



CUA-PP-1: REMOTE MEETINGS

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Adopt

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC **SUPPORTS** legislation authorizing local governing bodies and other local boards and committees to meet remotely.

BACKGROUND: Governor Ron Desantis issued Executive Order No. 20-52 on March 9, 2020, declaring a state of emergency related to the spread of COVID-19 and instituting social distancing guidelines and other protective measures consistent with guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control. The effect of this order was to require local government meetings to comply with the CDC guidelines imposing social distancing and limiting the number of people who could be in a room at one time.

Since March 20, 2020, local governments have been authorized by Executive Order 20-69 to hold remote meetings. This allowed commissioners and members of other local government boards attending remotely to count towards a quorum, allowing the body to take action. This allowance is particularly important for boards and bodies with members in at-risk groups (over age 65 or with pre-existing conditions), whose members live with at-risk individuals, or who had members that may have been subject to quarantine for exposure and thus unable to attend in person.

This order only affected the requirement that board members attend in person and did not affect any requirements related to public accessibility, notice, or input at meetings. Though the move to hybrid or remote meetings did require changes to local meeting practices and procedures, these changes were done consistent with the existing laws and statutes governing public access.

ANALYSIS: In many cases, the terms Governor's emergency declaration and associated CDC guidelines required local government bodies to completely suspend public meetings or to develop remote meeting procedures to minimize physical interaction of the participants. Attorney General Ashley Moody issued an Advisory Opinion 2020-03 on March 19 opining that local government bodies could meet remotely, if authorized by statute or state of emergency declaration. Importantly, the provisions that required variance dealt only with statutorily implied in-person meeting requirements for *board members*.

Consistent with AGO 2020-03, on March 20, Governor Desantis issued Executive Order No. 20-69 suspending statutes requiring a quorum to be present, requiring a local government body to



meet at a specific public place, and authorizing local government bodies to use communications media technology such as telephonic and video conferencing. EO 20-69 has been extended in compliance with the Governor’s emergency powers through September 30. This authorization has allowed local governments, at their discretion, to meet remotely in compliance with social distancing guidelines avoiding unnecessary physical interaction between elected officials, staff, and the public. Remote meetings have allowed local government to provide continuity for budgets, contracts, and procurement decisions; ensured that development approvals continued; and has permitted local elected officials to take action to protect the health, safety and welfare of their communities during the worst days of the pandemic to continue in the Sunshine.

Article 1, section 24(b) of the Florida Constitution requires that all meetings of the collegial boards governing counties be open and noticed to the public whenever official acts, such as the adoption of a budget, are taken or when other public business is to be transacted and discussed. Section 286.011(1) declares meetings of any board or commission of any state agency, county, city, or political subdivision to be public meetings to be taken and must be open to the public at all times. In AGO 20-03, Attorney General Moody notes that, though there is no case law on point, a series of Attorney General Opinions have established the general rule that members of a board may participate in and vote at meetings remotely, but that a quorum of the board’s members must still be physically present to take action.¹

These general provisions govern the public meetings and, since neither expressly requires an in-person quorum or specifies a means to meet, the Legislature was free to authorize most state agencies to hold public meeting via “communications media technology” in 1997. The Legislature has subsequently authorized numerous other public entities to conduct meetings using communications media technology.² Florida court proceedings are not subject to the

¹ Op. Atty’ Gen. Fla. 83-100 (1983), opining that a county could not conduct a meeting unless members constituting a quorum were physically present; Op. Atty’ Gen. Fla. 92-44 (1992), Op. Atty’ Gen. Fla. 98-28, and Op. Atty’ Gen. Fla. 2002-82 (2002) establishing that board members could vote in a meeting where a quorum was physically present; Op. Atty’ Gen. Fla. 2003-41 (2003) concluding that a member participating remotely could not be counted toward a quorum; Op. Atty’ Gen. Fla. 2010-34 (2010) finding that an ordinance could not authorize a local government board to meet the quorum requirement.

² Entities created under subsection (7) of the Florida Interlocal Cooperation Act of 1969 section 163.01, Fla. Stat. (2019); Water management district governing board, committees, and advisory boards. Section 373.079(7), Fla. Stat. (2019); Florida Inland Navigation District (Sec. 374.983(3)); Meetings of the Florida Building Commission and any meetings associated therewith. 553.75(3); Charter school governing boards 1002.33(9)(p)3; Jacksonville Transportation authority (though a quorum is still required to be physically present) § 349.04(8), Fla. Stat. (2019).



