ST. PETERSBURG CITY COUNCIL
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

February 27, 2020 @ 10:30 a.m.
Sunshine Center Auditorium
330 5th Street N. St. Petersburg, FL 33701

AGENDA

Members & Alternate:
Chair Brandi Gabbard, Vice Chair Ed Montanari, Amy Foster,
Lisa Wheeler-Bowman; Alternate – Deborah Figgs-Sanders

Support Staff:
Linnie Randolph, Legislative Aide

A. Call to order

B. Approval of agenda

C. Approval of minutes – January 16, 2020

D. New Business

1. Mid-Session Update on Council Priorities
   ~ Dr. Jeffery Sharkey & John Rodriguez
   a. Affordable Housing Trust Fund (SB 306/HB 381)
   b. Urban Agriculture
   c. Private Laterals (SB 150)
   d. Vessel Safety Revisions
   e. Fire Arm Safety
   f. Carter G. Woodson Funding (HB 9155)

2. Mid-Session Issues
   a. HB 459 - Building Designs  ~ Liz Abernethy
   b. Penny Amendment (Housing) ~ Rob Gerdes
   c. HB 1371/SB 1000 Traffic & Pedestrian Safety ~ Evan Mory & Whit Blanton

3. St. Pete Days Chamber Update
   ~ Matt Lettelleir

Next Meeting:
• April 23, 2020 – Session Recap

Attachments:
Support Material for New Business Items
ST. PETERSBURG CITY COUNCIL  
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS  
COMMITTEE  

Report  

January 16, 2020

Present:  Ed Montanari, Brandi Gabbard, Lisa Wheeler-Bowman, Amy Foster. Deborah Figgs-Sanders, Darden Rice

Also:  Assistant City Attorney, Michael Dema; Chief of Policy and Public Engagement, Kevin King; Government Affairs Director, John Rodriguez, St. Pete Chamber Advocacy Manager, Matt Lettelleir

Legislative Aide – Linnie Randolph

A. Call to Order – 2:00 PM

B. Approval of Agenda – CM Gabbard moved approval, all members voted in favor.

C. Approval of October 17, 2019 Minutes – CM Gabbard moved approval, all members voted in favor.

D. Election of 2020 Committee Chair and Vice Chair
   CM Amy Foster nominated CM Brandi Gabbard for 2020 Committee Chair – Motion was approved unanimously.
   CM Lisa Wheeler-Bowman nominated Council Chair Ed Montanari as Committee Vice Chair – Motion was approved unanimously.

E. New Business
   1. Review of 2020 City Council Legislative Priorities
      Newly appointed Chair of the LAIR committee, CM Brandi Gabbard, opened the new business portion of the agenda by recognizing Assistant City Attorney Michael Dema for a brief update on the Committees 2020 Legislative Priorities

      Affordable Housing: SB 306/HB 381 – In regard to protecting the Sadowski Fund for Affordable Housing only. These bills have been filed and Council passed a resolution in support.

      Urban Agriculture: No stand-alone bill for this item. We are working with Representative Valdez from Tampa to see if we can add this language to a pre-filed bill.

      Private Laterals: SB 150 – There is no companion House bill for this item and the filing deadline has passed so unless something comes up in an existing bill we don’t expect this to go any further.
**Vessel Safety Revisions:** SB 1378/HB 1407 regarding derelict vessels. Council passed a resolution in support and these two bills are currently moving through committee.

**Funding Priorities:** HB 9155 – regarding funding for the Carter G Woodson Museum. Council passed a resolution in support of this bill. This bill passed its first committee of reference this week.

**Fire Arm Safety:** a variety of Senate and House Bills have been filed relating to gun safety. SB7028 which closes the gun show loop hole has made it out of its first committee with what appears to be bi-partisan support.

Council Member Darden Rice added that Tampa Bay Water is in support and following SB 715/HB 1656 which are bills setting a framework regarding recycled water into drinking water. (direct and indirect potable reuse) These bills also includes a prohibition on surface water discharge by 2024.

2. **Mayor and Administration Legislative Priorities**

   Government Affairs Director, John Rodriguez, gave an update on another gun safety bill dealing with background checks that appeared to go in the opposite direction of what Council wants. This bill did not receive a companion and therefore do not appear to be moving forward. The same for a bill opposed to the use of plastic carryout bags.

   Committee Chair Gabbard made a request to Mr. Rodriguez that since the LAIR committee isn’t scheduled to meet again until the end of session that she would like for him to send the Council updated reports on all the bills he’s tracking on a weekly or bi-monthly timeframe. Mr. Rodriguez said he would do this and would have an updated list for Council by end of day on Friday.

   Council Member Montanari asked Chief of Policy and Public Engagement, Kevin King about a funding request for Sea Walls that was discussed in the last LAIR committee meeting. Mr. King explained that the request wasn’t timely enough for this session and mentioned that Sustainability and Resiliency Director, Sharon Wright was working on a plan to approach this outside of a legislative budgetary process. Mr. King estimates that this project will be around a 12 million dollar need to complete the downtown project. Mr. Rodriguez mentioned that he’s looking into the possibility of sea walls qualifying under water projects because the State sets aside funds every year for water projects.

3. **St. Petersburg Chamber Priorities & Tallahassee Days Update**

   St. Pete Chamber Advocacy Manager, Matt Lettelleir is recognized by Committee Chair Gabbard for an update on legislative items from the Chamber. Mr. Lettelleir started off with an update on Tallahassee Days. St. Pete Days in Tallahassee are on February 19th and 20th. The Chamber is working on a rough draft agenda that should be ready on February 1st. A full itinerary will be distributed on the morning of February 19th. Mr. Lettelleir encourages all Council Members to attend.

   The Chamber’s priorities are: USFSP Consolidation, Carter G. Woodson funding, Tampa Bay Innovations Center, TBARTA operations, Affordable Housing to protect the State Housing Trust Fund, Behavioral Health Funding, and Visit Florida Funding.
Committee Chair Gabbard asked the Committee if they would like to have a mid-session LAIR meeting after Tallahassee days to discuss any updates or new information. Committee members agreed.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:21 PM

** The next LAIR Committee meeting will be held on February 27, 2020 at 2:00 PM in the Sunshine Center Auditorium.
2020 City Council Legislative Priorities

Affordable Housing:
SB 306/HB 381-Protect State Housing Trust Fund and Local Government Trust Fund from being swept into other funds

Urban Agriculture:
“Florida Urban Agriculture Act” will be filed for consideration during the 2020 session of the Florida Legislature and proposes to preserve local governments’ authority to regulate urban agriculture under certain conditions to further the growth of farmland and promote the establishment of new farms and agricultural uses within dense urbanized land areas of the State.

