDEN ON RETROGRESSION, THAT HE WAS RIGHT WHEN HE SAID THAT OUR MAP WAS HANDS DOWN THE BEST PERFORMING MAP, THE BEST TIER II-COMPLIANT MAPS OF ANY OF THE MAPS PRESENTED.

AND I WOULD SUGGEST, YOUR HONORS, THAT WHEN YOU DEVELOP THE MAP AND ENFORCE THE MAP, THAT CP1 FOR SOUTH FLORIDA FROM DISTRICTS 20-27 OUGHT TO BE PART OF THAT MAP.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU FOR YOUR ARGUMENT.

>> MR. MEROS, YOU'VE GOT TWO MINUTES.

>> SO LITTLE TIME, SO MUCH TO SAY.

LET ME START, YOUR HONOR, WITH JUSTICE PARIENTE.

I THINK THERE'S A FUNDAMENTAL, RESPECTFULLY, MISUNDERSTANDING ABOUT VOTER COHESION.

THERE IS NO QUESTION IN THIS RECORD THAT THERE IS VOTER, HISPANIC VOTER COHESION FOR AN HISPANIC CANDIDATE.

IT DOES NOT MATTER WHETHER IT IS A DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE OR HISPANIC CANDIDATE OR A REPUBLICAN HISPANIC CANDIDATE. THAT IS MISSING.

AND WHAT WE HAVE HERE IN CP1-- AND I DON'T HAVE TIME TO GO OVER IT-- IS A SITUATION WHERE IN

THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY THE
AFRICAN-AMERICAN POPULATION IN
2002 WAS 13% OF THE DEMOCRATIC,
THE BLACK SHARE OF THE
DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY.

IN CP1 WHAT APPELLANTS HAVE DONE
HAS DOUBLED THAT POPULATION,
OVER DOUBLED FROM 13.3% TO 28.9%
IN THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY.

AND WHAT THAT DOES-- AND,
AGAIN, UNCONTESTED EVIDENCE THAT
IN MIAMI-DADE COUNTY BLACKS AND
HISPANICS NOT ONLY DON'T VOTE
COHESIVELY, THEY VOTE IN
OPPOSITION TO EACH OTHER.

AND SO 29% OF THE DEMOCRATIC
PRIMARY NOT ONLY WILL NOT BE
COHESIVE, BUT WILL BE A
SUBSTANTIAL ROADBLOCK.

DOUBLE THE POPULATION FROM THE
BENCHMARK DISTRICT TO THIS
DISTRICT.

THAT IS CLASSIC DIMINISHMENT.
AND MR. KING CAN GO DOWN EVERY
RABBIT TRAIL REGARDING OTHER
ANALYSES, BUT THEY NEVER
PRESENTED A FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS
TO THIS COURT THAT SHOWED
PRIMARY DATA.

WHAT WE HAVE IS THERE ARE
CONTESTED ELECTIONS.

IF THE DEMOCRATS DO NOT NOMINATE
AN HISPANIC, THEN THE
UNCONTESTED TESTIMONY IS THAT
HISPANIC INDEPENDENTS WILL VOTE
FOR THE HISPANIC.

THAT'S COHESION.

THEY WILL VOTE FOR ETHNICITY
OVER PARTY.

THAT IS COHESION.

THAT IS WHY SO MANY OF THE
CANDIDATES WERE ELECTED, BECAUSE
THEY HAD A PATH TO VICTORY IN
THE REPUBLICAN PRIMARY, THEY HAD
A PATH TO VICTORY IN THE
REPUBLICAN GENERAL.

THERE IS NO PATH TO VICTORY IN
THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY.

AND WHAT WE WOULD HAVE HERE WITH
AMENDMENT ONE, I MEAN, WITH

AMENDMENT SIX SAYING THAT TIER I
DIMINISHMENT MUST NOT HAPPEN--

>> SO YOU'RE REALLY SAYING THAT
AS TO HISPANICS, THAT THE IDEA
OF HAVING COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS
WHERE PRIMARIES ARE IMPORTANT
AND THEN THE GENERAL ELECTION
LOOKS AT THE BEST CANDIDATE,
THAT REALLY-- YOU'VE GOT TO GO
BACK AND LOOK AT THE PRIMARY,
AND THERE-- IS THAT--

>> ABSOLUTELY.

>> OKAY.