Sunshine Law, but the participants are entitled to due process under the constitution, which tends to require greater notice and access than that required by the Sunshine Law. Both Florida and Federal Courts have begun holding civil hearings virtually, allowing both evidence and testimony to be taken using communication meeting technology. A few Florida courts have also impaneled juries. This would imply that the courts believe that the virtual meeting procedures can comply with the due process requirements of both the U.S. and Federal Constitution.

FISCAL IMPACT: None

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: FAC Staff

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: Not Applicable



CUA-PP-2: REMOTE MEETINGS DURING STATE OF EMERGENCY

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Adopt

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC **SUPPORTS** legislation granting an exemption for county elected officials to be able to participate in emergency-related briefings during a declared state of emergency.

BACKGROUND: Charlotte County is seeking FAC's support for a bill amending s. 286.011, F.S., providing an exemption for county elected officials to be able to participate in emergency-related briefings during a declared state of emergency.

The terrible COVID-19 pandemic has revealed serious opportunities across all levels of government to improve efficiency and effectiveness during a declared state of emergency. Several times throughout this rolling crises it has become increasingly clear that allowing an exemption for county elected officials to participate in emergency-related briefings would allow for a more fluid and responsive discussion and execution of policy issues among our county leadership.

ANALYSIS: Charlotte County is concerned that our counties response in future rolling crises or multiple crises will be limited without such an exemption. Charlotte County believes that the exemption provides a reasonable prevention of abuse given that this exemption only occurs during a declared state of emergency. This means that the initiating agent for this exemption of Sunshine Law isn't rooted in the county elected officials but the Governor of the State of Florida.

FISCAL IMPACT: Indeterminate

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Charlotte

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: Unknown



CUA-PP-3: AFFORDABLE HOUSING IMPACT FEES

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Adopt

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC **SUPPORTS** amending s. 163.3180, F.S. – Concurrency, to include *affordable housing unit construction* in the definition of *capital facility*, and require affordable housing units funded by impact fees to remain *affordable* for 30 years.

BACKGROUND: In 2019, the Legislature approved Ch. 2019-165, L.O.F., which authorizes counties and municipalities to continue using inclusionary housing ordinances that require a developer to provide a specified number or percentage of affordable housing units within a development or, in lieu of, allow a developer to contribute to a housing fund or other alternative. In exchange, however, a county or municipality must provide incentives to fully offset all costs to the developer for its affordable housing contribution. Incentives may include: Allowing the developer density or intensity bonus incentives or more floor space than allowed under the current or proposed future land use designations; Reducing or waiving fees, such as impact fees or water and sewer charges. Additionally, the law codifies the dual rational nexus test by requiring an impact fee to be proportional and have a rational nexus both to the need for additional capital facilities and to the expenditure of funds collected and the benefits accruing to the new construction. Local governments must designate the funds collected from impact fees for acquiring, constructing, or improving capital facilities to benefit new users.

ANALYSIS: Amend s. 163.3180, F.S. – Concurrency, to include “affordable housing unit construction” in the definition of “capital facility.” This would provide stronger authority for the counties to apply impact fees for affordable housing to commercial development by defining affordable housing as a “capital facility” under state law. In addition, affordable housing impact fees would provide a source of revenue for the funding of affordable housing programs and projects, and ultimately increase the supply of affordable housing units. Require that affordable projects funded by impact fees, remain affordable over the long term (e.g., minimum of 30 years); doing this will most likely result in commercial developments paying additional impact fees. County residents would benefit from an increased number of affordable housing units. Local governments would benefit from collection of impact fees to fund affordable housing programs and projects, and affordable housing developers and agencies would benefit from increased funding. Affordable housing is one of the most critical issues facing Broward County. While we are expecting a significant increase in job growth



across the county and region, the shortage of affordable workforce housing has risen exponentially. Recently, Florida International University's Metropolitan Center updated a 2014 Rational Nexus Study for Broward County. The Study found that new commercial and residential development create demand for new affordable housing, resulting in a rational nexus between development and the imposition of impact fees required under state law. More than 911,000 very low-income households pay more than 50% of their income on housing and these individuals and families are one missed paycheck away from homelessness. Local governments must designate the funds collected from impact fees for acquiring, constructing, or improving capital facilities to benefit new users.

