



**SUMMARY OF
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS
CERTIFIED FOR THE 2018 BALLOT**

2018 General Election

June 2018

There are 13 proposed amendments to the Florida Constitution that are certified for the 2018 General Election ballot. They will appear on the General Election ballot on November 6, 2018. The proposed amendments are summarized in numeric order.

Copies of these proposed constitutional amendments are available on the Florida Department of State Division of Elections' website at *dos.elections.myflorida.com/initiatives*.

AMENDMENT 1:

Homestead Exemption Increase (Gen 2018)

Currently, the Florida Constitution provides an exemption on portions of the assessed value of homesteaded properties. As of 2018, the exemption applies to the portion of a home's assessed value between (1) \$0 and \$25,000 and (2) \$50,000 and \$75,000. So, if your home's assessed value is \$75,000 or \$200,000, the maximum homestead exemption under current law is \$50,000 for either home. Amendment 1 would provide an additional homestead exemption on the portion of a home's assessed value between \$100,000 and \$125,000 – raising the maximum homestead exemption to \$75,000. This exemption applies to all levies other than school district levies and would take effect January 1, 2019.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A “yes” vote supports exempting the portion of assessed home values between \$100,000 and \$125,000 from property taxes other than school taxes, bringing the maximum homestead exemption up to \$75,000.

SUPPORTERS:

Florida House of Representatives vote:

83 to 35, 2 not voting

Florida Senate vote:

28 to 10, 1 not voting

“Making homes more affordable, we’re going to allow people to move from rental units back into homes. And in doing so, it’s going to give us the ability to generate revenue for doc stamps, the tangible tax and a whole host of other things that go along with home ownership.”

- Sen. Tom Lee (R-20)

“... Democratic supporters said the proposal will make it easier for first-time home buyers and that lawmakers shouldn’t underestimate the ability of voters to understand the proposal’s potential impacts on local governments.”

- Palm Beach Post

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A “no” vote opposes exempting the portion of assessed home values between \$100,000 and \$125,000 from property taxes other than school taxes, keeping the maximum homestead exemption at \$50,000. If passed, Amendment 1 is expected to cost municipalities, counties and special districts \$644.7 million per year.

OPPONENTS:

Florida League of Cities; Florida Association of Counties

“Amendment 1 isn’t what it seems. The politicians call it a tax break, but it’s really a tax SHIFT that will leave millions of hardworking homeowners with a bigger share of the property tax burden.”

- Florida League of Cities

“That would exacerbate the inequities in Florida’s tax code and cost millions that local governments need for basic services such as parks, libraries and public safety. ... This constitutional amendment is unnecessary, and it is nothing more than an attempt to curry election-year favor with voters.”

- Tampa Bay Times

AMENDMENT 2:

Permanent Cap on Nonhomestead Parcel Assessment Increases (Gen 2018)

Currently, the Florida Constitution limits property tax assessment increases to 10 percent a year for specified non-homesteaded property. However, the 10 percent cap is set to expire January 1, 2019. Amendment 2 would make the 10 percent cap permanent. The non-homesteaded properties the measure applies to include non-homesteaded residential properties, such as second homes, rental apartments and nonresidential property, such as commercial property and vacant land. The cap does not apply to school district taxes.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A “yes” vote would make permanent the cap of 10 percent on annual nonhomestead parcel assessment increases set to expire on January 1, 2019.

SUPPORTERS:

Florida House of Representatives Vote:

110 to 3, 7 not voting

Florida Senate Vote

35 to 0, 4 not voting

Amendment 2 is For Everybody; Florida Association of Realtors

“Amendment 2 really is good for everybody because if the non-homestead tax cap expires in 2019, every Floridian will be negatively impacted in some way. Whether it’s a business having to increase the cost of their goods and services or tenants having their rent go up a significant amount, communities across the state will suffer.”

– **Maria Wells**, president of **Florida Association of Realtors**

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A “no” vote would allow the cap of 10 percent on annual nonhomestead parcel assessment increases to expire on January 1, 2019.

