

**SC19-1070**

---

---

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA**

---

**ADVISORY OPINION TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL RE: PROVIDE MEDICAID  
COVERAGE TO ELIGIBLE LOW-INCOME ADULTS**

---

**REPLY BRIEF OF THE FLORIDA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
IN OPPOSITION TO THE INITIATIVE**

---

DANIEL BELL (FBN 1008587)  
**FLORIDA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
402 South Monroe Street, Suite 418  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
(850) 717-5500  
*Daniel.Bell@myfloridahouse.gov*

DANIEL NORDBY (FBN 14588)  
**SHUTTS & BOWEN LLP**  
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 804  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
(850) 241-1717  
*DNordby@shutts.com*

*Counsel for Opponent Florida House of Representatives*

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CITATIONS.....	iii
REPLY ARGUMENT .....	1
I.    THE BALLOT TITLE AND SUMMARY ARE MISLEADING AND DO NOT CLEARLY AND UNAMBIGUOUSLY PROVIDE FAIR NOTICE TO VOTERS OF THE MEDICAID INITIATIVE’S CHIEF PURPOSE. ....	2
A.    The Ballot Summary falsely states that the Medicaid Initiative would direct AHCA to implement the initiative “by maximizing federal financial participation for newly eligible individuals” when the initiative itself contains no such requirement.....	3
B.    The Ballot Title and Summary fail to clearly and unambiguously disclose the Medicaid Initiative’s chief purpose and most significant ramification: the imposition of a state constitutional requirement that Florida participate in the federal Medicaid program. ....	6
II.   THE MEDICAID INITIATIVE VIOLATES THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION’S SINGLE-SUBJECT REQUIREMENT.....	8
A.    The Medicaid Initiative substantially alters and performs the functions of multiple branches of state government. ....	9
III.  THE MEDICAID INITIATIVE IS INVALID BECAUSE IT REPRESENTS AN ATTEMPTED DIRECT EXERCISE OF THE LEGISLATIVE POWER THAT IS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF ARTICLE XI OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION. ....	13
CONCLUSION.....	15
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND COMPLIANCE .....	17

## TABLE OF CITATIONS

### CASES

<i>Adv. Op. to the Att’y Gen. re Amend. to Bar Gov’t from Treating People Differently Based on Race in Public Educ.,</i> 778 So. 2d 888 (Fla. 2000) .....	5
<i>Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Fla. Marriage Protection Amendment,</i> 926 So. 2d 1229 (Fla. 2006) .....	6
<i>Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Fla. Transp. Init. for Statewide High Speed Monorail, Fixed Guideway, or Magnetic Levitation System,</i> 926 So. 2d 1218 (Fla. 2006) .....	11
<i>Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Protect People, Especially Youth, from Addiction, Disease, and Other Health Hazards of Using Tobacco,</i> 926 So. 2d 1186 (Fla. 2006) .....	10
<i>Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Term Limits Pledge,</i> 718 So. 2d 798 (Fla. 1998) .....	2, 7
<i>Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Req’t for Adequate Pub. Educ. Funding,</i> 703 So. 2d 446 (Fla. 1997) .....	10, 12
<i>Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Water &amp; Land Conservation,</i> 123 So. 3d 47 (Fla. 2013) .....	2, 9
<i>Askew v. Firestone,</i> 421 So. 2d 151 (Fla. 1982) .....	8
<i>Dep’t of State v. Hollander,</i> 256 So. 3d 1300 (Fla. 2018) .....	7-8
<i>Fine v. Firestone,</i> 448 So. 2d 984 (Fla. 1984) .....	9
<i>In re Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Limits or Prevents Barriers to Local Solar Electricity Supply,</i> 177 So. 3d 235 (Fla. 2015) .....	9

<i>In re Adv. Op. to the Att’y Gen. re Physician Shall Charge the Same Fee for the Same Health Care Service to each Patient, 880 So. 2d 659 (Fla. 2004)</i> .....	5
<i>In re Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. – Save Our Everglades, 636 So. 2d 1336 (Fla. 1994)</i> .....	10, 12

**STATUTES AND LAWS**

§ 20.03, Fla. Stat. ....	12
§ 20.42, Fla. Stat. ....	11
§ 101.161, Fla. Stat. ....	8
§ 409.903, Fla. Stat. ....	15
42 U.S.C. § 1396d.....	4

**CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS**

Art. XI, § 3, Fla. Const. ....	<i>passim</i>
--------------------------------	---------------

## REPLY ARGUMENT

The Initial Brief of the Florida House of Representatives (the “House”) identified a variety of legal defects in the Medicaid Initiative and its ballot summary. The House’s brief demonstrated that the Initiative’s ballot summary fails to provide a clear and unambiguous statement to voters of the measure’s chief purpose, but instead includes a misleading summary employing impermissible political rhetoric. IB at 12-20. The House’s brief also explained how the Medicaid Initiative violates the Florida Constitution’s single-subject requirement by substantially altering and performing the functions of both the legislative and executive branches of state government. IB at 20-25. Finally, the House’s brief argued that the Initiative is substantively invalid because it proposes a direct exercise of the legislative power that is beyond the scope of a ballot initiative under Article XI of the Florida Constitution. IB at 25-27.

The Sponsor’s Answer Brief fails to rebut the House’s arguments. As to the House’s ballot summary objections, the Sponsor asks this Court to excuse its use of ballot summary language that differs from that used in the initiative itself, and argues that constitutionalizing Florida’s participation in the federal Medicaid program is a mere “ramification” of the initiative that need not be disclosed to voters. AB at 7-10. In response to the House’s single-subject arguments, the Sponsor appears to concede a substantial effect on the legislative branch but

makes the unexpected claim that the Agency for Health Care Administration is “not in the executive branch.” AB at 5. The Sponsor effectively declines to respond to the House’s thirteen pages of arguments that the Medicaid Initiative exceeds the scope of the initiative power reserved to the people under Article XI of the Florida Constitution. AB at 18-19.

For the reasons set forth below, in addition to those contained in the House’s Initial Brief, this Court should issue an advisory opinion finding the Medicaid Initiative invalid and prohibiting its submission to the voters.

**I. THE BALLOT TITLE AND SUMMARY ARE MISLEADING AND DO NOT CLEARLY AND UNAMBIGUOUSLY PROVIDE FAIR NOTICE TO VOTERS OF THE MEDICAID INITIATIVE’S CHIEF PURPOSE.**

The House’s Initial Brief demonstrated that the Medicaid Initiative’s ballot title and summary are misleading and fail to clearly and unambiguously provide fair notice to voters of the proposal’s chief purpose. *See, e.g., Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Water & Land Conservation*, 123 So. 3d 47, 50 (Fla. 2013). Because voters are entitled to a ballot summary that provides “fair notice of the content” of a proposed amendment so that voters “will not be misled as to its purpose, and can cast an intelligent and informed ballot,” *Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Term Limits Pledge*, 718 So. 2d 798, 803 (Fla. 1998) (citation omitted), the defective ballot summary here renders the initiative invalid.

**A. The Ballot Summary falsely states that the Medicaid Initiative would direct AHCA to implement the initiative “by maximizing federal financial participation for newly eligible individuals” when the initiative itself contains no such requirement.**

As described in the House’s Initial Brief, the ballot summary misleads voters by falsely stating that the Medicaid Initiative directs the Agency for Health Care Administration (“AHCA”) to “maximize[e] federal financial participation for newly eligible individuals” when the text of the initiative does not provide any such directive. The Medicaid Initiative itself would simply direct AHCA to implement the proposal’s expansion of Medicaid coverage by submitting a State Plan Amendment for approval by the federal government. This Court should find the Initiative invalid because its ballot summary affirmatively misstates the text of the proposal and because the Sponsor’s misleading ballot summary includes impermissible political rhetoric.

In defending its ballot summary, the Sponsor acknowledges that “the degree of federal financial participation in basic Medicaid is based on a formula over which the state has no control.” AB at 8; *see also* IB at 15 (noting that “the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage is set by the federal government based on relative per capita incomes in each state compared to the national per capita income”). The federal contribution for the population of working-age, non-disabled, childless adults that would be covered by the Initiative is also established at a fixed

percentage over which the state has no control. AB at 8 (citing 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(y)(1)(E)). The ballot summary’s suggestion that AHCA has various methods for submitting a State Plan Amendment—and that the Medicaid Initiative would direct AHCA to do so in a particular way that “maximize[es] federal financial participation for newly eligible individuals”—is entirely unsupported by the Initiative’s text and substantive Medicaid law.

