

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: CS/HB 7045 PCB GAP 09-16 Professional Sports Franchises

SPONSOR(S): Economic Development & Community Affairs Policy Council, Governmental Affairs Policy Committee and Schenck

TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** CS/HB 1308

	REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
Orig. Comm.:	Governmental Affairs Policy Committee	11 Y, 0 N	McDonald	Williamson
1)	Economic Development & Community Affairs Policy Council	15 Y, 0 N, As CS	McDonald	Tinker
2)	Full Appropriations Council on Education & Economic Development		Fennell	Martin
3)				
4)				
5)				

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Sixteen Major League Baseball franchises conduct their spring training season in Florida, but after the 2009 season that number will be reduced to at least 15, as the Cincinnati Reds leave Sarasota for Arizona’s Cactus League. The Baltimore Orioles, whose current spring training home is in Fort Lauderdale, also may be moving within the next 2 years because of stadium issues.

Current law specifies a process by which the Governor’s Office of Tourism, Trade, and Economic Development (OTTED) has certified 10 local governments to receive up to \$15 million each in state sales tax revenues to help pay for spring training facilities. Two of those 10 certified local governments – Sarasota and Fort Lauderdale – are likely to be without teams within the next 2 years.

The statute does not require OTTED and the certified local governments to enter into contracts before receiving the state funds; does not have a reporting requirement or other mechanism by which OTTED can monitor the funds’ expenditures; and does not include provisions to decertify and recover state funds from local governments whose spring training franchises have relocated, either out of state or to other Florida communities.

The bill proposes a number of changes to current Florida law to address these issues. Some of those changes include giving OTTED explicit authority to: enter into contracts with certified local governments receiving state funding for spring-training facilities; decertify local governments that no longer meet the certification requirements, however, decertification proceedings may be delayed if certain requirements are met; and recover unencumbered state funds. The bill also provides that the Auditor General conduct audits to verify proper use of funds distributed to certified applicants and the Department of Revenue may institute recovery of funds. A number of these new provisions are aimed at improving state oversight and management of the spring training certification. The bill also directs OTTED to take the lead in developing a strategic plan for supporting spring training baseball in Florida that will help guide the future of spring training baseball in Florida. This plan must be provided to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by December 1, 2009.

In addition, the bill expands the scope of the incentive, which is currently restricted to “retained” spring training franchises that were based in Florida prior to 2000, to include any spring training franchise. This allows the incentive to be used by local communities to attract Arizona-based teams to Florida, if additional state funding becomes available.

The fiscal impact of the bill is indeterminate, but positive. See "Fiscal Comments."

This document does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill sponsor or House of Representatives.

STORAGE NAME: h7045c.CEED.doc

DATE: 4/6/2009

HOUSE PRINCIPLES

Members are encouraged to evaluate proposed legislation in light of the following guiding principles of the House of Representatives

- Balance the state budget.
- Create a legal and regulatory environment that fosters economic growth and job creation.
- Lower the tax burden on families and businesses.
- Reverse or restrain the growth of government.
- Promote public safety.
- Promote educational accountability, excellence, and choice.
- Foster respect for the family and for innocent human life.
- Protect Florida's natural beauty.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Current Situation:

Florida's Grapefruit League

The first professional team to come to Florida for spring training was the Washington Capitals, in 1888, which spent three weeks in Jacksonville to get ready for the upcoming regular season.¹ In the modern era, Florida's Grapefruit League² has been the spring-training home to as many as 20 of the 30 Major League Baseball teams. But since the late 1990s, it has been losing teams to Arizona's Cactus League,³ which has a 60-year history of its own with Major League Baseball spring training. A 2007 economic impact study indicated that spring training generates nearly \$311 million annually to Arizona's economy.⁴

The impetus for Arizona's emergence as a spring-training competitor to Florida was passage in 2000 of legislation creating the "Arizona Sports and Tourism Authority" with authority to levy and collect certain taxes (such as car-rental fees), and to bond them as debt service, for certain specified sports facilities.⁵ These revenue sources, coupled with local bed-tax and other funds, have enabled the construction of new spring-training ballparks, some shared. For example, construction is continuing on an estimated \$108 million spring training facility in Goodyear, Arizona.⁶ The facility will include a 10,000-seat stadium to be shared by the Cincinnati Reds and the Chicago White Sox, but have separate clubhouses, offices, and practice fields for each team.