FISCAL IMPACT: This proposal would increase county funding available for affordable housing.

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Broward County, Commissioner Nan Rich

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: Yes



CUA-PP-4: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - SHIP

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Adopt

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC **SUPPORTS** changing the formula for local housing fund distribution so that counties can allocate housing funds in a manner most effective for their local housing market, this includes reducing the percentage of funds required to be distributed for homeownership and allowing counties to increase the percentage reserved for rental housing up to 50% of the funds available.

BACKGROUND: The two critical cites are 420.9075 (5)(a) which "requires" 65% of the awarded SHIP funding to be used for home ownership and (5)(b) which indicates 25% of the funding "may" be used for rental housing.

ANALYSIS: Since the Great Recession, all of the urban counties in Florida have a much greater need for rental housing than home ownership. Also, due to the extreme home prices in Broward County specifically, only 13% of ALL families in the county can afford the median priced home (\$365,000 per home). Florida Housing Finance Corporation also has confirmed that Broward County is the last ranked county in the State and has less than 25 affordable units for every 100 families earning less than 60% of area median income. We strongly suggest that the language in FS 420.9075 be modified to allow up to 50% of funding for home ownership and up to 50% of the funding for multifamily rental housing. A Countywide Affordable Housing Analysis conducted by Florida International University's Jorge M. Perez Metropolitan Center for Broward County supports this conclusion. Full Report: <https://metropolitan.fiu.edu/research/services/economic-and-housing-market-analysis/affordable-housing-needs-2018.pdf> . No direct fiscal impact, but it would allow for a redistribution of existing strategies.

FISCAL IMPACT: None

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Commissioner Nan Rich, Broward County

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: Community and Urban Affairs

BOARD SUPPORT: No Action



CUA-PP-5: MOBILE HOME REGULATION REVIEW

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Adopt

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC **SUPPORTS** legislation requiring a review of state laws applicable to manufactured homes and park communities, as it relates to the clarification of state and municipal regulatory requirements, obligations, and authority.

BACKGROUND:

Manufactured housing is a significant form of unsubsidized affordable housing in the state. With approximately 612,900 manufactured housing units, of which 463,685 are owner-occupied, combined with the overall shortfall of affordable housing, preserving this type of housing remains a priority in addressing the broader discussion of present-day housing issues. Such an endeavor relies heavily on the clarity of state laws and the ability to effectively solve modern-day problems. Local governments, park owners, and residents alike are oftentimes uncertain of who ultimately has the authority to implement and enforce policies and procedures which ensure the safety, equity, and overall well being of these communities. In the absence of clarity, this can lead to situations where no such policies are followed.

ANALYSIS:

A review of state statutes that are applicable to manufactured homes will identify any inconsistencies or shortfalls that may currently exist. Areas for consideration include, but are not limited to, owner and resident duties and responsibilities, rental increases and fees, the sale of manufactured home parks, and enforcement authority. This will enable state and local policy makers to put forward additional solutions for the challenges that exist. Manufactured homeowners are often low-to-moderate-income, senior citizens, or on a fixed income, creating the need to provide a range of adequate safe and resilient, affordable housing units. An example of issues that fuel these challenges include: environment of a high number of manufactured housing units that have exceeded their life span; reduced vacancies; rising land costs and interest to extract more value from the land via change of use; and absentee landowners.

FISCAL IMPACT: None



SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Pinellas, Brian Lowack

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: Unknown.



CUA-PP-6: NUISANCES IN UNPLATTED SUBDIVISIONS:

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Adopt.

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC SUPPORTS legislation to expand §60.05, Florida Statutes, dealing with nuisance abatement, to allow local governments to address nuisances within unrecorded subdivisions meeting certain criteria regarding size, ownership, and noisome activities.

BACKGROUND:

A number of years ago, Polk County began exploring legislation to address the impact of several of the approximate 32 unrecorded subdivisions in the county meeting the criteria in the proposed legislation. This consideration was coupled with increased law enforcement efforts, creation of an MSTU, and installation of gates and fencing, which yielded positive short-term results and the proposed legislation suspended. The noisome activities have expanded dramatically after the short-term reprieve and the legislation is needed now more than ever. With approximately 32 such subdivisions, ranging from benign to major law enforcement problems, law enforcement agencies are challenged in enforcing the laws where property boundaries are difficult to determine, there is widespread lawlessness, and it is unsafe for deputies to respond to requests for services. It is believed based upon media searches that such problem areas exist in many other counties in the state of Florida.