The Sponsor responds that, because the federal government’s contribution toward a state’s coverage of the newly eligible population would currently be higher than its contribution toward coverage of Florida’s existing Medicaid population, “implementation of the Amendment would maximize the federal contribution to Florida Medicaid.” AB at 9. But this argument confuses two entirely separate concepts: the Initiative’s ballot summary does not refer to maximizing the federal contribution to *Florida Medicaid*, but maximizing federal financial participation for *newly eligible individuals*. Because the level of federal financial participation for newly eligible individuals is established by federal law as a fixed percentage that can be neither maximized nor minimized by the manner in which AHCA would implement the Initiative, the ballot summary is misleading to voters and is therefore invalid.

Perhaps recognizing that the ballot summary’s language diverges from that of the initiative itself, the Sponsor asks this Court to find the differences in

terminology to be “of no consequence” because a summary need not be “verbatim.” AB at 9 (citing *In re Adv. Op. to the Att’y Gen. re Physician Shall Charge the Same Fee for the Same Health Care Service to each Patient*, 880 So. 2d 659 (Fla. 2004)). As noted in the House’s Initial Brief, however, the disparate terms used in the ballot summary and the initiative have substantially different meanings. *See* IB at 15 (citing definitions of “obtain” and “maximize”). This Court has carefully scrutinized differences between the language employed in initiatives and their ballot summaries. *See, e.g., Adv. Op. to the Att’y Gen. re Amend. to Bar Gov’t from Treating People Differently Based on Race in Public Educ.*, 778 So. 2d 888, 897 (Fla. 2000) (invalidating proposed amendment due to misleading ballot summary based on legal differences between the terms “people” and “person[s]”). The differences in terminology between “obtain” and “maximizing” here render the ballot summary misleading and the Medicaid Initiative invalid.

Because the Medicaid Initiative itself does not contain any requirement that AHCA implement the initiative by “maximizing federal financial participation,” the House’s Initial Brief noted that the misleading terminology served only as political rhetoric: a misleading suggestion to voters that the Initiative Proposal will require AHCA to implement its terms by securing a greater financial participation from the federal government than through some other method of expanding eligibility. IB at 15-16. The Sponsor denies that the ballot summary’s reference to

“maximiz[ing]” federal financial participation is political rhetoric and even claims that the (non-existent) “maximization of the federal contribution” is part of the Initiative’s chief purpose. AB at 9. For the reasons explained above, the Medicaid Initiative itself does not impose a requirement for AHCA to “maximize” federal contributions to the newly eligible population. It is therefore misleading to suggest otherwise, and misleading “political rhetoric” in a ballot title or summary designed to invite an emotional response from voters rather than providing an accurate “synopsis of the proposed amendment” is “improper.” *Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Fla. Marriage Protection Amendment*, 926 So. 2d 1229, 1238 (Fla. 2006).

This Court should find the Medicaid Initiative invalid because it contains an inaccurate and misleading ballot summary in violation of Florida law.

**B. The Ballot Title and Summary fail to clearly and unambiguously disclose the Medicaid Initiative’s chief purpose and most significant ramification: the imposition of a state constitutional requirement that Florida participate in the federal Medicaid program.**

The House’s Initial Brief also demonstrated that the ballot title and summary fail to clearly and unambiguously disclose that the Medicaid Initiative would require Florida’s continued participation in the federal Medicaid program for *other* Medicaid populations as a matter of state constitutional law. IB at 16-19. This elimination of the Legislature’s discretionary policymaking and appropriations authority over 20 percent of the state’s general revenue—and more

than 31 percent of the total state budget in Fiscal Year 2019-20—is effectively concealed from the voter by the ballot summary’s focus on the extension of Medicaid coverage to a new population that is optional under federal law.

The Sponsor’s brief waves off this dramatic constitutional commitment of billions of dollars as a mere “ramification” of the Initiative, the essence of which is not “practicable” to provide to voters. AB at 9-11. To the contrary, the removal of the Legislature’s existing discretion to opt out of Medicaid is a far more significant legal effect than the expansion of Medicaid benefits to the working-age, non-disabled, childless adult population that would be covered by the Medicaid Initiative. The Initiative’s requirement that the State provide “Medicaid benefits” to the referenced population (rather than a broader term such as “health care” or “health insurance”) would shift health care appropriations and policymaking authority inexorably from the state legislature to the federal administrative state. The ballot title and summary fail to adequately explain this dramatic constitutional change.