Besides the availability of large, new or renovated facilities, baseball teams are drawn to Arizona because of the proximity of the spring training stadiums, which are located within two adjacent counties, Maricopa and Pima. Florida's spring training facilities are scattered along the state's two coasts and within the state's heartland.

¹ Baseball in Florida, written by Kevin M. McCarthy. Published by Pineapple Press in 1996. Page 141.

² More information about the league is available at <http://www.floridagrapefruitleague.com/>.

³ The Cactus League began in 1947 with two teams, and now has 14 teams. The Cincinnati Reds will join play in 2010.

⁴ See report at http://www.cactusleague.com/downloads/2007_Cactus_League_Report.pdf.

⁵ See Chapter 8 of the Arizona Statutes at <http://www.azleg.gov/ArizonaRevisedStatutes.asp?Title=5>. The relevant statewide legislation was ch. 372, Laws 2000, and the implementing local referendum was Proposition 302, which Maricopa County voters approved by a 52% to 48% vote, authorizing new tourism taxes. Legislation filed for the 2008 session, which would have created a similar sports authority for Pima County and given its residents a chance to vote on raising taxes to pay for stadium improvements, failed to pass.

⁶ Information available at <http://www.goodyearaz.gov/index.asp?NID=1800>. The White Sox facilities are completed, and the team will play there beginning in 2009. The Reds' facilities are expected to be completed before the 2010 season.

Since 1998, six teams have left (or announced their intentions to leave) the Grapefruit League for the Cactus League. They are: the Texas Rangers, the Kansas City Royals, the Chicago White Sox, the Los Angeles Dodgers, the Cleveland Indians, and the Cincinnati Reds.

A 2000 economic impact study on spring training baseball in Florida estimated that the sport created a total business volume of \$490 million, with \$10.2 million state sales tax revenues and \$2.8 million in local tax revenues, and an estimated 5,600 full-time jobs.⁷

Florida's Current Grapefruit League Teams⁸

Team	Host Community	State Certified?	Public or Private Stadium?	Term of Lease	Average Attendance Per Game in 2008
Atlanta Braves	Disney	No	Private	2017	9,024
Baltimore Orioles ⁹	Fort Lauderdale	Yes	Public	2009	5,312
Boston Red Sox	Fort Myers	No	Public	2019	7,899
Cincinnati Reds ¹⁰	Sarasota	Yes	Public	2010	5,318
Detroit Tigers	Lakeland	Yes	Public	2016	7,718
Florida Marlins	Jupiter	No	Public	2017	7,061
Houston Astros	Osceola County	Yes	Public	2016	4,068
Minnesota Twins	Fort Myers	No	Public	2020	7,808
New York Mets	St. Lucie County	Yes	Public	2017	6,121
NY Yankees	Tampa	No	Public	2027	10,731
Philadelphia Phillies	Clearwater	Yes	Public	2024	8,194
Pittsburg Pirates	Bradenton	Yes	Public	2036	5,404
St. Louis Cardinals	Jupiter	No	Public	2027	6,257
Tampa Bay Rays ¹¹	Charlotte County	Yes	Public	2029	4,996
Toronto Blue Jays	Dunedin	Yes	Public	2016	4,603
Wash. Nationals	Viera	No	Public	2017	4,157
None	Indian River Co. ¹²	Yes	Public	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Note: Shaded cells indicate teams playing in communities that have received state certification under s. 288.1162, F.S.

⁷ "Economic and Fiscal Impacts Associated with Major League Baseball Spring Training Operations in the State of Florida (and) the Grapefruit League." Prepared by Van Horn Associates at the request of the Florida Sports Foundation. May 2000.

⁸ Information in this chart was compiled from information provided by the Florida Sports Foundation, Florida's Grapefruit League, and OTTED.