Private Laterals:
SB 150 – encouraging counties and municipalities to, by specific date, establish a sanitary sewer lateral inspection program; providing parameters for such a program.

Vessel Safety Revisions:
Proposed changes to Chapter 327 will be filed for consideration during the 2020 session of the Florida Legislature which propose to resolve these issues by addressing special hazards and officer safety, providing for the declaration of a public nuisance for certain vessels, funding the stored vessels study mandated in 2019, and providing a mangrove vegetation buffer/protection zone for vessels.

Fire Arm Safety:
A Resolution supporting SB 94, SB 134, SB 266, SB 270, SB 310, SB 428, SB 460, SB 548, SB 558, SB 586, SB 634, SB 652, HB 6009, HB 117, HB 201, HB 245, HB 289, HB 451, and any other proposed legislation which supports the ability of local governments to respond to the continuing and ever worsening gun violence and massacres by firearms; opposing HB 6001, HB 6003, HB 183 and any other proposed legislation which seeks to remove existing safeguards in place to prevent potential violence; urging the Pinellas County Delegation to support certain legislation; instructing the City Clerk to transmit this resolution to certain persons and entities

Funding Priorities:
HB 9155 - Carter G. Woodson Museum
A bill to be entitled
An act relating to building design; amending s. 163.3202, F.S.; providing that certain regulations relating to building design elements may not be applied to certain structures; providing exceptions; defining the term "building design elements"; providing applicability; amending s. 553.73, F.S.; authorizing a substantially affected person to file a petition with the Florida Building Commission to review certain local government regulations, laws, ordinances, policies, amendments, or land use or zoning provisions; defining the term "local government"; providing requirements for the petition and commission; requiring the commission to issue a nonbinding advisory opinion within a specified timeframe; making technical changes; amending ss. 125.01 and 125.56, F.S.; conforming cross-references to changes made by the act; making technical changes; providing an effective date.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

Section 1. Subsection (5) of section 163.3202, Florida Statutes, is renumbered as subsection (6), and a new subsection (5) is added to that section to read:

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.
163.3202 Land development regulations.—

(5)(a) Land development regulations relating to building design elements may not be applied to a single- or two-family dwelling unless:

1. The dwelling is listed in the National Register of Historic Places, as defined in s. 267.021; or is located in a National Register Historic District; or is designated as a historic property or located in a historic district, under the terms of a local preservation ordinance.

2. The regulations are adopted in order to implement the National Flood Insurance Program.

3. The regulations are adopted pursuant to and in compliance with chapter 553.

4. The dwelling is located in a community redevelopment area, as defined in s. 163.340(10).

(b) For purposes of this subsection, the term "building design elements" means the external building color; type or style of exterior cladding material; style or material of roof structures or porches; exterior nonstructural architectural ornamentation; location or architectural styling of windows or doors, including garage doors; number and type of rooms; and interior layout of rooms. The term does not include the height, bulk, orientation, or location of a structure on a zoning lot; or the use of buffering or screening to minimize potential adverse physical or visual impacts or protect the privacy of
neighbors.

(c) This subsection does not affect the validity or enforceability of private covenants or other contractual agreements relating to building design elements.

Section 2. Subsection (4) of section 553.73, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

553.73 Florida Building Code.—

(4)(a) All entities authorized to enforce the Florida Building Code under pursuant to s. 553.80 shall comply with applicable standards for issuance of mandatory certificates of occupancy, minimum types of inspections, and procedures for plans review and inspections as established by the commission by rule. Local governments may adopt amendments to the administrative provisions of the Florida Building Code, subject to the limitations in this subsection paragraph. Local amendments shall be more stringent than the minimum standards described in this section herein and shall be transmitted to the commission within 30 days after enactment. The local government shall make such amendments available to the general public in a usable format. The State Fire Marshal is responsible for establishing the standards and procedures required in this subsection paragraph for governmental entities with respect to applying the Florida Fire Prevention Code and the Life Safety Code.

(b) Local governments may, subject to the limitations in
of this section and not more than once every 6 months, adopt amendments to the technical provisions of the Florida Building Code that apply solely within the jurisdiction of such government and that provide for more stringent requirements than those specified in the Florida Building Code, not more than once every 6 months. A local government may adopt technical amendments that address local needs if:

1. The local governing body determines, following a public hearing which has been advertised in a newspaper of general circulation at least 10 days before the hearing, that there is a need to strengthen the requirements of the Florida Building Code. The determination must be based upon a review of local conditions by the local governing body, which review demonstrates by evidence or data that the geographical jurisdiction governed by the local governing body exhibits a local need to strengthen the Florida Building Code beyond the needs or regional variation addressed by the Florida Building Code, that the local need is addressed by the proposed local amendment, and that the amendment is no more stringent than necessary to address the local need.

2. Such additional requirements are not discriminatory against materials, products, or construction techniques of demonstrated capabilities.

3. Such additional requirements do may not introduce a new subject not addressed in the Florida Building Code.
(c) The enforcing agency shall make readily available, in a usable format, all amendments adopted under pursuant to this section.

(d) Any amendment to the Florida Building Code shall be transmitted within 30 days after adoption by the adopting local government to the commission. The commission shall maintain copies of all such amendments in a format that is usable and obtainable by the public. Local technical amendments are shall not become effective until 30 days after the amendment has been received and published by the commission.

(e) An amendment to the Florida Building Code adopted by a local government under pursuant to this subsection is paragraph shall be effective only until the adoption by the commission of the new edition of the Florida Building Code by the commission every third year. At such time, the commission shall review such amendment for consistency with the criteria in paragraph (9)(a) and adopt such amendment as part of the Florida Building Code or rescind the amendment. The commission shall immediately notify the respective local government of the rescission of any amendment. After receiving such notice, the respective local government may readopt the rescinded amendment under pursuant to the provisions of this subsection paragraph.

