

**GROWTH·AGRICULTURE·
TRANSPORTATION &
ENVIRONMENTAL
POLICY COMMITTEE**

2017-2018 FAC Legislative Conference

November 15-17, 2017

Hyatt Regency Sarasota

Sarasota County, Florida



2017-2018 Policy Workbook



THE FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES WOULD LIKE TO
THANK OUR 2017-2018 CORPORATE PARTNERS.

PLATINUM

FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF
COUNTIES TRUST (FACT)
FBMC
FLORIDA LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FINANCE PROGRAM (FLGFP)
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT (FPL)
HEALTHSTAT
PERKSCONNECT
JONES EDMUNDS
NABORS, GIBLIN & NICKERSON
NATIONWIDE
SERVIUM GROUP
JET PAY

GOLD

AETNA
CLARKE
WASTE MANAGEMENT
SOUTHERN STRATEGY GROUP
AT&T
UBER
CROWN CASTLE

SILVER

DUKE ENERGY
FERGUSON GROUP
WASTE CONNECTIONS, INC
BRYANT MILLER OLIVE
ADVANCED DISPOSAL
RENOVATE AMERICA
COMMUNICATIONS
INTERNATIONAL
BRIDGES INTERNATIONAL
AMR
IEM
BOSTON MUTUAL



Growth, Agriculture, Transportation & Ag Policy Committee

Thursday, November 16, 2017

1:00 p.m. - 1:55 p.m.

AGENDA

- Opening Remarks & Review of Process (**Appendix: Page 19**)
- Introduction of Committee Leadership (**Page 3**)
- Review and Consideration of Revised Guiding Principles (**Page 5**)
- Consideration of Proposed Policies and GATE Committee Recommendations (**Page 9**)
 - A. **Proposals Adopted at 2017 Policy Conference Recommended for Final Adoption**
 1. FAC Staff / St. Lucie – Beaches and Shores (**Page 9**)
 2. Levy - Real Property in Flood Zones (**Page 11**)
 - B. **Proposals Recommended to be Withdrawn from Consideration**
 3. St. Lucie - Med. Marijuana / Cultivation and Processing Facilities (**Page 12**)
 4. Marion - Med. Marijuana / Dispensing Facilities (**Page 14**)
 5. Alachua - Community Redevelopment Agencies (**Page 15**)
 6. Broward - Community Redevelopment Agencies (**Page 16**)
 7. Manatee - Impact Fee Waiver for Affordable Housing (**Page 18**)
- Consideration of FAC Resolution regarding Affordable Housing (**Separate Handout**)
- 2018 Legislative Preview and Highlights
- Adjourn

2018 FAC LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE



**Growth Management, Agriculture, Transportation & Environment
Policy Committee
Committee Leadership**

CHAIR

Lee Constantine
Seminole County

Vice-Chair

Daniella Levine Cava
Miami-Dade County

Policy Leaders

Peter O'Bryan, Indian River County
John Meeks, Levy County
Terry Burroughs, Okeechobee County
Charles Chestnut, Alachua County
Weston Pryor, Glades County
Bill Truex, Charlotte County

Janet Long, Pinellas County
Emily Bonilla, Orange County
Timothy Sullivan, Lake County
Cathy Townsend, St. Lucie County
Ronald Kitchen, Citrus County
Jim Barfield, Brevard County

Staff

SUSAN HARBIN, ESQ.
SENIOR ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC POLICY
SHARBIN@FL-COUNTIES.COM

2018 FAC LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE



Growth Management

The impact of growth and development in Florida during the last 30 years has brought significant benefits and costs to county government. Given Florida's expected future growth and because Florida's communities are remarkably diverse, Florida's counties must have flexibility in planning decisions to address unique local concerns and conditions. County officials must have the ability to make reasonable decisions for the advancement of the local community on zoning, comprehensive planning, transportation, and infrastructure issues without being subjected to prohibitive claims for damages for infringement on private property rights.