⁹ Fort Lauderdale's proposal to renovate its spring-training facility for the Orioles was rejected by the FAA without an accompanying increase in rental fees, so the Orioles may decide to relocate.

¹⁰ The Reds have announced plans to move spring-training operations to Arizona after the 2009 season.

¹¹ The Rays had been playing their spring training games at Florida Power Park-Al Lang Field in St. Petersburg, but beginning with the 2009 season, will move into the newly renovated Port Charlotte Park in Charlotte County built in part with state certification funds.

¹² 2008 was the last spring training season for the Los Angeles Dodgers at the publicly owned Dodger Town in Indian River County's Vero Beach. Beginning in spring 2009, the Dodgers will share with the Chicago White Sox a new spring training stadium in Glendale, Arizona. Total cost of the facilities is estimated at \$100 million.

Florida's Role in Funding Spring Training Facilities

Chapter 88-226, L.O.F., established a funding mechanism for state financial support of the construction of new professional sports franchise facilities within Florida.¹³ Legislation in 1991 added eligibility for state funding for local-government-owned facilities for “new spring training franchises,” defined as teams not based in Florida prior to July 1, 1990, and a certification process for local governments.¹⁴ No local government ever applied for the certification.

The source of the state funds is a distribution of state sales tax revenues, pursuant to s. 212.20(6)(d)7.b., F.S. Certified facilities are eligible for a maximum \$41,667 monthly for no more than 30 years.

As the pressure from Arizona to recruit Grapefruit League teams intensified in the late 1990's, the Legislature in 2000 amended s. 288.1162, F.S., to make the certification process easier for local governments.¹⁵ A key change in the law expanded eligibility by replacing the definition for “new spring training franchise” with that of “retained spring training franchise,” meaning a franchise that has been based in Florida prior to Jan.1, 2000. The legislation also gave OTTED (the successor to the Department of Commerce) the responsibility for certifying spring training facilities for state funding. The information the certification applicants were required to submit to OTTED includes:

- Whether the applicant local government was responsible for the acquisition, construction, management, or operation of the retained spring training franchise facility, or held title to the property on which the facility was located;
- A verified copy of a signed agreement with a retained spring training franchise for the use of the facility for a term of at least 15 years;
- Whether the applicant had a financial commitment of 50 percent or more of the funds required by an agreement for the acquisition, construction, or renovation of the facility;
- Valid projections demonstrating that the facility would attract paid attendance of at least 50,000 annually; and
- If the facility was or would be located in a county levying a tourist development tax pursuant to s. 125.0104, F.S.

OTTED was to “competitively evaluate” the applications, and nine criteria were specified in the new law in descending order of priority:

- The intended use of the funds by the applicant, with priority given to the construction of a new facility;
- The length of time that the existing franchise has been located in the state, with priority given to retaining franchises that have been in the same location the longest;
- The length of time that a facility to be used by a retained spring training franchise has been used by one or more spring training franchises, with priority given to a facility that has been in continuous use as a facility for spring training the longest;
- For those teams leasing a spring training facility from a unit of local government, the remaining time on the lease for facilities used by the spring training franchise, with priority given to the shortest time period remaining on the lease;
- The duration of the future-use agreement with the retained spring training franchise, with priority given to the future-use agreement having the longest duration;
- The amount of the local match, with priority given to the largest percentage of local match proposed;
- The net increase of total active recreation space owned by the applying unit of local government following the acquisition of land for the spring training facility, with priority given to the largest percentage increase of total active recreation space;

¹³ Information in this paragraph based on bill analysis for HB 1439 (ch. 2000-186, L.O.F.).

¹⁴ Only three spring training franchises met the original date criteria: the Blue Jays, the Marlins, and the Devil Rays (now known as the Rays).

¹⁵ Chapter 2000-186, L.O.F., which amended s. 288.1162, F.S.

- The location of the facility in a brownfield, an enterprise zone, a community redevelopment area, or other area of targeted development or revitalization included in an Urban Infill Redevelopment Plan, with priority given to facilities located in these areas; and
- The projections on paid attendance attracted by the facility and the proposed effect on the economy of the local community, with priority given to the highest projected paid attendance.

