



Voter Guide – State & Local Ballot Measures General Election – November 8, 2022

State of Florida Constitutional Amendments

Amendment 1- Limit on increased property assessment for flood improvements.

Ballot Language:

“Proposing an amendment to the State Constitution, effective January 1, 2023, to authorize the Legislature, by general law, to prohibit the consideration of any change or improvement made to real property used for residential purposes to improve the property’s resistance to flood damage in determining the assessed value of such property for ad valorem taxation purposes.”

Synopsis:

Many home improvement projects ultimately increase the assessed value of a home, which means the homeowners pay higher property taxes. This amendment would allow the Florida Legislature to pass laws that would make improvements intended to protect homes from flood damage exempt from higher assessments. The amendment is in response to the threat to Florida homes from rising sea levels.

[Click here to read House Bill 1377 \(2021\) - The Florida Senate \(flsenate.gov\)](#)

Supporters: Florida Legislature (originator of Amendment)

Opponents: no known opponents

A Yes Vote Would:

- Authorize the Florida Legislature to pass laws that would exempt flood resistance improvements from contributing to increases in property assessments. That means property owners wouldn’t pay higher taxes because of those improvements.
- Exempt flood resistance improvements such as “elevating structures, filling basements, and waterproofing,” as well as improvements “to allow for stormwater runoff, waterproofing basements, installing check valves capable of preventing water backup, and elevating furnaces, heaters, and electrical panels.”
- Take effect Jan. 1, 2023.

A No Vote Would:

- Maintain the status quo, which means homeowners’ flood resistance improvements might result in higher property assessments and higher taxes.

Amendment 2- Abolish the state Constitution Revision Commission (CRC)

Ballot Language:

“Proposing an amendment to the State Constitution to abolish the Constitution Revision Commission, which meets at 20-year intervals and is scheduled to next convene in 2037, as a method of submitting proposed amendments or revisions to the State Constitution to electors of the state for approval. This amendment does not affect the ability to revise or amend the State Constitution through citizen initiative, constitutional convention, the Taxation and Budget Reform Commission, or legislative joint resolution.”

Synopsis:

An amendment to Florida’s Constitution can get on the ballot several ways, including through a vote by the Legislature, a citizen-led petition drive, constitutional convention, the Taxation and Budget Reform Commission and the Florida Constitution Revision Commission (CRC), which convenes every 20 years and whose 37 members are appointed by the governor, legislative leaders and the chief justice of the Florida Supreme court. This amendment would abolish the CRC, which last convened in 2017-18 and placed eight amendments on the 2018 ballot, several of

which bundled different amendments into one question. The Citizen Initiative process for amending the Constitution has already been significantly restricted by the state Legislature in recent years.

[Click here to read Senate Bill 204 \(2021\) - The Florida Senate \(flsenate.gov\)](#)

Supporters: Florida Legislature (originator of Amendment)

Opponents: League of Women Voters of Florida

A Yes Vote Would:

- Eliminate the Constitution Revision Commission, which was created in 1968 and meets every 20 years to consider changes to the state Constitution.
- Leaves four ways for a constitutional amendment to get on the ballot: through the Legislature, a citizen-led initiative, constitutional convention, or the Taxation and Budget Reform Commission.

A No Vote Would:

- Preserve the state's Constitution Revision Commission and its ability to present amendments to the voters every 20 years.

Amendment 3- New \$50,000 homestead exemption for certain public service employees

Ballot Language:

"Proposing an amendment to the State Constitution to authorize the Legislature, by general law, to grant an additional homestead tax exemption for nonschool levies of up to \$50,000 of the assessed value of homestead property owned by classroom teachers, law enforcement officers, correctional officers, firefighters, emergency medical technicians, paramedics, child welfare services professionals, active duty members of the United States Armed Forces, and Florida National Guard members. This amendment shall take effect January 1, 2023."

Synopsis:

This amendment would authorize the state Legislature to create a new homestead exemption of up to \$50,000 for certain public service employees, including "classroom teachers, law enforcement officers, correctional officers, firefighters, emergency medical technicians, paramedics, child welfare services professionals, active duty members of the United States Armed Forces, and members of the Florida National Guard." The exemption means property owners in these professions can subtract \$50,000 from the assessed value of their property, which will reduce their local property tax bills. The exemption would be in addition to the standard \$50,000 homestead exemptions Floridians already receive on their primary residence. The new exemption would not apply to assessments for school taxes. The Legislature has already passed a companion bill that, if the constitutional amendment is passed by 60% of Florida's voters, will create the new exemption and make it effective on Jan. 1, 2023.

