

Orange County Government

*Orange County Administration Center
201 S Rosalind Ave.
Orlando, FL 32802-1393*



Charter Review Commission Agenda - Final

Wednesday, March 4, 2020

5:30 PM

County Commission Chambers

2020 Charter Review Commission

CRC Members:

Camille Evans, Chair

James R. Auffant, Vice Chair

Jack Douglas–Russell Drake–John E. Fauth–Matthew Klein–

Jeffrey A. Miller–Nikki Mims–Angela Melvin–Samuel Vilchez Santiago–Soraya Smith–

Lee Steinhauer–Eugene Stoccardo–Anthony (Tony) Suarez–Dotti Wynn

Call to Order**Pledge of Allegiance****I. Public Comment****II. Consent Item**

- A. CRC-20-092 Approval and execution of the minutes of the February 5, 2020 meeting of the Charter Review Commission (CRC).

Attachments: 2020-02-05 CRC Draft Minutes

III. Chair Comments**IV. Subcommittee Recommendations - Second Reading and Vote**

- A. CRC-20-093 Consideration of the Ethics Concerning Lobbyists Committee's recommendation to make no changes to the Orange County Charter with respect to the Ethics Concerning Lobbyists evaluation topic; and further, to make no changes to the Orange County Charter with respect to the creation of an Ethics Commission separate from the Ethics Advisory Board that currently is provided for under the Orange County Ethics Code.

Attachments: 2020-03-04 IV. A1 Ethics Concerning Lobbyists Final Report

- B. CRC-20-094 Consideration of the Number and Composition of County Commission Districts Committee's recommendation to make no changes to the Orange County Charter with respect to the number and composition of Orange County Districts; and further, to make no changes to the Orange County Charter with respect to whether the Board of County Commissioners are full or part-time officers.

Attachments: 2020-03-04 IV. B1 Number and Composition of Districts Final Report

- C. CRC-20-095 Consideration of the Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee's recommendation to amend the Orange County Charter with respect to prohibiting pollution of the Wekiva River, Econlockhatchee River and all other waters of Orange County.

Attachments: 2020-03-04 IV. C1 Rights of the Wekiva and Econ River Final Report
2020-03-04 IV. C2 Lake-Erie

V. Subcommittee Updates

- A. CRC-20-096 Split Oak Subcommittee Meeting Held on February 12, 2020 (Vice Chair Auffant)

Attachments: 2020-03-04 V. A1 Split Oak Committee Summary Report

- B.** CRC-20-097 Permanent Funding of Green PLACE Subcommittee Meeting Held on February 17, 2020 (Chair Evans)

Attachments: 2020-03-04 V. B1 Permanent Funding of Green PLACE Report

- C.** CRC-20-098 Citizen-Initiated Charter and Ordinance Amendment Process Subcommittee Meeting Held on February 19, 2020 (Member Smith)

Attachments: 2020-03-04 V. C1 Citizen-Initiated Charter and Ordinance Process Report

VI. New Business

Orange County Government

*Orange County Administration Center
201 S Rosalind Ave.
Orlando, FL 32802-1393*



Draft Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 5, 2020

5:30 PM

County Commission Chambers

2020 Charter Review Commission

CRC Members:

Camille Evans, Chair

James R. Auffant, Vice Chair

Jack Douglas–Russell Drake–John E. Fauth–Matthew Klein–

Jeffrey A. Miller–Nikki Mims–Angela Melvin–Samuel Vilchez Santiago–Soraya Smith–

Lee Steinhauer–Eugene Stoccardo–Anthony (Tony) Suarez–Dotti Wynn

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m.

Present: 13 - Member Camille Evans, Member Jack Douglas, Member Russell Drake, Member John E. Fauth, Member Angela Melvin, Member Jeffrey A. Miller, Member Nikki Mims, Member Samuel Vilchez Santiago, Member Soraya Smith, Member Lee Steinhauer, Member Eugene Stoccardo, Member Anthony (Tony) Suarez, and Member Dotti Wynn

Absent: 2 - Member James R. Auffant, and Member Matthew Klein

Others present:

CRC General Counsel Cliff Shepard
Deputy Clerk Katie Smith
Assistant Deputy Clerk Jessica Vaupel
Senior Minutes Coordinator Craig Stopyra
Senior Minutes Coordinator Noelia Perez

Pledge of Allegiance**I. Public Comment**

The following persons addressed the CRC during public comment:

- Chuck O'Neal
- Steve Meyers
- Valerie Anderson
- Marcos Vilar
- Nicole Wilson
- Sally Baptiste
- Anh Volmer
- Marj Holt

II. Consent Item

- A. CRC-20-080** Approval and execution of the minutes of the January 9, 2020 District 2 Public Hearing of the Charter Review Commission (CRC).

A motion was made by Member Wynn, seconded by Member Steinhauer, to approve and execute the minutes of January 9, 2020. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 13 - Member Evans, Member Douglas, Member Drake, Member Fauth, Member Melvin, Member Miller, Member Mims, Member Santiago, Member Smith, Member Steinhauer, Member Stoccardo, Member Suarez, and Member Wynn

Absent: 2 - Member Auffant, and Member Klein

III. Chair Comments

CRC-20-082 Chair Comments

Chair Evans addressed the CRC regarding the following:

- Commended the CRC for their service and attendance at the subcommittee and full CRC meetings.
- Highlighted the evaluation process and subcommittee work product guidelines, which can be found on the Charter's website and serve as a guide for the work of the CRC in the course of moving forward with proposed amendments.
- Highlighted an item on the agenda requesting the approval from the CRC to allow for the Comptroller's Office to provide a financial impact analysis for any subcommittee recommendation proposing an amendment.
- Based upon the evaluation process, today was the deadline for any new topics of consideration to be placed on the agenda.
- First Readings of Subcommittee Recommendations for Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Subcommittee, Ethics Concerning Lobbyists, and Number and Composition of County Commission Districts.
- The next CRC meeting scheduled is for March 4, 2020. Chair Evans requested the second CRC meeting in March be rescheduled to March 16, 2020. Both meetings will begin at 5:30 p.m., in the County Commission Chambers.

IV. Discussion Items

A. CRC-20-086 Financial Impact Analysis/Statement - Proposed Charter Amendments

Chair Evans discussed her memo to the CRC along with a memorandum provided by Chief Deputy Comptroller, Eric Gassman, which outlined the Comptroller's Office process for the CRC subcommittees requesting the financial impact analysis of their respective potential Charter amendments.

A motion was made by Member Steinhauer, seconded by Member Wynn, to approve the request to have the Comptroller be the designated entity to provide the financial impact analysis. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 13 - Member Evans, Member Douglas, Member Drake, Member Fauth, Member Melvin, Member Miller, Member Mims, Member Santiago, Member Smith, Member Steinhauer, Member Stoccardo, Member Suarez, and Member Wynn

Absent: 2 - Member Auffant, and Member Klein

B. CRC-20-075 Proposed Charter Review Topic - Permanent Funding of Green PLACE (Continued from January 9, 2020)

General Counsel Shepard presented the Proposed Charter Review Topic-Permanent Funding of Green PLACE. Member Stoccardo proposed the amendment. The topic involves the idea that seven and a half million dollars be spent on the acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands. The

topic was first discussed at the CRC meeting on January 9, 2020, in which questions arose and the Commission tabled discussion. Additionally, the CRC instructed General Counsel to conduct research on the legality of the proposed amendment. General Counsel Shepard mentioned his full analysis of the topic has been submitted and that memo can be found in the agenda packet. General Counsel Shepard indicated the opinions of numerous Attorney Generals and the findings/rulings of similar amendments have been found to be in violation of the Constitution. Furthermore, General Counsel Shepard mentioned the Case of Hillsborough County versus the State of Florida Case # 19-CA-13-82 in which a state trial court determined that a similar Charter amendment was ruled unconstitutional. The case is under direct appeal of the Florida Supreme Court with a ruling to be determined. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Shepard contributed to the discussion.

A motion was made by Member Stoccardo, seconded by Member Santiago, to establish Permanent Funding of Green PLACE as an evaluation topic for the 2020 CRC. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Member Drake, Member Fauth, Member Melvin, Member Mims, Member Santiago, Member Smith, and Member Stoccardo

Nay: 6 - Member Evans, Member Douglas, Member Miller, Member Steinhauer, Member Suarez, and Member Wynn

Absent: 2 - Member Auffant, and Member Klein

A motion was made by Member Santiago, seconded by Member Stoccardo, to establish the Permanent Funding of Green PLACE as a subcommittee for the 2020 CRC. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 13 - Member Evans, Member Douglas, Member Drake, Member Fauth, Member Melvin, Member Miller, Member Mims, Member Santiago, Member Smith, Member Steinhauer, Member Stoccardo, Member Suarez, and Member Wynn

Absent: 2 - Member Auffant, and Member Klein

Chair Evans appointed the following CRC Members to serve on the Permanent Funding of Green PLACE subcommittee:

Subcommittee Chair: Chair Evans

Subcommittee: Member Melvin, Member Smith, Member Steinhauer, and Member Stoccardo

C. CRC-20-084 Proposed Charter Review Topic - 180-Day Timeline Limitation Related to the Citizen-Initiated Charter and Ordinance Amendment Process

Chair Evans requested an update from Member Smith on the Citizen-Initiated Charter and Ordinance Amendment Process subcommittee meeting. Member Smith indicated a memorandum providing the details and background of the topic has been included in the agenda

packet. The subcommittee requests authority from the CRC to extend their topic review in order to look at all aspects of the 180 day timeline limitation as it affects the petitioners ability to proceed in a timely basis with a citizen initiated petition. Discussion ensued.

A motion was made by Member Smith, seconded by Member Drake, to approve the Citizen-Initiated Charter and Ordinance Amendment Process with moving forward and extending their topic review during the next subcommittee meeting for further review of the 180 day timeline limitation that currently exists. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 13 - Member Evans, Member Douglas, Member Drake, Member Fauth, Member Melvin, Member Miller, Member Mims, Member Santiago, Member Smith, Member Steinhauer, Member Stoccardo, Member Suarez, and Member Wynn

Absent: 2 - Member Auffant, and Member Klein

V. Subcommittee Recommendations - First Reading (Second Reading on March 4, 2020)

- A. CRC-20-087** Consideration of the Ethics Concerning Lobbyists Committee's recommendation to make no changes to the Orange County Charter with respect to the Ethics Concerning Lobbyists evaluation topic; and further, to make no changes to the Orange County Charter with respect to the creation of an Ethics Commission separate from the Ethics Advisory Board that currently is provided for under the Orange County Ethics Code.

Chair Evans requested Member Steinhauer present the First Reading of Ethics Concerning Lobbyists and the creation of an Ethics Commission separate from the Ethics Advisory Board that currently is provided for under the Orange County Ethics Code. Member Steinhauer indicated the subcommittee was tasked with evaluating a Charter amendment restricting lobbyists from serving on advisory boards and commissions in Orange County. Furthermore, the consideration was expanded to include consideration on whether a separate Ethics Commission should be established. The subcommittee held numerous public hearings to allow for public input regarding this topic. The subcommittee reviewed the public records documenting registered lobbyists and the information reviewed by subcommittee reflects that no ethics complaints had been filed in the past several years, only a minimal number of registered lobbyists served on advisory boards and commissions, and there was no indication of any potential conflicts of interests. The subcommittee also examined the current Orange County Ethics Code and a code provision for the establishment of an Ethics Advisory Board by Resolution. The subcommittee also examined the current restrictions concerning lobbyists, the state ethics regulations/restrictions on lobbyists, and the ethics codes of other jurisdictions. Based upon their review, the subcommittee recommends that no amendments to the Orange County Charter be made with respect to the Ethics Concerning Lobbyists Topic or Ethics Commission. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Shepard contributed to discussion.

A motion was made by Member Evans, seconded by Member Miller, to approve the first reading on the recommendation of the Ethics Concerning Lobbyists subcommittee. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Member Evans, Member Douglas, Member Drake, Member Melvin, Member Miller, Member Mims, Member Steinhauer, and Member Wynn

Nay: 4 - Member Fauth, Member Santiago, Member Smith, and Member Stoccardo

Absent: 3 - Member Auffant, Member Klein, and Member Suarez

- B. CRC-20-088** Consideration of the Number and Composition of County Commission Districts Committee's recommendation to make no changes to the Orange County Charter with respect to the number and composition of Orange County Districts; and further, to make no changes to the Orange County Charter with respect to whether the Board of County Commissioners are full or part-time officers.