>> AND WHAT YOU WILL FIND IS IF
YOU HAVE AN HISPANIC CANDIDATE
IN THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY AND IN
THE REPUBLICAN PRIMARY, IT'S
GOING TO BE A TOSS-UP.

AND THE HISPANIC WILL BE IN
THERE.

BUT HERE WE HAVE THE SITUATION
WHERE THE LIKELIHOOD IS CLEARLY
DIMINISHING, IS THAT A
NONWHITE-- NONHISPANIC WHITE
WILL END UP WINNING.

AND WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE
TIER I OBLIGATION NOT TO
DIMINISH DISTRICTS?

AND I WISH I HAD MORE.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> YOU HAVE TWO MINUTES, BUT
WE'LL SEE.

[LAUGHTER]

>> THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

I'D LIKE TO ADDRESS SOME OTHER
ISSUES REGARDING THE OTHER
DISTRICTS.

THIS COURT DID NOT REQUIRE AN
ENTIRE REDO OF THE MAP.

IT DID NOT REQUIRE DISTRICTS
CHANGED THAT WEREN'T CHALLENGED
BEFORE, SO THE PLAINTIFFS' CP1
MADE CHANGES TO DISTRICTS 20,
DISTRICT 24, OTHER DISTRICTS
THAT WERE NEVER MENTIONED, WERE
NEVER INVALIDATED AND SAY, WELL,
NOW WE KEEP SEVEN MORE CITIES
WHOLE.

WELL, THAT'S CERTAINLY BASED ON
DIFFERENT RULES--

>> DIDN'T THEY ALSO SAY THAT IN MAKING THE CHANGES TO THOSE DISTRICTS THAT WERE INVALID THAT IT MAY AFFECT SOME OF THE OTHER DISTRICTS WHEN YOU'RE TRYING TO PUT THESE MAPS TOGETHER?

I DON'T THINK--

>> I UNDERSTAND--

>>-- IT WAS ABSOLUTELY A BAR TO CHANGING OTHER DISTRICTS.

>> CHANGING OTHER DISTRICTS IF THEY NEED TO BE CHANGED.

YOU DON'T NEED TO DO AN ENTIRE REDO OF DISTRICT 20 LIKE THEY DID WITH AN ENTIRELY NEW TENTACLE INTO DISTRICT 21 AND 22 IN ORDER TO REDRAW 26 AND 27 OR EVEN 21 AND 22.

>> BUT I THINK 21 AND 22, AGAIN, IT'S HARD IF WE DON'T HAVE THE VISUALIZATION, THERE'S NO QUESTION THAT THE PROBLEM WITH 21 AND 22 WERE THE LACK OF COMPACTNESS.

WE COULDN'T SAY IT WAS THE INTENT TO FAVOR THE DEMOCRATS, BECAUSE IT'S A DEMOCRATIC AREA. AND SO IN COMPACTNESS IF YOU DISREGARD THE TENTACLE OF 20 INTO THE-- WHICH THE ROMO MAPS SHOW AND OUR OPINION SHOWS-- HOW DO YOU NOT MAKE IT MORE COMPACT IF YOU'VE GOT AN APPENDAGE THAT IS UNNECESSARY? SO I DON'T SEE HOW THE ELIMINATION OF THE APPENDAGE INTO 21 AND 22 IS NOT PART OF THE REDRAWING OF MAKING 21 AND 22 MORE COMPACT.

>> EXCEPT THEY DID IT BY CREATING AN ADDITIONAL APPENDAGE.

IT'S NOT THAT THEY ELIMINATED ONE NORTH-SOUTH APPENDAGE--

>> YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT HIALEAH, MAKING HIALEAH WHOLE?

>> NO, NO, NO, IN MIRAMAR. THEY WENT THROUGH AND CREATED A DIFFERENT APPENDAGE THROUGH MIRAMAR ON THE SOUTHERN BORDER

OF DISTRICT 20.

AND THIS COURT HAS SAID
APPENDAGES ARE OFFENSIVE-- TO
USE A NONPOLITICAL TERM--

[LAUGHTER]

AND SO THAT'S--

[LAUGHTER]

AND SO THAT'S SOMETHING THAT'S
ANATHEMA TO THE COURT, AND YOU
HAVE TO HAVE A VERY GOOD REASON.
AND HERE THERE WAS NONE.