- GATE 1. The Florida Association of Counties supports comprehensive policies that reduce a county's risk to the impacts of coastal and inland flooding.
- GATE 2. The Florida Association of Counties recognizes and supports the critical role Regional Planning Councils play in supporting communities by coordinating intergovernmental solutions to growth problems on greater-than-local issues, providing technical assistance to local governments.
- GATE 3. The Florida Association of Counties supports policies that provide a mechanism to ensure the extra-jurisdictional impacts from large-scale development projects are adequately addressed within the impacted counties prior to development approval.
- GATE 4. The Florida Association of Counties supports retaining the full amount of dedicated documentary tax revenues to fund state and local affordable housing programs.
- GATE 5. The Florida Association of Counties supports the development and maintenance of dedicated funding of the Florida Forever Grant Program and Florida Communities Trust which provide recreational opportunities for parks, open space, greenways and trails to help meet growth challenges and protect natural resources.
- GATE 6. The Florida Association of Counties supports the development and maintenance of dedicated funding the Rural and Family Lands Protection Act to allow for the purchase of rural easements to prevent the subdivision and conversion of such land into other uses.
- GATE 7. The Florida Association of Counties supports the distribution of land management appropriations to local governments in proportion to the percentage of public conservation lands managed within local jurisdictions.



Transportation

FAC believes that Florida's transportation system is a vital component in building and sustaining communities, moving people and goods, and developing competition at local and regional levels, and on a national scale. Florida's counties play a critical role in the state's transportation system. Florida's counties should be recognized as major partners in the maintenance and development of Florida's transportation infrastructure and provided levels of funding and authority that adequately reflect their role in the state's transportation system.

- GATE 8. The Florida Association of Counties supports funding for all modes of the state and local transportation infrastructure network.
- GATE 9. The Florida Association of Counties supports policies and funding that encourage and facilitate more efficient and effective use of regional transportation solutions.
- GATE 10. The Florida Association of Counties supports critical state funding for the Small County Road Assistance program (SCRAP).
- GATE 11. The Florida Association of Counties supports continuing enhanced state funding for the Small County Outreach Program (SCOP).
- GATE 12. The Florida Association of Counties supports policies providing for Strategic Intermodal System funds to be used on roads and other transportation facilities not designated on the SIS network if the improvement relieves congestion on the SIS.
- GATE 13. The Florida Association of Counties opposes any effort to divert revenues from the state transportation trust fund for non-transportation purposes.

Environment

Conservation and protection of Florida's natural resources is critical to managing growth, promoting economic development, and maintaining a healthy environment to ensure a high quality of life for Floridians.

- GATE 14. The Florida Association of Counties supports the allocation of matching funds to county governments to purchase environmentally sensitive and endangered lands.
- GATE 15. The Florida Association of Counties supports a comprehensive state climate change action plan, with energy policies and other initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases and to address ecosystem sustainability, long term water supply, flood protection, public health and safety, and economic prosperity.



GATE 16. The Florida Association of Counties supports state and federal recognition of adaptation and mitigation as critical to any climate change plan, and the funding necessary to assist local governments in developing and implementing these initiatives.

GATE 17. The Florida Association of Counties supports streamlining the permitting and regulatory processes for solar product manufacturers, installers, and consumers, and further supports reducing burdensome regulations that hinder solar market penetration.

GATE 18. The Florida Association of Counties supports the ability of counties to utilize electricity produced at county-owned facilities at other adjacent and non-contiguous county-owned properties without penalty, or in the alternative, be able to sell surplus power at market rate.

GATE 19. The Florida Association of Counties supports state designation of the Southeast Florida Coral Reef Conservation Area.

GATE 20. The Florida Association of Counties supports maintaining funding of the Small County Consolidated Grant Program, and maintaining the waste tire fee as a dedicated revenue source for funding mosquito control, solid waste and recycling programs.

GATE 21. The Florida Association of Counties supports policies that provide appropriate resources and incentives to local governments to achieve statewide recycling goals, and further supports comprehensive recycling initiatives that encourage increased participation of the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors. ~~with credit afforded for all recycled materials including municipal biomass and other waste-to-energy processes.~~

Water

Increased demands on Florida's water supply are forcing many diverse interests to work with county government to plan the future of water policy in Florida. In an effort to achieve the best possible result, county government should continue to expand partnerships with the agricultural community, urban water users, regional government agencies, and environmental organizations to encourage water conservation, water resource, and water supply development projects. The primary goal of such water resource planning efforts should be ensuring resource availability for all reasonable beneficial uses, consistent with the protection of water and related natural resources.