Chair Evans requested General Counsel Shepard present the First Reading of the Number and Composition of County Commission Districts subcommittee's recommendation. General Counsel Shepard indicated the subcommittee was established to determine whether the county commissioner membership should be expanded to include additional districts or allow at large members to-be added to the current commission. Members of the public expressed concern regarding the ability of Commissioners to perform their duties due to the County's growth. The subcommittee considered proposals relating to expanding the membership of the Orange County Commission and considered the need for full time or part time positions for the County Commission. Additionally, the subcommittee reviewed the work of the similarly tasked committee of the 2016 CRC, historical population information, and the anticipated costs of implementing proposals for expansion of the districts. The subcommittee reached out to County Commissioners and aides and the evidence reviewed by the subcommittee indicated there is no immediate need for additional districts or to designate the Commissioners as full or part time County officers. The subcommittee recommends that no amendments to the County Charter be made. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Shepard contributed to discussion.

A motion was made by Member Evans, seconded by Member Wynn, to approve the first reading on the recommendation of the Number and Composition of County Commission Districts subcommittee. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 12 - Member Evans, Member Douglas, Member Drake, Member Fauth, Member Melvin, Member Miller, Member Mims, Member Santiago, Member Smith, Member Steinhauer, Member Stoccardo, and Member Wynn

Absent: 3 - Member Auffant, Member Klein, and Member Suarez

- C. CRC-20-089** Consideration of the Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee's recommendation to amend the Orange County Charter with respect to prohibiting pollution of the Wekiva River, Econlockhatchee River and all other waters of Orange County.

Chair Evans requested Member Mims present the First Reading of the Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Subcommittee Final Report. Member Mims explained the history surrounding the evaluation topics examined by the subcommittee that encompassed establishing the Rights of Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River and all bodies of water within Orange County. Over the course of multiple meetings the subcommittee considered and analyzed several drafts of the proposed amendments and considered the reasons for and against recommendation. After consideration of information presented, the subcommittee voted to

recommend to the full CRC the amendment to the Orange County Charter, including Ballot title and summary, with respect to the Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Shepard contributed to discussion.

A motion was made by Member Mims, seconded by Member Santiago, to approve the first reading on the recommendation of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River subcommittee to amend the Orange County Charter with respect to prohibiting pollution of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River and all waters of Orange County. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Member Drake, Member Fauth, Member Melvin, Member Mims, Member Santiago, Member Smith, and Member Stoccardo

Nay: 5 - Member Evans, Member Douglas, Member Miller, Member Steinhauer, and Member Wynn

Absent: 3 - Member Auffant, Member Klein, and Member Suarez

VI. Subcommittee/Sunshine Meeting Updates

A. CRC-20-091 Split Oak Committee Meeting Held on January 22, 2020

Member Mims presented the subcommittee report in the absence of Vice Chair Auffant. On January 22, 2020, the subcommittee held its last meeting to review the final version of the subcommittee final report, ballot title, summary and proposed textual changes to the Charter. The subcommittee considered arguments for and against the proposed Charter amendment. It was the consensus of the subcommittee to present the Charter amendment to the full CRC. During the meeting, Member Santiago proposed a resolution declaring opposition to any action of the Orange County Board of County Commissioners regarding Central Florida Expressway Authority routing the eastern expressway extension through Split Oak Forest wildlife and environmental areas prior to the outcome of the 2020 General Election.

Member Mims requested direction from Chair Evans on bringing forth the proposed resolution to the full CRC. Chair Evans indicated any actions proposed by the subcommittee be brought forward when the subcommittee submits their final report requesting proposed action from the full CRC. Discussion ensued.

A motion was made by Member Mims, seconded by Member Smith, to revise the Subcommittee Report Work Product Guidelines adopted on November 6, 2019, to allow the Split Oak Subcommittee to present its First Reading to the public and the full CRC on April 1, 2020; and further, to present its Second and Final Reading to the public and the full CRC during the regular business hours scheduled on May 6, 2020, with the justification to allow the Comptroller's Office sufficient time to prepare financial impact analysis in light of legal challenges to the uncertain results. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 11 - Member Evans, Member Douglas, Member Drake, Member Fauth, Member Melvin, Member Mims, Member Santiago, Member Smith, Member Steinhauer, Member Stoccardo, and Member Wynn

Absent: 3 - Member Auffant, Member Klein, and Member Suarez

Recuse 1 - Member Miller
d:

- B. CRC-20-085** Sunshine Meeting Held on January 23, 2020 Between Members Fauth and Vilchez Santiago Regarding the Release of Subcommittee Reports to the Full CRC

Member Santiago indicated he and Member Fauth met at a Sunshine Meeting on January 23, 2020, to discuss the CRC's work product guidelines and to consider the topics reviewed at the various different subcommittee meetings.

VII. New Business

Member Mims requested General Counsel or CRC staff prepare materials regarding the governing bylaws of the Charter for the consideration of the full CRC.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the CRC adjourned at 10:11 p.m.

Camille Evans, Chair
2020 Charter Review Commission



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

January 13, 2020

Committee Recommendation

Ethics Concerning Lobbyists Committee

Committee Members:

Lee Steinhauer, Chair
Camille Evans
Matthew Klein
Jeffrey A. Miller
Samuel Vilchez Santiago

Background

On July 10, 2019, the 2020 Charter Review Commission (the "CRC") initially considered whether to establish as an evaluation topic the establishment of ethics rules concerning the appointment of lobbyists to advisory boards and commissions established by the Orange County Board of County Commissioners (the "Commission"). The CRC voted to table the issue.

On August 7, 2019, the CRC renewed its consideration of whether to establish as an evaluation topic whether there should be ethics rules concerning the appointment of lobbyists to advisory boards and commissions. The CRC received a proposal from Member Eugene Stoccardo in favor of establishing an evaluation topic and a memorandum from General Counsel concerning current and forthcoming restrictions on lobbyists under state law and the Orange County Code. The CRC voted 7 to 4 in favor of establishing Ethics for Appointing Lobbyists to Advisory Boards and Commissions as an evaluation topic. The CRC also voted 10 to 1 in favor of creating a separate committee to explore the topic and report its findings back to the CRC.

Summary of Recommendation

Beginning on August 22, 2019, the Ethics Concerning Lobbyists Committee (the "Committee") held six public meetings to hear public input and consider proposals regarding ethics rules restricting registered lobbyists from serving on advisory boards or commissions. Additionally, on October 2, 2019, with the approval of the CRC, the scope of the Committee's area of inquiry expanded to include consideration of whether a separate Ethics Commission should be established in Orange County. The Committee considered and analyzed the current Orange County Ethics Code, which provides for the creations of an Ethics Advisory Board by the Commission by resolution, as well as current Orange County restrictions concerning lobbyists, state ethics regulations and restrictions on lobbyists, and the ethics codes of a number of other jurisdictions. The Committee also reviewed public records showing registered lobbyists who have been appointed to serve on advisory boards from the years 2009-2019, as well as reports, recommendations and ordinances resulting from the Orange County Ethics Task Force in the years 2007-2010, which led to the establishment of the

current Orange County Ethics Code and a code provision for the establishment of an Ethics Advisory Board by the Commission by resolution. The Committee further heard from the Orange County Comptroller's Director of Audit, Chris Dawkins, regarding the role of the Comptroller under the Orange County Charter and from Assistant County Attorney Kate Latorre concerning annual ethics training provided to advisory board members by the Orange County Attorney's Office and the number of ethics complaints filed in Orange County. The Committee also heard from members of the public as to their respective concerns and proposals relating to registered lobbyists serving on advisory boards and the possible creation of an independent ethics commission with investigation and enforcement authority.

After careful consideration of the information presented, the Committee voted 4 to 1 to recommend to the full CRC that no amendment to the Orange County Charter be made with respect to the Committee's evaluation topic.

Although some members of the public expressed concerns regarding registered lobbyists serving on advisory boards and commissions, and some members of the public were in favor of the creation of an independent ethics commission, the information reviewed by the Committee fails to establish a need for a prohibition on registered lobbyists from serving on advisory boards or commissions, or for the creation of an independent ethic commission, separate from the Ethics Advisory Board option currently available by resolution under the Orange County Ethics Code, to investigate and enforce the Orange County Ethics Code. The information reviewed by the Committee reflects that no ethics complaints have been filed in the past several years, only a minimal number of registered lobbyists have served on advisory boards or commissions since 2009, all without any indication that such service was related to their private lobbying activities, and Orange County currently has a robust Ethics Code. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that no amendments to the Orange County Charter be made with respect to the Committee's evaluation topic.

Reasons for Recommendation

1. Orange County has an Ethics Code.

As a result of an Orange County Ethics Task Force established by the Commission in the years 2007-2010, which spent considerable time and effort analyzing the issue, the current Ethics Code was created. The current Ethics Code establishes standards of conduct, procedures and due process for handling ethics complaints. In addition, the Ethics Code provides that the Commission may establish by resolution an Ethics Advisory Board at any time.

2. Florida Law and the Orange County Charter Regulate Lobbying.

The Committee reviewed memorandums prepared by General Counsel detailing the substantial regulation of lobbyists that currently exist under Florida Law and the Orange County Charter. Thus, new regulations or prohibitions on lobbyists serving on advisory boards or commissions may be duplicative or conflict with such laws.

3. No Substantial Evidence of a Problem.

No ethics complaints have been filed in recent years. No information was provided to the Committee indicating that any of the very few registered lobbyists who have volunteered to serve on advisory boards or commissions since 2009 did so inappropriately or at the behest of their principals. Furthermore, existing laws and regulations appear to cover any such inappropriate conduct. Prohibiting Orange County citizens from serving on advisory boards or commissions simply because they are employed as a lobbyist may have a chilling effect on those few citizens who are willing to serve in the future.

Arguments Against Recommendation

1. Conflicts of Interests and Public Perception of Lobbyists.

Some members of the public expressed concerns that without a prohibition on lobbyists serving on advisory boards or commissions there will be inherent conflicts of interests in our government. The public perception of lobbyists is that they serve the interests of their principal. In order to avoid that perception and the appearance of impropriety, lobbyists should be prohibited from serving on advisory boards and commissions in Orange County.

2. Other Jurisdictions Regulate Lobbyists and Have Strong Ethics Commissions.

Some of the largest counties in Florida have supplemental regulations for lobbyists and strong Ethics Commissions with investigative and enforcement powers. As Orange County is one of the fastest growing counties in Florida, it too should have supplemental regulations for lobbyists and a strong Ethics Commission.

3. Public Perception Indicates there is a Problem in Orange County.

Some members of the public expressed the view that despite the fact no ethics complaints have been recently filed in Orange County under the Orange County Ethics Code, there are real ethical problems in Orange County which are not adequately addressed by the current code.

Committee Recommendation

After careful consideration of the information presented, Member Chair Evans made a motion that the Committee recommend no amendments to the Orange County Charter be made with respect to the Ethics Concerning Lobbyists Evaluation Topic. The motion was seconded by Member Miller. The Committee voted 4 to 1 in favor of the motion. Member Miller also made a motion that the Committee recommend no amendments to the Orange County Charter be made with respect to the creation of an Ethics Commission separate from the Ethics Advisory Board that currently is provided

for under the Ethics Code. The motion was seconded by Member Steinhauer. The Committee voted 5 to 0 in favor of the motion.

Accordingly, having carefully considered the comments and proposals of the public, the comments and information provided by invited guests, the memorandums and information provided by General Counsel, the reports provided by staff, and otherwise being fully advised in the premises, **the Committee recommends that no amendments to the Orange County Charter be made with respect to ethics concerning lobbyist or with respect to the creation of an Ethics Commission.**



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

December 18, 2019

Committee Recommendation

Number and Composition of County Commission Districts, and Full Time/Part Time Commissioners

Committee Members:

Jack Douglas, Chair
Russell Drake
Matthew Klein
Anthony (Tony) Suarez
Dotti Wynn

Summary of Recommendation

Beginning on July 24, 2019, the Number and Composition of County Commission Districts Committee (the "Committee") held five public meetings to hear public input and consider proposals relating to expanding the membership of the Orange County Commission. Additionally, on November 6, 2019, with the approval of the 2020 Orange County Charter Review Commission, the Committee's area of inquiry expanded to include analyzing whether the charter should be amended to expressly provide that county commissioners are full-time county officials. The Committee reviewed the work of a similarly-tasked committee of the 2016 CRC, historical population information, and anticipated costs of implementing proposals for expansion. The Committee further heard from county officials in writing and as invited guests, including Mayor Jerry L. Demings, Commissioners Betsy VanderLey, Maribel Gomez Cordero, Christine Moore, Emily Bonilla, and Mayra Uribe, County Administrator Byron W. Brooks, Supervisor of Elections Bill Cowles, Orange County Chief of Staff Roseann Harrington, and Office of Management and Budget Manager Kurt N. Petersen. The Committee also heard from members of public as to their respective concerns relating to the responsibilities, representativeness and responsiveness of current county commission districts.

