

FINAL BILL ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 7207

FINAL HOUSE FLOOR ACTION:
87 Y's 31 N's

SPONSOR: Rep. Aubuchon (Rep. Workman)

GOVERNOR'S ACTION: Approved

COMPANION BILLS: CS/HB 7129, CS/CS/SB 1122, HB 945, SB 1440, HB 987, CS/CS/SB 1904

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

HB 7207 passed the House on May 6, 2011, and subsequently passed the Senate on May 6, 2011. The bill was approved by the Governor on June 2, 2011, chapter 2011-139, Laws of Florida, and took effect on June 2, 2011. This bill focuses the state oversight role in growth management on protecting important state resources and facilities.

This bill, designated as "The Community Planning Act", substantially amends part II of ch. 163, F.S., to reflect the experience of local government planning efforts, to streamline processes and to remove unworkable provisions that delay economic development and result in outcomes that hinder urban development and flexible planning solutions.

This bill amends the necessary components for various required elements within a comprehensive plan. Within the Future Land Use Element, this bill modifies and incorporates provisions relating to "urban sprawl" and modifies the need requirement to be based upon a minimum population. Within the Capital Improvements Element, this bill removes the financial feasibility requirement and requires local governments to list their funded and unfunded capital improvements. This bill also removes specific provisions for optional elements within a local government's comprehensive plan. This bill repeals rule 9J-5 of the Florida Administrative Code (FAC) and incorporates important and relevant definitions and provisions of the rule into statute.

This bill changes the requirements associated with the large-scale planning tools of sector plans and rural land stewardship areas.

This bill streamlines the comprehensive plan amendment process while maintaining public participation in the local government planning process. State review and challenges are focused on protecting important state resources and facilities. This bill removes the twice-a-year limitation on local government adoption of plan amendments.

This bill removes state required concurrency for transportation, parks and recreation, and schools, but allows local governments to continue applying concurrency in these areas without taking any action.

This bill continues to require local governments to evaluate their comprehensive plans once every seven years and to adopt update amendments as necessary, but this bill removes the state requirement for local governments to adopt an evaluation and appraisal report every seven years.

This bill grants a 4-year extension to already approved development of regional impact (DRI) projects, provides exemptions from the DRI review process for certain non-residential developments, and increases the substantial deviation standards for certain job-related types of development.

This bill grants a 2-year extension to certain permits set to expire between January 1, 2012 and January 1, 2014, and provides a 2-year extension for certain permits extended in 2009. However, the cumulative extensions granted to a permit by the Legislature in 2009, 2010, and under this bill may not exceed 4 years.

This bill does not require any updates to a local government's comprehensive plan prior to the regular adoption of update amendments following the required seven year local evaluation of the plan. Part II of ch. 163, F.S., as amended by this bill, continues to provide the minimum standards for Florida's comprehensive growth management system. This bill is not intended to reduce the home rule authority of any local government.

This bill repeals several provisions in law including 163.3189, F.S., relating to the process for amendment of an adopted plan, 163.32465, F.S., relating to the alternative state review pilot program, and rules 9J-5 and 9J-11.023, FAC. The Century Commission for a Sustainable Florida is to be repealed on June 30, 2013.

This document does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill sponsor or House of Representatives.

I. SUBSTANTIVE INFORMATION

A. EFFECT OF CHANGES:

GROWTH MANAGEMENT IN FLORIDA

Current Situation

In 1972, Florida took its first step towards an intergovernmental system of planning by adopting the Environmental Land and Water Management Act that created a program to designate areas of critical state concern¹ and a program to provide increased regulation and regional and state oversight for DRIs² affecting multiple jurisdictions. In 1975, the Legislature passed the Local Government Comprehensive Planning Act that required local governments to adopt comprehensive plans by July 1, 1979, and to manage development according to the adopted plans.

In response to continued rapid growth and the challenges of state and local governments to adequately address development impacts, the Legislature adopted Florida's Growth Management Act in 1985, known officially as "The Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act" (the Act).³ The Act was designed to remedy deficiencies in the 1975 Act by giving more state oversight and control of the planning process to the Department of Community Affairs (DCA), the state's land planning agency. As directed by law, DCA adopted minimum standards for all local plans.⁴ The 1985 Act created the intergovernmental system of planning we know today. Today, every county and municipality is required to adopt a local government comprehensive plan in order to guide future growth and development, and the Act authorizes DCA to review comprehensive plans and plan amendments for compliance with the Act. Other state and regional entities also review local government plans and amendments and provide comments to DCA. With state, regional, and local government oversight, Florida has one of the most comprehensive, regulatory, growth management systems in the country.

Since it was adopted, the Act has been amended in some way almost every year. Recent notable changes occurred in 2005 and 2009.⁵ Since 1985, the Act has been amended to address certain unintended consequences and to provide numerous specific options to meet the needs of a few local governments. In some cases the changes have provided more flexibility, less state oversight and more creative planning tools for local governments, but in other cases, the changes created solutions that were inflexible and unworkable for all but a few local governments.

Florida's growth management system today is much different than it was in 1985. Currently, every local government has a comprehensive plan in place containing required elements along with adopted local land use regulations to implement the plan. Local governments that were inexperienced and unsophisticated in land use planning in 1985 are now more sophisticated and many have employed creative planning techniques to guide the future growth of their communities. Though the specific criteria and guidelines put into law in 1985 were designed to help local governments manage their growth, some requirements have hindered the ability of local governments to effectively manage growth and promote economic development within their communities.

Effect of the Bill

This bill substantially amends part II of ch. 163, F.S., in order to modernize Florida's growth management laws. In addition, this bill recognizes the progress that local governments have made since the 1985 Growth Management Act was first adopted by providing local governments with greater local control over planning decisions that affect the growth of their communities. This bill preserves part II of ch.163, F.S., as the minimum standards for Florida's comprehensive growth management system. This bill also preserves the opportunities in current law for public participation in the local planning

¹ See s. 380.05, F.S.

² See s. 380.06, F.S.

³ See ch. 163, pt. II, F.S.

⁴ Rule 9J-5, F.A.C. (Minimum Criteria for Review of Local Government Comprehensive Plans and Determination of Compliance).

⁵ See ch. 2005-157, ch. 2005-290, ch. 2005-291, ch. 2009-85, ch. 2009-96, L.O.F.

process and maintains the broad standing for affected persons to challenge a plan or plan amendment adopted by a local government. In addition, this bill focuses the state's role in the growth management process to one of protecting important state resources and facilities.

CONTENTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Current Situation

The Act requires all local governments to adopt comprehensive land use plans and implement those plans through land development regulations and development orders. Each local government comprehensive plan must include at least two planning periods, one covering at least the first 5-year period after the plan's adoption and one covering at least a 10-year period.

Each comprehensive plan contains chapters or "elements" that address future land use (including a future land use map), housing, transportation, infrastructure, coastal management, conservation, recreation and open space, intergovernmental coordination, capital improvements (and a 5-year capital improvement schedule) and public school facilities. Section 163.3177, F.S., and rule 9J-5, FAC, provide the requirements for elements of local comprehensive plans. The statute also provides for scheduled updates to various elements and imposes penalties for failure to adopt or update elements.

Effect of the Bill

This bill maintains the required comprehensive plan elements in current law but no longer mandates a public school facilities element. Most provisions relating to public school facilities are only required if a local government chooses to maintain school concurrency at the local level. This bill removes many of the state specifications and requirements for optional elements in the comprehensive plan, but specifically states that a local government's comprehensive plan may continue to include optional elements. All mandatory and optional elements of a comprehensive plan and plan amendments are required to be based upon professionally accepted data. Local governments are not required, but may choose to use original data as long as their methodologies are professionally accepted. This bill maintains that a major objective of the planning process is for elements to be coordinated with one another and requires elements within a plan to be consistent with one another. In addition to the 5-year and 10-year planning periods, this bill specifically allows for other planning periods for specific components, elements, land use amendments or projects.

Rule 9J-5

Current Situation

Rule 9J-5, FAC, establishes the minimum criteria for the preparation, review, and determination of compliance of comprehensive plans and plan amendments pursuant to part II of ch. 163, F.S. DCA adopted rule 9J-5, FAC, at the direction of the Legislature in the 1985 Growth Management Act. This rule was important at the time of adoption because it provided the necessary detail and specificity that local governments needed to create their local comprehensive plans. All plans and plan amendments must meet the technical guidelines of rule 9J-5, FAC, in order to be "in compliance" under part II of ch. 163, F.S. Initially, rule 9J-5, FAC, required ratification by the Legislature to become effective. Since that time, DCA has amended the rule several times pursuant to the requirements of ch. 120, F.S.

Effect of the Bill

This bill repeals rule 9J-5, FAC, and incorporates into the law important and relevant definitions and provisions of the rule relating to the contents of and requirements for elements within a comprehensive plan.

Capital Improvements Element

Current Situation

In order to maintain a financially feasible 5-year schedule of capital improvements, the Legislature in 2005 required local governments to update their capital improvements schedule, within their capital improvements element (CIE), as an annual amendment to the comprehensive plan to demonstrate a financially feasible 5-year schedule of capital improvements.⁶ The 5-year schedule of capital

⁶ S. 163.3177(3)(b)1, F.S.

improvements must include specific capital projects necessary to achieve and maintain level-of-service standards identified in other areas of the comprehensive plan, reduce existing deficiencies, provide for necessary replacements, and meet future demand during the time period covered by the schedule. Failure to update can result in penalties such as ineligibility for certain grant programs, or ineligibility for revenue sharing funds. In order to be financially feasible, the CIE must identify sufficient revenues to fund the 5-year schedule of capital improvements. Local governments have had difficulty meeting this requirement.

When the financial feasibility and update requirements were strengthened, local governments had until December 1, 2007, to meet the requirements. The Legislature later extended that date to December 1, 2008. In early 2009, a majority of local governments had failed to submit their financial feasibility reports by the December 1, 2008, deadline. In 2009, the deadline for local governments to comply with the financial feasibility requirement was extended again from December 1, 2008, to December 1, 2011.