FISCAL IMPACT: Not Applicable

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Polk County, Michael Craig

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: Yes



CUA-PP-7: VACATION RENTAL TAX REMITTANCE

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Adopt

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC **SUPPORTS** legislation requiring taxes associated with vacation home rental to be provided in a format specified by each collection authority and/or outlined in a local ordinance pertaining to the collection of taxes.

BACKGROUND: This proposal would support several county tax collectors in their efforts to ensure that vacation rentals are remitting bed taxes. On March 25, 2020, the 4th District Court of Appeal ruled that vacation rental platforms, such as AirBnB, were not “dealers” under the statutes governing collection and remittance of Tourism Development Taxes (“TDT”). Instead, the court held that vacation rental property owners are “dealers” responsible for collecting the taxes from renters and remitting the taxes to the collection authorities. This decision will require many tax collectors to change processes and software to enable the collection of TDT from many different property owners, as opposed to two or three platforms.

ANALYSIS: The proposed language would authorize local officials to establish the manner by which TDT “dealers” remit taxes to the local government.

FISCAL IMPACT: Not Applicable

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Palm Beach County, Rebecca Delarosa

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: Yes



CUA-PP-8: FLEET ELECTRIFICATION

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Adopt.

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC **SUPPORTS** legislation to encourage the state to develop electric vehicle acquisition policies including preference for low/no emission vehicles, allowing cost to own to justify EV purchase and municipal leasing mechanisms to gain access to federal EV tax credits.

BACKGROUND:

The United States is in the midst of a transportation revolution. It is important that Florida—with the nation's third largest market share with over 60,000 light-duty electric vehicles — accelerate transportation electrification. The electrification of public fleets and clean transportation is also paramount and will demonstrate a commitment to public health especially for frontline communities. Electrifying transportation is key to protecting health by making the air we breathe cleaner. Also key during this time of economic insecurity, is the opportunity for citizens to save money is paramount. EVs save taxpayers money, as shown by recent analysis by the City of Seattle. When considering the lifetime costs of ownership, it is already less expensive to own an EV than a fossil-fueled vehicle for many Americans. With battery prices continuing to fall, the sticker price of EVs are expected to reach parity by 2024. And even with COVID-19 gasoline prices electricity is roughly 1/3 the cost of gasoline.

Additionally, EVs require much less in maintenance. Seattle determined they would save \$2 million over 10 years if they purchased 300 Nissan Leafs instead of hybrids for its passenger vehicles due to fuel and maintenance cost savings. These fleet goals could be achieved by, and we encourage the state to develop electric vehicle acquisition policies including preference for low/no emission vehicles, allowing cost to own to justify EV purchase and municipal leasing mechanisms to gain access to federal EV tax credits. Leveraging volume purchasing can encourage advantageous pricing and increase EV model availability. Additionally, modifying state contract procurement policies would reduce the barrier of limited model availability by allowing purchase of the flux of EV models entering the market. Florida is deploying VW settlement dollars to develop charging infrastructure.

ANALYSIS: We encourage the state to use remaining settlement funds to finance electrification of school, transit and shuttle buses at Florida's school districts, transit districts, and



municipalities. Transportation electrification, from private vehicles to public transit and heavy duty fleets, will benefit our State. We must also lower the barriers and incentivize uptake to ensure all Floridians realize the range of economic and environmental benefits electrification can produce. Florida's leaders must ensure that the state has a robust EV charging infrastructure. Encouraging the build-out of a statewide public EV charging network is key. To ensure chargers are deployed effectively, though, we need robust utility engagement and investment and routine reassessments given the changing technology landscape. Data from the EV Roadmap being conducted by the Florida Energy Office which is housed in the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services will help identify gaps and identify optimal locations for new charging stations however this assessment should consider the needs of all transportation classes including light-duty, medium duty, buses and freight EVs.

FISCAL IMPACT: Unknown

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Pinellas, Commissioner Janet Long

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: No Action



CUA-PP-10: TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED FUNDING

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

Do not adopt. Already included in guiding principles.¹

PROPOSED POLICY:

FAC SUPPORTS establishing a rule within the state Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD) funding process that allows allocation of an additional 10% over the standard funding to assist with the required tasks of being the CTC.