Although some members of the public expressed concerns regarding the ability of Commissioners to perform their work with the growing population of Orange County, none of the Commissioners reported that they had difficulty or were unable to fulfill their duties. Mayor Jerry L. Demings also reported that he was unaware of any Commissioner being unable to manage their present duties and he advised the Committee that pursuant to Section 202 of the charter the County is required to reconsider and adjust its districts in response to the 2020 census. In response to Committee questions regarding whether Commissioners had the appropriate number of staff, Mayor Demings reported that they did, but if additional staff are needed, those issues may be addressed through the normal budgetary process. Thus, although the population of Orange County continues to grow, the vast majority of the evidence reviewed by the Committee does not indicate that there is an immediate need for additional districts or to expressly designate the Commissioners as full or part time County officers.

Committee Recommendation

After careful consideration of the information presented, Member Dotti Wynn made a motion that the Committee recommend no amendments to the Orange County Charter be made with respect to the number and composition of Orange County Districts. The motion was seconded by Member Matthew Klein. The Committee voted 5 to 0 in favor of the motion. Member Dotti Wynn also made a motion that the Committee recommend no amendments to the Orange County Charter be made with respect to whether the Board of County Commissioners are full or part-time officers. The motion was seconded by Member Russell Drake. The Committee voted 5 to 0 in favor of the motion.

While the population of Orange County may be growing by as many as 1,000 people per week, and there are a large number of residents per district, the majority of the evidence received by the Committee demonstrates that the growing population has not negatively impacted the ability of the Commissioners to perform their duties nor resulted in racial or demographic underrepresentation. Thus, having carefully considered the comments of current Commissioners, Mayor Demings, other county officials, members of the public, and the estimated cost of increasing the number and composition of districts in 2020, as well as other data presented, **the Committee recommends that no amendments to the County Charter be made with respect to the number and composition of commission districts or to the Commissioners' full or part time status.**



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

January 22, 2020

Committee Recommendation

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
John E. Fauth
Anthony (Tony) Suarez
James R. Auffant
Nikki Mims

Background

On July 10, 2019, the 2020 Charter Review Commission (the “CRC”) considered a proposal from Member Eugene Stoccardo in favor of establishing an evaluation topic the Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River. The CRC voted 7 – 5 to establish the evaluation topic and 12 – 0 to create a separate committee to examine the issue and report its findings back to the CRC. Thereafter, on November 6, 2019, the CRC voted 8 - 4 to expand the evaluation topic to include all bodies of water in Orange County, as the basins of the two rivers comprise a huge portion of Orange County.

Summary of Recommendation

Beginning on July 25, 2019, the Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee (the “Committee”) held 12 public meetings to hear public input and consider proposals regarding the creation of “Rights of Nature”¹ for the Wekiva and Econlockhatchee Rivers, the violation of which would be actionable by citizens of Orange County and by Orange County itself. On November 6, 2019, with the approval of the CRC, the scope of the Committee’s area of inquiry expanded to all bodies of water in Orange County.

Over the course of multiple meetings the Committee considered and analyzed several drafts of proposed amendments provided to the Committee and prepared by representatives of a group called the Community Environmental Legal Defense Fund and other local environmental activists

¹ According to the website, <https://therightsofnature.org>, Rights of Nature “is the recognition and honoring that Nature has rights. It is the recognition that our ecosystems – including trees, oceans, animals, mountains – have rights just as human beings have rights. Rights of Nature is about balancing what is good for human beings against what is good for other species, what is good for the planet as a world. It is the holistic recognition that all life, all ecosystems on our planet are deeply intertwined.”

A more detailed explanation of the “Rights of Nature” can be found here: <https://therightsofnature.org/what-is-rights-of-nature/>.

including Chair Stoccardo. The Committee also heard from members of the public as to their respective concerns and suggestions regarding the creation of a charter amendment granting “rights of nature” to the waters of Orange County.

On December 16, 2019, the Committee met to further review proposed Charter amendment language. At that meeting, the General Counsel was directed to assist in drafting the amendment and to attempt to “delete” or “collapse” the scope of the amendment to address some of the legal issues presented by the then current draft.

On January 22, 2020, the Committee met to consider for final vote a draft amendment prepared and submitted by the General Counsel as well as a draft final report. After substantial discussion and careful consideration of the information presented, the Committee voted 4 to 0 to recommend to the full CRC that the General Counsel’s version of the draft amendment to the Orange County Charter be submitted to the voters. The draft amendment attempts to further protect the waters of Orange County from pollution by prohibiting certain conduct by governmental agencies, non-natural persons or corporate entities and by providing a private right of action to every citizen of the County to enforce the prohibitions set forth in the amendment.

Although some members of the public expressed concern that the proposed draft amendment prepared by the General Counsel at the direction of the Committee was not broad enough to provide all of the protections and remedies that should be available to the citizens and Waters of Orange County, the majority of the Committee expressed the opinion that the condensed draft amendment prepared by General Counsel met the intent of the Committee and provided potentially enforceable rights and restrictions versus one that provided broader rights and remedies, but was also more readily subject to legal challenge on the basis of vagueness.

Fundamental to legal enforceability is that a party charged with a violation of law must have been able to clearly identify the prohibited conduct before being so charged. Moreover, where injunctive relief to correct a violation is called for (as opposed to monetary damages alone) the law should set out guideposts for what a violator must do to remedy the situation. For example, if a violator is ordered to “restore” a water body to its pre-violation condition, how would a court or the violator know when that has been achieved? Prior drafts of the amendment contained many terms like “thrive” and “rehydrate” with nebulous and legally problematic definitions. Those terms have been eliminated from the Committee approved final draft. Additionally, the approved final draft adopts existing state law definitions for the critical term, “pollution.” The General Counsel’s memo discussing the vagueness issue is included as an exhibit to this report.

Reasons for Recommendation

1. Orange County Waters Need Additional Protection from Unchecked Growth.

Over the course of the various meetings the Committee was presented with information related to nitrate concentrations, sources and its effects on the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River. The Committee was also presented information related to regulatory agencies, cases and studies

regarding toxins and waterways. The general consensus of those who presented to the Committee was that unchecked growth was largely responsible for the degradation of the two rivers and that the State of Florida and the County Commission had not been up to the task of adequately protecting these waters.

2. Federal Law, Florida Law and County Regulations are Insufficient Protection and don't provide an Individual Right to Sue for Enforcement.

The Committee heard from speakers who argued that the current regulatory structure needed to be changed to protect the things that are valued (like air and water) and that creating a private right of action and allowing individual citizens standing to sue would be an important deterrent and better protected these Waters.

3. Protection of Water is Essential to the Health and Welfare of the Citizens of Orange County and its Economy.

Citizens expressed concerns regarding the costs and legal fees associated with pursuing violations or defending implementation of the proposed amendment should be compared with the cost of cleaning up the rivers after the fact. Further information was provided concerning the economic value on tourism and property values of having clean waters throughout the County. Thus, the overall sentiment from the public was that the cost of enforcement or defending the protections afforded by a charter amendment from legal challenges were outweighed by the benefits such an amendment would have on the County, its residents, tourists, and the Waters.

4. "Rights of Nature" is an Emerging Movement which Attempts to Empower Citizens to Protect Natural Resources against Pollution and Degradation by Creating Private Enforcement Rights to Citizens.

A full explanation and discussion of the emerging "Rights of Nature" movement can be found at <https://therightsofnature.org> and is not repeated here. However, fundamental to that movement is the idea that *"we – the people – have the legal authority and responsibility to enforce these rights on behalf of ecosystems. The ecosystem itself can be named as the injured party, with its own legal standing rights, in cases alleging rights violations."* <https://therightsofnature.org/what-is-rights-of-nature/>.

This concept is what the proposed amendment attempts to codify in a legally defensible way.

Arguments Against Recommendation

1. Property Rights not Adequately Protected.

The committee heard concerns expressed by a few members of the public as well as the General Counsel concerning the failure of the proposed amendment to address a number of issues, among them, existing property rights – some of which may already be vested and actionable.

2. Potential Litigation over Preemption, Standing and Property Rights Issues.

There are concerns regarding whether the amendment is (or will be) preempted by state and federal law, whether the broad standing provision will pass legal scrutiny, and whether the law provides adequate protections for existing property rights. Any or all of these issues could lead to costly litigation against its implementation and enforcement, as it has in some other parts of the country where similar initiatives or charter amendments have been attempted. Notably, however, no litigation has occurred in other jurisdictions.

3. Draft Amendment does not go far enough to Protect the Waters of Orange County.

The Chair and some other members of the public have expressed concern that the original version of the amendment and several subsequent versions do more to protect the waters of Orange County than the adopted version. In other words, the amendment recommended by the Committee does not go far enough to remedy the perceived harm. Their argument is that the current system has failed and that a more comprehensive approach is warranted even if it results in substantial litigation costs to the defend its enforceability.

Committee Recommendation

After careful consideration of the information presented, the Committee recommended on a 4-0 vote that the attached draft ballot title, summary and charter amendment be forwarded to the CRC for its consideration.

Accordingly, having carefully considered the comments and proposals of the public, the comments and information provided by invited guests, the memorandums and information provided by General Counsel, and the various other versions of the proposed amendment considered by the Committee, and otherwise being fully advised in the premises, **the Committee recommends that the attached amendment to the Orange County Charter, including Ballot Title and Summary, be made with respect to the Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River.**

Exhibits:

Proposed Amendment, Ballot Title and Summary

All Committee minutes

All legal memoranda provided the Committee by the General Counsel

Letter dated October 9, 2019 from Bobby R. Beagles, Florida Farm Bureau

Letter dated November 15, 2019 from Byron W. Brooks, County Administrator

Ballot Title, Summary and Proposed Amendment – Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

A. Introduction.

This Charter amendment would provide for definitions, create natural rights for the waters of Orange County, the right to clean water, a private right of action and standing for citizens of Orange County to enforce these rights and injunctive remedies. The proposed amendment prohibits any governmental agency, non-natural person or corporate entity from intentionally or negligently polluting the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee Rivers, or any other Waters within Orange County.

B. Ballot Proposal: The ballot title and question for Question #__ are as follows:

PROHIBITING POLLUTION OF THE WEKIVA
RIVER, ECONLOCKHATCHEE RIVER AND
ALL OTHER WATERS OF ORANGE COUNTY

Amending the charter by providing charter protections for the natural rights of the Wekiva and Econlockhatchee Rivers and all other Waters of Orange County by prohibiting pollution, providing a definition of Waters, providing a private right of action and standing for citizens of Orange County to enforce these protections against governmental agencies, non-natural persons or corporate entities that intentionally or negligently pollute the Waters, and providing for severability and exceptions.

Comptroller estimated financial impact: _____.

_____ Yes

_____ No

C. Text Revisions: Article 7 of the Orange County Charter is amended by adding Section 704.1. (Underline text is added to the charter).

Section 704.1 – Right to Clean Water, Standing and Enforcement.

A. Natural Rights of Orange County Waters and Citizens.

(1) The Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River, portions of which are within the boundaries of Orange County, and all other Waters within the boundaries of Orange County, have a right to exist, Flow, to be protected against Pollution and to maintain a healthy ecosystem.

(2) All Citizens of Orange County have a right to clean water by having the Waters of Orange County protected against Pollution.

B. Standing, Private Right of Action.

Orange County, municipalities within Orange County, any other public agency within Orange County, and all Citizens of Orange County shall have standing to bring an action in their own name or in the name of the Waters to enforce the provisions of this Section of the Charter. Such actions shall be filed in the Ninth Judicial Circuit Court in and for Orange County, Florida, or, where jurisdiction exists, in the United States District Court, Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division.

