

**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

26 | 163.3202 Land development regulations.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

51 neighbors.

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

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

57 553.73 Florida Building Code.—

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

75 (b) Local governments may, subject to the limitations in

76 ~~of~~ this section and not more than once every 6 months, adopt
77 amendments to the technical provisions of the Florida Building
78 Code that ~~which~~ apply solely within the jurisdiction of such
79 government and that ~~which~~ provide for more stringent
80 requirements than those specified in the Florida Building Code, ~~7~~
81 ~~not more than once every 6 months~~. A local government may adopt
82 technical amendments that address local needs if:

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

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

99 3. Such additional requirements do ~~may~~ not introduce a new
100 subject not addressed in the Florida Building Code.

101 (c)4. The enforcing agency shall make readily available,
 102 in a usable format, all amendments adopted under ~~pursuant to~~
 103 this section.

104 (d)5. Any amendment to the Florida Building Code shall be
 105 transmitted within 30 days after adoption by the ~~adopting~~ local
 106 government to the commission. The commission shall maintain
 107 copies of all such amendments in a format that is usable and
 108 obtainable by the public. Local technical amendments are ~~shall~~
 109 not ~~become~~ effective until 30 days after the amendment has been
 110 received and published by the commission.

111 (e)6. ~~An~~ Any amendment to the Florida Building Code
 112 adopted by a local government under ~~pursuant to~~ this subsection
 113 ~~is paragraph shall be~~ effective only until the adoption ~~by the~~
 114 ~~commission~~ of the new edition of the Florida Building Code by
 115 the commission every third year. At such time, the commission
 116 shall review such amendment for consistency with the criteria in
 117 paragraph (9) (a) and adopt such amendment as part of the Florida
 118 Building Code or rescind the amendment. The commission shall
 119 immediately notify the respective local government of the
 120 rescission of any amendment. After receiving such notice, the
 121 respective local government may readopt the rescinded amendment
 122 under ~~pursuant to~~ the provisions of this subsection ~~paragraph~~.

123 (f)7. Each county and municipality desiring to make local
 124 technical amendments to the Florida Building Code shall ~~by~~
 125 ~~interlocal agreement~~ establish by interlocal agreement a

126 countywide compliance review board to review any amendment to
 127 the Florida Building Code that is~~r~~ adopted by a local government
 128 within the county under ~~pursuant to~~ this subsection and
 129 ~~paragraph~~, that is challenged by a any substantially affected
 130 party for purposes of determining the amendment's compliance
 131 with this subsection ~~paragraph~~. If challenged, the local
 132 technical amendments are ~~shall~~ not ~~become~~ effective until the
 133 time for filing an appeal under paragraph (g) ~~pursuant to~~
 134 ~~subparagraph 8.~~ has expired or, if there is an appeal, until the
 135 commission issues its final order determining if the adopted
 136 amendment is in compliance with this subsection.

137 (g) 8. If the compliance review board determines such
 138 amendment is not in compliance with this subsection ~~paragraph~~,
 139 the compliance review board shall notify such local government
 140 of the noncompliance and that the amendment is invalid and
 141 unenforceable until the local government corrects the amendment
 142 to bring it into compliance. The local government may appeal the
 143 decision of the compliance review board to the commission. If
 144 the compliance review board determines that such amendment is ~~to~~
 145 ~~be~~ in compliance with this subsection ~~paragraph~~, any
 146 substantially affected party may appeal such determination to
 147 the commission. Any such appeal must ~~shall~~ be filed with the
 148 commission within 14 days after ~~of~~ the board's written
 149 determination. The commission shall promptly refer the appeal to
 150 the Division of Administrative Hearings by electronic means

151 through the division's website for the assignment of an
152 administrative law judge. The administrative law judge shall
153 conduct the required hearing within 30 days after being assigned
154 to the appeal, and shall enter a recommended order within 30
155 days after ~~of~~ the conclusion of such hearing. The commission
156 shall enter a final order within 30 days after an order is
157 rendered thereafter. ~~The provisions of Chapter 120 and the~~
158 uniform rules of procedure shall apply to such proceedings. The
159 local government adopting the amendment that is subject to
160 challenge has the burden of proving that the amendment complies
161 with this subsection ~~paragraph~~ in proceedings before the
162 compliance review board and the commission, as applicable.
163 Actions of the commission are subject to judicial review under
164 ~~pursuant to~~ s. 120.68. The compliance review board shall
165 determine whether its decisions apply to a respective local
166 jurisdiction or apply countywide.

167 (h)9. An amendment adopted under this subsection ~~paragraph~~
168 shall include a fiscal impact statement that ~~which~~ documents the
169 costs and benefits of the proposed amendment. Criteria for the
170 fiscal impact statement shall include the impact to local
171 government relative to enforcement and, ~~the impact to property~~
172 and building owners and, ~~as well as to industry,~~ relative to the
173 cost of compliance. The fiscal impact statement may not be used
174 as a basis for challenging the amendment for compliance.