BACKGROUND: Agencies in each county that are also the Community Transportation Coordinator (CTC) would also be eligible to receive the additional proportion. Manatee County Area Transit (MCAT) is the sole CTC provider in Manatee County. Our service provides regional connections to the St. Petersburg for veterans needing to get to the VA as well as connecting residents to nearby Sarasota. The financial impact of the proposed change would benefit Manatee County Area Transit and other CTC providers in the State.

ANALYSIS: There have been no bills or legislation filed previously. The issue stems from the growing strain on public transportation and the need to provide the important service of getting disadvantaged citizens to and from work, to healthcare appointments, and other essential trips. While some communities around the state have the advantage of several service providers, others are impacted negatively since the current funding rules apply a "one size fits all" structure.

FISCAL IMPACT: Not Applicable.

SUBMITTING COUNTY, CONTACT: Manatee, Chad Butzow

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: No Action

¹ CUA 11-16 cover transportation funding generally. More specially, HSJ 19. The Florida Association of Counties supports policies that protect the Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) trust fund, as well as dedicated state funding for the TD program, including funding to address unmet TD needs in rural areas.



CUA-PP-10: BOCC OVERSIGHT OF COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Defer

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC **SUPPORTS** strengthening county oversight of community redevelopment agencies.

BACKGROUND:

CRA's throughout the state are notorious for misusing or misspending their CRA funding. The local board of County Commissioners, who are responsible for providing this funding, should have some oversight in how this money is used.

ANALYSIS:

Allowing oversight of Community Redevelopment Agencies: 1. Each Board of County Commissioners should have a sitting commissioner serving on the local CRA. 2. Each year the CRA should have to submit their annual budget for approval by the local BOCC. CRA's throughout the state are notorious for misusing or misspending their CRA funding. The local board of County Commissioners, who are responsible for providing this funding, should have some oversight in how this money is used. By opening the books for the local governing body, all parties can be assured the funds are being properly used. The CRA money used by one local community for debt service is an abortion to the process. Levy County will return 800,000 in tax revenue collected by the tax collector, levied by the BOCC, to one local community. Over the years millions in ad valorem revenues have been returned with little to show for the spending.

FISCAL IMPACT: The CRA in Cedar Key will cost the BOCC \$800,000 this year alone.

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Levy, Commissioner John Meeks

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: Yes



CUA-PP-11: SUNSETTING COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Defer.

PROPOSED POLICY: Regulation or Elimination of Community Redevelopment Agencies (CRAs) legislation to eliminate/abolish/sunset current CRAs.

BACKGROUND:

Current practices by many CRAs in the state abuse or misuse the monies intended for revitalization of certain parts their local communities. These are tax dollars collected by the local tax collector, levied by local commissions and in many cases are being misused. Most CRAs do not submit their yearly reports, are never audited, and misspend CRA funds to prop up their general fund. If CRAs can not be eliminated the legislature needs to adopt language that gives the counties some oversight in how these dollars are used.

ANALYSIS:

Cedar Key has managed to get their entire city into a CRA. This is a farce. They have overspent their funding so badly, they currently have much of their future CRA funds leveraged against debt service. The difference between what is collected and where they are locked in in the CRA has become a very sizable amount of money as property values have risen over the years. (Currently \$800K) This money could be used to help all the county citizens, not just a select few.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Currently Levy County returns \$800,000 to one municipality within the county.

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Levy, Commissioner John Meeks

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: Yes



CUA-PP-12: CRA REVENUE CAP

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Adopt.

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC **SUPPORTS** legislation that would allow local governments to cap revenues and determine areas of need moving forward.

BACKGROUND:

While a CRA is a valuable tool for local governments to raise money for capital investment and local economic development in areas of need, local governments can fall victim to the CRA's own success when the TIF revenues generated within the CRA exceed the relative need. In other words: the money can only be spent within the area, even when there are other areas of greater need outside the CRA. Unlocking the TIF dollars would allow for more equitable distribution of tax dollars. While a CRA is a valuable tool for local governments to raise money for capital investment and local economic development in areas of need, local governments can fall victim to the CRA's own success when the TIF revenues generated within the CRA exceed the relative need. By allowing flexibility of funds, a municipality could serve areas of need.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Unknown

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Palm Beach, Commissioner Weiss

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: No Action



CUA-PP-13: LOCAL OPT-OUT OF M-CORES

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Defer.