OPPONENTS:

Unknown at this time

AMENDMENT 3:

Voter Approval of Casino Gambling (Gen 2018)

Amendment 3 would provide voters the exclusive right to decide whether to authorize casino gambling in the state of Florida. If passed, the Florida Legislature would not be allowed to authorize casino gambling through statute or through referring a constitutional amendment to the ballot. The measure defines “casino gambling” as card games, casino games and slot machines. Pari-mutuel wagering on horse racing, dog racing or jai alai exhibitions is not included in the measure’s definition of casino gambling. The measure would not impact casino gambling on Native American tribal lands established through state-tribe compacts.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A “yes” vote would provide voters, through citizen-initiated ballot measures, with the exclusive right to decide whether to authorize casino gambling in Florida.

SUPPORTERS:

Voter in Charge; Disney World Services, Inc.;
Seminole Tribe of Florida

“Amendment 3 is about who should have the authority to authorize casino gambling in Florida. Politicians and lobbyists in Tallahassee or Florida voters? For nearly a century, approval of casino gambling was strictly left for voters to decide. Only in the last few years have Tallahassee politicians decided they can legalize casinos without voter approval. Amendment 3 seeks to give that ultimate authority back to Florida voters where it belongs.”

– **Voters in Charge**

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A “no” vote would not provide voters, through citizen-initiated ballot measures, with the exclusive right to decide whether to authorize casino gambling in Florida.

OPPONENTS:

Sen. Bill Galvano (R-21); Isadore “Izzy” Havenick

“It’s game over for the Legislature if that (constitutional) amendment gets on the ballot and passes. And at that point, we’ll just be spectators in the world of gaming, which will essentially be a monopoly for the Seminole Tribe.”

– **Sen. Bill Galvano (R-21)**

“I think it will have a huge impact on our industry, because as opposed to the Legislature regulating us, we’ll need 60 percent of the residents of Florida to regulate us in the future. And, as the most regulated business in the state, that just makes anything we want to do to grow our business in the future more difficult.”

– **Isadore “Izzy” Havenick**, owner of dog racing tracks in Naples and Miami

AMENDMENT 4:

Restoration for Felon's Voting Rights (Gen 2018)

Currently, the law requires individuals with prior felonies to go before a state board to restore their individual voting rights. Amendment 4 would automatically restore the right to vote for people with prior felony convictions upon completion of their sentences. Sentences include prison, parole and probation. The amendment does not restore voting rights for individuals convicted of murder or a felony sexual offense.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A “yes” vote would automatically restore the right to vote for people with prior felony convictions, except those convicted of murder or a felony sexual offense, upon completion of their sentences, including prison, parole and probation.

SUPPORTERS:

U.S. Rep. Charlie Crist (D-13); Former U.S. Rep. Gwen Graham (D-2); Tallahassee Mayor Andrew Gillum (D); Miami Beach Mayor Philip Levine (D); Gubernatorial Candidate Christopher King (D); Florida Rights Restoration Coalition; American Civil Liberties Union; Our Revolution; New Approach PAC; Floridians for a Fair Democracy

“Americans believe in second chances. We need to make sure that Florida Law does too. Nearly 1.5 million people in Florida are permanently excluded from voting because of a prior felony conviction. Florida is one of only four states that still has a system that excludes so many people from voting. These are our family members, friends, and neighbors who have already repaid their debts to society. Now is the time to restore the ability to vote to Floridians who have earned the opportunity to participate in and give back to their communities.”

– **Floridians for a Fair Democracy**

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A “no” vote would NOT automatically restore the right to vote for people with prior felony convictions, except those convicted of murder or a felony sexual offense, upon completion of their sentences, including prison, parole and probation.

OPPONENTS:

Floridians For A Sensible Voting Rights Policy; Agriculture Commissioner Adam Putnam; Rep. Richard Corcoran (R-37)

“Other than murder and sexual felonies, it [the initiative] treats all other felonies as though they were the same. It’s a blanket, automatic restoration of voting rights. If it gets on the ballot, your only choice will be an all or nothing, yes or no vote on the amendment. If it passes, neither you nor anyone else will ever be allowed to consider the specifics of the crime or the post-release history of the criminal before that new voter registration card is issued.”