- GATE 22. The Florida Association of Counties supports the allocation of matching funds to county governments to restore impaired springs, estuaries, lagoons and other waterbodies in accordance with state policy and local needs.
- GATE 23. The Florida Association of Counties supports state funding for water quality improvement projects designed to reduce nutrient pollution in Florida’s impaired waterbodies, recognizing that multiple sources contribute to nutrient loading, including, but not limited to, wastewater and septic systems, industrial, agricultural, and residential water use.
- GATE 24. The Florida Association of Counties supports policies that enhance regional and local financial capacity to address water supply development with allocation flexibility in all available funding sources.
- GATE 25. The Florida Association of Counties supports the funding of the Water Protection and Sustainability Program within the Department of Environmental Protection for the development of alternative water supplies, water quality improvement projects, and comprehensive water infrastructure needs.
- GATE 26. The Florida Association of Counties supports the “Florida Green Industries Best Management Practices” as a basic level of water quality protection, with more stringent protections authorized to address water bodies in need.
- GATE 27. The Florida Association of Counties supports the economically, technically and environmentally feasible use of reclaimed water with incentivized infrastructure investment and reliable distribution including reuse service areas and prioritized irrigation and nonpotable uses.
- GATE 28. The Florida Association of Counties supports state legislation to prohibit new well stimulation activities, including hydraulic fracturing (fracking).
- GATE 29. The Florida Association of Counties opposes efforts to increase offshore drilling activities.



GATE-PP-1: Beaches and Shores

Committee Recommendation: Adopt

Proposed Policy: **SUPPORT** the creation of a new dedicated and recurring statutory funding source for beach renourishment projects which accurately reflects the increase in participating programs and future beach and inlet project funding needs. **SUPPORT** the revision of statutory criteria for the annual ranking of beach projects for state cost sharing; specifically, the inclusion of criteria that prioritizes dune restoration, where feasible, as an investment in beach protection and preservation, and also recognizes economic benefits and cost effectiveness, the reduction in storm damage, and the ability to leverage federal dollars.

Issue Summary: Florida's beach management program is a partnership between the federal, state, and local governments aimed at addressing beach erosion problems. A predictable, annual funding source for this program, along with updated ranking criteria that better accounts for economic benefits of dune restoration and storm damage reduction, will improve the program's effectiveness.

Background: Florida has 825 miles of sandy coastline, which draw millions of tourists annually and serve as one of the state's primary tourism attractions. Approximately half of Florida beaches are critically eroded. Of the 416 miles critically eroded beaches, only 229 miles are part of an active beach management project.

A 2015 Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR) study concluded that the state's beach management program produced a 5.4 return on investment, with a \$44 million program investment generating an additional \$238 million in state revenue. Additionally, nourished beaches provide significant protection to upland properties against storm damages and coastal flooding, and also provide critical habitat for various species of plants and animals.

During the 2017 Legislative Session, bills were filed to revise the beach renourishment project ranking criteria, adding enhanced emphasis on economic benefits of tourism and storm damage reduction as well as increasing focus on inlet management projects. The bills also directed DEP to develop a three-year work plan for beach management. Additionally, the Senate proposal (SB 1590) would have appropriated the lesser of \$50 million or 7.6 percent of available Land Acquisition Trust Funds (LATF) annually to fund beach renourishment and inlet management projects. While the bills did not pass, the beach management program did receive \$50 million in funding, including \$30 million from the LATF.

Analysis:

Past funding amounts are no longer sufficient to meet Florida's needs. A simple adjustment for inflation would require \$54 million in 2017 dollars annually. This does not account for the fact that, since 1998, the number of miles participating in the program has increased by 50 percent. Funding half of the project requests over the last few years would require nearly \$50 million annually, and annualizing beach and inlet project funding needs over the next 20 years would require roughly \$60 million.

Fiscal Impact: Significant positive impact when local government cost share is calculated, dependent upon the project submitted.



GATE-PP-2: Real Property in Flood Zones

Committee Recommendation: Adopt

Proposed Policy: **SUPPORT** a statutory change to Section 163.3178, F.S. that clarifies for state and local officials how risk reduction is evaluated in special flood hazard areas (SFHA), as shown on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs).