Effect of the Bill

This bill requires a local government to review its CIE on an annual basis. Modifications to the capital improvements schedule may be accomplished by ordinance and are not deemed to be amendments to the local comprehensive plan. These changes are a return to the pre-2005 standard. This bill also removes the requirement that the capital improvements element be financially feasible. However, this bill provides that projects necessary to ensure that any adopted level-of-service standards are achieved and maintained for the 5-year period must be listed and identified as either funded or unfunded and given a level of priority for funding.

Future Land Use Plan Element

Current Situation

The future land use element includes a future land use map or map series. The law has numerous requirements relating to the designation of existing and future land uses. Several provisions are specifically mentioned including compatibility of land uses with military bases and airports, siting of schools, and future municipal incorporation.

Effect of the Bill

This bill changes the format of the future land use element provisions to increase readability. Specific requirements from rule 9J-5, FAC, have been added, including provisions relating to urban sprawl. Each map depicting future conditions must reflect the principles, guidelines, and standards within all elements and each such map must be included in the comprehensive plan. This bill requires the future land use element to clearly identify the land use categories in which public schools are an allowable use, but removes outdated language relating to compliance. This bill also removes requirements relating to energy efficiency and green house gas reductions. Further, this bill addresses population projections, the issue of identified need for future development and highlights the need to address outdated land uses, such as antiquated subdivisions. The issues of need, urban sprawl, and antiquated subdivisions are addressed below.

- ***Need***

Effect of the Bill

This bill requires the comprehensive plan to be based upon permanent and seasonal population estimates and projections, which must either be those provided by the University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR), or generated by the local government based upon a professionally acceptable methodology.⁷ This bill requires the future land use plan and plan amendments to be based in part upon the amount of land designated for future planned uses to provide a balance of uses that foster vibrant, viable communities, provide economic development strategies, and address outdated development patterns, such as antiquated subdivisions. This bill requires, as a minimum standard, that the comprehensive plan must accommodate at least the amount of land required to accommodate the medium projections of BEBR for at least a 10-year planning period. However, areas of critical state concern that are limited in their population growth

⁷ Rule 9J-5, FAC.

under s. 380.05, F.S., including related rules of the Administration Commission are not required to plan based on the medium projections of BEBR.

- ***Urban Sprawl***

Current Situation

One of the key components of rule 9J-5, FAC, and of growth management law in Florida is the discouragement of urban sprawl. Land use planning is designed to avoid urban sprawl, which forces limited resources to be allocated to the creation of new infrastructure rather than to maintaining existing infrastructure, thereby creating burdens on local governments, disrupting agricultural land uses, and creating scattered automobile-dependent communities.

Effect of the Bill

This bill provides a definition of urban sprawl and incorporates, from rule 9J-5, FAC, the thirteen primary indicators that a plan or plan amendment does not discourage urban sprawl. In addition, this bill adds eight indicators that a plan or plan amendment discourages urban sprawl. If the future land use element or a plan amendment achieves four of these eight indicators within its development pattern or urban form it will be determined to discourage the proliferation of urban sprawl.

- ***Antiquated Subdivisions***

Current Situation

Because they were created prior to the enactment of land development regulations, areas known as “antiquated subdivisions” share characteristics that hinder their vitality in today’s market, and result in detrimental effects on the local economies and environment. Largely platted throughout the 1950’s and 1960’s, antiquated subdivisions are often predominantly residential land with insufficient space reserved for industrial or commercial enterprises necessary for sustaining the community. Many such subdivisions lack adequate infrastructure including sewer systems and higher capacity arterial roads, and local law enforcement, fire, and emergency services often struggle to reach these remote developed parcels.

Effect of the Bill

This bill requires the future land use plan and plan amendments to be based upon surveys, studies, and data regarding the area, as applicable, including the need to modify land uses and development patterns within antiquated subdivisions. This bill requires the future land use plan and plan amendments to be based in part upon the amount of land designated for future planned uses to provide a balance of uses that foster vibrant, viable communities, provide economic development strategies, and address outdated development patterns, such as antiquated subdivisions. This bill requires the local government to consider outdated subdivisions such as antiquated subdivisions when developing its future land use plan and plan amendments, but it does not require any action by a local government in regards to outdated subdivisions.

Other Comprehensive Plan Elements

Current Situation

Comprehensive plans also must include an element for sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, potable water, and natural groundwater aquifer recharge, as well as elements for transportation, conservation, recreation and open space, housing, and intergovernmental coordination. Coastal counties and municipalities must also adopt a coastal element. The coastal element includes a provision that encourages local governments to adopt recreational surface water use policies. The Office of Program Policy Analysis and Governmental Accountability (OPPAGA) completed a review of the recreational surface water use policies and noted that most local governments were unaware of the 2006 statutory provision and have addressed this issue through other mechanisms.⁸ Currently, the transportation requirements for elements are located in various subsections⁹ of the law, which apply to local

⁸ “Few Local Governments Have Adopted Optional Recreational Surface Water Use Policies,” OPPAGA Report No. 10-58.

⁹ Ss. 163.3177(6)(b), 163.3177(6)(i) – (k) and 163.3177(7)(a) – (d), F.S.

governments with differing characteristics, such as size and whether they are members of a metropolitan planning organization.

Effect of the Bill

Provisions of rule 9J-5, FAC, are included in this bill to provide the necessary direction and guidance for the contents of a comprehensive plan. In the housing element, the provision requiring the element to include principles, guidelines, standards and strategies for energy efficiency and renewable energy resources in the design and construction of new housing is removed. Further, the provision requiring counties meeting certain requirements to adopt a plan for workforce housing has been removed, as well as the limitation on receipt of affordable housing funds if the county fails to adopt such a plan. The provisions relating to assistance in data collection are also removed. In the coastal management element, the optional provisions relating to recreational surface water use policies are removed. In the interlocal agreement element, several redundant provisions, and outdated provisions are removed. This bill combines the multiple subsections of the transportation element into one subsection of law.

PROCESS

Current Situation

DCA is designated as the lead oversight agency, responsible for reviewing comprehensive plans and amendments to determine consistency with state law. Amendments to comprehensive plans generally may be adopted no more than two times during any calendar year; however, over time a number of statutory exceptions have been created for situations where the twice-a-year limit is unworkable.

Traditional State Review Process (s. 163.3184, F.S.)

Section 163.3184, F.S., sets forth the criteria for the adoption of comprehensive plans and amendments to those plans. A local government may amend its comprehensive plan provided certain conditions are met including two advertised public hearings on a proposed amendment before its adoption and review by the state land planning agency. State, regional, and local governmental agencies submit comments on the plan or plan amendment to the state land planning agency, which has the option to review the amendment, unless required to review upon a request from the regional planning council (RPC), an affected person, or the local government transmitting the amendment. If DCA elects to review or is required to review it must issue the local government an objections, recommendations, and comments report (ORC report) regarding whether the plan or plan amendment is “in compliance.”¹⁰ After receiving the report, the local government has 60 days to adopt the amendment, adopt the amendment with changes, or not adopt the amendment.¹¹ Currently, the statutorily prescribed processing timeline for a comprehensive plan amendment requires at a minimum 136 days.¹²

After adoption, within 10 days, the local government must transmit the adopted plan amendment to DCA that has between 20 and 45 days to issue a notice of intent (NOI) to find the amendment either “in compliance” or “not in compliance.”¹³ If DCA issues a NOI to find in compliance, within 21 days any “affected person”¹⁴ may challenge the plan or plan amendment by filing a petition with the Division of

¹⁰ S. 163.3184(1)(b), F.S. defines “in compliance” as “consistent with the requirements of ss. 163.3177, 163.3178, 163.3180, 163.3191, and 163.3245, with the state comprehensive plan, with the appropriate strategic regional policy plan, and with chapter 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code, where such rule is not inconsistent with this part and with the principles for guiding development in designated areas of critical state concern and with part III of chapter 369, where applicable.”

¹¹ The local government has 120 days to hold the second hearing regarding adoption if adopting a new plan or an amendment pursuant to the Evaluation and Appraisal Report.

¹² OPPAGA Report No. 08-62.

¹³ On February 16, 2011, DCA provided written responses to questions posed at the February 9, 2011, meeting of the Community & Military Affairs Subcommittee. DCA stated that “the vast majority of plan amendments [are] announced through a notice of intent published in a local newspaper publication. During FY 2010-2011, about \$390,000 was budgeted for the newspaper publication.”

¹⁴ Section 163.3184(1)(a), F.S., defines “affected person” as “the affected local government; persons owning property, residing, or owning or operating a business within the boundaries of the local government whose plan is the subject of the review; owners of real property abutting real property that is the subject of a proposed change to a future land use map; and adjoining local governments that can demonstrate that the plan or plan amendment will produce substantial impacts on the increased need for publicly funded infrastructure or substantial impacts on areas designated for protection or special treatment within their jurisdiction.”

Administrative Hearings (DOAH), and DCA may intervene in the proceeding. If DCA issues a NOI to find not in compliance the NOI is forwarded to DOAH for a hearing and any affected person may intervene in the proceeding. Depending on the entity initiating the challenge, the administrative law judge's recommended order is submitted to either DCA or the Administration Commission for final agency action.

The burden of proof regarding plans and plan amendments adopted pursuant to s. 163.3184, F.S., is provided in statute based on DCA's NOI determination. If the adopted plan or plan amendment is challenged and the state land planning agency issued a NOI to find in compliance, the plan or plan amendment will be determined to be in compliance if the local government's determination of compliance is "fairly debatable."¹⁵ If the adopted plan or plan amendment is challenged and the state land planning agency issued a NOI to find not in compliance, the local government's determination that the comprehensive plan or plan amendment is in compliance is presumed to be correct and the local government's determination will be sustained unless it is shown by a preponderance of the evidence¹⁶ that the comprehensive plan or plan amendment is not in compliance.