– **Richard Harrison**, executive director of **Floridians For A Sensible Voting Rights Policy**

AMENDMENT 5:

Two-Thirds Vote of Legislature to Increase Taxes or Fees (Gen 2018)

Currently, the Florida Legislature can pass new taxes or fees, and it can increase existing ones (except the corporate income tax), through a simple majority vote in each chamber. It can also pass new taxes or fees, and increase existing ones, using multi-subject bills. If Amendment 5 passes, the legislature would need a two-thirds vote in each chamber to pass a new tax or fee, or increase an existing one. In addition, if a bill enacts a new tax or fee, or increases existing ones, it must not contain any other subject. This voting requirement would not apply to any tax or fee imposed by a county, municipality, school board or special district.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A “yes” vote supports requiring a two-thirds vote of each chamber of the Florida Legislature to enact new taxes or fees or increase existing ones.

SUPPORTERS:

Florida House of Representatives Vote:

80 to 29, 7 Not Voting

Florida Senate Vote:

25 to 13

Gov. Rick Scott; Rep. Tom Leek (R-25); Rep. Dane Eagle (R-77); Rep. Larry Metz (R-32); Rep. Richard Corcoran (R-37)

“We should always make it much more difficult to raise taxes than it is to cut them. This amendment will secure and protect that legacy from future legislatures bent on raising taxes.”

– **Rep. Richard Corcoran (R-37)**

“I believe that taking a citizen’s hard-earned money should not be taken lightly.”

– **Rep. Tom Leek (R-25)**, a legislative sponsor of the amendment

“Politicians should not have the authority to raise taxes when they feel like it. There should be a higher threshold.”

– **Rep. Kionne McGhee (D-117)**

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A “no” vote would allow the Legislature to continue to enact new taxes or fees or increase existing ones, except the corporate income tax, through a simple majority vote.

OPPONENTS:

Rep. Joseph Geller (D-100); Rep. Sean Shaw (D-61); Sen. Jose Javier Rodriguez (D-27)

“I think this is a short-sighted idea. There’s simply no need for this. Have some confidence in the people who will sit in these seats after you are gone.”

– **Rep. Joseph Geller (D-100)**

“Each and every Session, there’s a different tension between taxes and revenue and what we want to spend money on and what we don’t. I’m no smarter than someone who’s going to come here 10 years from now to vote. And so I don’t think I ought to have more power than that person that sits in this seat 10 years from now to vote. They should be able to vote up or down on tax policy, up and down on revenues, just like I do.”

– **Rep. Sean Shaw (D-61)**

“This legislature would be constrained from raising funds going into the future but when it comes time – like this legislature does every year – to carve special exemptions out of the tax base, there would not be a heightened threshold. What that does is make our tax code more and more and more regressive.”

– **Sen. Jose Javier Rodriguez (D-27)**

AMENDMENT 6:

Marsy's Law Crime Victim Rights, Judicial Retirement Age and Judicial Interpretation of Laws and Rules (Gen 2018)

Amendment 6 would provide crime victims, their families and their lawful representatives with a series of rights including a right to due process; a right to be treated with fairness and respect; freedom from intimidation, harassment and abuse; a right to be protected, within reason, from the accused and persons acting on behalf of the accused; a right to proceedings free from unreasonable delay; and more. In addition, Amendment 6 would increase the judicial retirement age from 70 to 75 years of age. The amendment would also prohibit state courts from deferring to an administrative agency's interpretation of a state statute or rule in lawsuits.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A "yes" vote would add specific rights of crime victims to Florida's Constitution, increase the judicial retirement age and prohibit state courts from deferring to an administrative agency's interpretation of a state statute or rule in lawsuits.

SUPPORTERS:

Constitution Revision Commission (CRC) Vote:
34 to 3

Florida Smart Justice Alliance; CRC Commissioner Darlene Jordan; Broward County Commissioner Chip LaMarca

"Like most Floridians, I believe that victims of crime and their families should be treated with fairness, dignity and respect. That is why I am proud to co-sponsor Marsy's Law for Florida."
- **Darlene Jordan, CRC** commissioner

"There is no reason vulnerable victims of crime should not have enumerated rights in our state's most valuable legal document - yet that is currently the case in Florida."
- **Chip LaMarca, Broward County** commissioner

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A "no" vote would NOT add specific rights of crime victims to Florida's Constitution or increase the judicial retirement age, and it would allow state courts to continue to defer to an administrative agency's interpretation of a state statute or rule in lawsuits.

OPPONENTS:

***Sun Sentinel*; CRC Commissioners Hank Coxe, Arthenia Joyner and Bob Solari**

"It would create endless conflicts between the stipulated rights of victims and the constitutional rights of defendants. These are already inherent in the system and they're best left for judges to resolve."