[Click here to read House Bill 1 \(2022\) - The Florida Senate \(flsenate.gov\)](#)

Supporters: Florida Legislature (originator of Amendment)

Opponents: League of Women Voters of Florida

A Yes Vote Would:

- Allow the Legislature to create a new, homestead exemption of up to \$ 50,000 for people in certain public service professions
- Exclude the exemption from assessments for school property taxes.
- Cost local governments \$85.9 million in lost revenue for fiscal year 2023-24, growing to \$96 million in fiscal year 2026-27. The state would make up for the losses in Florida's 29 "fiscally constrained" counties, primarily rural counties in the Panhandle and South Florida's interior.
- Trigger a companion bill that puts the new exemption into effect as of Jan. 1, 2023.

A No Vote Would:

- Reject giving lawmakers the ability to create a new homestead exemption for certain public service occupations of up to \$50,000
- Have no effect on property tax revenue collected by local governments.
- Render moot the bill that would have created the new homestead exemption if the amendment had passed.

Local Ballot Measures

Clearwater Charter Amendment: Redevelopment of 2 government-owned properties located west of Osceola Ave in the downtown core

Ballot Language:

Shall the Clearwater City Charter be amended to allow the City, instead of selling the vacant City Hall and a portion of the former Harborview sites to the highest bidder at a public auction, to sell the properties to Gotham Property Acquisitions and The DeNunzio Group; who will create approximately 600 apartments and 158-key hotel, retail, entertainment, restaurants and cultural uses available to all Clearwater residents, as further described and limited by City Ordinance 9597-22?

Synopsis:

The region generally referred to as Downtown Clearwater is designated as a community redevelopment area. This area includes the waterfront sites of the former City Hall and former Harborview Center, which are currently unoccupied/vacant. After reviewing proposals from three development teams to acquire and redevelop these two sites (known as the Bluffs), the City Council unanimously selected to work with Gotham Property Acquisitions and The DeNunzio Group. The proposal includes a hotel, retail space, commercial space, two twin residential towers, and an underground parking garage. The proposal also includes the preservation of oak trees and the creation of a pocket park and plaza. The properties would connect to the new amphitheater and reimagined Coachman Park.

Except under certain conditions, the City's Charter requires real property to be sold to the highest bidder, typically at a public auction. While the City can impose terms or restrictions relating to such bidding, it is possible that a public auction could result in the purchase of these properties by an entity who would leave the properties vacant or use the properties in a way that is undesirable for Clearwater residents. Therefore, instead of conducting a public auction selling to the highest bidder, this amendment to the City Charter is proposed to allow the city to enter into a purchase and development agreement with Gotham Property Acquisitions and The DeNunzio Group. This makes the identity of the purchasers and property plans known. The proposed amendment only confers this authority as related to these two properties (former City Hall and former Harborview Center).

A Yes Vote Would: Amend the City Charter to allow the sale of the two identified properties to Gotham Property Acquisitions and The DeNunzio Group for development into a mixed-use area of commercial and residential purposes. This allows the City to sell the property for the purposes outlined in the selected proposal and place some conditions on use in accordance with the proposal.

A No Vote Would: Not amend the City Charter and therefore require any sale of the two identified properties to be to the highest bidder, whose identity and planned purpose may not be known.

Dunedin Charter Amendment 1: Charter Review Committee Appointments

Ballot Language:

Shall Section 6.02 of the City of Dunedin City Charter be amended as provided in Section 2 of Ordinance 22-09 to change the appointments of a charter review committee from every five (5) years to seven (7) years?

Synopsis:

The current charter states that at least once every five years, the City Commission shall appoint a Charter Review Committee to review the City Charter. During the City Commission meeting on March 24, 2022, the City Attorney stated that the City Commission would need to make a decision at the end of this year to appoint a new Charter Review Committee. As implementation is still ongoing for some of the recommendations of the current Charter Review Committee, the City Commission agreed to call for a referendum to change the appointment of a Charter Review Committee from every five years to every seven years. This would essentially extend the current Charter Review Committee and allow sufficient time for review of any new recommendations.