Alternative State Review Process Pilot Program (s. 163.32465, F.S.)

In 2007, the Legislature created a pilot program to provide an alternate, expedited process for plan amendments based on streamlined state agency review. Under the pilot process, selected communities¹⁷ transmit proposed plan amendments directly to specified state agencies and local governmental entities after the first public hearing on the plan amendment. Most plan amendments proposed in the pilot program jurisdictions are required to follow the alternative review process.¹⁸ In 2009, the Legislature authorized any local government to use the alternative state review process to designate an urban service area in its comprehensive plan. State agencies commenting on a plan amendment under the alternative review process may include technical guidance on issues of agency jurisdiction as it relates to part II of ch. 163, F.S. Such comments must clearly identify issues that, if not resolved, may result in an agency challenge to the plan amendment. Comments are sent to the local government proposing the plan amendment within 30 days after the commenting agency receives the amendment.

Following a second public hearing for the purpose of adopting the plan amendment, the local government must transmit the adopted amendment to the state land planning agency and any other state agency or local government that provided timely comments. An affected person, as defined in s. 163.3184(1)(a), F.S., or the state land planning agency may challenge a plan amendment adopted by a pilot community within 30 days after adoption of the amendment. A challenge by the state land planning agency is limited to those issues raised in the comments by the reviewing agencies, however the state land planning agency is encouraged to focus its challenges on issues of regional or statewide importance. The state land planning agency does not issue a report detailing its objections, recommendations, and comments (ORC report) on the proposed amendment or a NOI on the adopted amendment. In a challenge initiated by the state land planning agency or an affected person, the local government's determination that the amendment is in compliance is presumed to be correct and is sustained unless it is shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the amendment is not in

¹⁵ "The fairly debatable standard of review is a highly deferential standard [for the local government] requiring approval of a planning action if reasonable persons could differ as to its propriety." *Martin County v. Yusem*, 690 So. 2d 1288 (Fla. 1997).

¹⁶ "Preponderance of the evidence" is the burden of proof in most civil trials and is also known as the "greater weight of the evidence" defined in the Florida Standard Jury Instructions as "the more persuasive and convincing force and effect of the entire evidence in the case." *In re Standard Jury Instructions In Civil Cases*- Report No. 09-01 (Reorganization of the Civil Jury Instructions), 35 So. 3d 666 (Fla. 2010).

¹⁷ Local governments subject to the pilot program include: Pinellas and Broward Counties, and the municipalities within these counties, and Jacksonville, Miami, Tampa and Hialeah.

¹⁸ Plan amendments not eligible for the alternative review process that must undergo the traditional state review process are those that propose a rural land stewardship area pursuant to section 163.3177(1)(d), F.S.; propose an optional sector plan; update a comprehensive plan based on an evaluation and appraisal report; implement new statutory requirements; or new plans for newly incorporated municipalities. Small-scale amendments may still be adopted in the pilot program jurisdictions according to section 163.3187(1)(c) and (3), F.S.

compliance. The alternative state review process shortens statutorily prescribed timeline for comprehensive plan amendments process from 136 days to 65 days.¹⁹ DCA has stated that expanded use of the Alternative State Review Pilot Program would result in cost savings for expenses and staff resources.²⁰

Small-Scale Amendment Process

Small-scale comprehensive plan amendment adoption is treated differently than other amendments. Amendments must meet several criteria to be eligible as a “small-scale amendment.” Small-scale amendments are limited to properties that are 10 acres or fewer, cannot be located in an area of critical state concern with exceptions, and must meet certain density criteria if it involves residential land use, among other requirements. Small-scale amendments may not change goals, policies, or objectives of the local government’s comprehensive plan. Instead, these amendments propose changes to the future land use map for site-specific small scale development activity. Unlike other comprehensive plan amendments, small-scale amendments require only one public hearing and are not subject to the twice-a-year limitation on plan amendments. The state land planning agency does not review or issue a NOI stating whether a small scale development amendment is in compliance with the comprehensive plan. Any affected person may challenge the amendment’s compliance in an administrative hearing, and the state land planning agency may intervene.

Local Government Comprehensive Planning Certification Program

In 2002, the Legislature created the Local Government Comprehensive Planning Certification Program. Since that time, only five local governments have chosen to apply for certification. Three local governments were certified by DCA (cities of Lakeland, Miramar, and Orlando) while two withdrew their applications (cities of Naples and Sarasota). The City of Freeport was certified as a result of a law passed during the 2005 legislative session. The four certified cities have been subject to less state and regional oversight of their comprehensive plan amendments allowing them to expedite the amendments’ approval. Counties, RPCs, and DCA generally report that they have not experienced problems as a result of the cities participating in the program.²¹

Effect of the Bill

- Removes the twice-a-year limit for the adoption of plan amendments allowing local governments to determine if and when their plans should be amended;
- Continues to require local governments to hold two public hearings on most proposed changes to the local comprehensive plan;
- Streamlines the review of plans and plan amendments into one of three processes:
 - The *Expedited State Review Process* is designed for most plan amendments and is similar to the alternative state review pilot program process;
 - The *State Coordinated Review Process* is designed for new comprehensive plans and plan amendments that require a more comprehensive review. The state land planning agency under the state coordinated review process issues an ORC report, NOI, and may challenge plans and plan amendments based on whether they are in compliance;
 - Maintains and streamlines the *Small-Scale Amendment Review Process*; and
 - Maintains the *Local Government Comprehensive Planning Certification Program*.
- Maintains the same state, regional, and local reviewing agencies and focuses state agency comments on adverse impacts to important state resources and facilities within their jurisdiction;
- Requires commanding officers of military installations that will be affected by a proposed plan or plan amendment to submit comments according to s. 163.3175, F.S., along with other reviewing agencies under the expedited and state coordinated review processes.
- Limits DCA’s ORC report and NOI to the state coordinated review process for new plans and certain amendments that require a more comprehensive review.

¹⁹ OPPAGA Report No. 08-62.

²⁰ See DCA written responses to questions posed at the February 9, 2011, meeting of the Community & Military Affairs Subcommittee. (Responses provided February 16, 2011, and on file with the Community & Military Affairs Subcommittee).

²¹ OPPAGA Report No. 07-47.

- Modifies the standard of review for challenges and removes the state land planning agency's ability to intervene in a challenge initiated by an affected person.
- Maintains the ability of parties to a challenge to enter into compliance agreements. This bill contains new procedures for compliance agreements.
- Maintains the ability of an affected person or the state land planning agency, after filing a petition challenging a plan or plan amendment, to demand mediation or expeditious resolution of its case.
- Modifies the Administration Commission's authority to impose sanctions. Sanctions may be imposed on a local government if the local government elects to make an amendment effective notwithstanding a determination of noncompliance or if a local government adopts a plan amendment that amends a plan that has not been finally determined to be in compliance.

Expedited State Review Process

This bill renames the alternative state review pilot program process the "expedited state review process" and expands it to statewide application. This process may be used for all plan amendments except those that are specifically required to undergo the state coordinated review process. The expedited state review process requires two public hearings and plan amendments are transmitted to reviewing agencies including the state land planning agency that may provide comments on the proposed plan amendment. The reviewing agencies²² are kept the same as under current law, except that if a plan amendment affects a military installation, the commanding officer of the military installation is now subject to the same timing requirements for comments as other reviewing agencies. Local governments that receive military installation comments must also be sensitive to private property rights and may not be unduly restrictive on those rights.

This bill limits the scope of state agency comments on a proposed plan amendment. State agencies may only comment on specified subjects within their jurisdiction as they relate to important state resources and facilities that will be adversely impacted by an amendment if adopted. The state land planning agency must limit its comments to important state resources and facilities outside the jurisdiction of other commenting state agencies and may include comments on countervailing planning policies and objectives served by the plan amendment that should be balanced against potential adverse impacts to important state resources and facilities. Comments provided by state agencies must state with specificity how the plan amendment will adversely impact an important state resource or facility and must list measures the local government may take to eliminate, reduce, or mitigate the adverse impacts. Comments regarding state resources and facilities that will be adversely impacted may result in a challenge.

After receiving reviewing agency comments, the local government is required to hold a second public hearing on whether to adopt the amendment. The second public hearing must be conducted within 180 days after the agency comments are received. For most plan amendments, if a local government fails to adopt the plan amendment within 180 days, the plan amendment is deemed withdrawn. Unless otherwise specified, the 180 day requirement may be extended by agreement as long as notice is provided to the state land planning agency and any affected person that provided comments on the plan amendment. After adopting an amendment, the local government must transmit the plan amendment to the state land planning agency within 10 days of the second public hearing, and the state land planning agency must notify the local government of any deficiencies with the plan amendment within 5 working days. Unless timely challenged, an amendment adopted under the expedited review process does not become effective until 31 days after the state land planning agency notifies the local government that the plan amendment package is complete.

²² "Reviewing agencies" means: state land planning agency; appropriate regional planning council; appropriate water management district; Department of Environmental Protection; Department of State; Department of Transportation; in the case of plan amendments relating to public schools, the Department of Education; in the case of plans or plan amendments that affect a military installation listed in section 163.3175, the commanding officer of the affected military installation; in the case of county plans and plan amendments, the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services; and in the case of municipal plans and plan amendments, the county in which the municipality is located.

Within 30 days after the local government adopts the amendment, any affected person may file a challenge with the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH). This bill maintains the same broad definition of an “affected person” from current law. The state land planning agency may also challenge an adopted amendment by filing a challenge with DOAH within 30 days after the state land planning agency notifies the local government that the plan amendment is complete.

The state land planning agency’s challenge is limited to the comments provided by the reviewing agencies upon a determination by the state land planning agency that an important state resource or facility will be adversely impacted by the adopted plan amendment.

In a challenge brought by the state land planning agency, a local government may contest the agency’s determination of an important state resource or facility, and if contested, the state land planning agency must prove its determination of an important state resource or facility by clear and convincing evidence.