- ***Sun Sentinel***

AMENDMENT 7:

Florida First Responder and Military Member Survivor Benefits, Supermajority Board Votes for College Fees and State College System (Gen 2018)

Amendment 7 would require employers of first responders to provide death benefits to surviving spouses if the first responders lost their lives on official duty. Regarding the military, the state would have to provide certain death benefits to surviving spouses of military members accidentally, unlawfully or intentionally killed. In addition, the state would have to waive certain educational expenses for surviving children or spouses who are pursuing a career-certificate, undergraduate education or postgraduate education. The amendment also makes it more difficult to raise college fees by requiring a supermajority vote by both a university's board of trustees and the state board of governors, as opposed to the simple majority needed under current law. Finally, the amendment would place the current structure of the state's system of higher education in the Florida Constitution.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A "yes" vote would require death benefits for first responders and military members, make it more difficult to increase college fees and place the current structure of the state's system of higher education in the Florida Constitution.

SUPPORTERS:

Constitution Revision Commission Vote:
30 to 7

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A "no" vote would NOT require death benefits for first responders and military members, make it more difficult to increase college fees or place the current structure of the state's system of higher education in the Florida Constitution.

OPPONENTS:

Unknown at this time

AMENDMENT 8:

School Board Term Limits, Allow State to Operate Non-Board Established Schools and Civic Literacy (Gen 2018)

Currently, there is no state law limiting how long a person could serve on a school board. Amendment 8 would limit school board members to two consecutive four-year terms and would change the constitution so that school boards only have authority to operate, control and supervise the public schools they themselves established. Currently, school boards operate, control and supervise all free public schools within their jurisdiction, but the measure would allow a different state institution to have oversight of public schools not established by school boards. Non-board established schools could include privately organized charter schools, lab schools, collegiate high schools and other types of schools. The amendment would also add language to the Florida Constitution stating that “education is essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people” and require the Florida Legislature to pass laws to ensure public school students “understand and are prepared to exercise their rights and responsibilities as citizens of a constitutional republic.”

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A “yes” vote establishes term limits for school board members; allows the state government to operate, supervise and control public schools not established by the school board; and requires the legislature to promote civic literacy in public education.

SUPPORTERS:

Constitution Revision Commission Vote:

27 to 10

“... Local school boards have tried to block organizations with proven track records from opening public charter schools ... Like most Floridians, I believe in local control. But local control should never trump individual rights – including the right of parents to access the best possible schools for their children. Parents should hold the ultimate local control.”

– **Erika Donalds, CRC** commissioner

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A “no” vote would NOT establish term limits for school board members; allow the state government to operate, supervise and control public schools not established by the school board; or require the legislature to promote civic literacy in public education.

OPPONENTS:

American Civil Liberties Union of Florida; Common Cause Florida; For Our Future Florida; Florida First Amendment Foundation; Florida AFL-CIO; Florida Alliance of Planned Parenthood Affiliates; Florida Consumer Action Network; Florida Education Association; Florida NOW; Florida Policy Institute; League of Women Voters Florida; National Council of Jewish Women; Progress Florida; Southern Poverty Law Center

“... Proposal 71 would allow a politically appointed, unaccountable board in Tallahassee – not local school boards – to decide when and where new charter schools will open. If such a radical change were to stand alone on the ballot, there’s little question voters would reject it. That’s why the politicians backing it have packaged it with two other proposed amendments they think will be more popular ...”

– **Pat Drago**, state executive board member of the **League of Women Voters**

“They want to take power away from the elected School Board and give it to an unaccountable group in Tallahassee. And guess who will appoint the members of that group? Those Tallahassee politicians.”

– **Janet McAilley**, former member of the **Miami-Dade School Board**

AMENDMENT 9:

Florida Ban on Offshore Oil and Gas Drilling and Vaping in Enclosed Indoor Workplaces (Gen 2018)

Amendment 9 would ban offshore oil and gas drilling from Florida's shoreline to the outermost boundaries of the state's territorial seas. It would not affect the transportation of oil and natural gas products produced outside the state's waters. The amendment would also ban the use of vapor-generating electronic devices in indoor workplaces. The measure makes allowances for private residences that are not being used for commercial childcare, adult care or health care; for retail tobacco and vapor-generating device shops; for designed smoking guest rooms in hotels; and in stand-alone bars.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A "yes" vote would ban offshore drilling for oil and natural gas on lands beneath all state waters and ban the use of vapor-generating electronic devices, such as electronic cigarettes, in enclosed indoor workplaces.