C. Violations.

It shall be unlawful and a violation of this Section of the Charter for any governmental agency, non-natural person or corporate entity to intentionally or negligently pollute the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee Rivers within the boundaries of Orange County, or any other Waters within the boundaries of Orange County. Violations include the Pollution of Waters which exist exclusively on private property owned by the same person(s) or entity, but only where Pollution thereon interferes with or causes Pollution of other Waters within Orange County or unreasonably interferes with or is injurious to the health and welfare of others. This Section of the Charter applies only to violations that occur after the effective date of the amendment as provided in Subsection (H).

D. Remedies.

(1) Remedies for violations of this Section of the Charter shall be injunctive and/or other equitable relief, including but not limited to a writ of mandamus requiring the violator, to the greatest extent reasonably possible, to restore the Waters at issue to the condition as it existed prior to being polluted by the violator. The prevailing party shall be entitled to recover its reasonable costs, including costs of expert witnesses.

(2) Attorneys' fees are not compensable unless the court determines that the action brought under this Section of the Charter is frivolous, vexatious, or is brought solely for the purpose of harassing the defendant. If such a finding is made, the Court may also award reasonable attorneys' fees to the defendant as a sanction.

E. Exception.

The provisions of the Section shall not apply to Constructed Wetlands.

F. Definitions.

(1) "Citizen" or "Citizen of Orange County" means an adult resident of Orange County with legal residence in the United States who has resided within the county for at least one (1) year prior to filing an action under this Section.

(2) “Constructed Wetland” means a non-natural swimming pool and any artificial wetland that uses natural processes involving wetland vegetation, soils, and their associated microbial assemblages to treat domestic wastewater, industrial water, greywater or stormwater runoff, to improve water quality.

(3) “Flow” shall have the same meanings as in FLA. STAT. § 373.042.

(4) “Pollutant” means any substance or contaminant, whether manmade or natural, that is the source or cause of Pollution.

(5) “Pollution” shall have the same meanings as in FLA. STAT. § 376.031(17) and Rule 62-520.200(15), Florida Administrative Code, and means the non-natural presence in the Waters of Orange County of any one or more substances, contaminants, noise, or pollutants in quantities which are or may be potentially harmful or injurious to human health or welfare, animals, fish, plant life, and water quality or which may unreasonably interfere with the enjoyment of life or property, including outdoor recreation.

(6) “Waters” shall have the same meaning as in Rule 62-520.200(25), Florida Administrative Code, and includes, but is not limited to rivers, lakes, streams, springs, impoundments, and all other waters or bodies of water within the boundaries of Orange County, including fresh, brackish, saline, tidal, surface or underground waters. Waters owned entirely by one person or entity are included, but only to the extent the pollution thereon interferes or is injurious to other Waters, property or persons within Orange County.

G. Severability and Conflicts.

The rights and violations provided herein should be interpreted, to the greatest extent possible, in harmony with any superior state or federal law governing the same rights and conduct. To the extent any provision of this Section of the Charter impermissibly conflicts with any superior state or federal law governing the same conduct, such provision shall be severable and all other provisions shall remain fully enforceable.

H. Effective Date.

This amendment shall become effective upon passage, which is the date certified by the Supervisor of Elections and shall not require further enabling legislation by the Orange County Board of County Commissioners.

D. Financial Analysis and Impact:

Based on information provided by the Comptroller’s Office, the cost of the proposed amendment is approximately_____, which represents_____.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

July 25, 2019
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
3:45 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
Anthony (Tony) Suarez
Andrew Hand, CRC Attorney
Katie Smith, Assisting CRC as Staff
Jessica Vaupel, Assisting CRC as Staff
Anissa Mercado, Assisting CRC as Staff

Absent Members

John E. Fauth
Nikki Mims

Invited Guests:

Chuck O'Neal
Steve Myers

Public Comment

The following person addressed the committee: Carmen Torres. Ms. Torres submitted information related to Orange County's Comprehensive Plan and lands located within the Wekiva Study Area.

Background Information and Members Open Discussion

The organizational meeting of the Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee was held to identify related issues and to address any member questions. Chair Stoccardo opened the meeting by summarizing the intent of the committee is to better understand the Rights of Nature issue and how it applies to the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River. Chair Stoccardo explained that the invited guests would present their proposal and educate the committee on the issue. Chair Stoccardo expects that at future meetings, additional invited guests will address the committee.

Mr. O'Neal presented information related to nitrate concentrations, sources and its effects on the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River. Mr. O'Neal explained the issue is not only about water quality but quantity as well. Mr. O'Neal defined the acronym 'WEBOR' as The Wekiva River and the Econlockhatchee River Bill of Rights, and further, defined the rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River. The intent of the Charter Amendment would be to enable citizens to bring action on behalf of the river and to challenge the pollution of the river in court.

Member Auffant questioned whether the Charter gives standing to this issue. Member Suarez questioned whether a precedent exists giving an inanimate object rights as if it were an individual and whether the proposal collided with state sovereignty. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Myers addressed the committee and presented information related to regulatory agencies and cited cases and studies related to toxins and waterways. Mr. Myers explained that he and Mr. O'Neal were presenting the proposal to the committee in order to get feedback and work together on the proposal. Member Suarez provided remarks regarding the specifics of the proposal and explained that the objective should be to draft a proposed amendment that would stand scrutiny. Discussion ensued.

Chair Stoccardo provided remarks regarding the committee's agreement of the concept but that the concept needs further work. Chair Stoccardo asked that the invited speakers attend the next committee meeting.

The following person addressed the committee: Melissa Martin.

Future Action Plan

After the discussion, it was suggested that the invited speakers provide examples of cities that have incorporated Rights of Nature Laws and applicable court decisions. Chair Stoccardo requested Members Auffant and Suarez prepare any examples of proposed language prior to the next meeting if possible.

The next scheduled committee meeting will be held on Thursday, August 8, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

August 8, 2019
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
John E. Fauth
Nikki Mims
Clifford Shepard, CRC Attorney
Katie Smith, Assisting CRC as Staff
Anissa Mercado, Assisting CRC as Staff

Absent Member

Anthony (Tony) Suarez

Invited Guests:

Jane Goddard Durocher
Chuck O'Neal
Steve Myers
Nicole Wilson

The Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee meeting was held to further identify related issues and to address any member questions.

Public Comment

The following person addressed the committee:

- Trini Quiroz

Ballot Language vs. Charter

CRC Attorney Clifford Shepard explained three components to a Charter amendment which includes the ballot title, ballot question, and Charter amendment textual language. Ms. Smith advised the committee members that the 75 word limit ballot question will include the financial impact statement. Ms. Smith further shared that in the past, the Chair of the CRC has typically formed a Ballot Summary Committee to examine the proposed ballot language and questions. Discussion ensued.

Rights of Nature Presentation and Members Open Discussion

Chair Stoccardo explained that the invited guests would present their proposal and educate the committee on the issue.

Mr. O'Neal presented information related to the Rights of Nature Laws and court decisions. Mr. O'Neal cited communities and countries which have enacted "community rights" laws prohibiting environmental threats.

Ms. Goddard Durocher presented on the legal history of the Rights of Nature movement. Ms. Goddard Durocher asked the committee to think about the law as a tool that protects the things that are valued and as something that can be changed.

Mr. O'Neal and Mr. Myers each presented to the committee members an updated draft copy of the proposed amendment to add Sections 704.1 and 704.2 to the Charter. Member Auffant provided remarks regarding the updated textual language which now addresses his concern with permitting. Member Auffant further expressed his concern with the one subject rule and the language indicating that Orange County has the authority to issue criminal charges. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Myers addressed the comments made regarding cost and fees associated with the violation of the proposed amendment by comparing the cost of litigation to the cost of cleaning the rivers. Mr. Myers further referenced the economic value on tourism and property values. Ms. Wilson presented information related to the Ohio State study regarding the economic impact in relation to Lake Erie. Discussion ensued.

Member Auffant expressed concern with the proposed amendment being limited to only two rivers. Member Fauth recommended the invited speakers review Article XIV of the New York State Constitution which Protects New York's Forest Preserve. Member Fauth further addressed broadening the language to include more than one element such as other tributaries and habitats, and to consider New York State's threat of the wild clause. Discussion ensued.

Chair Stoccardo encouraged the committee members to individually work on the proposed language with the invited speakers prior to the next committee meeting. Discussion ensued. Member Mims suggested expanding the view to be inclusive of all waterways of Orange County to address the health, safety, and welfare of all of Orange County. Discussion ensued.

Member Auffant questioned whether this committee would be the appropriate conduit to introduce a new related topic. Ms. Smith explained that the new topic would have to follow the written submittal process. Discussion ensued.

Future Action Plan

After the discussion, it was suggested that the invited speakers work further on the proposed language prior to the next meeting.

The next scheduled committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 21, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

August 21, 2019
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
John E. Fauth
Nikki Mims
Clifford Shepard, CRC Attorney
Katie Smith, Assisting CRC as Staff
Jessica Vaupel, Assisting CRC as Staff

Absent Member:

Anthony (Tony) Suarez

Invited Guests:

Steve Meyers
Chuck O'Neal
Nicole Wilson

The Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee meeting was held to further identify related issues and to address any member questions.

Public Comment

The following persons addressed the committee:

- Camille Evans
- Trini Quiroz

Committee Chair Comments

Chair Stoccardo reminded attendees to provide comments during the appropriate time at the committee meetings and advised the public that CRC staff and legal counsel direction is provided by the Chair and committee members. Chair Stoccardo thanked the members and the public for their attendance.

Rights of Nature Presentation and Members Open Discussion

Based upon member input from the committee meeting held on August 8, 2019, Mr. O'Neal presented a revised Charter amendment draft which he explained contained more concise language and broader scope. Mr. O'Neal noted the revised Charter amendment now includes

other aquatic ecosystems such as lakes. Mr. O'Neal provided remarks regarding the Clean Water Act and the costs associated with the proposal as well as the costs associated with inaction.

Member Mims raised concerns regarding the safety of tourists and/or residents who may be unaware of contaminated waterways. Member Fauth provided remarks regarding the four key elements defined in the New York State Constitution regarding the Adirondacks: criteria, boundary, government responsibility and standing, and further, offered textual changes to Mr. O'Neal's revised Charter amendment language. Member Auffant provided remarks regarding costs associated with cleaning waterways. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Meyers addressed member comments regarding standing and referenced three Florida court cases concerning standing and single-subject rule in his letter to the committee and legal counsel dated August 20, 2019. Discussion ensued. Member Mims suggested that the committee look to protect the waterways from future pollution as opposed to try and fix issues from past pollution.

Member Auffant questioned whether he needs to submit a new proposal for Split Oaks. Chair Stoccardo and Ms. Smith advised the new topic would need to follow the written submittal process.

Future Action Plan

After the discussion, Chair Stoccardo suggested that the committee use Mr. O'Neal's revised Charter amendment language, redline the document and bring it to the next committee meeting. Ms. Smith recommended that the committee seek the input of the CRC Attorney regarding the topic.

The members agreed the next committee meeting will be to review the language and make the necessary textual changes. Ms. Smith offered that the members may submit their individual textual changes to CRC staff to be included as back up to the next agenda.

The next scheduled committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 18, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

September 18, 2019
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
John E. Fauth
Anthony (Tony) Suarez
Clifford Shepard, CRC Attorney
Jessica Vaupel, Assisting CRC as Staff
Anissa Mercado, Assisting CRC as Staff

Absent Member:

Nikki Mims

Committee Chair Comments

Chair Stoccardo thanked the members and the public for their attendance. Chair Stoccardo advised the purpose of the meeting was to review the proposed Charter amendment language. Chair Stoccardo advised the public that if there was time left at the end of the meeting, the public would be permitted to provide remarks concerning the discussion.

Public Comment

The following person addressed the committee: Trini Quiroz.

Members Open Discussion

Chair Stoccardo opened the floor for member discussion concerning the proposed Charter amendment language and advised the committee members they would be working from Member Fauth's red line version. Member Fauth provided remarks concerning his red line version which focused on past committee discussions as well as used established language from sources such as the Econ Protection Act, Outstanding Florida Waters and the Clean Water Act.

Member Suarez expressed concerns regarding standing and questioned whether any citizen would have the right to bring forward a lawsuit. Member Auffant proposed that any citizen would have the standing to inform the County of its noncompliance with its regulations. Discussion ensued. Citizen Steve Meyers contributed to the discussion.