How local government may use the state funds is expressed in two separate subsections in s. 288.1162, F.S. Subsection (6) specifies that state funds may only be used to pay for acquisition, construction, reconstruction, or renovation of a spring training facility; to pay or pledge for the payment of debt service on a facility; or to reimburse or refinance bonds issued for the facility. The earlier subsection (5)(d) states that the state funds also “may be used to relocate” a retained spring training franchise to another unit of local government within Florida only if the local government from which it is relocating agrees to the move. The statute does not define “relocate” or the process by which the current host community would make its decision to either approve or veto the relocation.

State funds may not be expended to subsidize privately owned and maintained facilities for use by the retained spring training franchise, under s. 288.1162(5)(d), F.S.

The law directed the Department of Revenue (DOR) to distribute sales tax proceeds to any applicant certified under s. 288.1162(5), F.S., as a “facility for a retained spring training franchise.” A certified applicant could receive up to \$41,667 monthly for up to 30 years.¹⁶

The original five certifications in 2000 were awarded to:

- The City of Lakeland: \$7 million over 15 years for a facility for the Detroit Tigers;
- The City of Dunedin: \$10 million over 20 years for a facility for the Toronto Blue Jays;
- Indian River County: \$15 million over 30 years for a facility for the Los Angeles Dodgers;
- Osceola County: \$7.5 million over 15 years for a facility for the Houston Astros; and
- The City of Clearwater: \$15 million over 30 years for a facility for the Philadelphia Phillies.

In 2006, the Legislature amended s. 288.1162, F.S., to authorize five more certifications for spring training facilities. The criteria were essentially identical and the source of funding, in s. 212.20, F.S., was unchanged. Six local governments submitted applications, and OTTED selected the following five:¹⁷

- Charlotte County: \$15 million over 30 years for a facility for the Tampa Bay Rays;
- The City of Bradenton: \$15 million over 30 years for a facility for the Pittsburgh Pirates;
- The City of Fort Lauderdale: \$15 million over 30 years for a facility for the Baltimore Orioles;
- The City of Sarasota: \$15 million over 30 years for a facility for the Cincinnati Reds; and
- St. Lucie County: \$7.5 million over 30 years for the New York Mets.

Eight of the local governments have begun spending the state funds. Sarasota and Fort Lauderdale have been certified and have received in excess of \$916,000 each in state funds as of December 31, 2008; however, they have not spent or otherwise encumbered the funds because their plans to build new stadiums have been derailed, for different reasons. Sarasota could not get support from local voters for funds to match the state contribution for new facilities for the Reds, and the team decided to relocate to Arizona. Fort Lauderdale and the Orioles have not renovated their facilities because they do not support some of the lease conditions imposed by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).¹⁸

¹⁶ The yearly distribution per franchise facility at the maximum is \$500,004 and the 30 year maximum is \$15,000,120. Section 212.20(5)(d)7.b., F.S., also stipulates that no more than \$416,670 may be distributed monthly in the aggregate to all certified retained spring training franchise facilities.

¹⁷ The City of Fort Myers’ application for a new facility for the Boston Red Sox was not approved by OTTED in 2006.

¹⁸ Among the conditions imposed by the FAA is an increase in the Orioles’ annual facility rental fee to \$1.3 million from the current maximum rate of \$120,000. The stadium is on land owned by the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport.

DOR Distributions to Hosts of Certified Spring Training Facilities¹⁹
As of December 31, 2008

Host Community	First Distribution Date/ Expiration Date	Total Paid to Date
Clearwater	Feb. 2001/Feb. 2031	\$3.917 million
Dunedin	Feb. 2001/Feb. 2023	\$3.917 million
Indian River County	Feb. 2001/Feb. 2031	\$3.917 million
Osceola County	Feb. 2001/Feb. 2016	\$3.917 million
Lakeland	Feb. 2001/Feb. 2016	\$3.656 million
Charlotte County	March 2007/Feb. 2037	\$916,674
Bradenton	March 2007/Feb. 2037	\$916,674
Fort Lauderdale	March 2007/Feb. 2037	\$916,674
Sarasota	March 2007/Feb. 2037	\$916,674
St. Lucie County	March 2007/Feb. 2037	\$483,680

Recent Legislation

During the 2008 Legislative Session, attempts were made to amend s. 288.1162, F.S., to facilitate the relocation of baseball spring training teams from one Florida city to another, without getting approval from the current host community, and also to transfer the state certification funds from one community to another.