A Yes Vote Would: Amend the City Charter to allow the City Commission to appoint a Charter Review Committee at least once every seven years, instead of every five years, providing an additional two years for the committee to address new recommendations.

A No Vote Would: Maintain the provision which requires a Charter Review Committee be appointed at least once every five years. This could potentially result in needing to appoint new Charter Review Committee members, allowing insufficient time for the current committee to complete its review of existing and any new issues.

Dunedin Charter Amendment 2: Ordinance Review Committee Appointments

Ballot Language:

Shall Section 6.03 of the City of Dunedin City Charter be amended as provided in Section 3 of Ordinance 22-09 to change the appointment of an ordinance review committee from every five (5) years to as often as deemed necessary by the City Commission?

Synopsis:

The City Charter currently requires an Ordinance Review Committee to be appointed every five years. The City Commission agreed to call a referendum to change the language in the City Charter to require an Ordinance Review Committee be appointed as often as deemed necessary, instead of every five years. The Ordinance Review Committee was last appointed in 2018.

A Yes Vote Would: Amend the City Charter to allow the City Commission to appoint an Ordinance Review Committee as deemed necessary, instead of every five years. This would provide the City Commission the flexibility to monitor the potential number of new ordinances and determine the need to convene a committee for any review.

A No Vote Would: Maintain the current language in the City Charter, which requires an Ordinance Review Committee to be appointed every five years. This would mean that an Ordinance Review Committee would be convened every five years whether or not there were sufficient ordinances and work to convene a committee.

Indian Shores Charter Amendment 1: Proposed Charter Amendment Relating to Qualifications for Office

Ballot Language:

Shall Article III, Section 3.02 and Article V, Section 5.03 of the Town of Indian Shores Charter be amended to provide that the mayor and council members must reside in the Town for one year instead of six months to qualify for office?

Synopsis:

The charter currently requires individuals who want to run for town office to be permanent residents of Indian Shores for 6 months or longer. This proposed amendment would require residents to have lived in Indian Shores for one year or longer to qualify to run for mayor or town council.

A Yes Vote Would: Require candidates for mayor or town council to reside in the Town of Indian Shores for one year or more to meet the qualification to run for office.

A No Vote Would: Leave the current requirement unchanged, requiring candidates for mayor or town council to reside in the Town of Indian Shores for six months or more.

Indian Shores Charter Amendment 2: Proposed Charter Amendment Relating to Mayor

Ballot Language:

Shall Article III, Section 3.05 of the Town of Indian Shores Charter be amended to provide for the Mayor to serve as the registered agent for the Town and remove the Mayor's administrative duties?

Synopsis:

The town charter currently states that the Mayor "shall be recognized as head of the Town government for administrative and for all ceremonial purposes." This amendment would remove administrative purposes from this provision and add that the Mayor is the Town's registered agent. This amendment is intended to prevent any conflict of duties between the mayor and the Town Administrator (the town is proposing in Amendment 5 that the present charter position of Town Auditor be changed to Town Administrator). This was discussed by the town's Administrative and Finance Committee in their April 12, 2022 meeting and approved by all members present.

A Yes Vote Would: Add wording indicating that the mayor is the town's registered agent and remove wording indicating that the mayor is the head of town government for administrative purposes.

A No Vote Would: Leave the duties of the Mayor as currently outlined, which could potentially produce a conflict of duties with the Town Administrator.

Indian Shores Charter Amendment 3: Proposed Charter Amendment Relating to Vice Mayor

Ballot Language:

Shall Article III, Section 3.06 of the Town of Indian Shores Charter be amended to provide for a rotation of the office of Vice Mayor based on seniority thereby providing the opportunity for each council member to hold this office?

Synopsis:

The charter currently states that the town council shall elect, after each regular town election, one of its members to serve as the Vice-Mayor. This proposal would amend the charter to change from a system of electing the Vice-Mayor to a seniority-based rotation system. Under the proposed system, council members would be ranked by their time of service on council, and the longest-standing council member would then be named as Vice-Mayor. Once someone has served as Vice-Mayor, their name would be moved to the bottom of the rotation.