Even if “all possible ramifications” need not be disclosed to voters, as noted by the Sponsor, the law requires the ballot summary provide “fair notice” of the question before the voter. *Term Limits Pledge*, 718 So. 2d at 803; *see also Dep’t of State v. Hollander*, 256 So. 3d 1300, 1307 (Fla. 2018) (“When the summary of a proposed amendment does not accurately describe the scope of the text of the

amendment, it fails in its purpose and must be stricken”); *Askew v. Firestone*, 421 So. 2d 151, 156 (Fla. 1982) (“The purpose of section 101.161 is to assure that the electorate is advised of the true meaning, *and ramifications*, of an amendment”) (emphasis added). Here, fair notice requires voters to be informed that the Medicaid Initiative would require Florida’s continued participation in the federal Medicaid program for non-expansion populations as a matter of state constitutional law. Florida law requires clarity in ballot summaries in recognition that an adequately informed electorate is far superior to the “post-election litigation” offered by the Sponsor as a means of resolving these significant questions. AB at 12.

The Medicaid Initiative’s ballot summary is misleading and fails to fairly and accurately advise voters regarding its true chief purpose and ramifications. As a result of these defects, this Court should issue an Advisory Opinion declaring the Initiative invalid and prohibiting its submission to the voters.

## **II. THE MEDICAID INITIATIVE VIOLATES THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION’S SINGLE-SUBJECT REQUIREMENT.**

In addition to noting the defects in the Medicaid Initiative’s ballot title and summary, the House’s Initial Brief also demonstrated that the Initiative violates the Florida Constitution’s single-subject requirement. Art. XI, § 3, Fla. Const. IB at 20-25. This Court requires “strict compliance” with the single-subject rule in the

initiative process because “our constitution is the basic document that controls our governmental functions, including the adoption of any laws by the legislature.” *Fine v. Firestone*, 448 So. 2d 984, 989 (Fla 1984). For that reason, this Court is called upon to provide “careful scrutiny” of an initiative proposal to ensure that it meets the single-subject requirement. *In re Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Limits or Prevents Barriers to Local Solar Electricity Supply*, 177 So. 3d 235, 242 (Fla. 2015).

As an analytical matter, one method by which this Court has evaluated compliance with the single-subject requirement is by determining whether the initiative substantially alters or performs the functions of multiple branches of state government. *Water & Land Conservation*, 123 So. 3d at 50. The Medicaid Initiative substantially alters or performs functions of both the executive and legislative branches. This constitutional violation constitutes additional grounds for this Court to declare the Initiative invalid.

**A. The Medicaid Initiative substantially alters and performs the functions of multiple branches of state government.**

The House’s Initial Brief explains that the Initiative performs and alters the legislative function by implementing a “policy decision of statewide significance”—the extension of Medicaid coverage to working-age, non-disabled, childless adults—and “thus performs an essentially legislative function.” IB at 22-

23 (citing *In re Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. – Save Our Everglades* 636 So. 2d 1336, 1340 (Fla. 1994)). By requiring Florida to participate in the federal Medicaid program as a matter of state constitutional law, the Medicaid Initiative also substantially alters the role of the legislative branch in Florida’s appropriations process. IB at 23-24. A “funding provision for an amendment may not substantially interfere with either the legislative appropriations function or the executive veto power.” *Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Protect People, Especially Youth, from Addiction, Disease, and Other Health Hazards of Using Tobacco*, 926 So. 2d 1186, 1192 (Fla. 2006); *see also Adv. Op. to the Att’y Gen. re Req’t for Adequate Public Educ. Funding*, 703 So. 2d 446 (Fla. 1997) (invalidating proposed amendment that would have required the state to expend forty percent of its entire appropriations for public education funding).

The House’s Initial Brief also describes how the Medicaid Initiative substantially alters or performs functions of the executive branch of state government by directing the specific manner in which its new statewide policy is to be implemented. IB at 24-25. The Initiative requires AHCA, an executive branch agency, to submit particular documents for approval by a specific federal agency. And by constitutionally mandating both Florida’s participation in the federal Medicaid program and the extension of Medicaid benefits, the Medicaid Initiative substantially interferes with the executive veto power. *See Adequate*

*Public Education Funding*, 703 So. 2d at 449 (finding single-subject violation where proposal would limit governor’s ability to veto specific appropriations); *see also Adv. Op. to Att’y Gen. re Fla. Transp. Init. for Statewide High Speed Monorail, Fixed Guideway, or Magnetic Levitation System*, 769 So. 2d 367, 372 (Fla. 2000) (Harding, dissenting) (concluding, in dissent, that proposal negating governor’s right to veto legislation does not simply *affect*, but substantially *alters or performs* the constitutional functions of the executive branch).