Issue Summary:

Address language in sec. 163.3178(2)(f)2. which requires local comprehensive plans to include provisions that will result in removal of real property from Flood Zone designations established by FEMA. The statute should be amended to encourage reducing or eliminating flood risks.

Background:

This is a glitch issue. Following the 2015 Legislative Session, Governor Scott signed into law SB 1094, which allows private insurance companies to sell flexible flood insurance in Florida. The bill also included language requiring coastal counties to add language into their comprehensive plans addressing flood mitigation. However, one of the provisions, as written, has been interpreted differently by county governments and the State Land Planning Agency (Department of Economic Opportunity). Specifically, the provision calls for counties to *“[e]ncourage the use of best practices development and redevelopment principles....and engineering solutions that result in the removal of coastal real property from flood zone designations established by FEMA.”* The concern is that counties may not be able to authorize development in many coastal areas if this statute is not changed.

Analysis:

One interpretation of the provision is that the county would be required to purchase properties located in coastal flood zones; however, another interpretation is that counties need only to take measures that reduce the flood risk of coastal properties in a way that has the effect of having the property no longer in mapped in a flood zone.

Fiscal Impact:

This statute has the potential of putting a freeze on construction and replacement of damaged property in coastal communities.



GATE-PP-3: Medical Marijuana

Committee Recommendation: Withdraw from Consideration

Proposed Policy: Support amending state law to clarify that local governments may specify allowable locations for cultivation and processing facilities through zoning ordinances or land development regulations.

Issue Summary:

Florida Statute 381.986 provides for regulation of Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers, preempting local zoning authority. The text of the preemption language is found in the “History” section below. As the statute preempts Medical Marijuana Treatment centers in different ways for different subtypes (Cultivation, Processing, Dispensing, Delivery) the subtypes have been identified with different colors to clarify which preemptions apply to which subtypes in the text of the Statute. These exceptions to the general preemption are clear regarding Dispensary locations and the applicability of the Florida Building Code and Florida Fire Prevention Code to all types of Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers. However, the preemption and remnant local authority related to Cultivation and Processing is unclear and contradictory, especially in terms of the licensing application requirements of the state. While the statute preempts all regulation of cultivation and processing (except for the prohibition to locate a cultivation and processing center within 500’ of a school,) the State Office of Medical Marijuana Use requires all applicants to submit a zoning verification letter from the local government for their proposed cultivation and processing location, along with their application package. It has been suggested that it was not the intent of the state to preempt local zoning in its entirety, but that local governments would be able to determine whether the marijuana cultivation and processing use was compatible with the subject zoning district based on an administrative determination basis as compared with “like” uses. While staff finds this possible intent to be unclear at best, based on a straightforward reading of the Statute, there are no “like” uses in the St. Lucie County Land Development Code. No codified Permitted or Conditional Use combines an indoor agricultural cultivation use with an industrial processing use. Therefore, in order to issue a Zoning Verification letter for a combined MMTC Cultivation and Processing use, an amendment to the Code is needed, adding the new use type to a zoning district. Based on the statutory preemption language, staff believes this would put St. Lucie County in a potentially adverse legal position. Staff requests the Legislature either clarify the language or rescind the preemption for MMTC Cultivation and Processing.

Background:

Florida Statute 381.986 provides for regulation of Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers, preempting local zoning authority, as follows: (11) PREEMPTION.—Regulation of cultivation,