This bill maintains the challenge process in current law involving an administrative law judge, the state land planning agency, and the Administration Commission. For challenges initiated by an “affected person”, the plan amendment is determined to be in compliance if the local government’s determination of compliance is fairly debatable. In challenges initiated by the state land planning agency, the local government’s determination that the amendment is in compliance is presumed to be correct and will be sustained unless it is shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the amendment is not in compliance.

State Coordinated Review Process

This bill amends section 163.3184, F.S., to create the state coordinated review process for new comprehensive plans and for amendments that require a more comprehensive review. Amendments that are in an area of critical state concern designated pursuant to s. 380.05, F.S., propose a rural land stewardship area pursuant to s. 163.3248, F.S.,²³ propose a sector plan pursuant to s. 163.3245, F.S., update a comprehensive plan based on an evaluation and appraisal pursuant to s. 163.3191, F.S., and new plans for newly incorporated municipalities adopted pursuant to s. 163.3167, F.S., are required to follow the state coordinated review process. The state coordinated review process requires two public hearings and a proposed plan or plan amendment is transmitted to the reviewing agencies within 10 days after the initial hearing. The scope of reviewing agency comments under the state coordinated review process is the same as under the expedited state review process, but the state land planning agency is able to comment more broadly on whether the plan or plan amendment is in compliance. Under the state coordinated review process, reviewing agency comments are sent to the state land planning agency that may elect to issue an ORC report to the local government within 60 days after receiving the proposed plan or plan amendment. The state land planning agency’s ORC report details whether the proposed plan or plan amendment is in compliance and whether the proposed plan or plan amendment will adversely impact important state resources and facilities.

When the state land planning agency makes an objection regarding an important state resource or facility that will be adversely impacted, it is required to state with specificity how the important state resource or facility will be adversely impacted and list measures that the local government may take to eliminate, reduce, or mitigate the adverse impacts. Challenges brought by the state land planning agency, to a plan or plan amendment adopted under the state coordinated review process, are limited to objections made in the ORC.

Once a local government receives the ORC report, it has 180 days to hold a second public hearing on whether to adopt the plan or plan amendment. If not held within 180 days, the plan or plan amendment will be deemed withdrawn, unless the 180 day time requirement is extended by agreement and notice is provided to the state land planning agency and any affected person that submitted comments. After a plan or amendment is adopted, the local government must transmit the plan or plan amendment to the state land planning agency within 10 days of the second public hearing, and the state land planning agency must notify the local government of any deficiencies within 5 working days. The state land planning agency then has 45 days to determine if the plan or plan amendment is in compliance and if

²³ S. 163.3177(11)(d), F.S., (2010).

not in compliance, to file a petition with DOAH challenging the plan or plan amendment. The compliance determination is limited to objections raised in the ORC report, unless the plan or amendment has substantially changed from the one commented on. The state land planning agency must issue a NOI to find that the plan or plan amendment is in compliance or not in compliance and must post a copy of the NOI on its website. If a NOI is issued to find the plan or plan amendment not in compliance, the NOI is forwarded to DOAH for a compliance hearing and the state land planning agency. The parties to the proceeding are the state land planning agency, the affected local government, and any affected person who intervenes. No new issue may be alleged as a reason to find a plan or plan amendment not in compliance in an administrative pleading filed more than 21 days after publication of notice unless good cause for not alleging the issue within that time period is established.

The burdens of proof for challenges brought against a plan or plan amendment adopted under the state coordinated review process are identical to those under the expedited state review process.

Small-Scale Amendment Review Process

This bill removes the density restriction on small-scale plan amendments, but maintains the current 10 acre per amendment limit and the 120 acre per year limit. It also maintains the requirement that a small-scale amendment must only undergo one public hearing. This bill changes the standard of review for challenges brought by an affected person. It provides that the plan amendment will be determined to be in compliance if the local government's determination that the small scale development amendment is in compliance is fairly debatable. This bill also removes the state land planning agency's ability to intervene in challenges filed by an affected person.

CONCURRENCY

Current Situation

Concurrency requires public facilities and services to be available concurrent with the impacts of development. Concurrency in Florida is required for sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, potable water, parks and recreation, schools and transportation. Concurrency is tied to provisions requiring local governments to adopt level-of-service standards, address existing service deficiencies, and provide infrastructure to accommodate new growth reflected in the comprehensive plan. Rule 9J-5.0055(3), FAC, establishes the minimum requirements for satisfying concurrency. Local governments are charged with setting level-of-service standards within their jurisdiction, and if level-of-service standards are not met, development permits may not be issued without an applicable exception. For example, a new development leading to traffic that exceeds the level-of-service for a roadway may be prohibited from moving forward unless improvements are scheduled within three years of the development's commencement, or the development is located in a transportation concurrency exception area (TCEA), or it meets other criteria or exceptions provided by law and the comprehensive plan.

Effect of the Bill

This bill maintains the state concurrency requirements for sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, and potable water. This bill removes the state concurrency requirements for parks and recreation, schools, and transportation facilities. If concurrency is applied to other public facilities, the local government comprehensive plan must provide the principles, guidelines, standards, and strategies, including adopted levels-of-service, to guide its application.

This bill specifies that in order for a local government to remove any optional concurrency provisions from its comprehensive plan, an amendment is required. An amendment removing any optional concurrency is not subject to state review. Further, local governments should consider the number of facilities that will be necessary to meet level-of-service demands when determining the appropriate levels-of-service, and the schedule of facilities that are necessary to meet the adopted level-of-service must be reflected in the capital improvements element. Infrastructure needed to ensure that adopted level-of-service standards are achieved and maintained for the 5-year period of the capital improvement schedule must be identified as either funded or unfunded.

Transportation Concurrency

Current Situation

Local governments are required to employ a systematic process to ensure new development does not occur unless adequate transportation infrastructure is in place to support the growth. To implement concurrency, local governments must define what constitutes an adequate level-of-service for the transportation system and measure whether the service needs of a new development exceed existing capacity and scheduled improvements for that period.

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is responsible for establishing level-of-service standards on the highway component of the strategic intermodal system (SIS) and for developing guidelines to be used by local governments on other roads. The SIS consists of statewide and interregional significant transportation facilities and services and plays a critical role in moving people and goods between major economic regions in Florida, to and from other states, as well as to shipment centers for global distribution.

Often, transportation concurrency requirements create unintended consequences. For example, transportation concurrency in urban areas is often times more costly and functionally difficult than in non-urban areas. As a result, transportation concurrency can result in urban sprawl and the discouragement of development in urban areas. This conflicts with the goals and policies of part II of ch. 163, F.S., and can prevent viable alternative forms of transportation from being employed.

Strict application of concurrency has resulted in developers seeking capacity in undeveloped areas. Consequently, methods to allow for greater flexibility to meet public policy objectives were adopted. In 1992, Transportation Concurrency Management Areas (TCMA) were authorized, which allowed an area-wide level-of-service standard, rather than facility-specific designations, to promote urban infill and redevelopment and provide greater mobility in those areas through alternatives such as public transit systems.

Subsequently, two additional relaxations of concurrency were authorized: TCEAs and Long-term Transportation Concurrency Management Systems. Specifically, the TCEA is intended to “reduce the adverse impact transportation concurrency may have on urban infill and redevelopment” by exempting certain areas from the concurrency requirement. Long-term Transportation Concurrency Management Systems are intended to address significant backlogs.

Broward County uses an alternative approach to concurrency called transit-oriented concurrency. The governor through the Office of Tourism, Trade, and Economic Development (OTTED) administers an expedited permitting process for “those types of economic development projects which offer job creation and high wages, strengthen and diversify the state’s economy, and have been thoughtfully planned to take into consideration the protection of the state’s environment.” These projects may also have transportation concurrency waived under certain circumstances.

Effect of the bill

This bill removes the state requirement for transportation concurrency, but allows local governments the option of continuing to apply transportation concurrency locally within their jurisdictional boundaries without having to take any action. Local governments may identify transportation concurrency exception areas and may continue to utilize existing areas as an exception to locally required transportation concurrency. For local governments that choose to continue to apply transportation concurrency, this bill provides the minimum requirements and guidelines for doing so. This bill specifically provides that if a local government wishes to remove transportation concurrency, it must adopt a comprehensive plan amendment. However, that amendment is not subject to state review.

Proportionate Fair-Share Mitigation and Proportionate Share Mitigation

Current Situation

Proportionate fair-share mitigation is a method for mitigating the impacts of development on transportation facilities through the cooperative efforts of the public and private sectors. Proportionate

fair-share mitigation can be used by a local government to determine a developer's fair-share of costs to meet concurrency. The developer's fair-share may be combined with public funds to construct future improvements; however, the improvements must be part of a plan or program adopted by the local government or the FDOT. If an improvement is not part of the local government's plan or program, the developer may still enter into a binding agreement at the local government's option provided the improvement satisfies part II of ch. 163, F.S., and:

- the proposed improvement satisfies a significant benefit test; or
- the local government plans for additional contributions or payments from developers to fully mitigate transportation impacts in the area within 10 years.

The formula used for proportionate share mitigation for DRI and non-DRI developments is provided in statute.

Effect of the Bill

This bill modifies proportionate share to clarify that when an applicant for a development permit contributes or constructs its proportionate share mitigation of impacts, a local government cannot require payment or construction of transportation facilities whose costs are greater than the development's proportionate share necessary to mitigate its transportation impacts. This bill provides a specific formula for calculating proportionate share contribution and specifies that when a development's proportionate share has been satisfied for a particular stage or phase of development, all of the transportation impacts from that stage or phase will be deemed fully mitigated in any cumulative transportation analysis for a subsequent stage or phase of development. This bill also provides that applicants are not responsible for funding "transportation backlog" or the cost of reducing or eliminating transportation deficits that existed prior to the filing of an application. Further, if an applicant is required to pay transportation impact fees in the future on the development, the local government is required to provide the applicant with a dollar-for-dollar credit on the transportation impact fees for the proportionate share already paid. The credit is to be reduced up to 20 percent by the percentage share that the project's traffic represents the added capacity of the selected improvement, or by the amount specified by local ordinance, whichever yields the greater credit.