Member Suarez requested clarification on whether citizens can enforce the rights of waterways as a nonhuman entity. Discussion ensued. Chair Stoccardo requested CRC Attorney Shepard provide the committee members with the standing language from the 3rd DCA case.

Member Suarez asked CRC Attorney Shepard if the Charter is amended to create Rights of Nature, will the Charter be in conflict with the State Constitution. CRC Attorney Shepard advised the State Constitution provides for the adoption of laws in any area not preempted by the Constitution or state legislature. CRC Attorney Shepard provided remarks concerning his findings regarding undefined terms in Member Fauth's red line version. Discussion ensued.

The committee members and CRC Attorney Shepard reviewed Member Fauth's red line version and offered suggested edits. CRC Attorney Shepard provided remarks concerning the "constructed wetlands" language in Member Fauth's red line version of Section 704.1 A4 and how one would determine what the constructed wetlands are in Orange County. Member Fauth advised County GIS supplies the information, and further, Member Fauth advised he will research the proper definitions and references. Discussion ensued.

Future Action Plan

Following the discussion, Chair Stoccardo advised that the purpose of the next committee meeting will be to review the work prepared by Member Fauth and CRC Attorney Shepard. Ms. Vaupel reiterated that CRC Attorney Shepard will provide the committee members with the standing language from the 3rd DCA case.

Public Comment

The following persons addressed the committee:

- Bobby Beagles
- Wayne Rich

Member Suarez requested that Mr. Beagles provide his concerns in writing for the committee members to review.

- Chuck O'Neal

Future Action Plan (Continued)

Member Auffant suggested to CRC Attorney Shepard that the committee include language in the draft Charter amendment stating that a citizen must put in writing, to the County, their complaint prior to filing a lawsuit. CRC Attorney Shepard advised he would look in to the language.

The next scheduled committee meeting will be held on Thursday, October 3, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

October 3, 2019
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
John E. Fauth
Nikki Mims
Anthony (Tony) Suarez
Clifford Shepard, CRC Attorney
Jessica Vaupel, Assisting CRC as Staff
Anissa Mercado, Assisting CRC as Staff

The Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee meeting was held to further review proposed Charter amendment language.

Public Comment

No members of the public addressed the committee during public comment.

Committee Chair Comments

Chair Stoccardo thanked the members and the public for their attendance. Chair Stoccardo advised the purpose of the meeting was to review the proposed Charter amendment language. Chair Stoccardo advised the public that if there was time left at the end of the meeting, the public would be permitted to provide remarks concerning the discussion.

Members Open Discussion

Chair Stoccardo opened the floor for member discussion concerning the proposed Charter amendment language and advised the committee members they would be working from Member Fauth's and Counsel's version. Legal Counsel provided remarks concerning the revised draft which focused on past committee discussions as well as definitions pulled from sources such as statutes, reports, and other authoritative sources.

The committee members and CRC Attorney Shepard reviewed the draft and offered suggested edits. Discussion ensued.

CRC Attorney Shepard provided the committee members with a memorandum containing standing language from the 3rd DCA case and from the Florida Wildlife Federation case. CRC Attorney Shepard clarified that the language used in the draft is from the Supreme Court case rather than the 3rd DCA case. Discussion ensued.

Member Auffant addressed the cost of litigation. CRC Attorney Shepard advised the committee that he has arbitration language which was not included in the current draft. Discussion ensued.

Public Comment

The following persons addressed the committee:

- Bobby Beagles
- Mike Dennis
- Chuck O'Neal

Future Action Plan

CRC Attorney Shepard encouraged the members to review the definitions provided and to bring any suggestions to the next committee meeting.

The next scheduled committee meeting will be held on Thursday, October 17, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

October 17, 2019
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
John E. Fauth
Anthony (Tony) Suarez
Patrick Brackins, CRC Attorney
Anissa Mercado, Assisting CRC as Staff

Absent Member

Nikki Mims

Invited Guest:

Chuck O'Neal

The Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee meeting was held to further review proposed Charter amendment language.

Public Comment

No members of the public addressed the committee during public comment.

Committee Chair Comments

Chair Stoccardo thanked members for working on the committee's proposed Charter amendment language revisions. Chair Stoccardo advised the public that if there was time left at the end of the meeting, the public would be permitted to provide remarks concerning the discussion.

Members Open Discussion

Chair Stoccardo opened the floor for member discussion concerning the proposed Charter amendment language and advised the committee members they would be working from CRC Attorney Shepard's version. Chair Stoccardo suggested the next version of the draft include a draft number.

Members provided remarks concerning their findings regarding undefined terms and language. Discussion ensued. Mr. O'Neal contributed to the discussion.

Member Auffant addressed the language he asked CRC Attorney Shepard to include in the draft Charter amendment regarding injunctive relief brought by a citizen. Discussion ensued. Chair Stoccardo advised the members that the section pertaining to the new language would be discussed in detail at the next committee meeting.

Member Fauth addressed the Orange County Farm Bureau letter which was forwarded to the members. Discussion ensued.

Public Comment

The following person addressed the committee: Wayne Rich.

Future Action Plan

Following the discussion, Chair Stoccardo reiterated that Member Fauth would define the terms referenced during the committee's meeting and the CRC Attorney is charged with addressing the concerns the Orange County Farm Bureau has with the draft Charter amendment.

The next scheduled committee meeting will be held on Thursday, November 7, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

November 7, 2019
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
John E. Fauth
Nikki Mims
Clifford Shepard, CRC Attorney
Jennifer Lara-Klimetz, Assisting CRC as Staff

Absent Member

Anthony (Tony) Suarez

The Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee meeting was held to further review proposed Charter amendment language.

Public Comment

The following persons addressed the committee:

- Chuck O'Neal
- Steve Meyers
- Nicole Wilson

Committee Chair Comments

Chair Stoccardo thanked members for working on the committee's proposed Charter amendment language revisions.

Members Open Discussion

Chair Stoccardo opened the floor for member discussion concerning the proposed Charter amendment language. Members provided remarks regarding the 'Definitions' and 'Rights of People and Orange County Waters' in the proposed Charter amendment. Mr. Meyers and Mr. O'Neal contributed to the discussion.

Member Mims suggested removing the definition for 'Guardian' from the amendment language. The committee members agreed. Discussion ensued.

Member Auffant addressed comments by members of the public regarding suggested changes to the Charter amendment language. Discussion ensued.

Chair Stoccardo asked Member Auffant and Mr. Meyers to work on the language regarding the County's enforcement section.

Member Mims encouraged committee members to focus on the committee's purpose when drafting the amendment language. Chair Stoccardo agreed with Member Mims and requested that all the committee members regroup to define the committee's purpose at the next meeting. Discussion ensued.

Chair Stoccardo discussed the timeline for the committee's final report. Discussion ensued.

Public Comment

The following person addressed the committee: Bobby Beagles.

Future Action Plan

Following the discussion, Chair Stoccardo reiterated that Member Fauth would continue to work on the definitions discussed during the meeting.

The next scheduled committee meeting will be held on Monday, November 18, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

November 18, 2019
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
John E. Fauth
Clifford Shepard, CRC Attorney
Katie Smith, Assisting CRC as Staff
Jennifer Lara-Klimetz, Assisting CRC as Staff

Absent Members:

Nikki Mims
Anthony (Tony) Suarez

Other Present:

Kate Latorre, Assistant County Attorney

The Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee meeting was held to further review proposed Charter amendment language.

Public Comment

The following persons addressed the committee:

- Chuck O'Neal
- Kathleen Fitzgerald

Members Open Discussion

Chair Stoccardo opened the floor for member discussion concerning the proposed Charter amendment language. Member Fauth requested that the committee first look at the definitions included in the language. Committee members and CRC Attorney Shepard offered suggested edits. Discussion ensued. Committee members agreed Member Fauth and CRC Attorney Shepard would review the existing proposed definitions prior to the next committee meeting.

Chair Stoccardo inquired as to whether the committee should contact an environmental attorney. Deputy Clerk Smith questioned whether it would be appropriate to invite the County's subject matter experts to address the committee. Assistant County Attorney Latorre advised that the County Attorney's Office has several environmental attorneys, and County staff has been

monitoring the work of the committee. Discussion ensued. CRC Attorney Shepard contributed to the discussion. Deputy Clerk Smith and Assistant County Attorney Latorre will work together on scheduling a Sunshine meeting between committee members, CRC General Counsel and County staff.

Committee members and CRC Attorney Shepard discussed the remaining sections of the proposed Charter amendment language. Discussion ensued. CRC Attorney Shepard contributed to the discussion. Committee members agreed Member Fauth and CRC Attorney Shepard will work on language related to a provision advising an individual or entity what is unlawful.

Public Comment

The following person addressed the committee: Chuck O'Neal.

Future Action Plan

Member Auffant requested that the meeting with County staff be scheduled first, prior to the next committee meeting. The committee members agreed that Mondays and Thursdays were acceptable meeting days, with the exception of Thursday, December 12, 2019.

Deputy Clerk Smith reminded members that the committee's deadline to staff for their final report and recommendations is January 24, 2019. The committee is scheduled to present their first reading to the full CRC on February 5, 2020.

The next scheduled committee meeting will be determined at a later date. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

December 16, 2019
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
John E. Fauth
Nikki Mims
Anthony (Tony) Suarez
Patrick Brackins, CRC General Counsel
Jennifer Lara-Klimetz, Assisting CRC as Staff

The Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee meeting was held to further review proposed Charter amendment language.

Public Comment

The following person addressed the committee: Chuck O'Neal.

Chair Comments

Chair Stoccardo provided remarks regarding his submittal of a new draft amendment.

Members Open Discussion

Chair Stoccardo opened the floor for member discussion. Member Mims inquired as to whether the committee was going to review the whole draft or only certain subsections of the new draft. Discussion ensued.

Member Auffant voiced his concerns regarding the new draft amendment and requested the committee enlist the help of General Counsel in drafting the amendment. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Brackins contributed to the discussion.

Member Auffant asked General Counsel Brackins to provide a legal opinion regarding the new draft amendment and provide additional amendment language as necessary. Member Mims contributed to the discussion and agreed to have General Counsel review and opine on the new draft amendment. Discussion ensued.

General Counsel Brackins requested committee direction regarding the new draft amendment. Discussion ensued. Member Auffant requested General Counsel Brackins provide an opinion regarding legal standing and preemption issues. Member Fauth contributed to the discussion.

Member Auffant requested injunctive relief be added to the new draft amendment. The committee members agreed. Discussion ensued.

General Counsel Brackins stated that the deadline for the final report is on January 24, 2020. Discussion ensued. Member Suarez contributed to the discussion.

Following the discussion, the members agreed to set the next committee meeting for Monday, January 6, 2020 at 2:00 p.m.

Member Mims asked General Counsel Brackins if he thought any of the issues within the new draft amendment should be deleted or collapsed. Discussion ensued.

The committee members discussed the definition for pollution of the waters.

Public Comment

The following persons addressed the committee:

Chuck O'Neal
Bob Olsen

Future Action Plan

The next scheduled committee meeting will be held on Monday, January 6, 2020 at 2:00 p.m. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

January 6, 2020
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
2:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
John E. Fauth
Nikki Mims
Anthony (Tony) Suarez
Clifford Shepard, CRC General Counsel
Jennifer Lara-Klimetz, Assisting CRC as Staff

The Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee meeting was held to further review proposed Charter amendment language.

Public Comment

The following persons addressed the committee:

Chuck O'Neal
Nicole Wilson

The following material was presented to the committee during public comment: Exhibit 1, Nicole Wilson.

Committee Chair Comments

Chair Stoccardo provided remarks regarding his submittal of new Draft Charter Amendment v 1.10.

Members Open Discussion

Chair Stoccardo opened the floor for member discussion. The committee members provided remarks regarding the Draft Charter Amendment v 1.9 and v 1.10 as presented during the meeting. General Counsel Shepard clarified that the Draft Charter Amendment v 1.9 was provided by general counsel and Draft Charter Amendment v 1.10 was provided by Chair Stoccardo. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Shepard contributed to the discussion.

Public Comment

The following person addressed the committee: Chuck O'Neal.

CRC General Counsel Update

General Counsel Shepard provided an overview of Draft Charter Amendment v 1.9 and addressed Member Auffant's question regarding permits. Discussion ensued.

General Counsel Shepard addressed the comment Mr. O'Neal made regarding the Draft Charter Amendment v 1.9 Section F. Definitions (1) "Citizen" or "Citizen of Orange County."