THE OTHER THING I'D LIKE TO DO
IS ADDRESS JUDGE LEWIS' ORDER.
JUDGE LEWIS FOUND THAT THERE WAS
NO INTENT IN DRAWING 26 AND 27,
THE MAP DRAWERS HAD NO INTENT.
THE LETTER THAT THE PLAINTIFF
SENT WAS NOT BASED ON, OH, IT'S
NOT COMPACT ENOUGH, IT'S BASED
ON THE FACT THAT THEY SAID YOU
HAD POLITICAL INTENT IN DRAWING
THESE DISTRICTS.

WELL, IF THE COURT FINDS THAT
THERE WAS NO POLITICAL INTENT
AND THE TESTIMONY WAS THERE WAS
NO POLITICAL INTENT AND THE
TESTIMONY WAS THAT THEY DID NOT
LOOK AT WHAT NEIGHBORHOODS THEY
WERE GOING THROUGH IN THE
POLITICAL OR EVEN CULTURAL
MAKE-UP OF THOSE NEIGHBORHOODS,
THEN WE COULD NOT GO BACK AND
CHANGE THEM BASED ON POLITICAL
INTENT BECAUSE THAT ITSELF WOULD
BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

AND THE COURT RECOGNIZES THIS ON
PAGE 11.

I SAYS, "I UNDERSTAND THE
DILEMMA FACED BY THE LEGISLATURE
IN THAT SITUATION."

"IF IT HAS DRAWN THE MAP WITHOUT
REGARD TO POLITICAL PERFORMANCE,
THEN IT WOULD BE IMPROPER FOR IT
TO, QUOTE-UNQUOTE, CORRECT THE
POLITICAL EFFECT OF THE MAP IN
CERTAIN DISTRICTS WHEN SOMEONE
COMPLAINS."

AND THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT HAPPENED
HERE.

THERE WAS NO POLITICAL INTENT.

THERE'S ALWAYS GOING TO BE SOME POLITICAL EFFECT IN WHAT YOU DRAW, BUT THE MAP DRAWERS, ALL THREE OF THEM, TESTIFIED CONSISTENTLY THAT THEY DID NOT LOOK AT THE POLITICAL PERFORMANCE WHEN THEY WERE GOING-- THEY DIDN'T KNOW WHAT NEIGHBORHOODS THEY WERE GOING THROUGH.

HE WERE ONLY TRYING TO PICK OUT POPULATION.

AND THE COURT FOUND THAT TESTIMONY CREDIBLE.

SO IF THAT'S CREDIBLE, THEN WHEN YOU'RE CRITICIZED FOR HAVING A POLITICAL EFFECT AND TOLD TO UNDO IT, WELL, YOU CAN'T UNDO SOMETHING THAT YOU DIDN'T DO IN THE FIRST PLACE.

>> ISN'T THE PROBLEM THOUGH, AGAIN, IS THAT IF RETRO DEPRESSION INVOLVES POLITICAL PERFORMANCE AND BASE MAP DRAWERS DIDN'T DO ANY POLITICAL PERFORMANCE AND THEN WHEN THE BULLARD AMENDMENT WAS INTRODUCED WHICH POINTED OUT A WAY TO DRAW THIS MAP SO THAT IT COULD BE, IT WOULD BE MORE COMPACT, THE LEGISLATURE IGNORES THAT, HOW-- THAT'S WHERE I'M HAVING TROUBLE.

>> WELL, I'LL EXPLAIN WHY. BULLARD SAID THIS WAS DRAWN WITH IMPROPER INTENT.

AND THE UNDISPUTED TESTIMONY WAS THAT WHEN DRAWING THE DISTRICTS, THEY DID NOT LOOK AT THE POLITICAL PERFORMANCE.

AFTER DRAWING THE DISTRICTS, THEY DREW ONE DISTRICT WITH DRAFT ONE WITH HOMESTEAD TOTALLY IN DISTRICT 26 AND DRAFT TWO WITH HOMESTEAD TOTALLY IN DISTRICT 27.

AFTER THEY DREW THOSE AND THE POPULATION WAS EQUAL BECAUSE UNDER CONGRESSIONAL PLANS THE POPULATION HAS TO BE TOTALLY EQUAL, THEN THEY WENT BACK AND

SAY, WELL, DOES THIS STILL
PERFORM FOR HISPANICS.
AND THEY DETERMINED THAT IT DID.
THAT WAS THE ONLY REASON FOR
LOOKING AT POLITICAL
PERFORMANCE.