The FDOT is directed to develop and submit a report by December 15, 2011, to the Senate President and Speaker of the House with recommendations, if any, for changes or alternatives to the proportionate share calculation. The FDOT's recommendations are to be developed in consultation with developers and representatives of local governments and must be designed to ensure that contributions are assessed in a predictable, equitable, and fair manner.

School Concurrency

Current Situation

School concurrency allows for coordinated planning between school boards and local governments in planning and permitting developments that will impact school capacity and utilization rates. In 2005, the Legislature required local governments and school boards to adopt a school concurrency system in order to implement a comprehensive focus on school planning.²⁴ Prior to this, school concurrency was optional. Mitigation options for developers to address school concurrency requirements include the contribution of land; the construction, expansion, or payment for land acquisition; or construction of a public school facility.

As part of implementing school concurrency, local governments were required by December 1, 2008, to adopt a Public Schools Facilities Element in their comprehensive plan and to update their existing public school interlocal agreement. Most counties and municipalities met this deadline. Failure to comply could subject non-compliant local governments and school boards to financial sanctions imposed by the Administration Commission.

²⁴ Ch. 2005-290, L.O.F.

Certain smaller counties are allowed a waiver from the school concurrency requirement. DCA may allow for a projected 5-year capital outlay student growth rate to exceed 10 percent when the projected 10-year capital outlay student enrollment is less than 2,000 students and the capacity rate for all schools within the district will not exceed 100 percent in the tenth year.

Effect of the Bill

This bill removes the state requirement for school concurrency, but allows local governments the option of continuing to apply school concurrency locally without having to take any action. This bill provides the minimum requirements and guidelines for doing so. This bill specifically provides that if a local government wishes to remove school concurrency, it must adopt a comprehensive plan amendment. However, that amendment is not subject to state review.

If a county and one or more municipalities within the county have adopted school concurrency into its comprehensive plan and interlocal agreement that represents at least 80 percent of the total countywide population, the failure of one or more municipalities within the county to adopt school concurrency and enter into the interlocal agreement does not prevent school concurrency from occurring in those jurisdictions that have opted to implement it.

All local government provisions included in comprehensive plans regarding school concurrency within a county must be consistent with each other as well as the requirements of part II of ch. 163.

For local governments that choose to apply school concurrency, this bill encourages school concurrency to be applied to development on a districtwide basis so that a concurrency determination for a specific development will be based upon the availability of school capacity districtwide. However, if a local government elects to apply school concurrency on a less than districtwide basis, then certain requirements must be met.

The CIE within a comprehensive plan that imposes school concurrency must identify facilities necessary to meet adopted levels of service during a 5-year period consistent with the school board's educational facilities plan.

For local governments that maintain school concurrency, this bill provides that a local government still may allow a landowner to move forward with developing a specific parcel of land without satisfying school concurrency, if certain requirements are met. Options for proportionate-share mitigation of impacts on public school facilities must be established in the comprehensive plan and the interlocal agreement according to s. 163.3177, F.S.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT

Current Situation

In 2000, almost 40 percent of Florida's public schools were at 90 percent or greater capacity. The Legislature enacted SB 1906 in 2002 that focused on school planning through coordination of information between local governments and school boards. This is accomplished by a required interlocal agreement that addresses school siting, enrollment forecasting, school capacity, infrastructure, collocation and joint use of civic and school facilities, and sharing of development and school construction information. These interlocal agreements are reviewed and approved by DCA with the assistance of the Department of Education. A local government or school board that does not enter into an interlocal agreement is subject to financial sanctions. There are exemptions from the statutory requirements for those local governments that do not require increased capacity because they are not experiencing growth in school age populations. Those exemptions are available if certain conditions are met, such as when there are not any schools within the jurisdiction's boundaries and when the school board verifies in writing that there is not any need for schools in the 5-year and 10-year planning period.

Effect of the Bill

Interlocal agreements between a county, the municipalities within, and a school board are maintained in this bill in order to coordinate plans and processes of the local governments and school boards. However, this bill removes state oversight and review of the interlocal agreements while maintaining

certain minimum issues that the interlocal agreement must address. If a local government chooses to maintain optional school concurrency within its jurisdiction, this bill specifies that the interlocal agreement must also meet additional requirements.

EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT

Current Situation

Because planning is a continuous and ongoing process, s. 163.3191, F.S., requires each local government to adopt an evaluation and appraisal report (EAR) once every seven years in order to assess its progress in implementing the comprehensive plan. The EAR is the principle process for updating local comprehensive plans to address changes in the local community and changes in state law relating to growth management. The report evaluates the success of the community in addressing land use planning issues through implementation of its comprehensive plan. Based on this evaluation, the report suggests how the plan should be revised to better address community objectives, changing conditions and trends affecting the local community, and changes in state requirements. The local government is required to submit its report to DCA, which conducts a sufficiency review to ensure the report fulfills the requirements of s. 163.3191, F.S. The local government is also required to adopt amendments to its plan, based on the recommendations in the report, within 18 months after DCA determines the report to be sufficient. The Administration Commission is authorized to impose sanctions if the local government fails to adopt and submit its report or fails to implement its report through timely amendments to its comprehensive plan. Although the report can serve an important purpose in requiring local governments to keep their comprehensive plans updated and current, the process of preparing an evaluation and appraisal report is both time consuming and costly, especially for smaller local governments who often are required to hire outside consultants to assist in the preparation of the report.

Effect of the Bill

This bill removes the state requirement for local governments to adopt an evaluation and appraisal report once every seven years along with the specific requirements regarding the preparation, adoption, submittal, and review of the evaluation and appraisal report.

This bill continues to direct each local government, at least once every seven years, to evaluate its comprehensive plan to determine if plan amendments are necessary to reflect changes in state requirements since the last update of the comprehensive plan. The local government must notify the state land planning agency by letter as to its determination. If changes are necessary, a local government must amend its plan and transmit the amendments updating the plan to the reviewing agencies within one year. If the local government fails to submit a letter to the state land planning agency regarding its need to amend its plan or update the plan as needed, it may not adopt any new plan amendments until the necessary amendments to update its plan are adopted. Local governments are encouraged to comprehensively evaluate, and as necessary, update their plans to reflect changes in local conditions.

This bill provides that local governments that are due or overdue for the submittal of its EAR or EAR-based amendments are to follow the revised provisions of s. 163.3191, F.S.

SECTOR PLANS

Current Situation

Established as an alternative to the DRI program, the optional sector planning process is designed to promote large scale planning of areas that include at least 5,000 acres and to avoid the duplicative data and analysis that would otherwise be necessary if projects were planned as DRIs. The optional sector plan process is designed to minimize repetitive permitting while ensuring adequate mitigation of a development's impacts. DCA enters into agreements to authorize the preparation of an optional sector plan. The process involves the development of a long-term, build-out overlay and detailed specific area plans. Currently, the optional sector plan is a pilot program limited to five local governments, or combinations of local governments.

Effect of the Bill

This bill amends s. 163.3245, F.S., to remove the pilot status of the optional sector plan program and increase the minimum acreage for a sector plan to 15,000 acres, which includes all existing approved sector plans. Sector plans continue to be prohibited in designated areas of critical state concern.

This bill allows the local government, prior to preparing a sector plan, to request a scoping meeting. The scoping meeting must be noticed and open to the public and is conducted by the applicable RPC with affected local governments and certain state agencies. If a scoping meeting is conducted, the RPC must make written recommendations to the state land planning agency and affected local governments on the issues requested by the local government.

This bill specifies that the sector planning process encompass two levels:

- 1) adoption of a long-term master plan (formerly a “conceptual long-term buildout overlay”) for the entire planning area as an amendment to the local comprehensive plan adopted pursuant to the state coordinated review process in s. 163.3184(4), F.S., and
- 2) adoption by a local development order of two or more detailed specific area plans that implement the long-term master plan and within which DRI requirements are waived.

This bill specifies that the long-term master plan must include maps, illustrations, and text supported by data and analysis to address and identify: land uses, water supply and conservation measures, transportation facilities, other regionally significant public facilities that may include central utilities, regionally significant natural resources based on the best available data and policies setting forth the procedures for protection or conservation, procedures and policies to facilitate intergovernmental coordination, and other general principles and guidelines including addressing the urban form and the interrelationships of future land uses and the protection, and as appropriate, restoration and management of lands identified for permanent preservation through recordation of conservation easements. This bill provides that the detailed specific area plans must be consistent with and implement the long-term master plan and must include certain specific requirements similar to the long-term master plan.

The two level planning process in this bill provides that a long-term master plan and a detailed specific area plan may be based upon a planning period longer than the planning period of the local comprehensive plan. Both the long-term master plan and the detailed specific area plan must specify the projected population within the planning area during the chosen planning period. A long-term master plan may include a phasing or staging schedule that allocates a portion of the local government's future growth to the planning area through the planning period. Both the long-term master plan and a detailed specific area plan are not required to demonstrate need based upon projected population growth or on any other basis.

This bill specifies that when the state land planning agency is reviewing a long-term master plan it must consult with certain state and governmental agencies.

When a local government issues a development order approving a detailed specific area plan, it must provide copies of the order to the state land planning agency and the owner or developer of the property affected by the order according to the rules established for DRI development orders. This order may be appealed by the owner, developer, or state land planning agency to the Florida Land and Water Adjudicatory Commission (Governor and Cabinet) by filing a petition alleging that the detailed specific area plan is not consistent with the long-term master plan or the local government's comprehensive plan. The administrative proceeding for review of a detailed specific area plan is to be conducted according to s. 380.07(6), F.S., and the commission must grant or deny permission to develop according to the long-term master plan and may attach conditions or restrictions to its decision.

If a development order is challenged by an aggrieved and adversely affected party in a judicial proceeding pursuant to s. 163.3215, F.S., the state land planning agency, if it has received notice, must dismiss its appeal to the commission and may intervene in the pending judicial proceeding.