Committee Vote

AYE (voice vote): Chair Stoccardo

NAY (voice vote): Members Auffant, Fauth, Mims and Suarez

Action: The committee moved to proceed with the Draft Charter Amendment v 1.10. The motion failed on a 1-4 vote.

AYE (voice vote): Members Auffant, Fauth, Mims and Suarez

NAY (voice vote): Chair Stoccardo

Action: The committee moved to proceed with the Draft Charter Amendment v 1.9. The motion passed on a 4-1 vote.

General Counsel Shepard will prepare the draft ballot title and summary prior to the next meeting.

Future Action Plan

The next scheduled committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 22, 2020 at 4:00 p.m. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee

January 22, 2020
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Eugene Stoccardo, Chair
James R. Auffant
John E. Fauth
Nikki Mims
Clifford Shepard, CRC General Counsel
Jennifer Lara-Klimetz, Assisting CRC as Staff

Absent Member:

Anthony (Tony) Suarez

The Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee River Committee meeting was held to vote on a recommendation to the full CRC and to discuss the subcommittee final report.

Public Comment

The following persons addressed the committee:

Nicole Wilson
Chuck O'Neal
Steve Meyers
Samuel Vilchez Santiago
Russell Drake

CRC General Counsel Update

General Counsel Shepard provided an overview of the Final Report, Ballot Title, Summary and Charter Amendment.

Members Open Discussion

Chair Stoccardo opened the floor for member discussion. The committee members provided remarks and changes to the Final Report, Ballot Title, Summary and Charter Amendment. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Shepard contributed to the discussion.

Committee Vote:

Motion/Second: Members Auffant / Fauth

AYE (voice vote): Chair Stoccardo; Members Auffant, Fauth and Mims

Absent: Member Suarez

Action: The committee moved to approve the amended Final Report, Ballot Title, Summary and Charter Amendment.

Public Comment

The following persons addressed the committee:

Chuck O'Neal

Nicole Wilson

Future Action Plan

General Counsel Shepard will make the approved changes to the Final Report, Ballot Title, Summary and Charter Amendment.

Clifford Shepard

From: Jacob Schumer
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2019 1:34 PM
To: Clifford Shepard
Subject: RE: Standing Language

Here's the statute language from **Florida Wildlife Federation**:

(a) The Department of Legal Affairs, any political subdivision or municipality of the state, or a citizen of the state may maintain an action for injunctive relief against:

1. Any governmental agency or authority charged by law with the duty of enforcing laws, rules, and regulations for the protection of the air, water, and other natural resources of the state to compel such governmental authority to enforce such laws, rules, and regulations;
2. Any person, natural or corporate, or governmental agency or authority to enjoin such persons, agencies, or authorities from violating any laws, rules, or regulations for the protection of the air, water, and other natural resources of the state.

Here's the charter language from **Herbits** (note the actual language from the Charter has since changed):

(A).2. *Truth in Government*. No County or municipal official or employee shall knowingly furnish false information on any public matter, nor knowingly omit significant facts when giving requested information to members of the public.

3. *Public Records*. All audits, reports, minutes, documents and other public records of the County and the municipalities and their boards, agencies, departments and authorities shall be open for inspection at reasonable times and places convenient to the public.

(C). *Remedies for Violations*. A citizen may bring a cause of action alleging a violation of this Article filed in the Dade County Circuit Court pursuant to its general equity jurisdiction and if successful, shall be entitled to recover costs as fixed by the Court.

(D). *Construction*. All provisions of this Article shall be construed to be supplementary to and not in conflict with the general laws of Florida.

JACOB SCHUMER | ATTORNEY AT LAW



SHEPARD, SMITH,
KOHLMYER & HAND, P.A.
2300 MAITLAND CENTER PKWY, STE 100
MAITLAND, FL 32751
TOLL FREE: 866.247.3008
OFFICE: 407.622.1772
FAX: 407.622.1884
SHEPARDFIRM.COM



DISCLAIMER:

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and contains confidential and/or privileged materials protected under the Attorney-Client Privilege. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon,



Memo

To: Rights of the Wekiva River and Econlockhatchee Rivers Subcommittee

From: Patrick Brackins

CC: Katie Smith and Cliff Shepard

Re: Vagueness – Generally and as Raised by The Orange County Farm Bureau

Date: November 7, 2019

At the October 17, 2019 Rights of the Wekiva and Econlockhatchee Rivers Subcommittee meeting, I was tasked with reviewing concerns raised by the Orange County Farm Bureau (the “Bureau”) in its October 9, 2019 correspondence to Mayor Demings and the Board.¹ The Bureau raised concerns similar to those raised in the Lake Erie Bill of Rights litigation now proceeding in the Northern District of Ohio, *Drewes Farm Partnership v. City of Toledo*, No. 3:19-cv-434 (N.D. OH. Feb. 27, 2019), such as vagueness, equal protection, standing, and state and federal preemption. Since it is not possible to address all potential causes of action or claims that may arise from the provisions of a draft charter amendment which is still in the initial drafting stage, this memorandum addresses vagueness standards generally and as applied to the current draft at a high level. It is not intended to address all potential vagueness issues that may be raised, but highlights threshold areas that may be of concern to the subcommittee and the Commission. Equal protection, standing, and state and federal preemption issues may be addressed in separate memorandums based on direction from the subcommittee at its next meeting on November 7, 2019.

¹ The October 9, 2019 correspondence is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

I. Vagueness – Basic Principles.

The United States Supreme Court has long recognized that vague laws are void because they violate substantive due process rights.² In *Hoffman Estates v. Flipside, Hoffman Estates*, 455 U.S. 489, 498 (1982), the Court succinctly held:

Vague laws offend several important values. First, because we assume that man is free to steer between lawful and unlawful conduct, we insist that laws give the person of ordinary intelligence a reasonable opportunity to know what is prohibited, so that he may act accordingly. Vague laws may trap the innocent by not providing fair warning. Second, if arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement is to be prevented, laws must provide explicit standards for those who apply them. A vague law impermissibly delegates basic policy matters to policemen, judges, and juries for resolution on an *ad hoc* and subjective basis, with the attendant dangers of arbitrary and discriminatory applications.

Id. (emphasis added). Thus, laws must be drafted in such a manner that a “person of ordinary intelligence” can reasonably know what he, she or it shall not do, and laws must also provide “explicit standards” explaining how an enforcement agency or court shall apply them. If a law or ordinance fails either of those standards, then it is void for vagueness.

Similarly, the Fifth District Court of Appeal, in reviewing a mandatory injunction issued pursuant to a Putnam County zoning ordinance, held:

Terms used in an ordinance must make reference to determinable criteria and provide context in which a court can determine [whether] a particular regulation is reasonable. No legislative body (County Commission) can delegate to an administrator arbitrary discretion to determine the meaning of a zoning code. If such standards or criteria do not exist, the zoning provision is a nullity.

² Courts in Florida analyze state substantive due process standards in the same manner as federal courts applying federal substantive due process standards.

Henry v. Bd of County Comm'rs, 509 So. 2d 1221, 1222 (Fla. 5th DCA 1987). See also *Everett v. City of Tallahassee*, 840 F. Supp. 1528, 1546 (N.D. Fla. 1992) (applying Florida law and holding “[a]n ordinance which lacks sufficient standards against which the zoning authority’s actions may be measured vests unreviewable discretion in the zoning authority and is void for vagueness.”).

II. Application.

As a threshold matter, the text of the October 2, 2019 draft is missing a critical element. It provides: definitions; a statement of rights; a description of who may bring suit to enforce the rights created therein; an obligation on the County to protect and defend the charter provision; a prohibition on the County issuing or entering into any permit, license, contract, or other agreement with anyone who violates the charter provision; and a pre-suit notice procedure. However, the current draft lacks a clause stating with particularity what conduct constitutes a violation of the charter. While it defines pollutant, pollute, and pollution, there is no provision telling a person or entity precisely what it shall not do. For example, the draft lacks the following: “It shall be unlawful and a violation of this provision for any person or entity to knowingly or intentionally (insert what conduct is prohibited here with particularity). Any person or entity who knowingly or intentionally violates this provision may be subject to (insert penalties here with particularity).” The precise language in the above example does not need to be utilized, but it is recommended that the subcommittee consider adding language explaining exactly what is prohibited and what the penalty or penalties for engaging in such conduct shall be.

Explicit standards for determining whether a violation has occurred and explicit standards governing available remedies should be considered. For example, as we discussed at the past meeting, if it is the intent of the subcommittee to permit courts to enter mandatory injunctions requiring violators to “Restore” the “Waters,” as that term is defined in the current draft, then not only should the charter provision expressly include “Restore” as a remedy for violations, but there should be detailed and precise instructions explaining to a court and an alleged violator exactly what the remedy of “Restore” means and standards for determining whether it is achievable or has been achieved.

If a court orders Company A to “Restore” a body of water, Company A must know how to fulfill that order and a court must be able to explain how to do so based on the terms of the charter provision. Likewise, if a plaintiff wants to challenge whether Company A has, in fact, complied with the Court’s order, there must be an explicit standard answering the question. If the standards are not set forth in the charter

provision and a Court, County, plaintiff, defendant, or some other body or person is able to set the standard arbitrarily, then there is a substantial risk the charter provision may be subject to a successful vagueness challenge.

While this memorandum addresses threshold vagueness issues, if the subcommittee would like further analysis with respect to any particular section, term or condition of the draft charter provision, we will promptly provide it.

The Voice of Agriculture
ORANGE COUNTY FARM BUREAU

Post Office Box 1329 • Christmas, FL 32709 • Phone: (407) 637-7727 • E-mail: Kris.Stell@ffbic.com

October 9, 2019

OFFICERS

BILL LENNON, JR.
PRESIDENT/CATTLE/CITRUS

AMY STOTLER
PRESIDENT ELECT/CATTLE

JOHN MADISON
VICE PRESIDENT/LANDSCAPE

MIKE PATTERSON
SEC./TREASURER/CATTLE

BOARD SECRETARY

KRIS STELL

DIRECTORS

GLENN BECK
CITRUS

RYAN BECK
CITRUS

MARK BYRD
FOLIAGE

CHUCK MACK
CATTLE

KATHREIN MARKLE
FLORICULTURE

DAVID WARD
CATTLE

SCOTT WEST
BLUEBERRIES

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

BOBBY R. BEAGLES

ADVISORS

DANNY GARNER

ELIZABETH R. JOHNSON

JOSH MCGRUFF
INSURANCE AGENCY
MANAGER

Dear Mayor Demings and Commissioners:

On behalf of Orange County Farm Bureau and approximately 5000 members, we ask that you reject *The Right to Clean Water* draft charter amendment. The proposed wording is fraught with vaguely worded phrases that are open to legal interpretation that will undoubtedly become a legal quagmire for Orange County.

The surface and ground waters located within Orange County are under the protection of the United States Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. §1251 et seq.) passed in 1972. Under the federal directive, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection monitors surface and ground water quality, sets their restoration goals and oversees restoration activities. They accomplish this goal by identifying, verifying and prioritizing pollution problems and require stakeholders to develop strategies to address and resolve the problems; and implementing those strategies with local stakeholders. Adding another layer of legal framework at the local level will not delay the restoration of impaired water bodies but it will create a litigious environment where resources will be spent in court instead of towards furthering restoration priorities.

The wetlands within Orange County are under the protection of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, two waters management districts, and the Orange County Environmental Protection Division. These agencies are charged with managing the natural resources under their purview. Adding this ambiguous language to the charter adds another layer of oversight to an already robust regulatory program within Orange County. The draft language is impossible to scientifically prove or disprove and it would make it impossible for anyone wanting to do any type of development within the County.

Using Florida's Agricultural Lands and Practices Act (§163 F.S.), amended in 2013 to prohibit local governments from adopting regulations and rules already regulated by any other government entity; if the Board of County Commissioners still wishes to approve the draft charter amendment, we request at a minimum, that bona fide agricultural practices be exempted by ordinance from the provisions of the amendment.

Sincerely,
Bobby R. Beagles, Exec. Dir.
Orange County Farm Bureau



November 15, 2019

Mr. Bobby R. Beagles
Executive Director
Orange County Farm Bureau
Post Office Box 1329
Christmas, FL 32709

Dear Mr. Beagles:

On behalf of Mayor Demings, I am responding to your October 9, 2019 letter regarding the Charter Review Commission's draft proposal to amend the County Charter to address the "rights of water." Thank you for communicating the concerns of the Orange County Farm Bureau.