processing, and delivery of marijuana by medical marijuana treatment centers is preempted to the state except as provided in this subsection. (a) A medical marijuana treatment center cultivating or processing facility may not be located within 500 feet of the real property that comprises a public or private elementary school, middle school, or secondary school. (b) 1. A county or municipality may, by ordinance, ban medical marijuana treatment center dispensing facilities from being located within the boundaries of that county or municipality. A county or municipality that does not ban dispensing facilities under this subparagraph may not place specific limits, by ordinance, on the number of dispensing facilities that may locate within that county or municipality. 2. A municipality may determine by ordinance the criteria for the location of, and other permitting requirements that do not conflict with state law or department rule for, medical marijuana treatment center dispensing facilities located within the boundaries of that municipality. A county may determine by ordinance the criteria for the location of, and other permitting requirements that do not conflict with state law or department rule for, all such dispensing facilities located within the unincorporated areas of that county. Except as provided in paragraph (c), a county or municipality may not enact ordinances for permitting or for determining the location of dispensing facilities which are more restrictive than its ordinances permitting or determining the locations for pharmacies licensed under chapter 465. A municipality or county may not charge a medical marijuana treatment center a license or permit fee in an amount greater than the fee charged by such municipality or county to pharmacies. A dispensing facility location approved by a municipality or county pursuant to former s. 381.986(8)(b), Florida Statutes 2016, is not subject to the location requirements of this subsection. (c) A medical marijuana treatment center dispensing facility may not be located within 500 feet of the real property that comprises a public or private elementary school, middle school, or secondary school unless the county or municipality approves the location through a formal proceeding open to the public at which the county or municipality determines that the location promotes the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community. (d) This subsection does not prohibit any local jurisdiction from ensuring medical marijuana treatment center facilities [all subtypes] comply with the Florida Building Code, the Florida Fire Prevention Code, or any local amendments to the Florida Building Code or the Florida Fire Prevention Code.

Analysis:

Places St. Lucie County in a double bind. Preempts all regulation to the state, while requiring a local government zoning verification letter for MMTC Cultivation and Processing applicants. Issuing such a letter, or adopting appropriate zoning for the new use type, may put the County in a legally challengeable position.

Fiscal Impact:

N/A



GATE-PP-4: Medical Marijuana

Committee Recommendation: Withdraw from Consideration

Issue Summary:

Support initiatives that would establish zoning flexibility of medical marijuana dispensaries.

Background:

On November 8, 2016 a referendum to expand the legal cultivation and dispensing of Medical Marijuana passed in the State of Florida. On November 15, 2016, the Board adopted a 180-day moratorium on locating a medical marijuana dispensary in Marion County, that moratorium ended on May 18, 2017. During the moratorium several public hearings were held that led to the adoption of the Medical Marijuana Dispensaries Ordinance on May 16, 2017. On June 28, 2017 Senate Bill 8-A (2017): Medical Use of Marijuana passed the Florida Legislature.

Analysis:

Marion County would like the Legislature to offer additional options to the counties regarding the placement of MMTC.

Current restrictions by state:

- o 500' to public or private school
- o No regulation more restrictive than that for a Pharmacy.

Since a community could opt to ban altogether the placement of a MMTC in their jurisdiction, Marion County would prefer to permit MMTC in a more restrictive manner than SB 8-A includes in the following ways:

- o Include Church and Public Park to Schools for spacing and permit the local government to establish the distance.
- o In lieu of holding Pharmacies as the standard for placement of MMTC, allow the local communities to establish zoning, separation and spacing standards which are no more restrictive than that of On-Site Consumptions of Alcohol. For Marion County those restrictions include Zoning of B-2, B-4 and B-5 (retail and heavy commercial zones) and 1000' to Church, School or Public Park. Additionally a reasonable separation between MMTC (like the State's 1000' separation between Community Residential Homes of 6 or Less) in order to make sure they are properly spread out in the community.

Fiscal Impact:

N/A



GATE-PP-5: Community Redevelopment Agencies

Committee Recommendation: Withdraw from Consideration

Issue Summary:

The Alachua County Commission wants FAC support for a bill concerning the proportional representation of Taxing Authorities on existing and future Community Redevelopment Agencies (CRAs).

Background:

Many counties participate in CRAs and have no representation on the governing body of the CRA. In some cases Counties are the majority contributors.

Analysis:

The effect is as follows: each Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) contributing Taxing Authority that provides at least 20% of the total CRA budget, must have representation on both the Governing Body and the Community Redevelopment Agency, except when the Taxing Authority chooses not to serve on the Governing Board or CRA. The representation should be proportional to the percentage of tax increment each Taxing Authority contributes to the CRA. Community Development Agencies involving municipalities with a population of less than 15,000 are exempt from this proportional representation.

Fiscal Impact:

No State impact. No immediate or automatic fiscal impact to counties. It will give counties more input into the use of their CRA tax increment dollars.