Once a long-term master plan becomes legally effective, this bill requires the plan to be connected to any long-range transportation plan developed by a metropolitan planning organization and the regional water supply plan. A water management district also may issue consumptive use permits for durations commensurate with the long-term master plan or detailed specific area plan while considering the ability of the master plan area to contribute to regional water supply availability and the need to maximize reasonable-beneficial use of the water resource. The permitting criteria must be applied based upon the projected population, the approved densities and intensities of use and their distribution in the long-term master plan, but the allocation of the water may be phased over the duration of the permit to reflect actual projected needs. This bill specifically provides that it does not supersede the public interest test in s. 373.223, F.S.

When a detailed specific area plan becomes effective for a portion of the planning area governed by a long-term master plan, developments within the area of the detailed specific area plan are not subject to DRI review. This bill authorizes a developer to enter into a development agreement with the local government and provides that the duration of the agreement may be through the planning period of the long-term master plan or the detailed specific area plan.

This bill allows property owners within the planning area of a proposed long-term master plan to withdraw their consent to the master plan prior to adoption by the local government, and the parcels withdrawn will not be subject to the long-term master plan, any detailed specific area plan, and the exemption from DRI review. After the local government adopts the long-term master plan, a property owner may withdraw from the master plan only if the local government approves by adopting a plan amendment.

This bill protects existing agricultural, silvicultural, and other natural resource activities within a long-term master plan or a detailed specific area plan. This bill also protects properties against downzoning, unit density reduction, or intensity reduction in the detailed specific area for the duration of the buildout date.

This bill provides that a landowner or developer who has received approval of a master DRI order may apply to implement the order by filing one or more applications to approve a detailed specific area plan.

Because the sector plan pilot program was limited to five areas, this bill allows large-scale plan amendments that were adopted by local governments on or before July 1, 2011, that meet the requirements for a long-term master plan, following a public hearing, to be subject to the sector plan provisions in statute notwithstanding any provision related to DRIs or planning agreement or plan policy to the contrary.

This bill provides that any detailed specific area plan to implement a conceptual long-term buildout overlay, adopted by a local government and found in compliance before July 1, 2011, will be governed by s. 163.3245, F.S., as amended by this bill.

RURAL LAND STEWARDSHIP AREAS

Current Situation

The Legislature originally enacted the Rural Land Stewardship Area (RLSA) Program as a pilot program in 2001.²⁵ The stated intent of the RLSA program has been the “restoration and maintenance of the economic value of rural land; control of urban sprawl; identification and protection of ecosystems, habitats, and natural resources; promotion of rural economic activity; maintenance of the viability of Florida’s agriculture economy; and protection of the character of the rural areas of Florida.”²⁶ The program uses a “transfer of development rights” process by which owners of land in designated conservation areas may trade their rights from the conserved areas for the right to use land in

²⁵ Ch. 2001-279, L.O.F., codified as s. 163.3177(11)(d), F.S.

²⁶ S. 163.3177(11)(d)2., F.S.

designated development areas. In 2004, the Legislature removed the pilot status from the program and substantially amended the statute.²⁷ The statute was again amended in 2005²⁸ and 2006.²⁹ Florida currently has two rural land stewardship areas: one consisting of approximately 200,000 acres in Collier County³⁰ and another of approximately 15,000 acres in St. Lucie County. In 2009, DCA adopted two rules governing rural land stewardship areas that were objected to and cited by critics as overly restrictive and unnecessary.

Effect of the Bill

This bill creates s. 163.3248, F.S., and transfers current provisions of law relating to RLSAs into the section with modifications to make the RLSA process more workable with less state oversight. This bill states that “rural land stewardship areas are designed to establish a long-term incentive based strategy to balance and guide the allocation of land so as to accommodate future land uses in a manner that protects the natural environment, stimulates economic growth and diversification, and encourages the retention of land for agriculture and other traditional rural land uses.”

RLSAs must be at least 10,000 acres and are to be located outside of municipalities and established urban service areas. A RLSA is not required to demonstrate need based on population or any other factor. A local government or property owner may request assistance and participation in the development of a RLSA from the state land planning agency and other state agencies, the appropriate regional planning council, private land owners, and stakeholders.

This bill repeals rules 9J-5.026 and 9J-11.023, FAC, which govern the RLSA process, and specifies that rulemaking is not authorized and the provisions of this section are to be implemented pursuant to law. Plan amendments proposing a RLSA are subject to the state coordinated review process in s. 163.3184(4), F.S., of this bill, and each local government with jurisdiction over a RLSA must designate the area through a plan amendment. This bill specifies that the local government voting requirements for designating a receiving area within a rural land stewardship area must be by resolution with a simple majority vote.

Upon the adoption of a plan amendment creating a RLSA, the local government must pass an ordinance establishing a rural land stewardship overlay zoning district, which provides the methodology for the creation, conveyance, and use of stewardship credits. This bill creates an improved process for determining the amount of transferrable stewardship credits that may be assigned within a RLSA and provides limitations on stewardship credits. In addition to stewardship credits, this bill provides other incentives to encourage owners of land within a RLSA to enter into an agreement, such as mitigation credits, extended permit agreements, opportunities for recreational leases and ecotourism, compensation for land management activities of public benefit, and option agreements for sale to public or private entities. This bill provides that the original RLSA in Collier County, which was created by a final order of the Governor and the Cabinet, receive the same incentives as newly created RLSAs.

DEVELOPMENTS OF REGIONAL IMPACT

A DRI is defined in s. 380.06, F.S., as “any development which, because of its character, magnitude, or location, would have a substantial effect upon the health, safety, or welfare of citizens of more than one county.” Section 380.06, F.S., provides for both state and regional review of local land use decisions involving DRIs. RPCs coordinate the review process with local, regional, state and federal agencies and recommend conditions of approval or denial to local governments. DRIs are also reviewed by DCA for compliance with state law and to identify the regional and state impacts of large-scale developments. The local governments receive recommendations from DCA for approving, suggesting mitigation conditions, or not approving proposed developments. Local DRI development orders may be appealed by the owner, the developer, or the state land planning agency to the Governor and Cabinet,

²⁷ Ch. 2004-372, L.O.F.

²⁸ Ch. 2005-290, L.O.F.

²⁹ Ch. 2006-220, L.O.F.

³⁰ Collier County’s area was created by a final order of the Governor and Cabinet prior to the creation of the rural land stewardship program in statutes.

sitting as the Florida Land and Water Adjudicatory Commission.³¹ Section 380.06(24), F.S., exempts numerous types of projects from review as a DRI.

In 2007,³² the Legislature, in recognition of the 2007 real estate market conditions, provided a 3-year extension for all phase, buildout, and expiration dates for certain DRIs, and specified that the extension did not constitute a substantial deviation.

In 2009³³ and again in 2010,³⁴ the Legislature provided a retroactive 2-year extension and renewal for buildout dates previously granted under s. 380.016(19)(c), F.S., which at the time of the extension had an expiration date of September 1, 2008, through January 1, 2012. Those eligible for the 2-year extension were required to notify the authorizing agency in writing no later than December 1, 2009, for the 2009 extension and December 31, 2010, for the 2010 extension identifying the specific authorization for which the holder intended to use the extension and the anticipated timeframe for acting on the authorization. The 2010 extension was provided for in addition to the 2009 extension.

Effect of the Bill

4-year Extension for Current DRIs

This bill in recognition of the slowed economy and its effect on real estate market conditions, grants a 4-year extension, in addition to any other extension granted, to all commencement, phase, buildout, and expiration dates for projects that are currently valid DRIs. In order to receive the 4-year extension, a developer must notify the local government in writing by December 31, 2011.

Associated mitigation requirements are extended for the same period unless, prior to December 1, 2011, the governmental entity notifies a developer that began construction within the phase for which the mitigation is required that a contract has been entered into for construction of a facility that relies on the development's mitigation funds for that phase.

This bill provides that the 4-year extension is not a substantial deviation, is not subject to further DRI review, and may not be considered when determining whether a subsequent extension is a substantial deviation.

Exemptions

This bill exempts movie theaters, industrial plants, industrial parks, and distribution, warehousing or wholesaling facilities, and hotel or motel development from DRI review.

This bill also exempts from DRI review any proposed solid mineral mine and any proposed addition to, expansion of, or change to an existing solid mineral mine. In order for mineral mines to be exempt from DRI review, the mine owner must enter into a binding agreement with the FDOT to mitigate impacts to SIS facilities. This bill specifically provides that all local government regulations of proposed solid mineral mines remain applicable to any new solid mineral mine or to any proposed addition to, expansion of, or change to an existing solid mineral mine. Pursuant to s. 380.115(1), F.S., a previously approved solid mineral mine DRI will continue to enjoy vested rights and continue to be effective unless rescinded by the developer. Proposed changes to previously approved solid mineral mine DRI development orders having vested rights, are not subject to further review or approval as a DRI or notice of proposed change review or approval as a substantial deviation, except that those applications pending as of July 1, 2011, must be governed by s. 380.115(2), F.S.

This bill further exempts projects from DRI review that no longer meet the criteria for review based on revisions to the statutory threshold levels. This exemption applies notwithstanding any provisions in an agreement with or among a local government, regional agency, or the state land planning agency, and notwithstanding any provision in a local government's comprehensive plan to the contrary.

³¹ S. 380.07(2), F.S.

³² S. 8, ch. 2007-198, L.O.F.

³³ S. 14, ch. 2009-96, L.O.F.

³⁴ S. 46, ch. 2010-147, L.O.F.

Substantial Deviation Increases

This bill targets and increases the substantial deviation standards by approximately 50 percent for attraction or recreational facilities, office development, and commercial development. This bill does not affect any substantial deviation standards for residential development.