At this time, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and County staff are monitoring the work of the Charter Review Commission ("CRC") committee working on the "rights of water" proposal and, as explained below, also maintain certain apprehensions regarding the proposed amendment. However, given the independent authority granted to the Charter Review Commission by the County Charter, the Mayor and BCC are not in a position to reject or approve the draft Charter amendment.

In Orange County, the CRC is separate and independent of the BCC. Proposed Charter amendments are not subject to the approval of the BCC prior to being slated on the ballot for a vote by the electorate. After the BCC appoints the members of the CRC, it has no further authority over the CRC to reject or approve proposed charter amendments. It is the CRC that is solely responsible for placing CRC Charter amendments on the general election ballot.

It is my understanding that the "rights of water" proposal is still under revision by the CRC committee. Once the Charter amendment language is finalized in committee, the proposal will be scheduled for consideration by the general CRC membership. A majority of the CRC members present will be required to approve the proposed Charter amendment before it can be included on the general election ballot.

As previously mentioned, County staff is also concerned about the committee's proposal. It is our intention to communicate those concerns to the committee and to the full CRC prior to the CRC voting on the proposal. Primarily, the County is uncomfortable with the proposed Charter amendment adding an additional layer of regulations to existing federal, state, and local laws. Such additional regulation may conflict with the regulatory and permitting programs of other agencies. These kinds of legal conflicts could very well increase the number of projects resulting in litigation.

Byron W. Brooks, A.I.C.P., County Administrator
201 South Rosalind Avenue • Reply To: Post Office Box 1393 • Orlando, Florida 32802-1393
Telephone: 407-836-7370 • Fax: 407-836-7399
Byron.Brooks@ocfl.net

Mr. Bobby R. Beagles
November 15, 2019
Page 2

Further, while I am unable to list every troubling facet of the proposal in this letter, the following aspects of the proposal are also problematic for the County:

- The proposed amendment contains numerous subjective or undefined standards of measuring water pollution.
- The proposal does not clearly identify what conduct is prohibited or what the County's enforcement responsibilities would be.
- The County could be subjected to continuous litigation by citizens seeking to rectify conduct created by any number of private entities.
- The definition of "clean water" uses Florida's Numeric Nutrient Criteria as a benchmark, which has not been adopted by the County in its water quality ordinances.
- The proposal does not account for environmental changes occurring naturally over time.
- The restoration of certain waters to historical conditions, as required by the proposal, could result in changes in water level, flows, and quality that could adversely impact urbanized areas, agricultural areas, and natural ecosystems.

The County will continue to monitor the work of the committee and will provide additional, detailed feedback to the CRC as this issue progresses. I appreciate your participation in the Charter Review process.

Sincerely



Byron W. Brooks

BWB/kl

cc: Mayor Jerry L. Demings
Commissioner Betsy VanderLey, District 1
Commissioner Christine Moore, District 2
Commissioner Mayra Uribe, District 3
Commissioner Maribel Gomez Cordero, District 4
Commissioner Emily Bonilla, District 5
Commissioner Victoria P. Siplin, District 6
Jeffrey Newton, County Attorney
Kate Latorre, Assistant County Attorney
Roseann Harrington, Chief of Staff
Chris Testerman, Deputy County Administrator
Jon Weiss, Director, Planning, Environmental, and Development Services
Ray Hanson, Director, Utilities
David Jones, Manager, Environmental Protection
Camille Evans, Esquire, CRC Chairperson

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

Drewes Farms Partnership,

Case No. 3:19 CV 434

Plaintiff,

ORDER INVALIDATING
LAKE ERIE BILL OF RIGHTS

-and-

JUDGE JACK ZOUHARY

State of Ohio,

Intervenor,

-vs-

City of Toledo,

Defendant.

INTRODUCTION

On a Saturday morning in August 2014, City of Toledo officials issued a warning to residents: Don't drink the water. The City water supply contained unsafe levels of a toxic substance, and pollution in Lake Erie was the culprit.¹ The water remained undrinkable for nearly three days.²

In response, Toledo residents began a multi-year campaign to add a Lake Erie Bill of Rights ("LEBOR") to the City Charter (Doc. 10-3 at ¶ 6). They collected over ten thousand petition signatures, triggering a February 2019 special election under Article XVIII, Section 9 of the Ohio Constitution (Doc. 41 at 37–38). LEBOR won about sixty percent of the 16,215 votes cast, so it became part of the Charter the next month (*id.* at 38).

¹ Emma G. Fitzsimmons, *Tap Water Ban for Toledo Residents*, N.Y. TIMES (Aug. 3, 2014), <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/04/us/toledo-faces-second-day-of-water-ban.html>.

² Michael Wines, *Behind Toledo's Water Crisis, a Long-Troubled Lake Erie*, N.Y. TIMES (Aug. 4, 2014), <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/04/us/toledo-faces-second-day-of-water-ban.html>.

Plaintiff Drewes Farms Partnership, which grows crops in four counties near Toledo, initiated this lawsuit the day after the election (Doc. 1 at ¶¶ 18, 21). Intervenor State of Ohio joined a few months later (Doc. 21). Both ask this Court to declare LEBOR invalid under Federal Civil Rule 12(c) and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 (Docs. 34, 35, 52, 53, 59). Defendant City of Toledo opposes (Docs. 47, 48, 56, 60). The City contends neither Drewes Farms nor the State has a right to challenge LEBOR, and it further contends LEBOR is valid. With agreement from both sides, this Court issued a Preliminary Injunction last year (Doc. 9). The Injunction prevents enforcement of LEBOR until this lawsuit ends. This Court heard oral argument at a recent Hearing (Doc. 61) and received an amicus brief from Toledoans for Safe Water, Inc. (Doc. 51).

LAKE ERIE BILL OF RIGHTS

LEBOR declares that “Lake Erie, and the Lake Erie watershed, possess the right to exist, flourish, and naturally evolve.” TOLEDO MUN. CODE ch. XVII, § 254(a). Additionally, the Charter amendment grants Toledo residents “the right to a clean and healthy environment.” *Id.* § 254(b). Under LEBOR, Toledoans also “possess both a collective and individual right to self-government in their local community, a right to a system of government that embodies that right, and the right to a system of government that protects and secures their human, civil, and collective rights.” *Id.* § 254(c). LEBOR contains no definitions or other provisions that would clarify the meaning of these rights, although it does indicate that the protected Lake Erie watershed includes “natural water features, communities of organisms, soil [sic] as well as terrestrial and aquatic sub ecosystems.” *Id.* § 254(a).

“The City of Toledo, or any resident of the City,” may sue to enforce the three rights enumerated in LEBOR. *Id.* § 256(b). Businesses and governments that infringe the rights “shall be guilty of an offense and, upon conviction thereof, shall be sentenced to pay the maximum fine allowable under State law for that violation.” *Id.* § 256(a). LEBOR applies to businesses and

governments “in or from any jurisdiction,” *id.* § 256(c), and “implementing legislation shall not be required,” *id.* § 254(d). State laws, regulations, permits, and licenses are declared invalid in Toledo to the extent they conflict with LEBOR. *Id.* §§ 255(b), 257(b). LEBOR also purports to supersede federal permits and licenses. *Id.* § 255(b). The full Charter amendment is attached to this Order.

STANDING

Before analyzing LEBOR, this Court must determine whether Drewes Farms or the State has a right to bring this lawsuit. The relevant doctrine is called standing. Litigants have standing to sue only if they “(1) suffered an injury in fact, (2) that is fairly traceable to the challenged conduct of the defendant, and (3) that is likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision.” *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 1547 (2016). Standing ensures that federal courts do not issue advisory opinions, which the United States Constitution forbids. *See Sierra Club v. Morton*, 405 U.S. 727, 732 n.3 (1972). Federal courts adjudicate live disputes only. *See FW/PBS, Inc. v. City of Dallas*, 493 U.S. 215, 237 (1990). This lawsuit may proceed if either Drewes Farms or the State has standing, even if one or the other does not. *See Janus v. AFSCME, Council 31*, 851 F.3d 746, 748 (7th Cir. 2017) (citing *Vill. of Oakwood v. State Bank & Trust Co.*, 481 F.3d 364, 367 (6th Cir. 2007)), *rev’d on other grounds by* 138 S. Ct. 2448, 2486 (2018).

The central dispute here concerns the injury-in-fact requirement. An injury in fact is an injury that is “concrete and particularized[,] and actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical.” *Susan B. Anthony List v. Driehaus*, 573 U.S. 149, 158 (2014) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). “An allegation of future injury may suffice if the threatened injury is certainly impending, or there is a substantial risk that the harm will occur.” *Id.* (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). Likely targets of a law need not wait for prosecution to challenge its validity. *See id.*

Drewes Farms and the State satisfy the injury-in-fact requirement. LEBOR has already injured the State: at least on paper, State laws, regulations, licenses, and permits are invalid in Toledo to the extent they conflict with LEBOR. *See Maine v. Taylor*, 477 U.S. 131, 136–37 (1986). The State could also be sued under LEBOR for failing to sufficiently protect Lake Erie or for violating LEBOR’s guarantee of local self-government. Drewes Farms falls within LEBOR’s crosshairs, too. The business spreads fertilizer on fields in the Lake Erie watershed (Doc. 1 at ¶¶ 18, 24, 51), arguably infringing the watershed’s right to “exist, flourish, and naturally evolve” and the right of Toledoans to a “clean and healthy environment.” TOLEDO MUN. CODE ch. XVII, §§ 254(a), (b). The risk of suit under LEBOR is particularly high because enforcement does not depend on government prosecutors -- Toledo residents may file suit themselves. *See Driehaus*, 573 U.S. at 164.

Drewes Farms and the State also satisfy the other two standing requirements: traceability and redressability. Their LEBOR-related injuries are traceable to the City -- LEBOR is part of the City Charter. True, LEBOR was enacted by voters rather than legislators, but the City is a proper defendant in this lawsuit nevertheless. *See, e.g., Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620, 623 (1996); *Washington v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1*, 458 U.S. 457, 462–64 (1982); *Equal. Found. of Greater Cincinnati v. City of Cincinnati*, 128 F.3d 289, 291 (6th Cir. 1997). Additionally, a court order invalidating LEBOR would redress the alleged injuries, meaning Drewes Farms and the State satisfy the third standing requirement. Having demonstrated their right to bring this lawsuit, both litigants are entitled to an adjudication of their claims. This Court therefore analyzes LEBOR next.

DUE PROCESS

The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution protects the right to due process. An “essential” element of due process is clarity of the laws. *Roberts v. United States Jaycees*, 468 U.S. 609, 629 (1984) (citation omitted). If a law is so vague that “persons of common intelligence

must necessarily guess at its meaning,” it is unconstitutional. *Id.* (brackets and citation omitted). Heightened scrutiny applies to laws that impose criminal penalties, burden the exercise of constitutional rights, or apply a strict-liability standard. *Vill. of Hoffman Estates v. Flipside, Hoffman Estates*, 455 U.S. 489, 498–99 (1982). Vague laws are unconstitutional for at least two reasons: they “may trap the innocent by not providing fair warning,” and they invite arbitrary enforcement by prosecutors, judges, and juries. *Grayned v. City of Rockford*, 408 U.S. 104, 108–09 (1972). The clarity requirement also “ensures that [governmental] power will be exercised only on behalf of policies reflecting an authoritative choice among competing social values.” *Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 629.

Federal courts have invalidated municipal legislation on vagueness grounds. For example, a Cincinnati ordinance criminalized gathering on sidewalks “in a manner annoying to persons passing by.” *Coates v. City of Cincinnati*, 402 U.S. 611, 611 (1971). The Supreme Court struck it down because “[c]onduct that annoys some people does not annoy others.” *Id.* at 614. A Detroit-area township regulated the use of machines that keep water near boats and docks free from winter ice. *Belle Maer Harbor v. Charter Twp. of Harrison*, 170 F.3d 553, 555 (6th Cir. 1999). These ice-free areas could not exceed a “reasonable radius.” *Id.* The Sixth Circuit found the ordinance void for vagueness, in part due to the “failure to include a definition of ‘reasonable.’” *Id.* at 558–59. A Columbus gun-safety ordinance met the same fate. The ordinance banned forty-six specific guns, as well as “other models by the same manufacturer . . . that have *slight* modifications or enhancements.” *Springfield Armory, Inc. v. City of Columbus*, 29 F.3d 250, 251 (6th Cir. 1994) (emphasis added) (brackets omitted). The Sixth Circuit saw “no reasoned basis” for determining what changes qualify as “slight,” so it invalidated the ordinance. *Id.* at 253–54.