175 (i)10. In addition to paragraphs (f) and (g) ~~subparagraphs~~

176 ~~7. and 9.~~, the commission may review any amendments adopted
177 under ~~pursuant to~~ this subsection and make nonbinding
178 recommendations related to compliance of such amendments with
179 this subsection.

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

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

197 (l) If a local government adopts a regulation, law,
198 ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or zoning provision
199 without using the process established in this subsection, and a
200 substantially affected person considers such regulation, law,

201 ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or zoning provision to
202 be a technical amendment to the Florida Building Code, then the
203 substantially affected person may submit to the commission a
204 petition for a nonbinding advisory opinion. If a substantially
205 affected person submits a request in accordance with this
206 paragraph, the commission shall issue a nonbinding advisory
207 opinion stating whether or not the commission interprets the
208 regulation, law, ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or
209 zoning provision as a technical amendment to the Florida
210 Building Code. As used in this paragraph, the term "local
211 government" means a county, municipality, special district, or
212 political subdivision of the state.

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

221 2. In order to initiate a review, a substantially affected
222 person must file a petition with the commission. The commission
223 shall adopt a form for the petition and directions for filing,
224 which shall be published on the Building Code Information
225 System. The form shall, at a minimum, require the following:

226 a. The name of the local government that enacted the
227 regulation, law, ordinance, policy, amendment, or land use or
228 zoning provision.

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

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

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

243 3. The petitioner shall serve the petition on the local
244 government's general counsel or administrator by certified mail,
245 return receipt requested, and send a copy of the petition to the
246 commission, in accordance with the commission's published
247 directions. The local government shall respond to the petition
248 in accordance with the form by certified mail, return receipt
249 requested, within 14 days after receipt of the petition,
250 including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays.

251 4. Upon receipt of a petition that meets the requirements
252 of this paragraph, the commission shall publish the petition,
253 including any response submitted by the local government, on the
254 Building Code Information System in a manner that allows
255 interested persons to address the issues by posting comments.

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

272 Section 3. Paragraph (bb) of subsection (1) of section
273 125.01, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

274 125.01 Powers and duties.—

275 (1) The legislative and governing body of a county shall

276 have the power to carry on county government. To the extent not
277 inconsistent with general or special law, this power includes,
278 but is not restricted to, the power to:

279 (bb) Enforce the Florida Building Code~~7~~ as provided in s.
280 553.80~~7~~ and adopt and enforce local technical amendments to the
281 Florida Building Code as provided in s. 553.73(4)~~, pursuant to~~
282 ~~s. 553.73(4)(b) and (c).~~

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

285 125.56 Enforcement and amendment of the Florida Building
286 Code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code; inspection fees;
287 inspectors; etc.—

288 (1) The board of county commissioners of each of the
289 several counties of the state may enforce the Florida Building
290 Code and the Florida Fire Prevention Code~~7~~ as provided in ss.
291 553.80, 633.206, and 633.208~~7~~ and, at its discretion, adopt
292 local technical amendments to the Florida Building Code as
293 provided in s. 553.73(4)~~, pursuant to s. 553.73(4)(b) and (c)~~
294 and local technical amendments to the Florida Fire Prevention
295 Code as provided in~~, pursuant to~~ s. 633.202~~7~~ to provide for the
296 safe construction, erection, alteration, repair, securing, and
297 demolition of any building within its territory outside the
298 corporate limits of any municipality. Upon a determination to
299 consider amending the Florida Building Code or the Florida Fire
300 Prevention Code by a majority of the members of the board of

301 county commissioners of such county, the board shall call a
302 public hearing and comply with the public notice requirements of
303 s. 125.66(2). The board shall hear all interested parties at the
304 public hearing and may then amend the building code or the fire
305 code consistent with the terms and purposes of this act. Upon
306 adoption, an amendment to the code shall be in full force and
307 effect throughout the unincorporated area of such county until
308 otherwise notified by the Florida Building Commission under
309 ~~pursuant to~~ s. 553.73 or the State Fire Marshal under ~~pursuant~~
310 ~~to~~ s. 633.202. This subsection does not ~~Nothing herein contained~~
311 ~~shall be construed to~~ prevent the board of county commissioners
312 from repealing such amendment to the building code or the fire
313 code at any regular meeting of such board.

314 Section 5. This act shall take effect July 1, 2020.

City of St. Petersburg

Florida House of Representatives CS/HB 459 - Building Design

February 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 well 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 residential housing~~project in which~~; (ii) 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,~~if~~; (iii) 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 (iv) 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 will you 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.