Other

- Clarifies that local governments may deny a proposed change to a DRI based on local issues such as plat restrictions on the underlying land.
- Provides that changes in a development order resulting from the recalculation of proportionate share contribution is presumed not to create a substantial deviation and may not be considered an additional regional transportation impact.
- Removes the requirement for DCA to submit a report to the Senate President and the Speaker of the House regarding the certification of local governments.
- Removes the “voluntary sharing of infrastructure” from factors to be considered for aggregation purposes and increases the total number of factors that must be met from two to three.

Dense Urban Land Area Exemption from DRI Review

Current Situation

In 2009,³⁵ the Legislature created the “dense urban land area” (DULA), defined in s. 163.3164(34), F.S., as:

- A municipality that has an average of at least 1,000 people per square mile of land area and a minimum total population of at least 5,000;
- A county, including the municipalities located therein, which has an average of at least 1,000 people per square mile of land area; or
- A county, including the municipalities located therein, which has a population of at least 1 million.

The Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR) is required to annually calculate the population and density criteria needed to determine which jurisdictions qualify as DULAs. Every year, EDR is required to submit to the state land planning agency a list of jurisdictions that meet the dense urban land area designation requirements. It is the responsibility of the state land planning agency to publish the list of jurisdictions on its website within 7 days of receiving the list.³⁶

TCEAs are designated in:

- A municipality that qualifies as a DULA;
- An urban service area that has been adopted into the local comprehensive plan and is located within a county that qualifies as a DULA;
- A county, including the municipalities located therein, which has a population of at least 900,000 and qualifies as a DULA, but does not have an urban service area designated in the local comprehensive plan.

DULAs also qualify for exemption from DRI review. Section 380.06(29)(a) exempts from the DRI review process developments within:

- A municipality that qualifies as a DULA;
- An urban service area that has been adopted into the local comprehensive plan and is located within a county that qualifies as a DULA;

³⁵ Ch. 2009-96, L.O.F.

³⁶ See 2010 List of Local Governments Qualifying as Dense Urban Land Areas, *available at* <http://www.dca.state.fl.us/fdcp/DCP/Legislation/2010/CountiesMunicipalities.cfm> (last visited June 2, 2011). In 2009, there were 246 local governments that qualified as DULAs. In 2010, there were 245 local governments qualifying as DULAs. Palm Coast was on the prior year's list (2009), but no longer meets the criteria. No other jurisdictions were added in 2010.

- A county, including the municipalities located therein, which has a population of at least 900,000 and qualifies as a DULA but does not have an urban service area designated in its comprehensive plan.

If a local government qualifies as a DULA for DRI exemption purposes and later becomes ineligible for designation as a DULA, developments within that area having a complete, pending application for authorization to commence development may maintain the exemption if the developer is continuing the application process in good faith or if the development is approved. The exemption from the DRI process does not apply within any area of critical state concern, within the boundary of the Wekiva Study Area, or within 2 miles of the boundary of the Everglades Protection Area.

Effect of the Bill

This bill removes state required transportation concurrency, and therefore makes DULAs, which qualify as TCEAs under current law, irrelevant for purposes of part II of ch. 163, F.S. This bill removes the definition of a DULA from s. 163.3164(34), F.S., and incorporates the same population and density requirements from that definition into s. 380.06(29)(a), F.S., for DRI exemption purposes. EDR continues to be required to calculate the population and density criteria to help determine which jurisdictions meet the criteria necessary to be exempt from DRI review. If any local government has had an annexation, contraction, or new incorporation, EDR must determine the population density using the new jurisdictional boundaries. EDR is required to submit to the state land planning agency, annually by July 1, a list of jurisdictions that meet the total population and density criteria. The state land planning agency must publish the list on its website within 7 days of receipt.

This bill specifically changes current law by providing that:

- Any jurisdiction that was placed on the DULA list before the effective date of this bill must remain on the list;
- Any county that meets the DULA criteria must remain on the list; and
- If a municipality that has previously met the DULA criteria no longer meets the criteria, the state land planning agency must maintain the municipality on the list and indicate the year the jurisdiction last met the criteria. However, any proposed DRI not within the established boundaries of a municipality at the time the municipality last met the criteria must meet the DRI requirements until such time as the municipality as a whole meets the criteria for exemption.

This bill provides that a development located partially outside of an area that is exempt from DRI review must still undergo DRI review for the entire development. However, if the total acreage within the DRI exempt area exceeds 85 percent of the total acreage and square footage of the approved DRI, the DRI development order may be rescinded by both local governments pursuant to s. 380.115(1), F.S., unless the portion of the development outside the exempt area meets the threshold criteria of a DRI.

OTHER ISSUES ADDRESSED

Planning Innovations and Technical Assistance

Effect of the Bill

This bill creates s. 163.3168, F.S., which encourages local governments to apply innovative planning tools to address future new development areas, urban service area designations, urban growth boundaries, and mixed-use, high-density development in urban areas. The majority of provisions in this newly created section were transplanted from more detailed provisions in the law or rule 9J-5, FAC, which this bill repeals. Section 163.3168, F.S., requires the state land planning agency to provide direct and indirect technical assistance to help local governments find creative solutions to foster vibrant, healthy communities, while protecting the functions of important state resources and facilities. If a plan amendment may adversely impact an important state resource or facility, upon request by the local government, the state land planning agency must coordinate multi-agency assistance, if needed, to develop an amendment to minimize any adverse impacts. The state land planning agency is required to provide guidance on its website for the submission and adoption of comprehensive plans,

plan amendments, and land development regulations. This guidance must not be adopted as an agency rule and is exempt from s. 120.54(1)(a), F.S.

Development Agreements

Effect of the Bill

This bill specifies that a development agreement may not exceed 30 years unless the local government and the developer agree to an extension and a public hearing is held. This bill removes the requirement to send a copy of a recorded development agreement between a local government and a developer to the state land planning agency. This bill maintains the requirement for the local government to review land subject to a development agreement once every year, but the requirement to send a written report to the state land planning agency and all parties to the agreement for years 6-10 of a development agreement is removed. This bill also removes the state land planning agency's ability to file an action in circuit court to enforce the terms of a development agreement or to challenge compliance of the agreement with the provisions of ss. 163.3220-163.3243, F.S.

Century Commission for a Sustainable Florida

Current Situation

The Century Commission was created in 2005 as a standing body charged with helping the state envision and plan for the future using a 25-year and a 50-year planning horizon.³⁷ The Century Commission must submit an annual report containing specific recommendations for addressing growth management in the state. The report, which must be submitted to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, must also contain discussions regarding the need for intergovernmental cooperation and the balancing of environmental protection with future development, as well as recommendations regarding dedicated funding sources for sewer facilities, water supply and quality, transportation facilities, and educational infrastructure.

The Century Commission consists of 15 members representing local governments, school boards, developers, homebuilders, the business, agriculture, environmental communities and other appropriate stakeholders. The Governor, President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives each receive five appointments to the commission.

The commissioners serve without compensation, but, with the exception of FY 2010-11³⁸ may receive reimbursement for per diem and travel expenses while in performance of their duties. Meetings of the commission are held at least three times a year in different regions of the state to collect public input and the DCA provides staff and other resources necessary for the Century Commission to accomplish its goals. The Century Commission was not funded for FY 2010-11. In recent years, the commission has operated primarily on private funding.

Effect of the Bill

This bill repeals s. 163.3247, F.S., and abolishes the Century Commission on June 30, 2013.

Comprehensive Plan Referenda³⁹

Current Situation

Section 163.3167(12), F.S., prohibits a local government from adopting "an initiative or referendum process in regard to any development order or in regard to any local comprehensive plan amendment or map amendment that affects five or fewer parcels of land." Under state law, local governments are not prohibited from adopting an initiative or referendum process for approval of development orders or

³⁷ Section 163.3247, F.S.

³⁸ Ch. 2010-153, L.O.F.

³⁹ A local referendum or initiative process for approving comprehensive plan amendments has become known as "mini-hometown democracy." Amendment 4, which appeared on the 2010 ballot, proposed an amendment to the Florida Constitution stating that before a local government may adopt a new comprehensive land use plan, or amend a comprehensive land use plan, the proposed plan or amendment must be subject to vote of the electors of the local government by referendum. This amendment became known as "Hometown Democracy" in reference to "Florida Hometown Democracy" the group that succeeded in getting the amendment on the ballot. Amendment 4 was defeated overwhelmingly 67% to 33% in the November 2010 election.

comprehensive plan amendments or future land use map amendments that affect more than five parcels of land.

The city of St. Pete Beach has attracted the most attention for its use of the referendum process for local land use decisions. In 2006, voters amended the city's charter to require voter referendums on all future changes to the comprehensive land use plan, community redevelopment plans, and any regulation increasing allowable building height. These actions effectively stalled local development. Voters in St. Pete Beach on March 8, 2011, approved three charter amendments that removed the referendum requirements imposed in 2006.⁴⁰

Effect of the Bill

This bill prohibits a local government from adopting any initiative or referendum process in regard to any development order or in regard to any local comprehensive plan amendment or map amendment. This bill provides that a plan amendment adopted according to s. 163.32465, F.S., subject to voter referendum by local charter, and found in compliance prior to this bill becoming law, may be readopted by ordinance and will become effective upon approval by the local government. Further the readopted amendment is not subject to review or challenge pursuant to ss. 163.3184 or 163.32465, F.S.

Military Issues

Effect of the Bill

This bill amends s. 163.3175(6), F.S., to provide that local governments when reviewing military installation comments must be sensitive to private property rights and not be unduly restrictive on those rights. This bill also clarifies that a local government that amended its comprehensive plan to address military installation compatibility requirements after 2004 and was found to be in compliance is not required to amend its plan again to meet new statutory requirements until required to do so after its 7-year evaluation and appraisal of the comprehensive plan according to s. 163.3191, F.S. This bill further clarifies that the commanding officer's comments, underlying studies, and reports are not binding on the local government.

Transportation Backlog

Effect of the Bill

This bill renames a number of items within s. 163.3182, F.S., including renaming "transportation concurrency backlog area" as "transportation deficiency area", "transportation concurrency backlog authority" as "transportation facility authority", and "transportation concurrency backlog plans" as "transportation sufficiency plans." This bill makes conforming changes to this section as well.