(f) Each county and municipality desiring to make local technical amendments to the Florida Building Code shall by interlocal agreement establish by interlocal agreement a
countywide compliance review board to review any amendment to
the Florida Building Code that is adopted by a local government
within the county under pursuant to this subsection and
paragraph, that is challenged by any substantially affected
party for purposes of determining the amendment's compliance
with this subsection paragraph. If challenged, the local
technical amendments shall not become effective until the
time for filing an appeal under paragraph (g) pursuant to
paragraph 8. has expired or, if there is an appeal, until the
commission issues its final order determining if the adopted
amendment is in compliance with this subsection.

(g) 8. If the compliance review board determines such
amendment is not in compliance with this subsection paragraph,
the compliance review board shall notify such local government
of the noncompliance and that the amendment is invalid and
unenforceable until the local government corrects the amendment
to bring it into compliance. The local government may appeal the
decision of the compliance review board to the commission. If
the compliance review board determines such amendment is to
be in compliance with this subsection paragraph, any
substantially affected party may appeal such determination to
the commission. Any such appeal must be filed with the
commission within 14 days after of the board's written
determination. The commission shall promptly refer the appeal to
the Division of Administrative Hearings by electronic means
through the division's website for the assignment of an administrative law judge. The administrative law judge shall conduct the required hearing within 30 days after being assigned to the appeal, and shall enter a recommended order within 30 days after of the conclusion of such hearing. The commission shall enter a final order within 30 days after an order is rendered thereafter. The provisions of Chapter 120 and the uniform rules of procedure shall apply to such proceedings. The local government adopting the amendment that is subject to challenge has the burden of proving that the amendment complies with this subsection paragraph in proceedings before the compliance review board and the commission, as applicable. Actions of the commission are subject to judicial review pursuant to s. 120.68. The compliance review board shall determine whether its decisions apply to a respective local jurisdiction or apply countywide.

(h) An amendment adopted under this subsection paragraph shall include a fiscal impact statement that documents the costs and benefits of the proposed amendment. Criteria for the fiscal impact statement shall include the impact to local government relative to enforcement and, the impact to property and building owners and, as well as to industry, relative to the cost of compliance. The fiscal impact statement may not be used as a basis for challenging the amendment for compliance.

(i) In addition to paragraphs (f) and (g) subparagraphs
7. and 9., the commission may review any amendments adopted 
under pursuant to this subsection and make nonbinding 
recommendations related to compliance of such amendments with 
this subsection.

(j) Any amendment adopted by a local enforcing agency 
under pursuant to this subsection may not apply to state 
or school district owned buildings, manufactured buildings or 
facility-built school buildings approved by the commission, or 
prototype buildings approved under pursuant to s. 553.77(3). The 
respective responsible entities shall consider the physical 
performance parameters substantiating such amendments when 
designing, specifying, and constructing such exempt buildings.

(k) A technical amendment to the Florida Building Code 
related to water conservation practices or design criteria 
adopted by a local government under pursuant to this subsection 
is not rendered void when the code is updated if the technical 
amendment is necessary to protect or provide for more efficient 
use of water resources as provided in s. 373.621. However, any 
such technical amendment carried forward into the next edition 
of the code under pursuant to this subsection paragraph is 
subject to review or modification as provided in this part.

(l) If a local government adopts a regulation, law, 
ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or zoning provision 
without using the process established in this subsection, and a 
substantially affected person considers such regulation, law,
ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or zoning provision to be a technical amendment to the Florida Building Code, then the substantially affected person may submit to the commission a petition for a nonbinding advisory opinion. If a substantially affected person submits a request in accordance with this paragraph, the commission shall issue a nonbinding advisory opinion stating whether or not the commission interprets the regulation, law, ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or zoning provision as a technical amendment to the Florida Building Code. As used in this paragraph, the term "local government" means a county, municipality, special district, or political subdivision of the state.

1. Requests to review a local government regulation, law, ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or zoning provision may be initiated by any substantially affected person. A substantially affected person includes an owner or builder subject to the regulation, law, ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or zoning provision, or an association of owners or builders having members who are subject to the regulation, law, ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or zoning provision.

2. In order to initiate a review, a substantially affected person must file a petition with the commission. The commission shall adopt a form for the petition and directions for filing, which shall be published on the Building Code Information System. The form shall, at a minimum, require the following:
a. The name of the local government that enacted the
regulation, law, ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or
zoning provision.

b. The name and address of the local government's general
counsel or administrator.

c. The name, address, and telephone number of the
petitioner; the name, address, and telephone number of the
petitioner's representative, if any; and an explanation of how
the petitioner's substantial interests are being affected by the
regulation, law, ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or
zoning provision.

d. A statement explaining why the regulation, law,
ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or zoning provision is
a technical amendment to the Florida Building Code, and which
provisions of the Florida Building Code, if any, are being
amended by the regulation, law, ordinance, policy, amendment, or
land use or zoning provision.

3. The petitioner shall serve the petition on the local
government's general counsel or administrator by certified mail,
return receipt requested, and send a copy of the petition to the
commission, in accordance with the commission's published
directions. The local government shall respond to the petition
in accordance with the form by certified mail, return receipt
requested, within 14 days after receipt of the petition,
including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays.
4. Upon receipt of a petition that meets the requirements of this paragraph, the commission shall publish the petition, including any response submitted by the local government, on the Building Code Information System in a manner that allows interested persons to address the issues by posting comments.

5. Before issuing an advisory opinion, the commission shall consider the petition, the response, and any comments posted on the Building Code Information System. The commission may also provide the petition, the response, and any comments posted on the Building Code Information System to a technical advisory committee, and may consider any recommendation provided by the technical advisory committee. The commission shall issue an advisory opinion stating whether the regulation, law, ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or zoning provision is a technical amendment to the Florida Building Code within 30 days after the filing of the petition, including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays. The commission shall publish its advisory opinion on the Building Code Information System and in the Florida Administrative Register. The commission's advisory opinion is nonbinding and is not a declaratory statement under s. 120.565.