PROPOSED POLICY: This issue proposes a local opt-out by a local county commission from the construction of a M-CORES corridor in their county.

BACKGROUND:

The legislature passed legislation creating Multi-use Corridors of Regional Economic Significance (M-CORES) in 2019 - the legislation contemplates construction of major roads in three areas of Florida. These roads will be funded by a variety of methods including tolls. This proposal is submitted to secure a "local veto" option that if the local government opposes a route, the project will be re-routed.

The program was signed into law by Governor Ron DeSantis on May 17, 2019. The design and construction of these Multi-use Corridors of Regional Economic Significance (M-CORES) program roads will have a significant impact on the local community. They will have substantial environmental impacts in areas currently undisturbed. The local community should be given a choice as to whether the road should be constructed through the county. The issue is not to kill the project – it is simply to allow the local government to determine whether a project of this nature should be constructed in the county. The Levy County Board of County Commissioners has previously adopted a Resolution Opposing Having the Suncoast Connector run through Levy County.

ANALYSIS:

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is currently working with three task forces studying three specific corridors: • The Suncoast Connector, extending from Citrus County to Jefferson County • The Northern Turnpike Connector, extending from the northern terminus of Florida's Turnpike northwest to the Suncoast Parkway • The Southwest-Central Florida Connector, extending from Collier County to Polk County The task forces will make recommendations to FDOT regarding the potential economic and environmental impacts of the corridor and other factors as specified in the M-CORES legislation. Each task force will issue a final report by November 15, 2020. If feasible, construction is expected to begin no later than December 31, These projects should be delayed due to limit public relating to the COVID-19.



FISCAL IMPACT:

Projects that result from the M-CORES process will be funded in traditional ways - bonds; financing by the Florida Department of Transportation Financing Corporation; advances from the State Transportation Trust Fund; with funds obtained through the creation of public-private partnerships; or by any combination of these means. Toll road revenue will also be used to pay, build, operate and maintain the roadways. Funding used for these projects will effectively divert funding away from high priority state road in local counties that have more of an impact on the local citizens.

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Levy County, Commissioner Lilly Rooks

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: Yes



CUA-PP-14: M-CORES LOCAL SERVICE FUNDING

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Defer

PROPOSED POLICY: FAC **SUPPORTS** additional funding sources for counties that are impacted by the M-CORES projects.

BACKGROUND:

Levy county will probably be home to both segments of the proposed Northern M CORES projects. Both the Turnpike extension and the Suncoast connector will bisect Levy County. The financial impact on the first responder aspect of the proposal is immeasurable. Until the roads are opened and operational, it is difficult to estimate how many accidents could occur.

ANALYSIS:

Additional funding needs to be provided to the counties that are impacted by the various M CORES projects throughout the state of Florida. Funding is critical for infrastructure that will need to be added within these counties. Examples are increased public safety facilities, funding for additional staff, and critical utility infrastructure at all exits/off ramps. Also, planning for interchange management and zoning issues in these locations will need to be addressed. Many of the counties directly affected by these new toll roads do not have the capital or resources to meet these increased demands. With increased traffic through our county on these proposed toll roads, it is inevitable accidents will happen. The demands of the services that will need to be rendered to the public along these proposed routes quite possibly could overwhelm the available services in the counties. Additionally, utility infrastructure around proposed exit/off ramps locations will need enhancements. In many cases, the local governments do not have the resources to install this infrastructure themselves. Planning and interchange management will also be critical for proper adaptation into the local communities. These issues will also need to be addressed. Levy county will probably be home to both segments of the proposed Northern M CORES projects. Both the Turnpike extension and the Suncoast connector will bisect Levy County. The financial impact on the first responder aspect of the proposal is immeasurable. Until the roads are opened and operational, it is difficult to estimate how many accidents could occur. In addition, it is also difficult to grasp how much planning and adding infrastructure will cost at this stage in the project.

FISCAL IMPACT:



New revenue would offset anticipated costs to counties due to increased services necessary to support M-CORES.

SUBMITTING COUNTY AND CONTACT: Levy County, Commissioner Matt Brooks

ASSIGNED COMMITTEE: CUA

BOARD SUPPORT: Yes