LEBOR’s environmental rights are even less clear than the provisions struck down in those cases. What conduct infringes the right of Lake Erie and its watershed to “exist, flourish, and

naturally evolve”? TOLEDO MUN. CODE ch. XVII, § 254(a). How would a prosecutor, judge, or jury decide? LEBOR offers no guidance. Similar uncertainty shrouds the right of Toledoans to a “clean and healthy environment.” *Id.* § 254(b). The line between clean and unclean, and between healthy and unhealthy, depends on who you ask. Because of this vagueness, Drewes Farms reasonably fears that spreading even small amounts of fertilizer violates LEBOR. Countless other activities might run afoul of LEBOR’s amorphous environmental rights: catching fish, dredging a riverbed, removing invasive species, driving a gas-fueled vehicle, pulling up weeds, planting corn, irrigating a field -- and the list goes on. LEBOR’s authors failed to make hard choices regarding the appropriate balance between environmental protection and economic activity. Instead, they employed language that sounds powerful but has no practical meaning. Under even the most forgiving standard, the environmental rights identified in LEBOR are void for vagueness.

The right of Toledoans to “self-government in their local community” is impermissibly vague as well. *Id.* § 254(c). At first blush, this provision seems to reiterate Article XVIII, Section 3 of the Ohio Constitution, which grants municipalities “authority to exercise all powers of local self-government.” Unlike the Ohio Constitution, however, LEBOR imposes a fine on any business or government that violates the right. The amount of the fine is “the maximum . . . allowable under State law for that violation.” *Id.* § 256(a). But Ohio law does not identify any fine for violating a right to self-government. Additionally, this right includes “the right to a system of government that protects and secures . . . human, civil, and collective rights,” but the nature of those human, civil, and collective rights is anybody’s guess. *Id.* § 254(c). Like LEBOR’s environmental rights, this self-government right is an aspirational statement, not a rule of law.

SEVERABILITY

LEBOR contains a severability clause: “If any court decides that any . . . provision of this law is illegal . . . such decision shall not . . . invalidate any of the remaining . . . provisions of the law.” *Id.* § 259. Notwithstanding the clause, however, the unconstitutional parts of LEBOR are severable from the rest only if “the severability will not fundamentally disrupt the statutory scheme of which the unconstitutional provision is a part.” *State v. Hochhausler*, 76 Ohio St. 3d 455, 464 (1996); *accord Midwest Media Prop. v. Symmes Twp.*, 503 F.3d 456, 464 (6th Cir. 2007); *State v. Dean*, 170 Ohio App. 3d 292, ¶¶ 50, 52 (2007). “Are the constitutional and the unconstitutional parts capable of separation so that each may be read and may stand by itself?” *Hochhausler*, 76 Ohio St. 3d at 464 (citations omitted). If not, the entire law must fall. *Id.*

No part of LEBOR can be saved under this standard. Once the three vague rights are stripped away, the remainder is meaningless. The City urges this Court to at least leave in place LEBOR’s preamble, but the preamble contains nothing to invalidate. TOLEDO MUN. CODE ch. XVII, § 253. It merely declares certain values and findings; it does not purport to create legal rights or obligations.

To be clear, several of LEBOR’s other provisions fail on their own merits (*see, e.g.*, Doc. 61 at 19–21). For example, LEBOR’s attempt to invalidate Ohio law in the name of environmental protection is a textbook example of what municipal government cannot do. Lake Erie is not a pond in Toledo. It is one of the five Great Lakes and one of the largest lakes on Earth, bordering dozens of cities, four states, and two countries. That means the Lake’s health falls well outside the City’s constitutional right to local self-government, which encompasses only “the government and administration of the internal affairs of the municipality.” *In re Complaint of Reynoldsburg*, 134 Ohio St. 3d 29, ¶ 25 (2012) (citation omitted). Consequently, municipal laws enacted to protect Lake Erie are generally void if they conflict with Ohio law. *See Mendenhall v. City of Akron*, 117 Ohio St.

3d 33, ¶¶ 17–18 (2008). *See also Pa. Gen. Energy Co. v. Grant Twp.*, 139 F. Supp. 3d 706, 720 (W.D. Pa. 2015) (invalidating part of local ordinance similar to LEBOR due to conflict with Pennsylvania state law). LEBOR flagrantly violates this rule.

With careful drafting, Toledo probably could enact valid legislation to reduce water pollution. For instance, a Madison, Wisconsin ordinance restricted the use of phosphorus-containing fertilizers within city limits in 2004. *CropLife America, Inc. v. City of Madison*, 432 F.3d 732, 733 (7th Cir. 2005). “[P]hosphorus . . . contributes to excessive growth of algae and other undesirable aquatic vegetation in water bodies.” *Id.* (brackets, citations, and internal quotation marks omitted). The ordinance survived a lawsuit like this one. *Id.* at 735. In contrast, LEBOR was not so carefully drafted. Its authors ignored basic legal principles and constitutional limitations, and its invalidation should come as no surprise.

CONCLUSION

Frustrated by the status quo, LEBOR supporters knocked on doors, engaged their fellow citizens, and used the democratic process to pursue a well-intentioned goal: the protection of Lake Erie. As written, however, LEBOR fails to achieve that goal. This is not a close call. LEBOR is unconstitutionally vague and exceeds the power of municipal government in Ohio. It is therefore invalid in its entirety. The Motions of Drewes Farms Partnership and the State of Ohio (Docs. 34, 35) are granted, and the City of Toledo’s Cross Motions (Docs. 47, 48) are denied. The Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 9), now unnecessary, is lifted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Jack Zouhary
JACK ZOUHARY
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

February 27, 2020



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Split Oak Committee

February 12, 2020
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

James R. Auffant, Chair
Russell Drake
John Fauth
Samuel Vilchez Santiago
Clifford Shepard, CRC General Counsel
Craig Stopyra, Senior Minutes Coordinator

Absent Members:

John Fauth
Nikki Mims

The Split Oak Committee meeting was held to discuss the subcommittee final report and proposed resolution.

Members Open Discussion

Chair Auffant asked the committee members if there was anything they would like to change or discuss before presenting to the full CRC. The members discussed the direction provided by Chair Evans at the February 5, 2020 meeting related to including the resolution as part of the subcommittee's final report. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Shepard contributed to the discussion.

Chair Auffant requested General Counsel Shepard contact Chair Evans for clarification that the final report and resolution will be two separate votes. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Shepard contributed to the discussion.

Member Vilchez Santiago recommended that the resolution be included for the full CRC meeting on May 14, 2020, after the committee has presented its second reading of the final report on May 6, 2020. Discussion ensued. Further, Member Vilchez Santiago recommended that the resolution be amended, as it was formatted by General Counsel, and include it for a vote on May 14, 2020 if the Split Oak amendment is approved on May 6, 2020. General Counsel Shepard advised that the resolution does not need to be amended. Discussion ensued amongst the subcommittee members and General Counsel.

Committee Chair Comments

Chair Auffant thanked Member Mims for her assistance and congratulated the subcommittee members on their excellent job. In addition, Chair Auffant thanked General Counsel for his work. Discussion ensued.

Future Action Plan

Chair Auffant advised he and General Counsel would present the first reading of the subcommittee's final report.

General Counsel Shepard confirmed with Chair Auffant that he will remove the language to include the resolution in the final report as well as fixing typographical errors.

Member Vilchez Santiago provided remarks regarding the committee's vote at their last meeting on January 22, 2020 related to bringing the resolution to the full CRC on March 23, 2020. Member Vilchez Santiago recommended amending the vote to present on May 14, 2020. Member Vilchez Santiago will provide the materials to the Clerk's Office in time for the agenda deadline.

Public Comment

No members of the public addressed the committee during public comment.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Permanent Funding of Green PLACE Committee

February 17, 2020
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Camille Evans, Chair
Angela Melvin
Soraya Smith
Lee Steinhauer (via telephone)
Eugene Stoccardo
Clifford Shepard, CRC General Counsel
Jennifer Lara-Klimetz, Assisting CRC as Staff

Invited Guests:

Kate Latorre, Assistant County Attorney
Kurt Petersen, Office of Management and Budget

The Permanent Funding of Green PLACE Committee met to identify issues and questions.

Public Comment

No members of the public addressed the committee during public comment.

Background Information

Chair Evans opened the meeting and stated that the goal for the meeting was to revisit the proposal and its intent as well as review the code provisions.

Member Stoccardo provided a synopsis of the genesis of the Permanent Funding for Green PLACE proposal.

General Counsel Shepard reviewed the memo he provided to the committee members titled Proposed Charter Amendment re: Required Funding for Conservation dated January 24, 2020.

Chair Evans discussed Section 17.243 – Use of Proceeds of the Orange County Public Service Tax Ordinance.

Kurt Petersen, Manager of the Office of Management and Budget, addressed the committee regarding the 10 year expenditure history of Fund 2319, the Public Service Tax Bonds Fund. Discussion ensued.

Members Open Discussion

Chair Evans requested that the County provide the committee with a history of environmentally sensitive lands that have been acquired by the County over the past 15 years, the protocol that was used to identify those lands, and the sources used during the acquisition. Chair Evans also requested a list of the lands acquired during 2003 and a list of lands available for acquisition. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Shepard contributed to the discussion.

Future Action Plan

Kate Latorre, Assistant County Attorney, stated she would get in contact with appropriate County staff to gather the information requested by Chair Evans.

The committee will schedule their next meeting at a future date. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda, audio and summary report, may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.



2020 ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC)

Committee Summary Report

Citizen-Initiated Charter and Ordinance Amendment Process Committee

February 19, 2020
Comptroller's 4th Floor Conference Room
4:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

Soraya Smith, Chair
Angela Melvin
Jeffrey A. Miller
Dotti Wynn
Patrick Brackins, CRC General Counsel
Lakela Louis, Senior Minutes Coordinator

Absent Member:

Jack Douglas

Invited Guest:

BCC District 5 Commissioner Emily Bonilla

The Citizen-Initiated Charter and Ordinance Amendment Process Committee met to discuss the 180-day timeline limitation and proposed ballot title, summary and amendment language.

Invited Guest

Commissioner Emily Bonilla shared her experience regarding the citizen initiative petition process and spoke in favor of amending the Charter to remove perceived barriers. Discussion ensued.

Public Comment

No members of the public addressed the committee during public comment.

Members Open Discussion

The committee members discussed the petition timeline as provided in Supervisor of Elections Cowles' Orange County Initiative Petition History memorandum and attachments dated December 2, 2019. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Brackins contributed to the discussion.

The committee requested General Counsel provide a memorandum clarifying what decision, if any, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) makes when the sponsor meets the 1% threshold and the Supervisor of Elections notifies the BCC of same. This request arose from the timeline provided by the Supervisor of Elections, which provides: "Upon reaching the 1% threshold, the

SOE shall notify the board. The board shall render its decision within twenty days after notification.” Discussion ensued.

General Counsel Present Proposed Language

General Counsel Brackins presented the proposed ballot title, summary and amendment language. Discussion ensued. Member Melvin requested that the proposed language utilizing the term “toll,” “tolled,” or “tolling” be amended by adding synonymous terms that are more easily understood by the general public. No other changes were requested as the committee’s discussion focused on whether to consider expanding or including additional areas of concern related to the citizen initiative process.

Committee Vote

Motion/Second: Chair Smith / Member Wynn

AYE (voice vote): Chair Smith; Members Melvin and Wynn

NAY (voice vote): Member Miller

Absent: Member Douglas

Action: The committee moved to rescind the committee’s prior vote taken on January 8, 2020 to recommend no action be taken on what has been presented to the committee regarding the percentages necessary to place a citizen-initiative Charter amendment on the ballot.

Future Action Plan

Member Miller questioned whether the committee should examine potential issues with the citizen initiative process beyond the 180-day time period. Discussion ensued regarding all aspects of the citizen initiative process provided in the Charter. The committee questioned the BCC’s role in the citizen initiative process.

The committee will schedule their next meeting at a future date. Supporting materials, including the meeting notice, agenda and summary report may be found by visiting <https://www.occompt.com/clerk-of-the-bcc/charter-2020/meetings/>.