A Yes Vote Would: Change the current system for selecting the Vice-Mayor of the Town of Indian Shores from a system where the council elects a Vice-Mayor from among its members, to a system where the Vice-Mayor is selected by rotation from a list of the longest-serving to newest members of the council.

A No Vote Would: Maintain the current method for selecting the Vice-Mayor based on a vote of the council members at the first meeting after the town's regular election.

Indian Shores Charter Amendment 4: Proposed Charter Amendment Relating to Holding Other Offices and Town Employment

Ballot Language:

Shall Article III, Section 3.07 of the Town of Indian Shores Charter be amended to clarify that elected Town officials may not hold any additional public office in violation of the Florida Constitution?

Synopsis:

The charter currently states that no elected town official may hold any other town office or be employed by the town during their term of office. This amendment would add that elected town officials are also prohibited from holding any other public office that would be in violation of the Florida Constitution's prohibitions on holding more than one office.

A Yes Vote Would: Bring the charter in line with the Florida Constitution and prohibit elected officials from holding additional public offices.

A No Vote Would: Leave the charter is as, without reference to the prohibition in the Florida Constitution.

Indian Shores Charter Amendment 5: Proposed Charter Amendment Relating to Charter Offices

Ballot Language:

Shall Article IV, Section 4.02 of the Town of Indian Shores Charter be amended to provide for a Town Administrator rather than a Town Auditor?

Synopsis:

This provision would change the charter position of Town Auditor to Town Administrator. The position of Town Administrator is not currently mentioned in the charter, but is mentioned in the town ordinances. The description of the position would read: "The Town Administrator shall be appointed by the Town Council and shall hold office at the pleasure of the council. He or she shall receive such salary and fees as may be determined by the Town Council."

A Yes Vote Would: Include the position of Town Administrator in the charter, replacing the Town Auditor.

A No Vote Would: Leave the position as Town Auditor in the charter and not define the position of Town Administrator.

Largo Charter Amendment 1: Exemption of "Horizon West Bay" Property from Referendum for Lease of City Owned Real Property

Ballot Language:

Shall the Largo City Charter be amended to exempt that certain real property known as "Horizon West Bay," located on the northern 400 block of West Bay Drive, from the existing referendum requirement for leasing real property owned by the city so long as the Horizon West Bay property is also used as the primary municipal services and administrative facilities of the city, all as described in Ordinance No. 2022-57?

Synopsis:

This amendment proposes to exclude Horizon West Bay (the new multi-purpose Downtown City Hall) from the referendum requirement for any lease of city-owned property for more than five years. This exemption will only be for the Horizon West Bay project on the 400-500 block of West Bay Drive and will allow the city to work with a professional leasing agent on lease terms for preferred downtown businesses. The city is seeking to attract coffee shops, restaurants, and other retailers that will help achieve the community's vision of an active and interconnected downtown. The Horizon West Bay project is intended to spark economic development in Downtown Largo. The project's design includes leasable retail space for interested businesses to build out storefronts, but the city can currently only lease space for up to five years without referendum approval.

A Yes Vote Would: Would allow the city to provide an exception for Horizon West Bay so that it is not limited to a five year lease timeframe. The Horizon West Bay location will be the only exception. This will not change the five year limitation on any other city-owned property or greenspace.

A No Vote Would: Maintain the five year lease restriction for Horizon West Bay, limiting the city's ability to lease the commercial spaces in the mixed-use Horizon West Bay project for five years or less. This may result in the project needing to be redesigned at additional cost to the city and may reduce the number of businesses interested in the leasing the spaces given the shorter-term leases.

Largo Referendum 1: Providing City Commission with the Authority to Grant Economic Development Ad Valorem Tax Exemptions

Ballot Language:

Shall the City Commission of the City of Largo be authorized to grant, pursuant to s.3, Art. VII of the State Constitution, property tax exemptions to new businesses and expansions of existing businesses that are expected to create new, full-time jobs in the City of Largo?

Synopsis:

This referendum proposes to extend the City Commission's authority, for 10 additional years, to grant temporary property tax exemptions to qualified new and expanding businesses. This is intended to encourage job growth and further investment in the City of Largo.