Yet, s. 288.1162(5)(d), F.S., provides that state incentive funds may not “be used to relocate a retained spring training franchise to another unit of local government” unless “the existing unit of local government with the retained spring training franchise agrees to the relocation.” Current law is silent about what happens to a certified host community’s state funds if the community loses the team on which its certification was based.

Various versions of the 2008 legislation would have done the following:

- Authorized OTTED to approve relocation, consistent with criteria it would develop for this purpose;
- Authorized OTTED to decertify local governments from continued eligibility to receive the incentive;
- Created a process for OTTED to recover unexpended state funds;
- Required annual reports of the certified local governments on how the state funds are being spent; and
- Created the position of Florida Commissioner of Baseball.

None of the legislation passed, but it focused scrutiny on the existing statute, revealing its lack of oversight by OTTED over the local governments receiving the state funds. For example, there is no formal, legal agreement between OTTED and a certified local government; instead, OTTED sends a letter to local governments announcing their successful certification, and a similar letter to DOR notifying it to begin releasing the funds. The statute does not direct OTTED to periodically monitor the certified local governments’ activities, and there is no financial reporting requirement to the state from the communities receiving the state funding.

During the interim between the 2008 and 2009 legislative sessions, an interim report on baseball spring training in Florida was prepared by the Senate Commerce Committee²⁰ and OTTED contracted for a new economic impact study on spring training baseball in Florida.²¹ Results of the study are expected to be available in April, after the conclusion of the 2009 spring training season.

¹⁹ Chart information provided by DOR. Complete Excel chart on file with the Commerce Committee.

²⁰ "Review Of The Retained Spring Training Franchise Incentive Program." Interim Report 2009-106. September 2008. Prepared by the Committee on Commerce, the Florida Senate.

²¹ The last statewide study conducted was in 2000.

Effect of Proposed Changes:

The bill removes the certification program for spring training facilities from s. 288.1162, F.S., which included new and retained professional sports franchises, and creates s. 288.11621, F.S., that specifically deals with the certification program for spring training facilities. In this new section, the bill removes a potential impediment to Florida communities interested in recruiting teams from Arizona's Cactus League by deleting a definition requiring that eligible teams had to be based in Florida prior to January 1, 2000.

The bill clarifies and strengthens existing statutory provisions related to the state certification program for local governmental entities applying for or receiving state funding for spring training baseball facilities.

The new certification program includes both provisions from the existing certification program and new provisions. Some provisions in the existing spring training certification program that are preserved in the new s. 288.11621, F.S., include:

- Before certifying an applicant local government to receive state funding for a facility for a spring training franchise, OTTED must verify that the:
 1. Applicant is responsible for the acquisition, construction, management, or operation of a spring training facility, or holds title to the property on which the facility is located;
 2. Applicant has a signed agreement with a spring training team;
 3. Applicant has made a financial commitment to provide at least 50 percent of the funds needed to acquire, construct, or renovate the spring training facility;
 4. Applicant demonstrates that the spring training facility will attract an annual paid attendance of at least 50,000 persons; and
 5. Spring training facility is or will be located in a county that levies a tourist development tax pursuant to s. 125.0104, F.S.
- OTTED must competitively evaluate applications for funding using the following criteria, with priority given in descending order (the order has been changed):
 1. Anticipated effect on local community economy where the spring training facility is to be built, including projections on paid attendance, local and state tax collections generated by spring training games, and direct and indirect job creation resulting from the spring training activities. Priority is given to applicants who can demonstrate the largest projected economic impact (partially new criterion);
 2. Amount of local matching funds committed relative to amount of state funding sought, with priority given to largest local commitment relative to state funding;
 3. Potential for facility to serve multiple uses (new criterion);
 4. Intended fund use with priority for purchase, construction, or renovation of facility;
 5. Length of time the applicant has been a host community for the spring training franchise;
 6. Length of time that the facility has been used by one or more spring training teams;
 7. Term remaining on the lease between the applicant and a spring training team for the facility's use;
 8. Length of time that spring training franchise has agreed to use the applicant's facility;
 9. Net increase of total active recreational space owned by the applicant local government, following the acquisition of land for a new spring training facility; and
 10. Whether the facility is located in a brownfield, an enterprise zone, a community development area, or a revitalization area in an urban infill redevelopment plan.
- No more than 10 communities can be certified at any one time.
- The state funds may be used only to: acquire, construct, or renovate a facility for a spring training franchise; pay or pledge debt service or fund debt service reserves for bonds issued to build or renovate a spring training facility; or to assist in the relocation of a spring training franchise from one local community to another, with the approval of the host community.
- State funds may not be used to subsidize facilities that are privately owned and maintained and used by the team only.