Section 3. Paragraph (bb) of subsection (1) of section 125.01, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

125.01 Powers and duties.—

(1) The legislative and governing body of a county shall
have the power to carry on county government. To the extent not
inconsistent with general or special law, this power includes,
but is not restricted to, the power to:

(bb) Enforce the Florida Building Code as provided in s. 553.80, and adopt and enforce local technical amendments to the
Florida Building Code as provided in s. 553.73(4), pursuant to 553.73(4)(b) and (c).

Section 4. Subsection (1) of section 125.56, Florida
Statutes, is amended to read:

125.56 Enforcement and amendment of the Florida Building
Code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code; inspection fees;
inspectors; etc.—

(1) The board of county commissioners of each of the
several counties of the state may enforce the Florida Building
Code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code as provided in ss. 553.80, 633.206, and 633.208 and, at its discretion, adopt
local technical amendments to the Florida Building Code as
provided in s. 553.73(4), pursuant to s. 553.73(4)(b) and (c)
and local technical amendments to the Florida Fire Prevention
Code as provided in, pursuant to s. 633.202, to provide for the
safe construction, erection, alteration, repair, securing, and
demolition of any building within its territory outside the
corporate limits of any municipality. Upon a determination to
consider amending the Florida Building Code or the Florida Fire
Prevention Code by a majority of the members of the board of
county commissioners of such county, the board shall call a
public hearing and comply with the public notice requirements of
s. 125.66(2). The board shall hear all interested parties at the
public hearing and may then amend the building code or the fire
code consistent with the terms and purposes of this act. Upon
adoption, an amendment to the code shall be in full force and
effect throughout the unincorporated area of such county until
otherwise notified by the Florida Building Commission under
pursuant to s. 553.73 or the State Fire Marshal under pursuant
to s. 633.202. This subsection does not Nothing herein contained
shall be construed to prevent the board of county commissioners
from repealing such amendment to the building code or the fire
code at any regular meeting of such board.

Section 5. This act shall take effect July 1, 2020.
We find that design regulations are critical for the following reasons:

1. They allow us to maintain neighborhood character, improving compatibility of new infill homes, which helps protect the investment of all the homeowners in the neighborhood.

2. They allow community support for change; if the community stakeholders understand what new buildings might look like, they can be more widely accepted:
   - Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), also commonly called carriage homes, garage apartments or granny flats were reintroduced in 2007 with design standards. Since 2007, City staff have worked with neighborhood associations and their residents to find an agreeable balance between the regulation of certain design elements and the promotion of new construction resulting in more residential units. In 2017 and 2019, slight modifications were made to the design standards which have yielded both strong support among residents and increased construction activity for ADUs. In 2019, the minimum lot size was changed, again with no opposition in part due to the design regulations, allowing over 30,000 lots to qualify for ADUs. If we lose the ability to regulate design, which require the ADUs to match the existing home, it will be more difficult to get support to allow future expansions throughout the City.
   - Neighborhood Traditional Mixed-Residential is a new zoning category adopted in December of 2019 which allows up to four units on a standard single-family lot (AKA “Missing Middle”) with design regulations to keep these buildings in size and character with the existing single-family homes. If we are precluded from having design regulations for duplex units, it will be very unlikely that neighborhoods will support the rezoning necessary to implement this new district.

3. Affordability is not impacted by the regulations. In 2019, the City made housing affordability a top priority instituting a variety of programs and changes to address affordability, including eliminating building fees for homes 1,400 s.f. and less (see Enhanced Incentives for Housing Affordability handout). In partnership with Habitat for Humanity, we approved minor reductions in design regulations for Certified Affordable Homes. Habitat estimated the regulations added $8,000-$10,000 cost to a new home. For the typical new home in our city, priced $600,000 – to over a million, this is less than 2%.

Background: Bill 459 prohibits zoning & development regulations relating to building design for one and two-family buildings with the exception structures listed on National Register of Historic Places or contributing structures to a historic district; or the regulations implement the National Flood Insurance Program. The Bill defines “building design elements” to mean building color, type or style of exterior cladding, style or material of roof structures or porches, exterior nonstructural architectural ornamentation, location of architectural styling or windows or doors, and number, type, and layout of rooms.”

St. Petersburg is a built-out city of over 275,000, with housing stock developed primarily in the 1920’s and 50’s, prior to the advent and more widespread use of HOA’s, covenants and
restrictions. Much of our housing consists of small, two-bedroom homes which don’t meet the needs of today’s residents. Many of these homes are being replaced and we support the updating and replacement of these structures through our infill development of both vacant lots, additions and razing/replacement of obsolescent structures.

In 2001, a community wide visioning process led to a citywide rezoning in 2007 and adoption of design standards for all development types in all districts. These design regulations are intended to preserve the character of our distinct neighborhoods and promote compatibility for new homes. We do not regulate color or architectural style, but a designer must choose one style, and homes need to be finished on all four sides. In our Neighborhood Traditional districts, which make up about half of our neighborhoods (see attached Neighborhood Single Family Zoning map), we also require design elements such as a front porch, a 12” step-up to the front entry, and a minimum percentage of windows and architectural features.

During the recession of 2007-12, we averaged about 50 new homes per year, and we are now averaging over 275, with some neighborhoods experiencing a 10-20% replacement of the existing housing stock. In 2017, after broad community outreach which included both neighborhood representatives as wells as designers and builders, the code was modified with unanimous approval, easing some design standards (percentages of windows and architectural features) while adopting limits on building size, to control scale and mass, and allow for larger homes with bonuses for design elements (see attached “Breaking Down the Big Box House”). In October of 2019, we reported back on the effect of the regulations and demonstrated that these standards are improving compatibility of new homes, while still allowing the size of homes desired by the market (see attached LDR FAR Bonus Amendment presentation).

**Proposed Historic Exemption:** We are concerned that the exemption for contributing structures will have the unintended consequence of incentivizing the demolition of these structures. If only those structures within the historic district which are deemed contributing are held to design standards, an owner of such a home may opt to demolish the building instead of being held to a standard that would not apply to other non-contributing properties in the same neighborhood.