To qualify for the tax exemption, a business must: be classified as a target industry or be a high-value business that has a significant economic impact, make a formal application to the city for the exemption, invest a significant amount of capital in expanding or building new space, commit to creating a minimum number of jobs during the first five years of the exemption, pay an annual wage for all jobs exceeding the average annual wage for Pinellas County, and continue to occupy the space identified in the application for the duration of the tax exemption. If a business does not comply with the program requirements, the City can revoke the exemption and the business can be required to repay the property tax, with interest.

Largo voters approved the City Commission's authority to grant these property tax exemptions in 2012. That authority is set to expire on November 11, 2022, unless voters approve it for an additional 10 years.

A Yes Vote Would: Maintain the City Commission's authority, for an additional 10 years, to grant temporary property tax exemptions as incentives to qualifying new or expanding businesses, on a case-by-case basis. This is not an exemption of all taxes businesses are required to pay. The city anticipates that businesses approved for the exemption will create an overall positive economic impact on Largo and Pinellas County above the value of the tax exemption. However, any tax exemption means that the city does not collect that tax revenue from that source, and any gap in revenue to support city infrastructure and services would have to be made up elsewhere.

A No Vote Would: End the City Commission's authority, as of November 11, 2022, to grant temporary property tax exemptions as incentives for qualifying businesses to locate, relocate, or expand in the city. This could place the city

at a competitive disadvantage to surrounding communities that have implemented this type of tax exemption incentive program.

Largo Referendum 2: Conveyance of City-Owned Real Property to Porter Development, LLC

Ballot Language:

Shall the City be authorized to convey fee simple title to approximately 87 acres of city-owned property located north of 8th Avenue SE and south of East Bay Drive, a portion of which includes a landfill, for fair market value to Porter Development, LLC for the development, operation, and maintenance of a privately owned and operated open space recreational indoor and outdoor sports complex, all as described in Ordinance No. 2022-58?

Synopsis:

This is a referendum to approve the potential sale of approximately 87 acres of property owned by the City of Largo to a private developer, Porter Development LLC, for fair market value. The property is located north of 8th Avenue SE and south of East Bay Drive. Part of the land is a former landfill located behind the Largo Public Library. The city charter requires voters to approve the sale of any city-owned property exceeding 1.5 acres for fair market value for the purposes stated.

Porter Development LLC submitted an unsolicited proposal stating their purpose to develop and operate a privately owned and operated recreation facility on this land. This referendum is for approval of the sale of the property, not for approval of the development or project design. The redevelopment of the site would remain subject to the city's Development Review process. The proposed complex is not a city project and will not be owned, managed, or operated by the City of Largo's Recreation, Parks, and Arts services. The city has indicated that residents wishing to learn more about the project plans can find information on the Porter Development website.

Supporters: Largo Mayor Woody Brown, Former St. Petersburg Mayor Rick Kriseman

Opponents: None known at this time

A Yes Vote Would: Allow the city to sell the property to Porter Development LLC for fair market value for the purpose of developing and operating a privately owned and operated recreation facility.

A No Vote Would: Not allow the sale to Porter Development LLC. The property would remain owned and maintained by the City of Largo. Note: Porter Development LLC is the only possible purchaser being considered by voters on the November 2022 ballot. Any new proposals to develop the property that would require a lease or sale of the property would require voter approval during a future election.

Madeira Beach Charter Amendment 1: Qualification and Term of Office

Ballot Language:

Should Section 2.2 B of the Charter be amended to provide that the term of each newly elected member of Board of Commissioners will begin upon induction into office at the first Board of Commissioners meeting following the election? This amendment is to avoid a conflict with Charter, Section 4.8, Induction of Board of Commissioners into office; meetings.

Synopsis:

The charter currently states that commissioners' terms begin at the first regular meeting following the election. The charter also states that newly elected commissioners shall be inducted into office "at a Board of Commissioners meeting to be held on or before the last day of the month in which the election was held." These provisions created challenges following the March 2022 election because the new commissioners were inducted on March 23 (prior to the end of the month in which the election was held), but their terms did not officially begin until the first regular meeting on April 13. At the same time, the out-going commissioners' terms ended when the newly elected members were sworn into office. This meant that the city did not have a full contingent of commission members who could legally sit in meetings during the period between March 23 and April 13. The Board of Commissioners therefore proposed this amendment to avoid such circumstances in the future.