The bill also includes a number of new provisions aimed at improving state oversight and management of the spring training certification program. For example, local governments certified by OTTED on or after July 1, 2009, must enter into a formal agreement with OTTED that specifies:

- The amount of state funds to be distributed;
- The criteria to be met in order to remain certified;
- The process by which a local government will be decertified if it fails to comply with certification requirements;
- State funds may be recovered in case of decertification;
- Information that the certified local government must provide to OTTED; and
- Any other provisions deemed prudent to OTTED.

OTTED also is given explicit authority to decertify local communities that no longer meet the criteria, and is able to collect the state funds that have not been encumbered. Certified local governments can ask to be decertified or OTTED can initiate the decertification if a community either no longer has a valid agreement with a spring training franchise or has satisfied its required local match for the state funds. However, decertification proceedings by OTTED against a local government certified prior to July 1, 2009, are stayed until 12 months after the expiration of its most recent team agreement without a new agreement being signed, provided that the local government can demonstrate to OTTED that it is in active negotiations with a different major league spring training franchise from the one that formed the basis of its original certification.²² Typically, the local government facing decertification has 60 days after it receives a notice of OTTED's intent to decertify to petition OTTED's executive director for a review of the decision. Within 45 days of the request for review, the executive director must notify the local government of the outcome of the requested review.

OTTED must notify DOR within 10 days after an order of decertification becomes final, at which time DOR stops the distribution of state funds to the decertified local government. A decertified local government must repay all of the unencumbered state funds received through this program, plus any interest earnings, within 60 days after the decertification order becomes final. The returned funds will be deposited into the state's General Revenue Fund.

Other new provisions are as follows:

- A host community must agree through a majority vote of its governing board to allow its retained spring training team to relocate to another Florida community.
- Certified local governments' agreements with spring training teams must be for a term of at least 20 years, rather than the minimum 15 years specified in current law.
- DOR may not distribute funds to any new certified local government until it is notified by OTTED that the local government has encumbered funds for the spring training facilities.
- All certified applicants, current or future, must place unexpended state funds in a trust account for the purposes provided in law. Additionally, certified local governments that have lost their teams may ask DOR to suspend further distributions of the state funds for 12 months after the expiration of their existing team agreements, in order to give them time to enter into a new agreement, at which point the distribution of funds would resume.
- Expenditure of the state funds to local governments certified prior to July 1, 2009, must begin within 48 months of the initial receipt of the funds, and construction or renovations to, a spring training facility must be completed within 24 months of the project's beginning date.²³
- By September 1 of each year, all certified local governments must submit an annual report to OTTED including the most recent annual audit, a detailed report on the use of all funds, a copy of the contract between the certified local government and the spring training team, a cost-benefit analysis of the team's impact on the host community, and evidence that the certified local government continues to meet the certification requirements.

²² This would apply to all 10 currently certified communities, but for all practical purposes may be used by the three that no longer have teams: Indian River County/Vero Beach, Sarasota, and Fort Lauderdale.

²³ This would apply to all 10 currently certified communities, but for all practical purposes may be used by the two that no longer have teams and have not encumbered state funds: Sarasota and Fort Lauderdale.