GATE-PP-6: Community Redevelopment Agencies

Committee recommendation: Withdraw from Consideration

Proposed Policy:

Statewide implementation of the CRA related recommendations in the Auditor General's Performance Audit Report No. 2015-037

Issue Summary:

The purpose of the CRA is to eliminate and prevent the development or spread of slum or blighted areas; provide affordable housing to residents of low or moderate income, including the elderly; and may include slum clearance and redevelopment in a community redevelopment area or rehabilitation or conservation in a community redevelopment area, in accordance with a community redevelopment plan. More often than not, local CRAs are not spending dollars appropriately or for reinvestment of blighted areas.

Background:

Every three years, Florida's Auditor General is required by general law to conduct a performance audit of the local government financial reporting system. The system is the set of statutory requirements relating to local government financial reporting that ensures the timely, accurate, uniform, and cost-effective accumulation of financial and other information to assist the Legislature and other appropriate officials accomplish certain specified statutory goals, including enhancing citizen participation in local government, improving the financial condition of local governments, and the efficient and effective provision of local government services, amongst others. The state Auditor General's Office has conducted numerous performance audits of community redevelopment agencies (CRAs) in the last few years, which have found questionable practices in the use of CRA funds and identified areas of the Community Redevelopment Act of 1969 (Act) that could be strengthened to provide greater transparency concerning the use of CRA funds, financial reporting, and CRA governance. In October 2014, the state Auditor General issued Report No. 2015-037, containing its findings and recommendation of its latest performance audit of the local government financial reporting system. The report made specific findings and recommendations relating to community redevelopment agencies, including recommended changes to the Community Redevelopment Act of 1969. The State Legislature filed HB 13 and SB 1770. Both bills would gradually phase out local CRA's.

Analysis:

Statewide implementation of the CRA related recommendations in the Auditor General's Performance Audit Report No. 2015-037, relating to the Local Government Financial Reporting System, would allow CRA's to operate effectively and efficiently. The Audit Recommendations are as follows: 1. Providing more specificity as to the types of expenditures for which redevelopment trust fund revenues may be used, particularly concerning promotional activities;



County Policy Proposal
Submitted by: Broward County
Contact: dsainvil@broward.org

2. Requiring county approval of adopted or amended municipal CRA redevelopment plans. For example, a county requires a municipal CRA plan amendment approval, in only the following instances: (1) a boundary change; (2) an extension to the term of the Plan involving the continuing contribution by the taxing authorities; and (3) a change to the Plan of such magnitude as would require a county or municipal land use plan amendment; 3. Requiring all CRAs to abide by the same redevelopment plan content requirements; 4. Authorizing CRAs to establish reserves for mitigating current and future risks and exempt such reserves from ending fund balance disposition requirements; and 5. Ensuring financial audits of CRA trust funds include a determination of compliance with Section 163.387(6), F.S. and Section 163.387(7), F.S., relating the expenditure of CRA trust fund revenues and disposition of unexpended CRA trust fund balances.

Fiscal Impact:

Indeterminate fiscal impact.



GATE-PP-7: Impact Fee Waiver - Affordable Housing

Committee Recommendation: Withdraw from Consideration

Issue Summary:

Manatee County would like FAC to consider support for a statutory revision that will allow local governments to consider a partial or full waiver for the collection of impact fees for affordable housing.

Background:

The affordable housing inventory in Manatee County is scarce as property values soar and homeowners increasingly choose to rent their properties as short-term rentals rather than more traditional extended leases. In the interest of reducing the overall cost of an affordable home, Manatee County SUPPORTS legislation that will amend Florida Statutes (F.S. 163.31801) to give local governments that collect school and government impact fees the ability to consider waiving or partially reducing only government-related impact fees for affordable housing projects.

Analysis:

Local governments that collect impact fees would now have the option of waiving impact fees for affordable housing construction, creating extra incentive for builders to construct affordable homes.

Fiscal Impact:

Governments will need to find a revenue source to pay for infrastructure improvements that otherwise would have been paid through impact fee revenues for the affordable home(s) being constructed. In Manatee County, an impact fee reserve could be drawn down to pay those costs.

APPENDIX

2018 FAC LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE

FAC'S POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The core mission of the Florida Association of Counties (FAC) is to help counties effectively serve and represent Floridians by strengthening and preserving county home rule through advocacy, education and collaboration. FAC provides county officials with an array of legislative activities to carry out this mission.