A Yes Vote Would: Allow new commissioners to begin their terms immediately upon induction rather than waiting for the following month's regular meeting.

A No Vote Would: Retain the current language in the charter, which means that newly inducted commissioners cannot participate in Board of Commissioners meetings until the following month's regular meeting, causing a delay in the commissioners serving and potentially leaving the city with gaps in leadership.

Madeira Beach Charter Amendment 2: Induction of Newly Elected Member of Board of Commissioners

Ballot Language:

Should Section 4.8 of the Charter be amended to provide that the first meeting of each newly elected member of the Board of Commissioners for induction into office shall be held at a meeting on or before the last day of the month in which the election was held? This amendment avoids a conflict with Charter, Section 2.2, Board of Commissioners; qualifications; term of office; and vacancies; Qualifications and Term of Office.

Synopsis:

This amendment is related to Amendment 1. It proposes to change the language in the charter to state: "The first meeting of each newly elected member of the Board of Commissioners for induction into office shall be at a Board of Commissioners meeting to be held on or before the last day of the month in which the election was held. The Board of Commissioners may hold such meetings at such times as they may prescribe, but not less frequently than once each month." It removes the words "special and regular" that were describing the types of meetings. As above, the Board of Commissioners proposed this amendment to avoid circumstances resulting in leadership gaps between the induction meeting and the first regular meeting.

A Yes Vote Would: Allow newly elected commissioners to begin their terms immediately upon induction rather than waiting for the following month's regular meeting.

A No Vote Would: Retain the current conflicting language in the charter, which could cause a delay in commissioners serving their terms and potentially result in a gap in city leadership between induction meeting and the first regular meeting.

St Petersburg Charter Amendment 1: Rescheduling Municipal Elections to Occur in Conjunction With National and State Elections in Even Years

Ballot Language:

The City Charter currently requires elections for Mayor and Council Members to occur in odd-numbered years. Shall the Charter be amended to hold those elections in conjunction with national and state elections in even-numbered years beginning in 2024? That change will extend the term of current City elected officials by approximately one year and is intended to increase voter turnout, add early voting at no additional cost, and reduce cost to the City.

Synopsis:

The City of St. Petersburg's charter currently requires municipal elections to be held in odd-numbered years. This amendment would move St Petersburg's municipal elections to occur in even-numbered years, at the same time as state and federal elections. If this amendment passes, the elections for Mayor and for council members in districts 2, 4, and 6 will be held at the same time as the federal "midterm" elections, and the elections for council members in districts 1, 2, and 5 will be held at the same time as presidential elections. The currently serving Mayor and Council Members would have their terms extended by approximately 1 (one) year to accommodate this change.

This proposed amendment arose from discussions about providing in-person early voting in St. Petersburg municipal elections. The city contracts with the Pinellas County Supervisor of Elections to administer the city's elections. The city is responsible to pay the cost of elections that do not occur at the same time as state and federal elections. Providing early voting in odd-numbered years was found to be cost-prohibitive for the city. In addition, the Supervisor of Elections advised the city that there are limits on the services they are able to provide, and thus the city should consider a change to even-numbered years if the city wanted to provide the complete range of voting options in municipal elections. In-person early voting is required under state law to be provided in elections that have state or federal candidates on the ballot. Additional rationale provided for moving municipal elections to even-numbered years includes the significantly higher voter turnout in midterm and presidential election years and decreased costs to the city to pay for election administration out of the city budget.

A Yes Vote Would: Move St Petersburg's city elections to happen in even-numbered years at the same time as state and federal elections. This would significantly increase voter turnout for choosing the mayor and city council, and provide voters with more options for casting their ballot in municipal races (including both in-person early voting and more access to secure ballot intake stations to drop off mail ballots). This would also save the city money by reducing

the cost of running elections. However, the increased cost of running a campaign in midterm and presidential election years would also make it harder to run for office, potentially reducing the number and diversity of candidates for city office. In addition, the ballot would be very long, which could deter some voters. Terms for the current mayor and city council members would be extended by approximately 1 year.

A No Vote Would: Leave the elections for St. Petersburg mayor and city council members unchanged to occur in odd-numbered years, without an option for in-person early voting and with limited access to locations for dropping off mail ballots.

St Petersburg Charter Amendment 2: Changing City Council Residency Requirements to Accommodate Redrawing District Boundaries Through the Redistricting Process

Ballot Language:

The City Charter establishes residency requirements for City Council candidates and members. Shall those requirements be amended to accommodate redrawing Council district boundaries through the redistricting process and clarify related provisions? That amendment would allow candidates to satisfy the existing residency requirement through a combination of residency within new and previous district boundaries and allow affected members to complete their terms following redistricting as long as they maintain residency within previous or new district boundaries.

Synopsis:

The city charter currently requires city council members to leave office immediately if they cease to reside within the boundaries of their district. The City Redistricting Commission is required by the city charter to redraw the city council districts after each 10 year census, to ensure "equal and effective representation." In redrawing the district boundaries, duly elected/appointed council members might end up residing outside the newly defined boundaries of their district. This amendment would allow council members who are in office when redistricting occurs to remain on council, provided they continue to reside either within the old district boundaries or the newly drawn boundaries of their district. This approach is consistent with Florida law relating to redistricting for state and county officials. If the district boundaries are redrawn during the 12 months prior to a primary election, this amendment would require a candidate to reside within the boundaries of the newly drawn district but allow them to satisfy the 12-month residency requirement through residency within the boundaries of the newly drawn district or the old district boundaries.

A Yes Vote Would: Allow council members whose district boundaries have been redrawn to remain in office for the full term for which they were elected/appointed, provided that they remain resident within the original district or the new district boundaries.

A No Vote Would: Leave the current residency requirements in place. This would require any council member who no longer resides within the boundaries of the newly drawn district to leave office immediately, and not serve out the full term for which they were elected/appointed.

St Petersburg Referendum 1: Approving Amendment of City's 99-year Lease for Dalí Museum to Allow Construction of Expansion

Ballot Language:

May City Council approve amendment of the 99-year lease of City-owned property used by the Dalí Museum to allow construction of a Museum expansion, subject to conditions in ordinance 512-H? Such conditions address insurance, indemnity, and coordination; operation of the Mahaffey Theater and the Grand Prix; and future development of the surrounding Center for the Arts. Such amendment would not extend the duration of the lease or require City funding for the expansion.

Synopsis:

The St. Petersburg City Charter specifies that no waterfront or park property owned by the city may be sold, donated, or leased without specific authorization by a majority vote in a citywide referendum. The Dalí Museum is seeking to construct a multi-level addition to the southwest side of the existing building. Some of the land that might be needed for this expansion is not included in its current lease of city waterfront property, which was executed in 2007. This referendum is seeking to amend the lease to allow for the inclusion of the additional land. The land in question is a city right-of-way that serves the parking garage and theater as well as the museum.

Along with the amended lease, City Ordinance 512-H places conditions on the museum expansion. The ordinance describes relocating the right-of-way and requires a plan that provides for continued access to the garage. The

ordinance also references a variety of plans for future improvements to the entire Center for the Arts. In addition, the amended lease must not obligate the city to provide any funding for the expansion and it cannot override any provision of the Grand Prix Race Agreement. Note, this referendum is not for approval of the expansion project design, but rather the approval for the amendment of the lease.

A Yes Vote Would: Allow amendment of the current lease of city property by the Dali Museum to include additional land, which will enable initiation of the design phase for an expansion with a larger footprint. This would not authorize any funding from the city.

A No Vote Would: Prevent the Dali Museum from changing its footprint at this time.

St Petersburg Referendum 2: Providing City Council with the Authority to Grant Economic Development Ad Valorem Tax Exemptions

Ballot Language:

Shall the City Council of St. Petersburg be authorized to grant, pursuant to s. 3, Art. VII of the State Constitution, property tax exemptions to new businesses and expansions of existing businesses that are expected to create new, full-time jobs in the City of St. Petersburg?

Synopsis:

This measure would give the St Petersburg City Council the power, for the next 10 years, to grant property tax exemptions to certain qualifying businesses that create new capital investment and new, full-time jobs in the city. St. Petersburg voters previously authorized this exemption in 2011. As it expired in 2021, this same referendum was placed on the November 2021 ballot last year and was defeated by a narrow margin.

This tax exemption was designed for "businesses that create a minimum of 10 jobs that earn more than the average wage in Pinellas County," according to the Tampa Bay Times. From 2011-2021, the city granted these tax exemptions to two large businesses: one for an exemption of \$100,000 per year for five years and another for an exemption of around \$67,000 per year for five years. The second of these exemptions was granted for a project in the northernmost part of the City that - at the time of approval in 2020 - involved \$11 million in capital investment and created a dozen new tech jobs paying an average salary of \$95,000, according to the St. Pete Catalyst.

A Yes Vote Would: Allow the St. Petersburg City Council to grant property tax exemptions as incentives for certain businesses that are expected to create new, full-time jobs in the city. Any tax exemption means that the city does not collect that tax revenue from that source, and any gap in revenue to support infrastructure and services would have to be made up elsewhere.

A No Vote Would: Not allow the St. Petersburg City Council to grant property tax exemptions as an incentive to certain businesses, and likewise not reduce tax revenue available from these sources for funding city services and infrastructure.

Treasure Island Charter Amendment 1: Proposed Charter Amendment of Treasure Island, Florida Deleting Section 4.06 Personnel System Entirely

Ballot Language:

Shall Article IV, Section 4.06 of the Charter of the City of Treasure Island, Florida pertaining to Personnel System be amended in accordance with the proposal set forth in Ordinance No. 2022-08 to delete Section 4.06 Personnel System entirely thereby removing outdated language and reflecting current practice?

Synopsis:

This amendment proposes to remove outdated language and reflect current personnel practices. This change was recommended by the Treasure Island Charter Review Committee because the city is not following what is in the Charter, they are following what is in the city's current administrative Personnel Practices.

A Yes Vote Would: Remove the outdated language from the charter. It will not change the city's current personnel practices.

A No Vote Would: Retain the outdated language in the charter.

Treasure Island Charter Amendment 2: Proposed Charter Amendment of Treasure Island, Florida Concerning Signature Requirement for Petitions for Charter Amendments

Ballot Language:

Shall Article VI, Section 6.02 of the Charter of the City of Treasure Island, Florida pertaining to Charter Amendments be amended in accordance with the proposal set forth in Ordinance No. 2022-09 so as to reduce the signature requirement for charter amendment petitions from twenty-five (25) percent to ten (10) percent as required by section 166.031, Florida Statutes?

Synopsis:

This amendment was recommended by the Treasure Island Charter Review Committee to bring the charter's signature requirements for petitions in line with Florida Statute. The city must comply with the 10% requirement outlined in Florida Statute 166.031.

A Yes Vote Would: Align the charter language with Florida Statutes.

A No Vote Would: Leave the conflicting language in the charter, thus making it appear the city is not following required Florida law.

Pinellas Suncoast Fire & Rescue District Referendum: Referendum to approve a new Pinellas Suncoast Fire and Rescue District Ad Valorem Tax

Ballot Language:

To improve fire, emergency medical, and rescue services, included but not limited to, construction of and improvements to new and existing fire stations and facilities, and the purchase of apparatus and equipment, shall the District be authorized to levy an annual ad valorem tax at a millage rate not to exceed 0.67 mills (\$0.67 for every \$1,000 of taxable value), with the authorized millage currently being 0 mills?

Synopsis:

The Pinellas Suncoast Fire and Rescue District supports Indian Shores, Belleair Beach, Belleair Shores, Indian Rocks Beach, and Unincorporated Oakhurst. It is currently primarily funded through a flat fee. Residents pay \$360/year, no matter how big or small their home. Because this flat fee is fixed, it has not kept up with rising expenses. The result is that the district is predicted to run out of money by September 2025. This is the only fire district in Pinellas County that does not currently have an ad valorem tax. This referendum has been proposed because the district needs a revenue source that will adjust with property values and create a permanent solution to funding issues.

Supporters: Belleair Beach Mayor Dave Gattis and Indian Rocks Beach Mayor Cookie Kennedy

Opponents: None known at this time

A Yes Vote Would: Authorize an ad valorem tax up to 0.67 mils, which would meet projected Pinellas Suncoast Fire & Rescue District needs through at least the year 2043.

A No Vote Would: Not authorize additional funding, which will eventually trigger a state takeover due to funding shortfalls and the district will likely dissolve.