- If a local government is decertified, OTTED may accept applications for the vacant slot.
- The Auditor General may conduct audits to verify that the state funding is being expended as required in this section. If the Auditor General determines that is not the case, then the Auditor General may contact DOR to recover the funds.
- OTTED is required to adopt rules to implement certification, decertification, and review processes, rather than given broad permissive authority to adopt rules.

The bill also directs OTTED, in conjunction with the Florida Sports Foundation and the Florida Grapefruit League Association, to develop a comprehensive strategic plan for Florida to retain and recruit spring training franchises. A copy of the strategic plan must be submitted to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by December 31, 2009.

B. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1. Amends s. 14.2015, F.S., to conform a cross-reference.

Section 2. Amends s. 212.20, F.S., to make conforming changes.

Section 3. Amends s. 218.64, F.S., to make conforming changes.

Section 4. Amends s. 288.1162, F.S., to delete all references to retained spring training baseball teams and to the certification process for local governments seeking state funds to help finance spring-training facilities; to direct the Auditor General, rather than DOR, to conduct audits to verify proper use of funds and to notify DOR of discrepancies; and to allow for DOR to pursue recovery of the funds.

Section 5. Creates s. 288.11621, F.S., which is devoted exclusively to the state funding program for communities with spring training baseball teams and is designed to increase program oversight and accountability; provides definitions; delineates the certification process; limits the number of certifications; specifies use of state funds; requires OTTED to enter into agreements with applicants; provides for distribution of funds; requires placement of unexpended state funds in a trust account; requires decertification of certified applicant in certain circumstances; delineates decertification process; authorizes additional certifications under certain conditions; requires annual reports by certified applicants; requires strategic plan and submission of plan to Governor and Legislature; requires rule adoption for specific purposes; and provides for audits and pursuit of fund recovery.

Section 6. Amends s. 288.1229, F.S., to add assistance in the retention of spring training baseball and other professional sports franchises among the duties of the Florida Sports Foundation, the sports-related direct support organization under contract to OTTED.

Section 7. Provides an effective date of July 1, 2009.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

See "Fiscal Comments."

2. Expenditures:

See "Fiscal Comments."

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:
None.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:
None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

According to OTTED, there is no additional fiscal impact on the office for the requirements of the bill.²⁴ The other requirements for the Auditor General are indeterminate since the number of audits and timing of audits are not specified. The requirement for audits performed by the Department of Revenue is removed; thereby, creating some cost savings to the department.

Because the bill allows OTTED to recover unencumbered state funds from decertified local governments, it is possible that at least \$2 million in released state funds can be returned to the state's General Revenue Fund. Additionally, up to \$28 million in sales tax revenue dedicated over the next 28 years can instead be directed to the General Revenue Fund, unless OTTED decides to certify new communities for the purpose of developing spring training baseball facilities.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

Not applicable. The bill does not appear to require a county or municipality to spend funds or take an action requiring expenditures; reduce the authority that counties and municipalities had as of February 1, 1989, to raise revenues in the aggregate; or reduce the percentage of a state tax shared in the aggregate with counties and municipalities as of February 1, 1989.

2. Other:
None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

OTTED, in current law, is authorized to adopt rules relating to spring training. The bill in section 5 requires OTTED to adopt rules addressing specific areas or responsibility.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/COUNCIL OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

On April 1, 2009, the Economic Development and Community Affairs Policy Council adopted two amendments and passed the bill as a council substitute. CS/HB 7045 differs from the original bill in the following ways:

- Allows a certified local government to ask DOR to suspend further distributions for 12 months after the expiration of its current contract with a team to give it time to recruit a new team. Once the new contract is signed, DOR resumes the distributions.
- Gives a certified local government certified prior to July 1, 2009, 48 months to begin spending the state funds, and requires it to complete the construction or modification of facilities within 24 months.

²⁴ Information received from telephone conversation with staff of OTTED the week of March 6, 2009.

- Delays decertification proceedings for certain local governments until 12 months after their current agreements expire without them having signed new teams, as long as they can show OTTED that they are actively negotiating with new teams.