In summary, St. Petersburg design guidelines do not restrict property rights or limit free market conditions; they allow building a dream home that is accepted and welcomed into our neighborhoods, protecting the rights of all property owners in the neighborhood. We would respectfully request that the pre-emption on design regulations for single-family and two-unit buildings be removed from HB 459. A friendly amendment that would exempt Accessory Dwelling Units and all adopted overlay districts would alleviate most of our concerns, as overlay districts can protect existing neighborhoods without HOA’s/Covenants & Restrictions.

**Handouts**
Neighborhood Single Family Zoning Map
“Breaking Down the Big Box House”, Elizabeth Abernethy, AICP Florida Planning, Fall 2017
NT Zoning District Significant Changes
LDR FAR Bonus Amendment Presentation
Enhanced Incentives for Housing Affordability
MEMORANDUM

To: Rob Gerdes, Neighborhood Affairs Administrator

From: Brett B. Pettigrew, Assistant City Attorney

Date: October 14, 2019

Subject: Proposed “glitch bill” to eliminate ambiguity with respect to use of infrastructure sales surtax funds for affordable housing land acquisition

In November 2017, pursuant to Florida Statutes section 212.055(2), Pinellas County voters approved a fourth round of the “Penny for Pinellas” one-cent local option sales surtax program to support infrastructure in Pinellas County from 2020-2029. This approval explicitly authorized the use of surtax funds for “land acquisition for affordable housing,” which was added to the statutory definition of “infrastructure” through the Community Renewal Act adopted in 2009.

Adoption of a “glitch bill” to remove various sources of ambiguity in the current statutory language would provide the City with greater certainty in its efforts to expand access to affordable housing and make it easier for the City to partner with non-profit organizations and private developers in the provision of such affordable housing.

Specifically, such a “glitch bill” could accomplish the following goals:

- Clarify the scope of housing types by replacing “residential housing project” with “residential housing.” This would remove an undefined term used nowhere else in the Florida Statutes and eliminate the stigmatized term “project.” But most importantly, it would clarify that affordable housing built on the land is not limited to large- and mid-rise apartment complexes and can be tailored on a per-development basis to fit the needs of each community.

- Clarify that “land acquisition” may be accompanied by demolition and site preparation work needed to make the land usable for affordable housing.

- Clarify how long land acquired pursuant to this statute must be used for affordable housing by explicitly providing a minimum compliance period that starts from the time the land is acquired with surtax proceeds.

- Clarify that authorization for a ground lease is not limited to the construction phase by explicitly authorizing reconstruction, renovation, recapitalization, and residential occupancy as permissible uses of a ground lease.
• Clarify that the affordable housing built on the land can be accompanied by ancillary facilities that benefit the residents and other members of the community.

With those clarifications in mind, please consider the following proposed amendment to Florida Statutes section 212.055(2)(d)(1)(e), with changes shown in strikethrough–underline format:

e. Any expenditure for land acquisition, expenditure for a demolition of existing structures, or other site preparation, subject to the following conditions: (i) the land is used for a residential housing project in which at least 30 percent of the units on the land are affordable to individuals or families whose total annual household income does not exceed 120 percent of the area median income adjusted for household size; (ii) the land is owned by a local government or by a special district that enters into a written agreement with the local government to provide such housing; and (iii) the land is used in accordance with these conditions for a period of at least 50 years from the date of acquisition. The local government or special district may enter into a ground lease with a public or private person or entity for nominal or other consideration for the construction, reconstruction, renovation, recapitalization, or residential occupancy of the residential housing project on land acquired pursuant to this sub-subparagraph. For purposes of this sub-subparagraph, “residential housing” may include, in addition to any housing unit, any facility ancillary to such a housing unit, including a laundry facility, community room, or child care center.

I am hopeful that you will find this a helpful place to start a discussion on this matter, and I look forward to answering any questions or concerns on the proposed language above.
A bill to be entitled
An act relating to traffic and pedestrian safety;
providing a short title; creating s. 316.0756, F.S.;
specifying pedestrian crosswalks that may be
controlled by yellow rectangular rapid flashing beacon
traffic control devices; requiring removal of such
devices from, and removal or retrofitting of, certain
crosswalks; requiring the Department of Transportation
to request that the Federal Government allow
replacement of yellow rectangular rapid flashing
beacon traffic control devices with red rectangular
rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices;
providing requirements for replacement of rectangular
rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices, or
retrofitting or removal of certain crosswalks, if such
request is granted; providing a declaration of
important state interest; providing an effective date.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

Section 1. This act may be cited as the "Sophia Nelson
Pedestrian Safety Act."

Section 2. Section 316.0756, Florida Statutes, is created
to read:

316.0756 Traffic control devices at crosswalks.—
(1) Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, only a pedestrian crosswalk that is located on a public highway, street, or road that has no more than two lanes and for which the speed limit is 35 miles per hour or less may be controlled by yellow rectangular rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices.

(2) Yellow rectangular rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices that are located on a pedestrian crosswalk on a public highway, street, or road that does not meet the requirements of subsection (1) must be removed from such crosswalk by October 1, 2024, and the entity with jurisdiction over such crosswalk must remove the crosswalk or retrofit the crosswalk with legally acceptable equipment.

(3)(a) No later than October 1, 2020, the Department of Transportation must submit to the Federal Government a request for authorization to allow yellow rectangular rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices to be replaced by red rectangular rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices.

(b) If the Federal Government grants such request:

1. All yellow rectangular rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices at each crosswalk described in subsection (1) must be replaced by red rectangular rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices within 12 months after the date of federal authorization.

2.a. All yellow rectangular rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices...
control devices at each crosswalk described in subsection (2) must be replaced by red rectangular rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices within 12 months after the date of federal authorization; or

b. By October 1, 2024, each crosswalk described in subsection (2) must be retrofitted with legally acceptable equipment or removed.

Section 3. The Legislature finds and declares that this act fulfills an important state interest.