FAC's Policy Development Process

The Florida Association of Counties has a deliberative, consensus building policy development process. The goal is to solicit and develop policy proposals and guiding principles on legislative issues affecting county government. Through participation in four standing legislative policy committees, and two caucuses, county officials identify, discuss, and ultimately vote on issues to be in FAC's Legislative Program. The four standing legislative policy committees include the following:

Finance, Tax and Administration (FTA)

The **FTA** committee primarily focuses on issues related to taxation, local revenue, state shared revenue, economic development, local fiscal administration, local administrative and management issues, and intergovernmental relations (constitutional officers).

Growth Management, Agriculture, Transportation & Environmental (GATE)

The **GATE** committee primarily focuses on issues related to Development, Planning and Zoning, Affordable Housing, State and Regional Transportation. Water Quantity and Water Quality, and Utilities and Energy.

Health and Safety (HS)

The **HS** committee primarily focuses on issues related to Behavioral and Mental Health, Healthcare and Human Services Funding and Policy, Emergency Medical Services, Law Enforcement and Corrections, and Emergency Management.

Federal Policy Committee

FAC maintains and facilitates a **Federal Policy Committee** to address similar policy issues encountered at the state level but that are initiated at the federal level.

Each policy committee includes one presidentially appointed Chair and Vice Chair, and several presidentially appointed Policy Leaders. These roles collectively serve as the Committee Leadership for the respective policy committees.

FAC policy committees are referred to as "committees of the whole," meaning that committee participation, as well as voting, is open to any interested county commissioner who is in attendance at the policy committee meetings that take place during conference. County staff persons are encouraged to participate in discussion and provide input, but are not permitted to vote.

Each policy committee has one FAC staff point person, who will coordinate Committee Leadership calls, policy committee meetings, and provide education on issues within the committee's purview.

FAC Policy Proposals

Policy proposals are single-purpose statements addressing a specific and relevant issue or piece of legislation. Submitted proposals must address an issue of statewide, regional, or significant and widespread impact and cannot promote individual county or project appropriations. Individual counties or commissioners, or FAC were permitted to submit policy proposals during the summer of 2017.

FAC's Guiding Principles

FAC's guiding principles have been revised and re-purposed to serve as the association's long-term platform. This platform will serve to provide ongoing direction and guidance to members and staff with regard to advocacy on multiple issues over a prolonged period of time. Thereby allowing FAC to focus its annual workplan on more short-term and immediate actions and priorities.

Pre-Policy Conference - Summer 2017

County Commissioners, statewide, were invited to submit statements and/or issues addressing a specific issue or piece of legislation. These submissions were vetted by staff to make sure that the proposals addressed an issue of statewide, regional, or significant and widespread impact. Staff made recommendations to each policy committee with regard to the disposition of each submittal. In turn, each policy committee debated the merits of all proposals and made recommendations on their disposition to be considered at FAC's 2017 Policy Conference in Osceola County, Florida.

Policy Conference - September 2017

During the 2017 Policy Conference, each committee held an open meeting to review and debate policy proposals within their respective jurisdiction. The meetings were open to the general membership of FAC and each proposal was voted upon by all commissioners. Proposals were either tentatively adopted, deferred for further discussion at the 2017 Legislative Conference in Sarasota, Florida, or not adopted.

FAC staff proposed a new set of guiding principles to be considered by the general membership of the association. The guiding principles, as proposed by staff, represent a long-term plan of issues that the association will advocate on for on behalf of its membership. The guiding principles were tentatively adopted and then submitted to the entire membership for a three-week period in October for comments and proposed revisions.

Legislative Conference - November 2017

During the 2017 FAC Legislative Conference the general membership of FAC will be able to discuss, debate and vote on the final 2018 Legislative action plan and guiding principles for the association.

Legislative Executive Committee (LEC) - 2018 Legislative Session

The LEC is comprised of the following members: the FAC Executive Committee; the Chairs and Vice Chairs of each policy committee; and the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Rural and Urban Caucuses. During the course of the legislative session, the LEC meets weekly via conference call and is responsible for any revision, modification, deletion or addition to the policy statements adopted by the membership, and may make interim policy decisions as needed.