THAT WAS AFTER THEY DREW THE
MAPS AND AFTER THEY FOUND
EVERYTHING ELSE WAS OKAY.
THEY HAD COMPLIED WITH THIS
COURT'S DETERMINATION TO KEEP
HOMESTEAD WHOLE, AND THE
POPULATION WAS EQUAL.

>> OKAY.

>> THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR INDULGENCE.

>> THANK YOU FOR YOUR ARGUMENTS.
COURT'S IN RECESS.

>> ALL RISE.

>> IT'S HEART BREAKING, BECAUSE
THEIR--

>> THE COMMISSION HAS 27 MEMBERS
AS WELL AS 32 OTHER STATES TO
LOOK TO WHERE SELF-COMMISSIONS
HAVE FOUND WAYS FOR LOW AND
MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES TO GET
LEGAL REPRESENTATION.

ONE POSSIBLE OPTION IS TO
PROMOTE PRO BONO LEGAL WORK.

>> IT'S A SAD COMMENTARY THAT
PEOPLE, YOU KNOW, THEY NEED TO
EAT AND FEED THEIR KIDS AND
CLOTHE THEIR KIDS, AND SOMETIMES
THEY JUST CAN'T AFFORD LEGAL
REPRESENTATION.

AND WHEN I SEE THAT AND IF I CAN
DO IT, I WILL TAKE THE CASE
EITHER PRO BONO OR AT A
DISCOUNT.

>> RICHIE HELPED ARMY VETERAN
MIKE MA GEL PLUS GAIN
CITIZENSHIP AT NO CHARGE.

HE HAD NEARLY GIVEN UP ON IT.

>> THE FIRST ATTORNEY THAT I
TALKED TO, HIS INITIAL FEE WAS
\$10,000 UP FRONT WITHOUT ANY
QUESTIONS, AND THAT DIDN'T
GUARANTEE ANYTHING.

>> OTHER FOLKS NEEDING LEGAL
ADVICE MAY TURN TO LEGAL AID

SOCIETIES, BUT LEGAL AID DOES NOT ALWAYS HAVE THE RESOURCES TO HELP.

THAT MEANS SOME PEOPLE GO TO COURT WITHOUT A LAWYER.

>> I WAS TOLD 60 OR 70% OF LITIGANTS IN FAMILY LAW CASES DO GO PRO SE.

>> MOST PEOPLE DON'T KNOW WHAT LEGAL AID IS.

BUT FRANKLY, MANY PEOPLE DON'T EVEN KNOW WHEN THEY HAVE A LEGAL ISSUE.

MUCH LESS HOW TO FIND HELP IF THEY EVEN RECOGNIZE THAT.

AND ONCE THEY FIND HELP, HOW TO NAVIGATE A COMPLEX SYSTEM.

>> THE COMMISSION HAS FIVE SUBCOMMITTEES INCLUDING PUBLIC OUTREACH, THE ACCESS TO AND DELIVERY OF LEGAL SERVICES, CONTINUUM OF SERVICES INCLUDING PEOPLE'S PREFERENCES FOR LEGAL HELP, TECHNOLOGY AND FUNDING.

THE FULL COMMISSION HAS UNTIL JUNE 30, 2016, TO CREATE A FINAL REPORT WHICH WILL BE GIVEN TO THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA, THE GOVERNOR, THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

FOR THE FLORIDA CHANNEL, I'M MIKE LICQUIA.

β

β

>> ENHANCEMENTS

MADE TO THE FLORIDA CHANNEL MOBILE APP MAKE STATE GOVERNMENT EVENTS EVEN MORE ACCESSIBLE FROM YOUR ANDROID OR APPLE DEVICE.

ALL LIVE EVENTS, DAILY SCHEDULES, EVEN ARCHIVES ARE JUST A TOUCH AWAY.

TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE NEW FEATURES, ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS DOWNLOAD THE NEW VERSION OF THE APP FREE IN THE iTunes STORE OR GOOGLE PLAY.

IT'S ANOTHER WAY OF BRINGING

FLORIDIANS CLOSER TO THEIR STATE
GOVERNMENT.
THE FLORIDA CHANNEL, CONNECTING