Section 4. This act shall take effect July 1, 2020.
A bill to be entitled
An act relating to traffic and pedestrian safety;
creating s. 316.0756, F.S.; requiring a pedestrian
crosswalk on a public highway, street, or road which
is located at any point other than at an intersection
with another public highway, street, or road to be
controlled by traffic control signal devices and
pedestrian control signals that conform to specified
requirements; providing coordination requirements for
such devices and signals; requiring, by a specified
date, the entity with jurisdiction over a public
highway, street, or road with a certain pedestrian
crosswalk to ensure that the crosswalk is controlled
by coordinated traffic control signal devices and
pedestrian control signals; authorizing such entity to
alternatively remove any such crosswalk; providing an
effective date.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

Section 1. Section 316.0756, Florida Statutes, is created
to read:

316.0756 Traffic control signal devices and pedestrian
control signals at crosswalks other than at intersections.—
(1) Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, a pedestrian
crosswalk on a public highway, street, or road which is located
at any point other than at an intersection with another public
highway, street, or road must be controlled by coordinated
traffic control signal devices and pedestrian control signals
that conform to the requirements of the most recent Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and other applicable Department of Transportation specifications. Traffic control signal devices and pedestrian control signals at crosswalk locations described in this section must be coordinated according to all of the following requirements:

(a) Vehicular traffic approaching the crosswalk is required to come to a complete stop before pedestrians are permitted to enter the crosswalk.

(b) Traffic control signal devices at intersections adjacent to the crosswalk are taken into consideration as provided in the most recent Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and other applicable Department of Transportation specifications.

(2) By October 1, 2024, the entity with jurisdiction over a public highway, street, or road with a crosswalk described in subsection (1) which is in existence on July 1, 2020, shall ensure that such crosswalk is controlled by coordinated traffic control signal devices and pedestrian control signals as required under subsection (1). The entity with jurisdiction may alternatively remove any such existing crosswalk.

Section 2. This act shall take effect July 1, 2020.
The flashing beacons are a proven safety device used all around the country. Florida could be the only state in the nation where they are made to be unavailable. It is very unlikely that the Federal Highway Administration will allow the flashing yellow beacons to be converted to red which means that marked crosswalks could only be provide in one of three ways: 1) Paint markings and signs with no lights at all, 2) Full traffic signal, or 3) Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (like we have at the Pinellas Trail and 16th St). The major challenges with only being able to use full signals or hybrid beacons for an enhanced crosswalk effect is that they take up so much room in a constrained right of way environment, cost so much to construct, and slow down traffic flow so significantly, that they will not be practical for installation in over 80% of the situations where a flashing yellow beacon exists today and would be appropriate in the future. There is a proposed amendment that may allow the devices on low-speed roadways which are also only 2 lanes, but those are the roads safer to cross than 3 or more lanes and it does not appear that a pedestrian refuge in the middle of the road would allow their use even if only 2 lanes had to be crossed at a time. The final result would be that many citizens will be left to cross roadways in unmarked locations, or inferior-marked locations if they do not walk to a fully signalized intersection. Staff and Administration has coordinated with Forward Pinellas and the local FDOT office to provide information about St. Petersburg’s experience with the devices, how many locations would be affected, and is attempting to provide our perspective to State Representatives who may be able to find a better path forward than the one currently being proposed. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thank you,
Evan

Evan Mory
Transportation & Parking Management Director
City of St. Petersburg
727-551-3322
Evan.Mory@stpete.org
Subject: Senate Bill 1000 – Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

Dear Senator Perry:

On behalf of the Florida Section of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, I would like to express our concern about the impacts of Senate Bill 1000, which proposes to eliminate the use of the Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) at midblock pedestrian crossings.

Section 316.130(7)(b) of the Florida Statutes requires motorists to come to a complete stop for a pedestrian in a crosswalk. Marked crosswalks at mid-block locations are accompanied by signs, both in advance of and at the crosswalk location, to further emphasize the presence of the crosswalk to the driver. Unfortunately, too many drivers ignore both the markings and the signs, endangering the pedestrians attempting to use the crosswalk.

The RRFB, developed a little over ten years ago in St. Petersburg, was intended to increase the conspicuity of the existing crosswalk markings and signs. Pedestrians activating the RRFBs alert the driver to their presence in the crosswalk. However, the RRFBs were never intended to serve as a traffic control device by itself.

The RRFB concept went through extensive testing in the field and was found to have a much higher rate of driver stopping compliance than markings and signs by themselves, even when accompanied by a traditional flashing amber beacon on the sign. Its simple design, capability for being solar powered, and minimal structural mounting requirements, kept the cost low—much lower than the alternative Hybrid Beacons or traditional traffic signals. In these days of limited resources, the lower cost allowed these proven devices to be used at many more locations while enhancing pedestrian safety.

By eliminating the availability of the RRFB as a crosswalk enhancing tool, our concern is that many crosswalks will need to be removed, thus having a negative effect on pedestrian safety. Please reconsider your support for this bill and allow the Florida Department of Transportation and the many local agencies that use RRFBs to continue to educate the public about their appropriate use.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Peter J. Yauch, P.E., PTOE, RSP2I
District Administrator
Senator Jeff Brandes  
416 Senate Building  
404 South Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1100  

Subject: Senate Bill 1000 – Traffic and Pedestrian Safety  

Dear Senator Brandes:  

On behalf of the Tampa Bay Section of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, which represents over 100 professionals in the region, I would like to express our strong opposition to Senate Bill 1000. We are concerned this bill’s unintended consequences would negatively impact the safety and welfare of the public. This bill as written proposes to modify or eliminate the use of the Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) at midblock pedestrian crossings and replace with Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHB) or signals at 10 times the cost, otherwise the crosswalk would need to be removed in its entirety.

RRFBs are an effective, low-cost tool endorsed by the Federal Highway Administration and the Florida Department of Transportation, that has proven to increase motorist stopping compliance by more 90 percent, similar to PHBs. RRFBs alert drivers and enhance pedestrian visibility when crossing the road. By Florida Statute 316.130(7b), motorists are required to come to a complete stop for a pedestrian in a marked crosswalk, no matter the traffic control device installed. By changing the color, compliance may or may not be marginally improved, but it will be at a drastic cost. In all likelihood, these will be removed.

By replacing this crosswalk enhancing tool with signals or PHBs, it could potentially lead to lower compliance by motorists, increased traffic delay, congestion and overall unsafe driving practices. Crash data has shown that crashes at signalized intersections are higher than at midblock crossings with RRFBs. Additionally, in situations where a traffic signal or PHB is not feasible or allowable by other engineering standards, this bill will require the removal of that crosswalk, reducing accessibility and forcing pedestrians to cross large streets, unprotected. This will only increase crashes in Tampa Bay, which many agencies and advocacy groups have worked diligently to reduce.