2017-2018 FAC POLICY AND CAUCUS CHAIRS, VICE CHAIRS, & POLICY LEADERS

Finance, Tax & Administration

Laura Youmans, Staff

Brian Sullivan, Staff

Chip LaMarca, Broward County, Chair

Carolyn Ketchel, Okaloosa County, Vice-Chair

Jack Richie, Highlands County, Policy Leader

Carl Zalak, Marion County, Policy Leader

Scott Carnahan, Citrus County, Policy Leader

Nancy Detert, Sarasota County, Policy Leader

Ralph Thomas, Wakulla County, Policy Leader

Donald O'Brien, Flagler County, Policy Leader

Charles Smith, Manatee County, Policy Leader

Linda Bartz, St. Lucie County, Policy Leader

Betsy Vanderley, Orange County, Policy Leader

Mack Bernard, Palm Beach County, Policy Leader

Kelly Owens, Okeechobee County, Policy Leader

Peggy Choudhry, Osceola County, Policy Leader

Susan Adams, Indian River, Policy Leader

Growth, Agriculture, Transportation & Environment

Susan Harbin, Staff

Lee Constantine, Seminole County, Chair

Daniella Levine Cava, M-Dade County, Vice-Chair

Peter O'Bryan, Indian River County, Policy Leader

John Meeks, Levy County, Policy Leader

Terry Burroughs, Okeechobee County, Policy Leader

Charles Chestnut, Alachua County, Policy Leader

Weston Pryor, Glades County, Policy Leader

Bill Truex, Charlotte County, Policy Leader

Janet Long, Pinellas County, Policy Leader

Emily Bonilla, Orange County, Policy Leader

Timothy Sullivan, Lake County, Policy Leader

Cathy Townsend, St. Lucie County, Policy Leader

Ronald Kitchen, Citrus County, Policy Leader

Jim Barfield, Brevard County, Policy Leader

Alan Maio, Sarasota County, Policy Leader

Health, Human Services & Public Safety

Robert Brown, Staff

Sally Heyman, Miami-Dade County, Chair

Rob Williamson, Santa Rosa County, Vice-Chair

John Hall, Polk County, Policy Leader

Lee Pinkoson, Alachua County, Policy Leader

Brandon Arrington, Osceola County, Policy Leader

Michael Swindle, Hendry County, Policy Leader

Stacy White, Hillsborough County, Policy Leader

Charles Hines, Sarasota County, Policy Leader

Heather Post, Volusia County, Policy Leader

William Chapman, Walton County, Policy Leader

Federal Committee

Eric Poole, Staff

Heather Carruthers, Monroe County, Chair

Tod Mowery, St. Lucie County, Vice-Chair

Bill Truex, Charlotte County, Policy Leader

Brian Hamman, Lee County, Policy Leader

Rob Williamson, Santa Rosa County, Policy Leader

Doug Smith, Martin County, Policy Leader

Michael Moran, Sarasota County, Policy Leader

Barbara Sharief, Broward County, Policy Leader

Carl Zalak, Marion County, Policy Leader

Sean Parks, Lake County, Policy Leader

Charlie Justice, Pinellas County, Policy Leader

Kathryn Starkey, Pasco County, Policy Leader

Cheryl Sanders, Franklin County, Policy Leader

John Meeks, Levy County, Policy Leader

Ralph Thomas, Wakulla County, Policy Leader

Rural Caucus

Laura Youmans, Staff

Cheryl Sanders, Franklin County, Chair

Larry Harvey, Putnam County, Vice-Chair

Weston Pryor, Glades County, Policy Leader

Terry Burroughs, Okeechobee County, Policy Leader

John Meeks, Levy County, Policy Leader

James Brooks, Highlands County, Policy Leader

Brenda Holt, Gadsden County, Policy Leader

Urban Caucus

Robert Brown, Staff

Matthew Schellenberg, Duval County, Chair

Mary Lou Berger, Palm Beach County, Vice-Chair

Audrey Edmonson, M-Dade County, Policy Leader

Pete Clarke, Orange County, Policy Leader

Janet Long, Pinellas County, Policy Leader

Les Miller, Hillsborough County, Policy Leader

Charlie Justice, Pinellas County, Policy Leader

