

**STORAGE NAME:** h0331s1z.ca  
**DATE:** May 19, 2000

**\*\*AS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE\*\***  
**CHAPTER #:** 00-125, Laws of Florida

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON  
COMMUNITY AFFAIRS  
FINAL ANALYSIS**

**BILL #:** CS/1ST ENG/HB 331

**RELATING TO:** Local Government Code Enforcement

**SPONSOR(S):** Committee on Community Affairs and Representative Greenstein

**TIED BILL(S):** None

**ORIGINATING COMMITTEE(S)/COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERENCE:**

- (1) COMMUNITY AFFAIRS YEAS 9 NAYS 0
  - (2) JUDICIARY YEAS 8 NAYS 0
  - (3)
  - (4)
  - (5)
- 

**I. SUMMARY:**

This bill authorizes local government code enforcement boards to sue for money judgments for fines levied after October 1, 2000. However, local government's authority to sue for money judgments is limited in that the money judgment option does not apply to fines arising from code violations on real or personal property covered by section 4, Article X of the Constitution.

This bill provides that in an action for a money judgment on a lien, the prevailing party is entitled to recover all costs.

This bill allows the code enforcement board to post notices at the main county governmental center.

This bill may have a positive fiscal impact for local governments. The bill will have no fiscal impact on state government.

II. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

A. DOES THE BILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES:

- |                                   |   |                             |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|
| 1. <u>Less Government</u>         | Yes <input type="checkbox"/>            | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. <u>Lower Taxes</u>             | Yes <input type="checkbox"/>            | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. <u>Individual Freedom</u>      | Yes <input type="checkbox"/>            | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. <u>Personal Responsibility</u> | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 5. <u>Family Empowerment</u>      | Yes <input type="checkbox"/>            | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

B. PRESENT SITUATION:

Part I, chapter 162, F.S., is known as the "Local Government Code Enforcement Boards Act." This act defines the authority and duties of local government code enforcement boards. Counties and municipalities are authorized to create administrative boards with authority to impose administrative fines and other noncriminal penalties to provide an equitable, expeditious, effective, and inexpensive method of enforcing county and municipal codes and ordinances where pending or repeated violations exist.

Section 162.09, F.S., authorizes code enforcement boards to impose limited fines and reasonable cost of repairs upon code violators. Certified copies of the order imposing the fine may be recorded in the public records, thereby constituting a lien against the land and any other real or personal property owned by the violator. By petition to a circuit court, the order may be enforced in the same manner as a court judgment by the sheriff. After three months from filing a lien, the local government attorney may foreclose on the lien.

Currently, there is no independent cause of action to collect a fine pursuant to chapter 162, F.S. See *City of Tampa v. Braxton*, 616 So. 2d 554, 555-556 (Fla. 2d DCA 1993)(chapter 162 does not permit a code enforcement board to collect a fine by action at law; the chapter only permits an action to enforce a lien). See also *Goodman v. County Court in Broward County, FL*, 711 So. 2d 587, 589 (Fla. 4th DCA 1998)(explaining that *City of Tampa* held that since chapter 162 contained no provision allowing enforcement of a lien by way of a money judgment, that relief was not available).

Local governments face an additional problem when dealing with the enforcement of code enforcement board liens. Many properties found to be in code violation and assessed fines are homestead properties. There is a constitutional prohibition against foreclosing an enforcement lien against homestead property. See *Miskin v. City of Fort Lauderdale*, 661 So. 2d 415, 416 (Fla. 4th DCA 1995). The boards maintain that in some situations, there is little ability to enforce compliance with the code.

Section 162.10, F.S., provides that in an action to foreclose on a lien, the prevailing party is entitled to recover all costs, including a reasonable attorney's fee, that it incurs in the foreclosure.

Section 162.12(1), F.S., requires that all notices be provided to alleged violators in a specified manner, such as certified mail, hand delivery, or leaving the notice at the violator's residence or business. Section 162.12(2), F.S., permits the code enforcement board to serve additional notice by publication or posting the notice at the property with the alleged violation and, in the

case of municipalities, at the primary municipal government office or, in the case of counties, at the front door of the county courthouse. Evidence that an attempt to deliver notice pursuant to s. 162.12(1), F.S., and proof of publication or posting pursuant to s. 162.12(2), F.S., is sufficient to meet the notice requirements of the statute.