SUPPORTERS:

Constitution Revision Commission Vote:
33 to 3, 1 not voting

Florida Wildlife Federation

"If we had a disastrous spill in Florida water, our beaches and wildlife would immediately be in peril. The absolute last thing we need in Florida is oil-soaked marshes, bays, mangroves, sea grasses, coral reefs and beaches."

– **Manley Fuller**, president of the **Florida Wildlife Federation**

"We would be the only state in the nation to have this in our state constitution. This would sound a loud environmental message, forever."

– **Jacqui Thurlow-Lippisch, CRC** commissioner

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A "no" vote would NOT ban offshore drilling for oil and natural gas on lands beneath all state waters or ban the use of vapor-generating electronic devices, such as electronic cigarettes, in enclosed indoor workplaces.

OPPONENTS:

Vets4Energy Florida; Florida Petroleum Council

"If this amendment passes, we will forego not only a safe process for developing the energy we depend on, but also the opportunity to add more than \$2.6 billion to our economy over the next two decades and provide jobs to more than 56,000 people through drilling in state and federal waters."

– **C.S. Bennet**, member of **Vets4Energy Florida**

"We'll stand on our merits of Floridians being interested in American energy production, creating more energy and more jobs, with the knowledge that the Legislature has already acted on this for the foreseeable future, and why wouldn't that be enough? We just think it's a bad idea to do that (put it in the Constitution), and we think Floridians will agree."

– **David Mica**, executive director of the **Florida Petroleum Council**

AMENDMENT 10:

Florida State and Local Government Structure and Operation

The amendment deals with state and local government structure and operation. If passed, it would add the existing State Department of Veteran Affairs to the Florida Constitution; create a state Office of Domestic Security and Counter Terrorism in the constitution; require the Florida Legislature to convene its regular session on the second Tuesday of January in even-numbered years; and prohibit counties from abolishing certain local offices – sheriff, tax collector, property appraiser, supervisor of elections and clerk of circuit court – and requiring elections for these offices. Amendment 10 would remove authority for a county charter or a special law to provide for choosing specified county officers in a manner other than election.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A “yes” vote would add the existing state Department of Veterans Affairs to the Florida Constitution, create a state Office of Domestic Security and Counter-Terrorism, require the legislature to convene regular session on the second Tuesday of January of even-numbered years, prohibit counties from abolishing certain local offices and require elections for these offices.

SUPPORTERS:

Constitution Revision Commission Vote:

29 to 8

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A “no” vote would NOT add the existing state Department of Veterans Affairs to the Florida Constitution, create a state Office of Domestic Security and Counter-Terrorism, require the legislature to convene regular session on the second Tuesday of January of even-numbered years, prohibit counties from abolishing certain local offices or require elections for these offices.

OPPONENTS:

Florida Association of Counties

“[The measure] would eliminate the constitutional right of local citizens to govern their sheriff, tax collector, property appraiser, supervisor of elections, and the management of county finances.”

– **Florida Association of Counties**

AMENDMENT 11:

Repeal Prohibition on Aliens' Property Ownership, Delete Obsolete Provision on High-Speed Rail and Repeal of Criminal Statutes' Effect on Prosecution (Gen 2018)

The amendment would remove discriminatory language that states: "... ownership, inheritance, disposition and possession of real property by aliens ineligible for citizenship may be regulated or prohibited by law." It also removed obsolete language repealed by voters regarding high-speed rail and removes a prohibition on the retroactive application of changes in criminal laws to the punishment of previously committed crimes.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A "yes" vote would repeal the prohibition on foreign-born persons ineligible for citizenship from property ownership and remove obsolete language regarding high-speed rail, as well as repeal criminal statutes' effect on prosecution.

SUPPORTERS:

Constitution Revision Commission Vote:

36 to 1

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A "no" vote would NOT repeal the prohibition on foreign-born persons ineligible for citizenship from property ownership, remove obsolete language regarding high-speed rail or repeal criminal statutes' effect on prosecution.