Rather than abolishing this tool, we would support using the proposed replacement funding to enhance and research the system. Traffic safety education and professional training, enforcement of pedestrian and motorist behavior, and research and innovation via sound, engineering principles are positive steps we recommend. Please reconsider your support for this bill and help agencies continue to provide improved accessibility and mobility for all road users in Tampa Bay.

Thank you,

Kris Milster, P.E., PTOE  
Past-President  
Tampa Bay Institute of Transportation Engineers
January 28, 2020

Representative Randy Fine
222 The Capitol
402 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300

RE: SB 1000 and HB 1371 – Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

Dear Representative Fine:

Forward Pinellas – the metropolitan planning organization for Pinellas County – has reviewed the proposed House Bill, “HB 1371” referred to as the “Turn the Flashing Yellow Crosswalks Red” bill, and the associated Senate Bill, “SB 1000,” and want to express our strong opposition. We are concerned that the proposed legislation removes local decision-making on the use of a pedestrian and bicycle safety device that is proven effective at reducing injuries and fatalities for our most vulnerable road users. If signed into law, this bill would undermine local and regional decision-making using legislative fiat to drastically curtail one of the most effective tools in the toolbox for safety.

The use of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) originated in Pinellas County almost 15 years ago as an experimental traffic control countermeasure to reinforce safe mid-block crossings in locations where signalized intersections are too far apart. In recognition of their effectiveness at increasing motorist yield rates when people are using crosswalks and their significant safety benefits, the Federal Highway Administration and Florida Department of Transportation have authorized and endorsed their use in a variety of settings. The FHWA lists the RRFBs as the top countermeasure for its Safe Transportation for Every Pedestrian (STEP) 2.0 initiative.

These yellow flashing beacons provide higher driver yield rates for pedestrians as demonstrated by the City of St. Petersburg’s analysis in 2010 and by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) in 2016. Factoring in appropriate design considerations and location, the 2016 TTI study and compliance with FHWA conditions, RRFBs increase pedestrian safety at uncontrolled marked crosswalks by 98 percent. In St. Petersburg, motorist compliance increased from two percent prior to installation of RRFBs to more than 90 percent afterwards. They have since been deployed throughout Pinellas County and many other jurisdictions across the state and country.


Requiring the conversion of yellow RRFBs into a coordinated traffic signal device (red signal phase) would be a step backwards for safety and accessibility. Traffic control devices, such as full traffic signals and High Intensity Activated Crosswalk (HAWK) beacons, must meet a higher standard and create a longer delay for motorists. These devices are not interchangeable or equal. Unlike RRFBs, which allow vehicles to continue once a pedestrian clears the travel lane, motorists may not continue until the signal returns to green. Because of these standards and additional delay caused to vehicle traffic, coupled with a significant unfunded mandate, FDOT and local governments will likely remove most of the RRFBs and not replace them with a red-phased signal.

Finally, the Pinellas Crash Data Management System we maintain shows far higher rates of pedestrian and bicyclist injuries and fatalities at fully signalized intersections than at mid-block crossings with RRFBs. Signalized intersections are prone to crashes involving pedestrians when drivers fail to yield while turning. We also have a high rate of red light running throughout Florida, leading to a significant problem for pedestrian safety at our intersections, not the mid-block crosswalks. The current design and implementation of RRFBs saves lives by physically highlighting the existing legal requirements for cars to yield for people in crosswalks.

Forward Pinellas is committed to safety for all roadway users in Pinellas County, and RRFBs are a key part of the solution. I urge you to consider the negative consequences, both direct and indirect, of this proposed bill. This legislation will reduce safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. It will force the costly removal or conversion of nearly 400 RRFBs in Pinellas County alone with neither funding nor commensurate replacement designs options, and it reinforces a culture of speed that is a principal factor in Florida’s dangerous roadways. A much more effective approach would be to increase funding for education and enforcement of traffic laws, such as making High Visibility Enforcement a year-round activity.

Please contact me at 727-464-8712 if you would like clarification on the Forward Pinellas policy position.

Respectfully,

Whit Blanton, FAICP
Executive Director

cc: Pinellas County Legislative Delegation
    Forward Pinellas Board
INTRODUCTION

Florida is the third largest state in the nation and the City of Largo is the twenty-ninth largest city in the State of Florida. The City of Largo's key legislative issues are more than just local or state legislative issues; many of the concerns are of national significance.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT | HOUSING

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG)
The City of Largo will SUPPORT the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program’s continued funding and SUPPORT for local community development and housing assistance programs administered by municipal and county elected officials.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM (HOME)
The City will SUPPORT the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Home Investment Partnership Program's (HOME) continued funding.

COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT (CRA)
The City seeks to SUPPORT and will WATCH legislation designed to "modernize" the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA). The Community Reinvestment Act was enacted by Congress in 1977 and is intended to encourage regulatory financial institutions to help meet the credit needs of the communities in which they operate, including the needs of low- and moderate-income communities.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION | SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The City of Largo will SUPPORT federal programs --- including Federal Economic Development Administration (EDA), and Small Business Administration (SBA) --- that recognize the importance of a federal role in state and local economic development, and provide funding resources, tax-free financing (e.g. bonds, bank-qualified loans and other forms of tax exempt financing), information and technical assistance to further this important role.

OPPORTUNITY ZONES

The City will SUPPORT the Opportunity Zone program - a new community investment tool established by Congress in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 to encourage long-term investments in low-income urban and rural communities nationwide. Opportunity Zones provide a tax incentive for investors to re-invest their unrealized capital gains into dedicated Opportunity Funds.

The City of Largo has five federally approved Opportunity Zones that were approved by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Economic Development Administration (EDA) on June 14, 2018: Two Opportunity Zones in Greater Downtown Largo and three Opportunity Zones in commercial areas within the City's existing corporate boundaries and future Planning Service Area: Seminole, Ulmerton and Railroad Track; Fairway Village and Paradise Island; and ICOT Center and High Point.

Guiding Principles: Transportation is a core service of government that is critical for promoting economic development, facilitating the efficient delivery of goods and services and delivering vital public safety services, including police, fire and rescue and disaster response services. Sufficient transportation funding of all options is needed in order to provide a robust and connected transportation network in Tampa Bay, throughout Florida and the nation.