The Sponsor does not appear to contest the House’s argument that the Medicaid Initiative substantially alters and performs functions of the legislative branch. In response to the House’s arguments that the Medicaid Initiative violates the single-subject requirement through its substantial alterations to the functions of both the legislative and executive branches of state government, the Sponsor advances the remarkable proposition that the Agency for Health Care Administration is “not in the executive branch.” AB at 5; *see also* AB at 13 (stating that AHCA is “not a constitutional part of the executive branch. It is a creature of the Legislature...”). This argument finds no support in the law.

Contrary to the Sponsor’s novel contention, AHCA is very much an agency of the executive branch of state government. The Agency for Health Care Administration is created by law as a “department” headed by a Secretary who is appointed by the Governor and is subject to confirmation by the Senate. § 20.42,

Fla. Stat. The term “department” is defined by law as “the principal administrative unit within the executive branch of state government.” § 20.03(2), Fla. Stat. And Title IV of the Florida Statutes, which includes Chapters 14-24 of the Florida Statutes (addressing the powers and duties of the Governor, Attorney General, Chief Financial Officer, Commissioner of Agriculture, and the organizational structure of the executive branch), is itself entitled “Executive Branch.”

The Sponsor does not even cite, much less attempt to distinguish, this Court’s decisions in *Adequate Public Education Funding* and *Save Our Everglades*. As noted above, the *Adequate Public Education Funding* opinion found that an initiative limiting the legislature’s appropriations power and the governor’s veto power over a significant portion of the state’s budget violated the single-subject requirement. IB 24-25. The Medicaid Initiative fails for the same reason.

Because the Medicaid Initiative violates the single-subject requirement by substantially altering and performing the functions of both the legislative and executive branches of state government, this Court should find the proposal invalid.

**III. THE MEDICAID INITIATIVE IS INVALID BECAUSE IT REPRESENTS AN ATTEMPTED DIRECT EXERCISE OF THE LEGISLATIVE POWER THAT IS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF ARTICLE XI OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION.**

Finally, the House’s brief laid out a detailed objection to the validity of the Medicaid Initiative on the independent ground that the proposal exceeds the reserved power of the people to propose a “revision or amendment” to the Florida Constitution through Article XI’s ballot initiative process. IB at 25-36. Citing the language of the Florida Constitution and more than a dozen of this Court’s opinions from the past 100 years, and contrasting the text of the Florida Constitution with that of other states, the House argued that the Initiative represents an attempt by the Sponsor to enlist the electorate in the direct exercise of the legislative power to establish a policy of statewide significance. *Id.* Because the exercise of “the legislative power” has been vested in the Florida Legislature and is not encompassed within the power to propose the revision or amendment of the Florida Constitution, the House’s Initial Brief contended that the Medicaid Initiative Proposal is constitutionally invalid. *Id.*

The Sponsor’s brief asserts that Article XI reserves to the people “the unlimited power” to amend the Constitution, subject only to the single-subject requirement. AB at 19. Rather than engaging with the House’s legal arguments, the Sponsor claims that the House “cites no authority” in support of its assertion

that Article XI's initiative power excludes the power to directly exercise the legislative, executive, or judicial powers that are vested elsewhere by the Florida Constitution. AB at 19; *but see* IB at 25-36.

The Sponsor's theory that Article XI reserves to the people an "unlimited power" to directly exercise the powers of state government in the form of an initiative petition collapses upon consideration of the examples set out in the House's Initial Brief. Under the Sponsor's view, this Court could not find invalid an initiative petition proposing to directly exercise the judicial power by amending Article X of the Florida Constitution to include a new section imposing a criminal sentence on a particular named defendant. IB at 35. Under the interpretation of Article XI advanced by the House, such an initiative petition would not be valid as an exercise of the *initiative power* because it proposes to directly exercise the *judicial power*. In like manner, an initiative petition cannot validly propose the direct commissioning of a particular person as a state officer because the executive power to "commission all officers of the state" is vested in the governor. The initiative power that is "reserved to the people" does not encompass the authority to propose the direct exercise of the legislative, executive, or judicial power, as those separate powers are vested elsewhere by the Constitution itself.