OPPONENTS:

Unknown at this time

AMENDMENT 12:

Lobbying Restrictions for Elected Officials (Gen 2018)

Amendment 12 would prohibit elected municipal officials, judges, statewide elected officers, legislators, county commissioners, county officers, school board members, school superintendents, special district officers with ad valorem taxing authority and state agency heads from paid lobbying while in office and for six years following their term of office. Specifically, Amendment 12 prohibits these officials from **PAID** lobbying on “issues of policy, appropriations or procurement” before any other governmental entity (federal, state, county, municipal or special district) while in office. The measure also prohibits these officials from **PAID** lobbying before their former governing body for six years after leaving office. Amendment 12 does not prohibit officials from representing their government before any other governmental entity if such action is within the duties of the office. It also does not define several key terms including “lobby,” “issues of policy,” “appropriation,” and “procurement.” The measure does, however, direct the Legislature to enact implementing legislation that may define these terms. The measure also prohibits the abuse of a public position by public officers and employees to obtain a personal benefit. If the amendment passes, the lobbying restrictions would take effect December 31, 2022.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A “yes” vote supports prohibiting public officials from lobbying for compensation during the official’s term in office and for six years after the official leaves office and prohibiting public officials from using the office to obtain a personal benefit.

SUPPORTERS:

Constitution Revision Commission Vote:

30 to 4, 3 not voting

Integrity Florida; CRC Commissioner Don Gaetz

The Amendment would “weed out those who enter public service to benefit themselves in their private lives. It would ensure people go into public service for the right reasons.”

– **Ben Wilcox**, research director for **Integrity Florida**

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A “no” vote opposes prohibiting public officials from lobbying for compensation during the official’s term in office and for six years after the official leaves office and prohibiting public officials from using the office to obtain a personal benefit.

OPPONENTS:

CRC Commissioner Jose Felix Diaz

“My big fear about this legislation is that I think that inadvertently it is going to capture people that it doesn’t mean to capture. I also think it’s going to discourage people from running or being appointed to positions and we might lose some really good opportunities to have some good people serving in office.”

– **Jose Felix Diaz**, CRC commissioner

AMENDMENT 13:

Florida Ban on Wagering on Dog Races (Gen 2018)

If passed, Amendment 13 would ban gambling on dog races. Specifically, pari-mutuel operations would be prohibited from racing greyhounds or any other dogs for gambling purposes beginning January 1, 2021. In addition, persons in the state would also be prohibited from wagering on the outcome of live dog races occurring in Florida. Civil or criminal penalties for violating this amendment are to be determined by the Legislature.

ARGUMENTS FOR:

A “yes” vote supports banning gambling on dog races, including greyhound races.

SUPPORTERS:

Constitution Revision Commission Vote:
27 to 10

Grey2K USA Worldwide; Elite Greyhound Adoptions; Humane Society of the United States

“... This is a major victory for everyone in the state who cares about dogs. Commercial greyhound racing is cruel and inhumane ... The animal protection community is united in its support for this humane proposal. We are prepared to run a formidable campaign, and are confident Floridians will vote ‘yes’ for the dogs this November.”

– **Carey M. Theil**, executive director of **Grey2K USA Worldwide**

ARGUMENTS AGAINST:

A “no” vote opposes banning gambling on dog races, including greyhound races.

OPPONENTS:

Palm Beach Kennel Club; Florida Greyhound Association; National Greyhound Association; CRC Commissioners Chris Smith and Arthenia Joyner

“If you make a mistake and misrepresent the facts, you can come back and fix it. You can’t fix a constitutional amendment without extraordinary measures.”

– **Jack Cory**, representative for the **Florida Greyhound Association**

“I don’t want to deny or take away a person’s right to earn a living, when there is a solution, short of putting it in the Constitution.”

– **Arthenia Joyner**, **CRC** commissioner



FLORIDA LEAGUE OF CITIES, INC.

301 S. Bronough Street, Suite 300, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

P.O. Box 1757 Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1757

Phone: (850) 222-9684 • Toll Free: 1-(800) 342-8112 • Fax: (850) 222-3806

© 2018 Florida League of Cities, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

This document was compiled by the Florida League of Cities for informational purposes and is in no way intended to provide any type of legal advice or guidance. This brochure is only intended to provide a brief synopsis of each of the proposed constitutional amendments.