1 A bill to be entitled
2 An act relating to traffic and pedestrian safety;
3 providing a short title; creating s. 316.0756, F.S.;
4 specifying pedestrian crosswalks that may be
5 controlled by yellow rectangular rapid flashing beacon
6 traffic control devices; requiring removal of such
7 devices from, and removal or retrofitting of, certain
8 crosswalks; requiring the Department of Transportation
9 to request that the Federal Government allow
10 replacement of yellow rectangular rapid flashing
11 beacon traffic control devices with red rectangular
12 rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices;
13 providing requirements for replacement of rectangular
14 rapid flashing beacon traffic control devices, or
15 retrofitting or removal of certain crosswalks, if such
16 request is granted; providing a declaration of
17 important state interest; providing an effective date.

18
19 Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

20
21 Section 1. This act may be cited as the "Sophia Nelson
22 Pedestrian Safety Act."

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

25 316.0756 Traffic control devices at crosswalks.-

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

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

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

44 (b) If the Federal Government grants such request:

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

50 2.a. All yellow rectangular rapid flashing beacon traffic

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

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

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

60 Section 4. This act shall take effect July 1, 2020.

By Senator Perry

8-00654-20

20201000__

1 A bill to be entitled
2 An act relating to traffic and pedestrian safety;
3 creating s. 316.0756, F.S.; requiring a pedestrian
4 crosswalk on a public highway, street, or road which
5 is located at any point other than at an intersection
6 with another public highway, street, or road to be
7 controlled by traffic control signal devices and
8 pedestrian control signals that conform to specified
9 requirements; providing coordination requirements for
10 such devices and signals; requiring, by a specified
11 date, the entity with jurisdiction over a public
12 highway, street, or road with a certain pedestrian
13 crosswalk to ensure that the crosswalk is controlled
14 by coordinated traffic control signal devices and
15 pedestrian control signals; authorizing such entity to
16 alternatively remove any such crosswalk; providing an
17 effective date.

18
19 Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

20
21 Section 1. Section 316.0756, Florida Statutes, is created
22 to read:

23 316.0756 Traffic control signal devices and pedestrian
24 control signals at crosswalks other than at intersections.-

25 (1) Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, a pedestrian
26 crosswalk on a public highway, street, or road which is located
27 at any point other than at an intersection with another public
28 highway, street, or road must be controlled by coordinated
29 traffic control signal devices and pedestrian control signals

8-00654-20

20201000__

30 that conform to the requirements of the most recent Manual on
31 Uniform Traffic Control Devices and other applicable Department
32 of Transportation specifications. Traffic control signal devices
33 and pedestrian control signals at crosswalk locations described
34 in this section must be coordinated according to all of the
35 following requirements:

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

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

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

51 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



Institute of Transportation Engineers

Florida Puerto Rico District

Peter J. Yauch, P.E., PTOE, RSP2I, District Administrator
1907 North US 301, Suite 120
Tampa, Florida 33619
pyauch@iteris.com

The Honorable Keith Perry
Florida Senate
316 Senate Building
404 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1100

February 10, 2020

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



Tampa Bay Institute of Transportation Engineers

2000 East 11th Avenue, Suite 300

Tampa, Florida 33605

Kris.milster@gmail.com

www.tbite.org | tbite@tbite.org

February 14, 2020

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,¹ 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)² 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.

¹ Federal Highway Administration. *MUTCD – Interim Approval for Optional Use of Pedestrian-Actuated Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacons at Uncontrolled Marked Crosswalks (IA-21)*. Memo IA-21. March 2018.

² Fitzpatrick, K., M. Brewer, R. Avelar, and T. Lindheimer. *Will You Stop for Me? Roadway Design and Traffic Control Device Influences on Drivers Yielding to Pedestrians in a Crosswalk with a Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacon*. Report No. TTI-CTS-0010. Texas A&M Transportation Institute, College Station, Texas. June 2016.

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



CITY OF LARGO 2020 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

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.

CITY OF LARGO 2020 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA



TRANSPORTATION

The City of Largo will **SUPPORT** legislation that preserves local governments' control of transportation planning, provides for an equitable transportation funding formula between the federal government, states, counties and municipalities, and provides for additional dedicated venue options for municipal transportation infrastructure and transit projects. The City seeks to **SUPPORT** and **WATCH** proposed legislation and regulation regarding the U.S. Department of Transportation's BUILD Discretionary Grant Program (formerly known as Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Grants).

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.



ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

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.

CITY OF LARGO 2020 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA



CYBERSECURITY

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](https://www.csoonline.com))



INFRASTRUCTURE

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).

CITY OF LARGO 2020 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA



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 method 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.

CITY OF LARGO 2020 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA



DISASTER RECOVERY

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).



WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

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).



APPROPRIATIONS

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);
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) and State Homeland Security Program;
- 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