Permit Extensions

Current Situation

In 2009,⁴¹ the Legislature provided a retroactive 2-year extension and renewal for permits that at the time had an expiration date of September 1, 2008, through January 1, 2012, from the date of expiration for:

- Any permit issued by the Department of Environmental Protection or a Water Management District pursuant to part IV of ch. 373, F.S.;
- Any local government-issued development order or building permit; and
- Buildout dates, including a buildout date extension previously granted under section 380.016(19)(c), F.S.

Those with valid permits or other authorization that were eligible for the 2-year extension were required to notify the authorizing agency in writing no later than December 1, 2009, identifying the specific

⁴⁰ See Sheila Mullane Estrada, *St. Pete Beach Voters Give Development Decisions back to City Commission*, ST. PETERSBURG TIMES, Mar. 9, 2011, available at: <http://www.tampabay.com/news/politics/elections/st-pete-beach-voters-give-development-decisions-back-to-city-commission/1156081> (last visited June 2, 2011).

⁴¹ S. 14, ch. 2009-96, L.O.F.

authorization for which the holder intended to use the extension and the anticipated timeframe for acting on the authorization.

The 2-year extensions did not apply to a permit or authorization:

- Under any programmatic or regional general permit issued by the Army Corps of Engineers;
- Held by an owner or operator determined to be in significant noncompliance with the conditions of the permit; and
- That would delay or prevent compliance with a court order if extended.

Permits extended continued to be governed by the rules in effect at the time the permit was issued, except when it could be demonstrated that the rules in effect at the time would create an immediate threat to public safety or health.

This applied to any modification of the plans, terms, and conditions of the permit that lessens the environmental impact, except that any such modification could not extend the time limit beyond two additional years.

The Legislature in 2010⁴² reauthorized the 2-year extensions granted in 2009 because the underlying law was being challenged in court.⁴³

In 2010,⁴⁴ the Legislature also provided another retroactive 2-year extension and renewal from the date of expiration for permits that at the time had an expiration date of September 1, 2008, through January 1, 2012. The types of permits eligible for the extension were identical to the types eligible in 2009. The 2-year extension granted in 2010 was in addition to the 2-year extension granted in 2009. Those with valid permits or other authorization that were eligible for the 2-year extension were required to notify the authorizing agency in writing by December 31, 2010, identifying the specific authorization for which the holder intended to use the extension and the anticipated timeframe for acting on the authorization.

Because the 2-year extensions granted in 2009 and 2010 only applied to those permits and authorizations that had expiration dates of September 1, 2008 through January 1, 2012, there were certain permits and authorizations that were extended beyond the September 1, 2008, to January 1, 2012, window by the 2009 2-year extension, and therefore were unable to take advantage of the 2010 2-year extension.

Effect of the Bill

This bill extends and renews any permit or any authorization that was extended by ch. 2009-96, s. 14, Laws of Florida, as reauthorized by ch. 2010-147, s. 47, Laws of Florida, for a period of two additional years with conditions from its previously scheduled expiration date. This extension is in addition to the extension granted by ch. 2009-96, s. 14, Laws of Florida, as reauthorized by ch. 2010-147, s. 47, Laws of Florida. The holder of a valid permit or authorization eligible for the 2-year extension must notify the authorizing agency in writing by December 31, 2011, identifying the specific authorization for which the holder intended to use the extension and the anticipated timeframe for acting on the authorization. Permits that were extended by a total of 4 years pursuant to ch. 2009-96, s. 14, Laws of Florida, as reauthorized by ch. 2010-147, s. 47, Laws of Florida, and ch. 2010-147, s. 46, Laws of Florida, are not eligible for this extension.

This bill also, in recognition of the 2011 real estate market conditions, extends and renews for a period of 2-years with conditions any building permit, and any permit issued by DEP or by a water management district pursuant to part IV of ch. 373, F.S., which has an expiration date from January 1, 2012, through January 1, 2014. This extension includes any local government-issued development

⁴² S. 47, ch. 2010-147, L.O.F.

⁴³ Because ch. 2009-96, L.O.F., was involved in pending litigation, *see City of Weston v. Crist*, Case No. 09-CA-2639 (Fla. 2d Cir. Ct. 2010), the Legislature in 2010 reauthorized the permit extensions granted in ch. 2009-96, L.O.F. in order to protect those who had relied on the extensions.

⁴⁴ S. 46, ch. 2010-147, L.O.F.

order or building permit including certificates of levels-of-service and is in addition to any existing permit extension. DRI development order extensions are not eligible for this extension and any permit that has received a cumulative extension of 4-years pursuant to ch. 2009-96, s. 14, Laws of Florida, as reauthorized by ch. 2010-147, s. 47, Laws of Florida; ch. 2010-147, s. 46, Laws of Florida; or another extension granted by this bill are not eligible for this 2-year extension.

Transition Language and Preservation of Rights

Effect of the Bill

This bill requires the state land planning agency, within 60 days of the effective date of this bill, to review administrative and judicial proceedings filed by it to determine if the issues raised are consistent with the revised provisions of ch.163, part II, F.S. If none of the issues raised are consistent with the revised provisions, the state land planning agency must dismiss the proceeding. If one or more issues raised are consistent with the revised provisions, the agency must amend its petition to specifically state how the plan or plan amendment fails to meet the revised provisions. In all challenges filed by the state land planning agency prior to the effective date of this bill that continue after the effective date the local government's determination that the comprehensive plan or plan amendment is in compliance is presumed to be correct, and the local government's determination shall be sustained unless it is shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the comprehensive plan or plan amendment is not in compliance.

Amendments to Implement New Statutory Requirements

Effect of the Bill

This bill clarifies existing law that local governments are not required to adopt amendments to their comprehensive plan in order to implement new statutory requirements until required by the evaluation and appraisal in s. 163.3191, F.S. However, any new comprehensive plan amendments adopted must comply with the statutory requirements in effect at the time of adoption.

Adaptation Action Area

Effect of the Bill

This bill defines “adaptation action area” or “adaptation area” and allows local governments to designate an area in low-lying coastal zones that experience coastal flooding as well as adopt policies and criteria to address issues related to flooding.

Definition of “Urban Service Area”

Effect of the Bill

This bill modifies the definition of “urban service area” to mean areas identified in the comprehensive plan where public facilities and services, including, but not limited to, central water and sewer capacity and roads, are already in place or are identified in the CIE. The definition also provides that the term includes any areas identified in the comprehensive plan as urban service areas, regardless of local government limitation.

Definition of “In Compliance”

Effect of the Bill

This bill adds s. 163.3248, F.S., the newly created section dealing with RLSAs, to the definition of “in compliance.” This bill no longer requires a plan or plan amendment to be consistent with the requirements of the state comprehensive plan and rule 9J-5, FAC, in order to be “in compliance.”

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

DCA would likely see significant cost savings because of the reduction in state oversight and review that the agency currently handles.

On February 16, 2011, DCA provided written comments to questions that were posed at the February 9, 2011, meeting of the Community & Military Affairs Subcommittee. Specifically, in regards to the amendment adoption process, DCA stated that expanding the alternative review process pilot program statewide would result in cost savings for expenses and staff resources.

This bill does not require DCA to issue or publish a NOI for plan amendments adopted under the expedited state review process. For plans and plan amendments adopted under the state coordinated review process, DCA is required to issue a NOI, but newspaper publication is no longer required and publication is accomplished by posting the NOI on the agency's website. During FY 2010-2011, DCA budgeted \$390,000 for newspaper publications that are no longer required under this bill.

The agency would see a reduction in their need for staff resources because under the expedited state review process and the state coordinated review process, DCA's ability to comment and challenge is narrowed and focused, and therefore DCA may screen most proposed and adopted amendments specifically for adverse impacts to important state resources and facilities. DCA would be able to dedicate staff resources only to those amendments that will create an adverse impact on important state resources and facilities, and DCA would only have to conduct a comprehensive review on certain plan amendments and new plans as opposed to a detailed review of each and every single amendment. These savings, however, may be offset to some degree given the rapid pace of the expedited review process.

Additionally, since DCA is not required to publish a NOI under the expedited state review process, most affected party challenges will be directed towards a local government action and not DCA's compliance determination. Consequently, DCA will not have to participate in each and every administrative proceeding.

There also would likely be a minor reduction in the staff resources necessary for plan processing and publication.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

This bill does not restrict the ability of local governments to raise revenues through their home rule powers. The 4-year extension of the expiration date for projects that are currently valid DRIs may delay local governments' receipt of certain funds that have already been budgeted for. However, mitigation requirements will not be extended if prior to December 1, 2011, the governmental entity notifies a developer that began construction within a phase for which the mitigation is required that a contract was entered into for construction of a facility with some or all of the development's mitigation funds for that phase. This bill eliminates unnecessary and redundant state oversight and gives local governments the ability to promote increased economic development within their jurisdictions.

2. Expenditures:

This bill does not appear to specifically require local governments to expend any funds. In addition, any funds that a local government may have to expend as a result of this bill are likely to be offset by the numerous cost savings for local governments provided for in this bill. Specifically, this bill:

- Removes state required transportation and school concurrency, allowing local governments the flexibility to employ less costly methods of managing transportation and school impacts. However, the local governments' authority to continue applying concurrency is retained.

- Removes the requirement for local governments to submit a financially feasible CIE, and the requirement for local governments to annually amend their comprehensive plans to update the element and to submit the update for state review.
- Provides greater deference to local government decisions, therefore potentially reducing the likelihood of lengthy and drawn-out challenge proceedings.
- Removes the requirement for local governments to submit the costly evaluation and appraisal report every seven years.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

By streamlining the plan amendment process, the private sector will likely see cost savings as a result of the expedited process. The 4-year extension of the expiration date for projects that are currently valid DRIs and the 2-year extension of certain permits will provide cost savings and avoid delays for private developers who otherwise would have had to renew certain permits and undergo costly review.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.