**C. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:**

This bill grants an additional cause of action to local government code enforcement boards to enforce a lien. Rather than being limited to foreclosing on a lien, this bill allows the local government attorney to sue to recover a money judgment for the amount of the lien plus accrued interest. However, local government's authority to sue for money judgments is limited in that the money judgment option does not apply to fines arising from code violations on real or personal property covered by section 4, Article X of the Constitution.

This bill provides that in an action for a money judgment on a lien, the prevailing party is entitled to recover all costs.

Code Enforcement Boards may only sue for a money judgment for fines levied after October 1, 2000.

This bill allows the county code enforcement board to post notices at the main county governmental center rather than only at the front door of the county courthouse.

**D. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:**

Section 1: Amends s. 162.09(3), F.S., to permit code enforcement boards to institute actions for money judgments three months after filing a lien if the lien remains unpaid; and declares that the money judgment option does not apply to fines arising from code violations on real or personal property covered by section 4, Article X of the Constitution.

Section 2: Amends s. 162.10, F.S., to permit code enforcement boards to collect attorney fees and costs in their actions for money judgments.

Section 3: Amends s. 162.12, F.S., to allow code enforcement boards to serve additional notice of a violation by posting notices at the main county governmental center.

Section 4: Limits application of actions for money judgments to fines levied after October 1, 2000.

Section 5: Provides effective date of upon becoming a law.

**III. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:**

**A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:**

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

None.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

Code enforcement boards can maintain separate actions for money judgments which may potentially increase revenues for local governments. One reason for the potential increase is that the code enforcement board may seek a money judgment against the owner of homestead property; whereas, currently, the enforcement of the lien against homestead property could only occur if the property lost its homestead status.

2. Expenditures:

There may be an increase in expenditures if there is an increase in actions for money judgments. However, if local governments are successful, they are entitled to recoup costs.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

Owners of homestead property are subject to a lawsuit for collection of fines owed to code enforcement boards. In addition, this bill increases the expenses of violators by awarding attorneys fees and costs to the code enforcement boards for suing the violators.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

IV. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

The bill does not require counties or municipalities to spend funds or to take an action requiring the expenditure of funds.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

The bill does not reduce the authority that counties or municipalities have to raise the revenue in the aggregate.

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

The bill does not reduce the tax authority that counties or municipalities have to raise revenue in the aggregate.

V. COMMENTS:

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. OTHER COMMENTS:

The Florida Association of Counties supports this bill.

VI. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

**Committee on Community Affairs**

On December 7, 1999, the House Committee on Community Affairs passed a committee substitute for HB 331 after the adoption of the following three amendments, offered by Representative Greenstein:

- A technical amendment which for consistency removed the reference in s. 162.09(3), F.S., which states that a fine imposed continues to accrue until judgment is rendered in a foreclosure suit. The amended section provides that the fine imposed continues to accrue until judgment is rendered in a suit filed to this subsection.
- A technical amendment which for consistency removed the reference in s. 162.10, F.S., which states that a lien continues for no longer than twenty years unless within that period an action to foreclose is commenced. The amended section provides that the lien be no longer than twenty years unless within that period an action pursuant to s. 162.09(3), F.S., is commenced.
- A clarifying amendment that provides that the ability to sue for a money judgment is applied prospectively. Code Enforcement Boards may only sue for a money judgment for fines levied after October 1, 2000. (Note: Although this amendment was adopted as a new section 3, bill drafting placed the new provision as section 4 of the bill, in order to make the bill more technically correct.)

**Floor Amendments**

On March 22, 2000, the House adopted a floor amendment offered by Representatives Eggelation, Greenstein, and Pruitt. This amendment limits the money judgment option by providing that the option does not apply to fines arising from code violations on real or personal property covered by section 4, Article X of the Constitution.

Upon passage of this bill by the House on March 22, 2000, the amendment was engrossed into CS/HB 331/1ST ENG.

**STORAGE NAME:** h0331s1z.ca

**DATE:** May 19, 2000

**PAGE 6**

VII. SIGNATURES:

**COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY AFFAIRS:**

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

Laura L. Jacobs, Esq.

Joan Highsmith-Smith

**AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY:**

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

L. Michael Billmeier, Senior Attorney

P.K. Jameson, J.D.

**FINAL ANALYSIS PREPARED BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY AFFAIRS:**

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

Laura L. Jacobs, Esq.

Joan Highsmith-Smith