These substantive limitations on the nature and scope of the powers that may be exercised by initiative petition exist even where the proposed measure

addresses a single subject and is accurately and fairly presented to the voters in a ballot summary. The limitations are both structural and textual and may properly be evaluated by this Court in determining the “validity of any initiative petition” upon the request of the Attorney General under Article IV, section 10, of the Florida Constitution.

Assessed against this background understanding of the scope of the initiative power under Article XI, the Initiative Proposal here is invalid because it proposes the direct exercise of the legislative power. As explained in the House’s Initial Brief, the Medicaid Initiative does not propose any alteration inherent to the State’s fundamental charter, such as a proposed reallocation of government power, a proposed restructuring of an aspect of government, or a proposed creation (or elimination) of an individual right. In all but its form, the Initiative Proposal effectively proposes the amendment of section 409.903 of the Florida Statutes. This attempted exercise of the legislative power is beyond the scope of the initiative power reserved to the people under section 3 of Article XI, and is therefore invalid.

### **CONCLUSION**

This Court should issue an Advisory Opinion declaring the Initiative Proposal invalid and prohibiting its placement on the ballot.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Daniel Nordby

DANIEL NORDBY (FBN 14588)  
**SHUTTS & BOWEN LLP**  
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 804  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
(850) 241-1717  
*DNordby@shutts.com*

DANIEL BELL (FBN 1008587)  
**FLORIDA HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES**  
402 South Monroe Street, Suite 418  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
(850) 717-5500  
*Daniel.Bell@myfloridahouse.gov*

*Counsel for Opponent Florida House of  
Representatives*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND COMPLIANCE**

I hereby certify that this computer-generated brief is prepared in Times New Roman 14-point font and complies with the font requirement of Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.210(a), and that a copy has been provided on the 6th day of January, 2020, through the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal to:

JOE JACQUOT  
**Executive Office of the Governor  
State of Florida**  
The Capitol  
400 S. Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0001  
Telephone: (850) 717-9310  
Facsimile: (850) 488-9810  
joe.jacquot@eog.myflorida.com

*General Counsel to Governor  
Ron DeSantis*

RICHARD DORAN  
ALEXANDRA AKRE  
**Ausley McMullen**  
Post Office Box 391  
Tallahassee, Florida 32302  
Telephone: (850) 224-9115  
rdoran@ausley.com  
aakre@ausley.com

*Counsel for Opponents Americans for  
Prosperity and Foundation for  
Government Accountability*

BRAD MCVAY  
**Florida Department of State**  
R.A. Gray Building  
500 South Bronough Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250  
Telephone: (850) 245-6536  
Facsimile: (850) 245-612  
brad.mcvay@dos.myflorida.com

*General Counsel to Secretary of State  
Laurel Lee*

JEREMIAH HAWKES  
General Counsel  
ASHLEY URBAN  
Deputy General Counsel  
**The Florida Senate**  
409 The Capitol  
404 S. Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100  
Telephone: (850) 487-5237  
hawkes.jeremiah@flsenate.gov

*General Counsel to Senate President  
Bill Galvano*

AMY J. BAKER  
Coordinator  
Financial Impact Estimating Conference  
**Office of Economic and Demographic  
Research**  
111 West Madison Street, Suite 574  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-6588  
Telephone: (850) 487-1402  
Facsimile: (850) 922-6436  
baker.amy@leg.state.fl.us

MARIA MATTHEWS  
Director, Division of Elections  
**Florida Department of State**  
R.A. Gray Building, Room 316  
500 South Bronough Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250  
Telephone: (850) 245-6200  
Facsimile: (850) 245-6217  
DivElections@dos.myflorida.com

ASHLEY MOODY  
Attorney General  
**State of Florida**  
The Capitol, PL-01  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1060  
Telephone: (850) 414-3300  
Facsimile: (850) 401-1630  
E-mail:  
oag.civil.eserve@myfloridalegal.com  
amit.agarwal@myfloridalegal.com  
jeffrey.desousa@myfloridalegal.com

BARRY RICHARD  
**Greenberg Traurig, P.A.**  
101 East College Avenue  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
richardb@gtlaw.com  
trammellc@gtlaw.com  
flservice@gtlaw.com

*Counsel for Sponsor Florida Decides  
Healthcare, Inc.*

*/s/ Daniel Nordby*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY