November 3, 2026 General Election Ballot Measures

Table of Contents:

State Constitutional Amendments:

Florida Amendment 1- Budget Stabilization Fund

Ballot Language:
Proposing an amendment to the State Constitution to increase the amount of funds that may be retained in the budget stabilization fund from 10% to 25% of general revenue collections, require the legislature to transfer the lesser of $750 million or the amount required to reach 25% of the general revenue collections each year unless certain conditions are met, and allow the legislature to withdraw funds for critical state needs.

Synopsis:
This amendment is proposed by the Florida State Legislature. It will amend Article III, Section 19. The term “revenue collections” refers to the last completed fiscal year’s net revenue collections for the general revenue fund.

This proposed amendment passed the House 100-1 and the Senate 29-4

Budget stabilization funds (BSF) are a form of savings account where states can place revenue, such as tax receipts, that will be used to finance unexpected budget deficits or emergencies. All 50 states have some form of a budget stabilization fund. The Florida BSF was created in 1992 after 83% of voters approved the Constitutional Amendment. The constitution requires that the balance of the Florida BSF not fall below 5% of revenue collections. The maximum balance allowed for the Florida BSF is 10% of the revenue collections. For example, for fiscal year 2024-2025, the amount in the BSF was 9.3% of the state’s revenue collections. The last time that Florida withdrew more money from the BSF than it deposited was in 2008 during the Great Recession.

This proposed amendment would increase the maximum amount of funds that can be retained in the Florida BSF, changing the limit to 25% of annual revenue collections. The legislature would also be required to transfer funds into the BSF each year. The amount transferred would be either $750 million, or however much is needed to bring the fund up to the 25% limit, whichever is less.

Under this amendment, funds could only be withdrawn from the BSF under three conditions:

1. The legislature passes a bill to withdraw funds to pay the expenses associated with an emergency.
2. The legislature passes a bill to withdraw funds to cover a shortfall in revenue, such as less than anticipated sales tax receipts.
3. The legislature determines there is a nonrecurring critical state need, the principal balance of the BSF is greater than 15% of state revenue collections, and two-thirds of the legislature approves the withdrawal of funds.

This amendment would also allow the legislature to suspend the annual revenue transfer to the fund under either of the following circumstances:

1. No more than once every five years, the legislature determines that there is a critical state need that requires funding in an amount exceeding what would have been transferred into the BSF, and two-thirds of the legislature approves the suspension of the transfer.
2. The legislature withdraws funds from the BSF during the same fiscal year for an emergency or revenue shortfall.

The fiscal impact on the state is indeterminate, but likely insignificant.

Opponents: Florida Education Association, LWV of Florida
Supporters: Florida Legislature (House 100-1, Senate 29-4)

A Yes Vote Would increase the amount of funds held in the Budget Stabilization Fund from 10% to 25% of revenue collections. Require an annual transfer to the fund equal to $750 million or 25% of the revenue collections (whichever is lesser). Define how money can be withdrawn from the fund. Allow the legislature to suspend the transfer under certain conditions.

A No Vote Would keep the maximum allowable amount of funds in the Budget Stabilization Fund at 10% of revenue collections.

Florida Amendment 2- Exemption of Tangible Personal Property on Agricultural Land from Taxation

Ballot Language:
Proposing an amendment to the State Constitution to exempt tangible personal property habitually located or typically present on land classified as agricultural, used in the production of agricultural products or for agritourism activities, and owned by the landowner or leaseholder of the agricultural land from ad valorem taxation. If approved this amendment would first apply for tax years beginning January 1, 2027.

Synopsis:
This amendment is proposed by the Florida State Legislature. It will amend Article VII, Section 3. It passed the House 110-1 and the Senate 37-0.

This proposed amendment would exempt the value of certain tangible personal property (such as farm equipment or tools) used in agriculture or agritourism from ad valorem property taxes, if the property:

1. is habitually located or typically present on agricultural land.
2. is used for producing agricultural products or for agritourism and owned by the landowner or leaseholder of the agricultural land.

Tangible personal property (TPP) refers to physical, movable assets such as furniture, machinery, tools, and equipment. Businesses pay property taxes on equipment used in the business, except for certain exempt categories - including motor vehicles, household goods, and the first $25,000 of TPP value for each taxpayer.

The Florida Legislature's Bill Analysis & Fiscal Impact Statement states that the Revenue Estimating Conference estimated this amendment, if approved by voters, will have a negative recurring impact on local government revenues of $31 million, beginning in Fiscal Year 2027-28.

Opponents: Florida Education Association, LWV of Florida
Supporters: Florida Legislature (House 110-1, Senate 37-0)

A Yes Vote Would exclude tangible personal property, such as farm equipment or tools, from the calculation of property taxes if the property is typically present on agricultural land, used for farming or agritourism activities, and owned by the landowner or leaseholder of the land.

A No Vote Would continue to include tangible personal property, such as farm equipment or tools, in the calculation of property taxes if the property is typically present on agricultural land, used for farming or agritourism activities, and owned by the landowner or leaseholder of the land.

Florida Amendment 3- Increased Homestead Exemption; Lower Cap on Increases in Non-Homestead Property Assessments

Ballot Language:

This amendment increases the homestead exemption, for all non-school taxes, to $150,000 in 2027 and $250,000 in 2028, and adjusts for inflation thereafter. It requires the Legislature to prescribe a uniform procedure for counties and municipalities, for their respective levies, to increase the homestead exemption up to full assessed value, and allows special districts, subject to referendum approval, to do the same. Persons who are not Florida residents on December 31, 2026, will receive the existing homestead exemption upon qualifying for a homestead exemption, with the increased homestead exemption beginning with the fifth year of exemption, to the extent permitted by the U.S. Constitution. This amendment reduces the annual cap on assessment increases for non-homestead properties from 10% to 5%.This amendment requires counties and municipalities to use property taxes solely for public safety, education and schools, infrastructure, natural resources, bond debt service, retirement benefits for employees, and operations and administration. Other expenditures may be approved by county officers or county or municipal governing bodies unless prohibited by general law, notwithstanding Article VII, Section 9(a) of the Florida Constitution, which allows counties and municipalities to levy property taxes for their respective purposes. This amendment takes effect January 1, 2027.

Synopsis:

This amendment is proposed by the Florida State Legislature. This amendment passed 75-27 in the House (16 not voting) and 30-8 in the Senate (2 not voting).

This amendment would revise Article VII Sections 4, 6, and 9 and create new Article XII - Save Our Homes From Excessive Property Taxes. If passed, it would become effective January 1, 2027.

***Ad valorem and Non-ad valorem Taxes*:** Tax bills have ad valorem taxes, which are based on a property's assessed value. These are referred to as "property taxes." Tax bills also have non-ad valorem taxes, which are flat fees that are collected to pay for specific local services or infrastructure improvements. This amendment only alters ad valorem taxes.

***Millage Rates**:* The Florida Constitution caps property tax millage rates for local governments at 10 mills. One mill equals $1 of tax for every $1,000 of assessed property value. So a rate of one mill on a $200,000 house equals $200. Examples of current rates in Florida municipalities:

- City of Miami: 7.5539 mills
- City of Tampa: 6.2076 mills
- City of Orlando: 6.6500 mills

"Permanent residence" is defined as the place a person considers their permanent home to which, whenever absent, they will return.

For homeowners who permanently reside on their property (house or condominium), there is a portion of the home's assessed value that is not subject to ad valorem taxes or "property taxes." This is known as the "homestead exemption." Currently, the first $25,000 of assessed value is exempt from **all** property taxes, including those levied by school districts. An additional $25,000 of assessed value is exempt from all property taxes except those levied by school districts. This additional $25,000 exemption applies to the assessed value of homestead property valued between $50,000 and $75,000.

The bill passed by the Legislature (CS/HJR 1F) is summarized below.

- For homeowners with homesteaded property established by December 31, 2026, the homestead exemption for all property taxes, except those levied by school districts, would increase to:
    - up to $150,000 of the assessed value beginning on January 1, 2027.
    - up to $250,000 of the assessed value beginning on January 1, 2028.
- Homesteads established on or after January 1, 2027 are only eligible for these changes after establishing residency status for five years. After the fifth year, these homesteads are eligible for the maximum $250,000 exemption.
- For homeowners with less than 5 years of homestead exemption, up to $25,000 of assessed value is exempt from all property taxes and an additional $25,000 is exempt from all property taxes, except non-school tax levies.
- The new exemption values will be adjusted annually for positive inflation growth beginning January 1, 2028.
- For non-homestead residential property (own home, but not permanent resident) and non-residential property, the maximum increase in annual property assessment used to determine property taxes is reduced from 10% to 5%, beginning January 1, 2027.
- Requires the legislature, through general law, to establish a procedure for counties and municipalities to schedule for further exemption of property taxes on all homestead property up to remaining assessed value, if a county or municipality chooses to do so.
- Property tax levied by counties and municipalities is limited to only cover expenditures to:
    - Provide for public safety, including law enforcement, fire service, and emergency medical service;
    - Provide funding for education and public schools;
    - Finance or refinance infrastructure, including expenditures on road and bridge construction and maintenance and stormwater control;
    - Finance or refinance natural resource projects, including flood control measures;
    - Issue local bonds for uses consistent with the approved used above and to make debt service payments for existing obligations;

  - Meet obligations for retirement benefits of local government employees;
  - Fund the operations and administration of county officers and commissioners established under Article VIII of the Florida Constitution and municipalities, and the expenditures approved by such county officers or county or municipal governing bodies, except those expenditures prohibited by general law.

A Balancing Act

Permanent residents with homestead property will receive significant property tax relief due to a permanent increase in the homestead property exemption amount. By January 1, 2028, a home valued at $250,000 or less will pay no ad valorem property taxes, except for those taxes levied by school districts. Owners of non-homesteaded property will also receive a property tax break because the amount their property assessment can increase each year is reduced from 10% to 5%, which reduces their property taxes..

However, this means that local governments, county and municipalities, will receive significantly less revenue to fund government services that these same residents use. Since this amendment also dictates how property taxes are spent by counties and municipalities, local governments are further constrained in how they manage their budgets.

The Revenue Estimating Conference analysis (under the Florida Legislature) dated June 12, 2026 states local governments could expect **nearly $5 billion less revenue in 2027-2028. That number is estimated to increase to $8.8 billion in 2028-2029, $9.7 billion in 2029-2030, $10.7 billion in 2030-2031 and $11.9 in 2031-2032 .** These values do not take into consideration the total loss in revenue if a county or municipality reduces property tax exemptions for homestead property even further.

Impact of the increased property tax exemptions:

- Moody's, Fitch and S&P Global Ratings all expect greater credit pressure for local governments if voters approve the proposed property tax amendment.
- The amendment would significantly decrease future revenue collection by counties and municipalities, which would constrain overall growth of local government.
- The original proposed trust fund was eliminated from the final legislation, leaving no safety net for the 29 fiscally constrained counties or lapsed critical services. FL Dept of Revenue's List of Fiscally Constrained Counties
- Adversely impacts counties, municipalities, and special districts like Children's Services Councils, Hospital Districts, Mosquito Control Districts and Water Management Districts.
- Services like public parks, public transportation, recreation centers, health services, public landscaping, environmental resources would lose millions of dollars needed to provide those services. This will force municipalities to either cut services or monetize services such as increase parking rates and charge entrance fees for parks & recreation centers.
- Public libraries are funded primarily through local property taxes and serve more than 23 million Floridians through 541 library locations, 22 bookmobiles, millions of annual visits, workforce development programs, digital access services, literacy initiatives, and educational programming.

Shifting How Tax Revenue May Be Collected:

The revenue loss would have to be offset by increasing taxes and fees and/or making budget cuts, effectively leading to a cost shift as Floridians either pay more in other ways or lose vital public services.

- **Increase Property Taxes:** Local governments can still make up the revenue shortfall by increasing property taxes on homestead and non-homestead properties. Because apartment buildings and rental houses fall into the category of non-homestead properties, landlords are likely to pass these added costs onto tenants in the form of higher rent. Commercial property owners will have higher overheads costs for their businesses.
- **Non-ad valorem Taxes:** These taxes are not tied to property values, which means they are not affected by this amendment. Counties and cities could make up the loss in funds resulting from higher homestead exemptions by relying more heavily on these revenue sources, which can include local sales taxes, motor fuel taxes, tourist development taxes and utility taxes (water, sewage, garbage). Additionally, local governments could pass ordinances to increase or create new fees to raise money. For example, fire protection services currently paid for by property taxes could be shifted to a fee-based system.
- **Special Assessments:** Homeowners may still receive a property tax bill to pay for special assessments, which may now occur more often. Assessments are one time fees issued to cover unexpected expenses or major projects.
- **Impact Fees**: Impact fees are charged to new real estate developments to cover the cost of expanding public infrastructure (such as schools, roads, and emergency services). Cities and counties facing constrained property tax budgets will likely look to maximize or restructure their impact fee schedules to shift the financial burden of new growth onto developers.
- **Monetizing City Assets** (naming rights, billboards or advertising) may be another way counties and municipalities could raise revenue to cover the shortfall due to decreased property tax revenue.

Click here to view the City-level impact statement issued by the Florida League of Cities: City-Level Impact Statement

Click here to view the County-level impact statement issued by the Florida Association of Counties: County-Level Impact Statement

Opponents: Florida Tax Watch, Florida Policy Institute, Florida for All, Florida PTA, Florida State Director of MomsRising/MamásConPoder, Southern Poverty Law Center, Florida League of Cities, Florida Association of Counties, Florida Rising, Florida Education Association, Pastors for Florida's Children, SEIU Florida State Council/SEIU 1991, The Tax Foundation, Florida Student Power, Editorial Boards of the Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, Miami Herald, Orlando Sentinel, Palm Beach Post and Sun-Sentinel, Vote No On 3, 3º Degrees Florida, Floridians for Shared Prosperity, League of Women Voters of Florida, Florida Professional Firefighters, Florida Fraternal Order of Police, Florida Fire Chiefs Association, Florida Festivals and Events Association, Catalyst Miami, Community Spring, EduVoter Action Network, Equal Ground Education Fund, Families for Strong Public Schools & Voters for Strong Public Schools, Florida AFL-CIO, Florida Voices for Health, NAACP FL State Conference, Progress Florida, UnidosUS, 1,000 Friends of Florida, FL Rural Economic Development Assoc. FL chapter of the American Planning Association, Florida Engineering Society, American Council of Engineering Companies of Florida, Florida Association of County Engineers & Road Superintendents, Florida Fire Marshals & Inspectors Association, Florida Library Assoc., Florida Assoc. of Special Districts

Supporters: Florida Realtors Board of Directors, Florida Legislature (75-27 House, with 16 not voting); 30-8 Senate, with 2 not voting).

A Yes Vote Would increase the current homestead property exemption from $50,000 to $150,000 effective January 1, 2027, and then increase to $250,000 effective January 1, 2028. Lower the annual cap increase on non-homestead property from 10% to 5%. Allow the legislature to dictate how counties and municipalities expend tax revenue.

A No Vote Would keep the current property tax structure in place.

City of St. Petersburg Charter Amendments & Referendums:

St Petersburg Charter Amendment #1 - Removing City-Owned Vacant Lots from Park and Waterfront Map to Create Housing

Ballot Language:
The City Charter Park and Waterfront Map contains a composite parcel identified as “Jamestown” composed of: Unity Park, recreational open space within Jamestown apartments, and nine City-owned lots in the adjacent neighborhood that are vacant and closed to the public. Shall the City Charter be amended to remove those nine vacant lots from the Map to allow subsequent/separate land use changes and potential sale of those lots for affordable or workforce housing?

Synopsis:
The City Charter Park and Waterfront Map is a legally binding document that is utilized to officially designate and protect the city's parks and waterfront property. It defines which city-owned lands cannot be sold or used for commercial development without public approval via a citywide referendum, such as this one.

The purpose of this referendum is to remove nine city-owned vacant lots from the City Charter Park and Waterfront Map so other uses can be pursued. The goal is to allow these lots to potentially be redeveloped for affordable or workforce housing, rather than remain classified as park land.

The lots are adjacent to the Jamestown Apartments and Townhomes and Unity Park in St. Petersburg. Unity Park is located at 4th Ave N and 12th Ln N. The lots have been vacant for over 40 years, are not open to the public, and are maintained only to meet minimum city code standards.

Four parcels (about 5,000 sq ft each) could be used for single-family homes; five larger parcels (10,000–13,000 sq ft each) could support multi-family housing. If zoning and land use designations are updated, up to 41 housing units could be created (4 single-family, 37 multi-family).

If the referendum passes, the city can proceed to rezone and potentially sell the lots for affordable housing projects, directly addressing local housing needs.

A Yes vote would allow the currently vacant lots to be rezoned and sold for affordable housing projects.
A No vote would leave the lots as owned by the City and designated as “park land”.

St Petersburg Charter Amendment #2 - Authorizing a 25-year lease limitation for the Port of St. Petersburg

Ballot Language:
The City Charter currently limits leases at the Port of St. Petersburg to 10 years without approval by citywide referendum. Shall the Charter be amended to increase that limitation to 25 years? That amendment would make the Port consistent with the adjacent Albert Whitted Airport and give the City additional flexibility to enter into agreements with private entities to redevelop Port facilities. That amendment would not change the permitted use of the Port.

Synopsis:
The purpose of this referendum is to increase the maximum lease term for the Port of St. Petersburg from 10 years to 25 years. The change aims to align the Port's lease terms with those of the adjacent Albert Whitted Airport, which already allows 25-year leases.

In 1984, a citywide referendum established protections and lease limitations for city-owned park and waterfront properties, including the Port. The Port is a city-owned, multi-use facility adjacent to Albert Whitted Airport. The Port has a 1,200-linear-foot wharf and approximately 4.4 acres of adjacent property occupied by a variety of government, institutional, and academic organizations engaged in maritime research.

Increasing the lease term is expected to facilitate redevelopment projects and provide flexibility for agreements with private entities such as for construction of the proposed Hub Expansion and Port Redevelopment Projects. The referendum does not alter the permitted uses of the Port, only the lease duration.

A Yes vote would increase the maximum lease term for the Port of St. Petersburg from 10 to 25 years, aligning the lease term with the adjacent Albert Whitted Airport.
A No vote would leave the current maximum lease term for the Port of St. Petersburg at 10 years.

St Petersburg Charter Amendment #3 -Technical, Clarifying, and Conforming Changes to Effectuate Holding Municipal Elections In Even-Numbered Years

Ballot Language:
In 2022, voters in a citywide referendum approved an amendment of the City Charter to reschedule elections for Mayor and Council Members to even-numbered years so that City elections would align with national and state elections beginning in 2024. Shall the Charter be amended to make technical, clarifying, and conforming changes necessary and appropriate to fully effectuate the intent of the 2022 referendum, including alignment of the Charter-review process with the current election schedule?

Synopsis:
This referendum updates the City Charter to clarify that municipal primary and general elections will now occur on the same dates as state primary and general elections. If the state returns to a two-primary system, the municipal primary will align with the first state primary. This referendum also makes minor rewording updates (no procedural updates) to improve readability, consistency with state law, and to reflect current election practices.

A Yes vote would revise language relating to when St Petersburg elections will be held to make it clear how the elections align with the state elections. Make minor changes to the language relating to elections in the City Charter.
A No vote would leave City Charter language as is, which does not address when the St Petersburg elections would be held if the state converted to a two-primary system.

St Petersburg Referendum #1 - Stormwater, Wastewater and/or Potable Water Improvements General Obligation Bond Referendum

Ballot Language:
Shall the City finance storm resilience improvements, including but not limited to, floodwater protection, stormwater pump stations, drainage infrastructure, as well as wastewater collection and treatment facilities, drinking water distribution and supply facilities, by issuing general obligation bonds in one or more series, not exceeding $600,000,000, bearing interest not exceeding maximum legal rates, maturing not more than 30 years from each issuance date, pledging the City's full faith, credit, and unlimited ad valorem taxing power?

Synopsis:
The purpose of this referendum is to approve issuing bonds to finance up to $600 million for storm, waste and drinking water system upgrades in the face of more intense storms and rising sea levels. Including interest, the total cost will be approx. $1 billion. The money would be repaid through a new annual property tax over 30 years. The estimated cost to property owners is $96 annually for every $100,000 of taxable property value. These infrastructure needs are detailed in the SPAR plan (St. Pete Agile Resilience).

<u>What is a General Obligation Bond and how does it work?</u>
A General Obligation (GO) Bond is a financing tool used by cities and municipalities to borrow an upfront lump sum to fund specific public improvements. Unlike revenue bonds backed by utility fees, GO bonds are backed by the City's "full faith and credit." This means property taxes must be pledged to repay the debt. This makes them lower risk for investors, resulting in lower interest rates. For the proposed $600 million General Obligation bond, the estimated interest rate is 4.5% over 30 years, issued in multiple bond series from 2027 to 2030.

Not all St Petersburg property owners are utility customers and not all utility customers are property owners. Using the GO bond, in addition to utility fees, distributes costs across all city residences and businesses. The estimated cost to property owners ($96 annually per $100,000 of taxable value) is less than the estimated $486 annual utility rate increase needed to implement the same improvements without GO financing within the 19-year timeframe. Note: if the State Constitutional Amendment on increased property tax exemptions passes, a millage rate greater than the $96/$100,000 will be required.

What is SPAR (https://www.stpete.org/residents/sustainability/spar/index.php)?
SPAR (St. Pete Agile Resilience) is the City's plan for prioritizing and accelerating resilience work to upgrade the stormwater, wastewater, and drinking water infrastructure. SPAR requires long-term investment and funding choices that impact timing and costs. From 2027-2050, projects for stormwater, potable water, and wastewater are estimated at $4.4 billion, of which SPAR projects represent $2.7 billion. The priority list of $2.7 billion in drainage and other water projects is estimated to take 24 years to finish using current utility rates. Issuing the bonds would shorten the timeline to approximately 19 years.

SPAR projects are currently funded through utility rates. Utility-rate funding means costs are paid through monthly utility bills. Projects are delivered as funds become available over time. This means the delivery timeline is longer, and costs are tied to utility use and the billing structure.

To reduce flood risks from heavy rains, possible investments include upsizing pipes and culverts, widening ditches, creating new bypass routes and adjusting road grades for improved drainage. The city would look at expanding capacity in canals, creeks, and ditches, increasing storage through interconnected ponds and adding stormwater pump stations.

For flood-prone areas, the city is looking at installing flood gate systems. They would use engineered and natural barriers to prevent tidal backflow from entering nearby water bodies.

To avoid sewage backups, the city would add capacity to tanks to prevent groundwater and surface water from entering the city's collection system during heavy rains. The city would consider elevating wastewater collection plants to avoid flooding and installing permanent generators as backup power during outages.

To reduce the need for residents to boil water after storms, the city would consider repairing or replacing drinking water pipes. The city would install generators at pumping and treatment facilities, increase capacity in water storage tanks, and elevate facilities to protect them from flooding.

The League of Women Voters of the St Petersburg Area and the Suncoast Sierra Club support the passage of this referendum. These groups support ongoing public involvement, transparent expenditure of funds, and program updates as the plans are refined and executed.

A Yes vote would mean that the City would proceed with issuing the GO bonds estimated to reduce the time to complete eligible infrastructure improvements from 24 years to 19 years.
A No vote would mean the infrastructure improvements would continue under existing utility bill funding sources (via utility rate increases) and be implemented over the longer timeframe of 24 years instead of 19 years.

St Petersburg Referendum #2 - Authorizing Amendment of Harborage Marina Lease to Extend Term to 30 Years and Require Improvements

Ballot Language:
May City Council approve amendment of the lease of City-owned submerged lands at Harborage Marina subject to conditions in ordinance 640-H? Such an amendment would extend the lease term to 30 years and require the tenant to construct new improvements at no cost to the City, including 200 linear feet of docks, boat lifts, and expanded restrooms. The City would own those improvements at the end of the lease.

Synopsis:
The purpose of this referendum is to amend the current Harborage Marina lease to extend its term and require new improvements at the marina. The original lease dates back to 1986 and has been amended four times.

The tenant (Harborage Marina, L.L.C.) must construct, at no cost to the City, 200 linear feet of new docks (with fire suppression, water, and electric service), new boat lifts, and expanded restrooms. All improvements become City property at the end or early termination of the lease. The leased area, located at 1110 3rd St S., cannot be expanded beyond what was authorized in the 2018 referendum (approx. 13.4 acres).

City officials estimate the extended lease would generate approximately $4.5 million in additional lease revenue over its lifetime while modernizing aging marina infrastructure. The referendum would extend Harborage Marina's lease to 30 years, which enables long-term financing of approximately $2.15 million in capital improvements.

A Yes vote would extend the current Harborage Marina lease up to 30 years, while requiring specific upgrades to the marina.
A No vote would keep the current term of the lease, which expires in 2048, and not require any marina upgrades.

City of Largo Amendment:

Largo Amendment #1 - Change of Date when Petitions for Candidates for Mayor and City Commission are First Available

Ballot Language:
Shall section 7.02(a) of the City of Largo Charter be amended to change the date that petitions for candidates for Mayor and City Commission are first available to March 15th of each year of a regular city election, or a date selected by the City Commission for a special election, all as more fully described in Ordinance No. 2025 - 24?

Synopsis:
The date when candidate petitions become available was not updated in the City Charter to reflect the change in the City's regular election to November. The City Charter currently states petitions would be available 45 days before the start of the qualifying period set by the City Commission.

This amendment would set the date that petitions become available to candidates to be March 15th of the year of a regular city election. If March 15th falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday observed by the City, the petitions shall be available on the immediately preceding business day. For any special elections held outside the normal election schedule, the petitions will be available on a date established by the City Commission.

A Yes Vote Would set the date petitions become available to City of Largo Mayoral and City Commission candidates to March 15, or the prior business day if a weekend/holiday.
A No Vote Would leave the date at 45 days before the qualifying period, which the City Commission sets each election year.

City of Madeira Beach Amendments:

Charter Amendments #1 through #3 must all be passed together in order to properly implement Ordinance 2026-07.

City of Madeira Beach Charter Amendment #1 - Change Municipal Election Date from March to November

Ballot Language:
Shall the City of Madeira Beach Charter be amended to change the date of regular municipal elections from March to November, so City elections occur in conjunction with the State General Election?

Synopsis:
Currently, the City of Madeira Beach holds its election in March. If this amendment is approved, Ordinance 2026-07 would become effective. The ordinance would shift elections to November to coincide with the state general election. The change is intended to save taxpayer money as the City currently is required to pay the costs of a March election. Additionally, November elections have higher voter turnout than March elections.

A Yes Vote Would: change the City's municipal elections from March to November. The March 2027 election would be moved to November 2027.
A No Vote Would: leave the City's municipal election schedule as is in March.

Madeira Beach Charter Amendment #2 - Change Candidate Qualifying Period from December to June

Ballot Language:
Shall the City of Madeira Beach Charter be amended to change the municipal candidate qualifying period from the first two full weeks in December, excluding weekends, to the first two full weeks in June, excluding weekends, to align with the revised November municipal general election schedule?

Synopsis:
Currently, the City of Madeira Beach holds its election in March. If this amendment is approved, Ordinance 2026-07 would become effective. The ordinance would shift elections to November to coincide with the state general election. In order to accommodate this change, the candidate qualifying period must be moved from December to June. The change is intended to save taxpayer money as the City currently is required to pay the costs of a March election. Additionally, November elections have higher voter turnout than March elections.

A Yes Vote Would: change the candidate qualifying period from December to June to align with changing the elections from March to November.
A No Vote Would: leave candidate qualifying period in December.

Madeira Beach Charter Amendment #3 - Extend Terms of Elected Officials to Implement November Elections

Ballot Language:
Shall the City Charter be amended to temporarily extend the terms of Commissioner District 3 and Commissioner District 4 until certification of the November 2027 election results; and the terms of Commissioner District 1, Commissioner District 2, and Mayor-Commissioner until certification of the November 2028 election results in order to implement the transition from March municipal elections to November municipal general elections?

Synopsis:
Currently, the City of Madeira Beach holds its election in March. If this amendment is approved, Ordinance 2026-07 would become effective. The ordinance would shift elections to November to coincide with the state general election. In order to accommodate this change, the terms of the Commissioners and Mayor need to be extended this one-time. The Commissioner District 3 and 4 terms will be extended November 2027 and the terms of Commissioner District 1, 2, and Mayor-Commissioner will be extended until November 2028.

A Yes Vote Would: extend the terms of the Commissioners and Mayor to properly align with the change from March to November elections.
A No Vote Would: leave the terms of the Commissioners and Mayor ending too soon, prior to the next applicable election.

Town of Belleair Amendments:

Town of Belleair Charter Amendment #1 - Removing the requirement the Town Commission Appoint a Planning and Zoning Board

Ballot Language:
Shall Section 5.04 of the Charter for the Town of Belleair be amended to remove the requirement that the Town Commission appoint a planning and zoning board because the language is unnecessary since Florida law requires the Town to appoint a local planning agency?

Synopsis:
The purpose of the proposed Amendment (Ordinance #597) is to amend the Charter to remove the requirement that the Town Commission appoint the Planning and Zoning Board. The Planning and Zoning Board is the only board required by the Town's Charter and the language is unnecessary because Section 163.3174, Florida Statutes, requires the Town Commission to appoint a local planning agency.

The proposed change was recommended by the Charter Review Committee to clean up redundant text.

A Yes Vote Would: Remove Section 5.04 of the Belleair Charter requiring a Planning and Zoning Board
A No Vote Would: Leave Section 5.04 in the Belleair Charter requiring a Planning and Zoning Board

Town of Belleair Charter Amendment #2 - Amending the Month the Charter Review Committee is Established

Ballot Language:
Shall Section 10.01 of the Charter for the Town of Belleair be amended to change the month the Charter Review Committee is established from June to May beginning in 2036 thereby providing the Charter Review Committee sufficient time to perform its duties and provide the Town with the time necessary to meet Pinellas County Supervisor of Elections deadlines allowing proposed amendments to be on the ballot for the general election the following November?

Synopsis:
The purpose of the proposed Amendment (Ordinance 598) is to amend the Charter to require the Town Commission to establish the Charter Review Committee before or during the month of May, every ten years, beginning in 2036, instead of the month of June. This change would allow the Charter Review Committee sufficient time to perform its duties and provide the Town with the time necessary to meet the Pinellas County Supervisor of Election's deadlines in order to ensure the proposed amendments are on the ballot for the general election in November.

The proposed change was recommended by the Charter Review Committee.

A Yes Vote Would: Change the month that the Charter Review Committee begins meeting, every 10 years, from June to May to allow more time to complete its review in time for the November election.
A No Vote Would: Leave the month that the Charter Review Committee begins meeting, every 10 years, in June.

City of Treasure Island Amendment:

City of Treasure Island Charter Amendment #1 - Shall Charter be Amended Requiring Four Commissioners' Approval for Planned Developments or Special Area Plans?

Ballot Language:
Shall the Treasure Island City Charter Section 3.07(c) be amended to require that "a supermajority vote of four members of the Board of Commissioners shall be required for the approval of any planned developments or special area plans?" This provision will become effective immediately upon approval by the electors or as otherwise provided by law.

Synopsis:
This amendment is the result of a citizen-initiative petition. The push for a stricter four-vote requirement follows community debate over post-hurricane redevelopment, building heights, and density rules (such as proposals allowing properties like the Thunderbird Beach Resort to rebuild taller or denser). Currently, only a simple majority of 3 votes is required to approve developments.

City commissioners have separately debated this issue. In order to balance post-storm economic recovery and preservation of the island's low-rise community character, the Commission has considered options such as requiring 4 votes only when projects request absolute maximum height and density limits.

A Yes Vote Would: Require a super-majority (4 out of 5 commissioners) approval vote for planned developments, rather than the current requirement for 3 approval votes, a simple majority.
A No Vote Would: Leave the current requirement of a simple majority, 3 commissioner votes, to approve a planned development.

Town of Redington Shores Referendums:

Town of Redington Shores Referendum #1 - Commissioners' Term of Office

Ballot Language:
Charter Section 5 currently provides that the term of office for a Commissioner is two years. Should Section 5 of the Charter be amended to convert terms of the Commissioners to three years?

Synopsis:
This referendum (Ordinance 2026-01) would change the term of office for Commissioners from 2 years to 3 years beginning with the general election in November 2027. Commencing with the November 2027 election, Commissioners from Districts 2 and 4 would serve 3 year terms. Commencing with the November 2028 election, Commissioners from Districts 1 and 3 would serve 3 year terms.

The Board of Commissioners determined that it is in the Town's best interests to leave the term of office for the Mayor at three years. In order to maintain staggered mayoral and commissioner terms, this referendum would shorten the 2027 mayoral term to 2 years, and then in 2029, return the term of the Mayor to 3-year terms. The Board of Commissioners feels that making these changes allows commissioners to better serve their constituents by having a longer term and reducing the frequency of Elections.

This referendum is directly tied to Referendum #2 - Mayoral 2027 Term of Office.

A Yes Vote Would: change to term of office for the Commissioners from 2 years to 3 years.
A No Vote Would: leave the term of office for the Commissioners at 2 years.

Town of Redington Shores Referendum #2 - Mayoral 2027 Term of Office

Ballot Language:
Charter Section 5 currently provides that the term of office for the Mayor is three years. If Referendum Question #1 passes extending the term of office for a Commissioner to three years should the Charter be amended to provide the term of office for the Mayor following the 2027 general election only be two years to maintain staggered terms of office for the Mayor and Commissioners?

Synopsis:
This referendum (Ordinance 2026-02) changes the Town's election date from March to November to align with State elections and reduce the cost and frequency of elections in the Town. It amends the qualifying period to correspond with the new November election date. The candidate filing period would move from December to July. This also extends the commissioners' terms for Districts 2 and 4, set to expire in March 2027, until the November 2027 election. Districts 1 and 3 will be held in the November 2028 general election.

If passed, this referendum only goes into effect if Referendum #1 - Commissioners' Term of Office also passes.

A Yes Vote Would: change the Town's elections from March to November to align with State elections
A No Vote Would: leave the Town's elections in March