In central areas, where dense development exists, a multi-modal system can provide transportation solutions for everyone. To be effective and affordable, the transportation network must contain a balance of roads, public transit and other solutions. No single piece will solve the entire puzzle (Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization).

The City seeks transportation options and solutions that ensure and enhance access to employment, health care, education, and other life-sustaining activities for persons with low- and moderate-incomes; persons with disabilities; older adults as well as at-risk children and youth who are dependent upon others for transportation.
The City of Largo urges Congress to SUPPORT legislation that ensures funding for locally owned infrastructure, including water and wastewater facilities, preserves the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds, promotes innovative financing, and ensures the long-term certainty and solvency of the Federal Highway Trust Fund (Florida Association of Counties).

Guiding Principles: Well-planned infrastructure investments are a catalyst for economic growth, long-term prosperity, access to more opportunities and improved public health. Today's bipartisan support for infrastructure holds the promise of not only new jobs and economic growth but also stronger communities and neighborhoods providing vital access to opportunity. Any federal infrastructure program should be driven by key principles of good planning. This requires considering the importance of location, helping communities fully leverage investments, and connecting infrastructure to related issues like resilience, housing, and economic development. Infrastructure programs should prioritize support for projects that offer multiple benefits (American Planning Association).

The City of Largo will SUPPORT legislation that protects infrastructure and the supply chain, ensures election integrity and builds a security workforce. The City will SUPPORT dedicating federal resources for the development and enhancement of cybersecurity by providing funding for technical assistance, threat assessment, employee training, infrastructure improvements and data protection, including the protection of exempt and confidential information such as law enforcement personnel information and building plans for government and recreational buildings and infrastructure (Florida League of Cities).

Digital threats are occurring daily and have the potential to severely damage or incapacitate business, government, military and political institutions, which affect the organizations that are being targeted as well as citizens, consumers and vendors of the targeted organizations. Cybersecurity and privacy issues are moving these topics to forefront of homeland security priorities and to the top of the congressional agenda. In 2019, the first session of the 116th Congress saw 30 bills introduced in the House of Representatives and 7 bills introduced in the Senate that dealt directly with cybersecurity issues. The proposed legislation seeks to address the following issues:

- Critical infrastructure legislation - Protecting the nation's water, electric, transportation and other critical infrastructure sectors;
- Workforce cybersecurity - Ensuring that the federal government has the cybersecurity expertise that is needed;
- Supply chain cybersecurity - Seeks to address the use of foreign technology by the U.S. government and military offices; and
- Election cybersecurity - Seeks to secure government computer networks from malicious cyber intrusions and protect the integrity of elections (International Data Group's csoonline.com)
FLOOD INSURANCE

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM (NFIP) | REFORMING THE PROGRAM
The City of Largo will SUPPORT re-authorization of the NFIP legislation with legislative, policy and programmatic modifications to ensure no coverage lapses and to improve the affordability, transparency and financial stability of the program through reforms in the following areas: 1) affordability | rate structure; 2) mapping | data collection | modeling; and 3) flood mitigation. The City will SUPPORT provisions that allow all property owners, including businesses and owners of second homes, access to affordable flood insurance. Additionally, the City will urge Congress to OPPOSE any re-authorization efforts that are detrimental to policy holders, local governments, and the integrity of the Program (Florida Association of Counties).

Specifically, the City seeks to SUPPORT and WATCH proposed legislation that provides for a more permanent time extension of the NFIP; a long term regulatory solution that positions the Program for the future, including Congress’ efforts to allocate financial resources to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security’s Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in order to provide the nation’s consumers with a precise understanding of their flood risk.

Guiding Principles: Modern technology should be embraced, including Li-DAR (a surveying mention using light from a laser), and should inform a modernized mapping program. A key to the NFIP’s sustainability is encouraging greater program participation and ensuring Floridians and consumers, nationwide, understand the importance of obtaining and maintaining flood insurance coverage (Florida Association of Counties). The re-authorization of NFIP presents an important opportunity to use good planning to create healthier and safer communities (American Planning Association).

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

REFORMING THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
The City of Largo will SUPPORT appropriation levels that ensure timely processing of local governments' reimbursement requests under the Public Assistance Program for communities impacted by hurricanes and natural disasters.

FEMA FLOOD MAPPING - RISK RATING 2.0
The City will urge Congress to SUPPORT legislation and rule-making that ensures transparency and visibility as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) strives to transform the NFIP. Although FEMA deferred the changeover to a new rating system for single-family homes from October 1, 2020 to October 1, 2021, the City will SUPPORT efforts by cities and counties to further delay FEMA’s implementation of its new Risk Rating 2.0 flood mapping initiative if it is deemed premature.
The City of Largo will **SUPPORT** increased investment in mitigation programs such as the Pre Disaster Mitigation Program, the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program and other partnerships between local and federal governments to complete mitigation projects and increase resiliency to disasters. The City will **OPPOSE** programmatic changes that would increase the local cost share for disaster recovery, such as implementation of a disaster deductible (Florida Association of Counties).

The City of Largo will urge Congress to **SUPPORT** bi-annual passage of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) that authorizes U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' projects and policies that often have state-side impacts to Florida, including port and inlet construction, beach nourishment; and Everglades restoration projects.

The City will urge Congress to **SUPPORT** restoration of congressionally directed spending (Florida Association of Counties).

The City of Largo will urge Congress to **SUPPORT** the continuation of adequate funding of critical programs that provide resources for the provision of local services and local public infrastructure (Florida Association of Counties). These funding programs include, but are not limited to, the following:

- U.S. Corp of Engineers - Port and inlet construction and maintenance; beach nourishment; and Everglades restoration;
- U.S. Department of Transportation;
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA);
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Grants;
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA);
- U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) workforce development, career training, and workforce shortage programs;
- U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) and Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants (JAG);
- National Endowment of the Arts;
- National Endowment for the Humanities;
- National Park Services’ Land and Water Conservation Fund, including grant funding resources for urban parks (e.g. Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Program (ORLP));
- Federal Economic Development Administration (EDA); and
- Small Business Administration