

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

**BILL #:** CS/HB 7159 PCB FTSC 13-08 Ad Valorem Taxation  
**SPONSOR(S):** State Affairs Committee; Finance & Tax Subcommittee, Caldwell  
**TIED BILLS:** **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:**

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR or BUDGET/POLICY CHIEF
Orig. Comm.: Finance & Tax Subcommittee	15 Y, 1 N	Aldridge	Langston
1) State Affairs Committee	16 Y, 0 N, As CS	Stramski	Camechis

### SUMMARY ANALYSIS

The bill contains several changes to statutes related to ad valorem taxation. The bill:

- Clarifies that a commercial mail delivery service postmark qualifies for the filing of certain applications and returns by taxpayers;
- Authorizes the use of electronic mail by property appraisers and value adjustment boards for certain documents with taxpayer consent;
- Requires notices related to tax roll certification to be provided on property appraiser websites;
- Provides long-term lessees the ability to retain their homestead exemption and related assessment limitations and exemptions in certain instances;
- Defines “bioproduction feedstocks” and related terms, provides for the taxation and assessment of bioproduction feedstocks, provides that the production of bioproduction feedstocks is an agricultural purpose, and provides an assessment methodology for structures used in the production of bioproduction feedstocks;
- Allows for an automatic renewal for assessment reductions related to certain additions to homestead properties if used as living quarters for a parent or grandparent, and aligns related appeal and penalty provisions to those for homestead exemptions;
- Deletes a statutory requirement that the owner of a property must reside upon the property to qualify for a homestead exemption, which has been ruled unconstitutional by the Florida Supreme Court;
- Clarifies the ability of local governments to provide property tax exemptions for persons 65 and older;
- Removes a residency requirement that a senior disabled veteran must have been a Florida resident at the time they entered the service to qualify for certain property tax exemptions, which is consistent with a constitutional amendment to remove this residency requirement approved in November 2012;
- Repeals the ability for certain limited liability partnerships to qualify for the affordable housing property tax exemption;
- Exempts property used exclusively for educational purposes when the entities that own the property and the educational facility are owned by the same natural persons;
- Amends certain requirements related to evidence exchange prior to value adjustment board proceedings; and
- Amends a 2012 law that amended the boundaries of St. Lucie and Martin Counties to remove school taxes from the taxes required to be transferred from Martin County to St. Lucie under the 2012 law.

The Revenue Estimating Conference has estimated impacts of three provisions in the bill that are expected to have a revenue impact on local government. The provision relating to property used for educational purposes would have a recurring negative impact of -\$0.1 million beginning in FY 2014-15. The provision relating to affordable housing would have a positive impact in FY 2013-14 of \$23.4 million (\$117.2 million recurring). The provisions relating to living quarters for a parent or a grandparent are expected to have a positive insignificant impact. The provisions related to taxation of bioproduction feedstocks are expected to have a negative fiscal impact of -\$0.4 million beginning in FY 2013-2014, projected to increase to -\$1.5 million by FY 2017-2018.

Except as otherwise expressly provided and except for the effective date section, which shall take effect upon the bill becoming a law, the bill takes effect July 1, 2013.

## FULL ANALYSIS

### I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

#### A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

The bill contains several changes to statutes related to ad valorem taxation.

#### **Filing Dates for Returns and Applications**

##### Current Situation

Section 192.047, F.S., instructs property tax administrators to determine the date a person filed a property tax return or an application for exemption or special classification by using the United States Postal Service postmark date. Taxpayers that use commercial mail delivery service do not receive a United States Postal Service postmark date and thus, may not receive the same amount of time to file returns and applications.

##### Proposed Change

The bill allows a postmark from the United State Postal Service or a commercial mail delivery service to be considered the date of filing for returns and applications.

#### **Electronic Notices Related to Property Taxes**

##### Current Situation

Property appraisers must periodically mail notices of proposed property taxes, renewal applications for exemptions, and notices of intent to deny certain exemptions to taxpayers. Value adjustment boards must mail board decisions to property appraisers and petitioners.

##### Proposed Change

The bill creates s. 192.130, F.S., authorizing property appraisers to obtain permission from taxpayers to provide notices of proposed property taxes, renewal applications for certain exemptions and notices of intent to deny exemptions by electronic mail (email), rather than by mail. The bill authorizes value adjustment boards to obtain permission to provide board decisions by email, rather than by mail.

In order to provide these items by email, property appraisers and value adjustment boards are required to obtain consent from the recipient in writing and verify the email address of the recipient. The form used to obtain the recipient's consent must contain a disclaimer that informs the taxpayer that email addresses are public records and, as such, are subject to disclosure pursuant to a public records request. If a document is sent by email and the email is returned undeliverable, the property appraiser and value adjustment board must send the item by mail. Documents sent by email must comply with statutory requirements as to notice and form. The sender must renew the consent and verification requirements every five years.

#### **Publication of Notice Concerning Certified Assessment Rolls**

##### Current Situation

After property appraisers certify their property assessment rolls, they are required to publish a notice of the date of certification in a local periodical meeting certain statutory requirements as to publication frequency.<sup>1</sup>

##### Proposed Change

The bill requires property appraisers to publish the notices of the date of certification on their websites in addition to the notices published in a local periodical.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 193.122(2), F.S.  
STORAGE NAME: h7159b.SAC  
DATE: 4/18/2013

## **Ad Valorem Tax – Homestead Exemption and Assessment Limitations**

### Current Situation

Florida provides ad valorem tax exemptions and assessment limitations for homestead property.<sup>2</sup> Both property owners and long-term lessees<sup>3</sup> are entitled to homestead exemptions and assessment limitations if they use their property as a homestead.

Property generally is assessed at just value on January 1 of the year following a “change in ownership.” A change of ownership is any sale, foreclosure, or transfer of legal or beneficial title.<sup>4</sup> However, certain title transfers—a transfer of title to correct an error, a transfer between legal and equitable title, and a transfer when the owner is listed as both a grantor and grantee—do not constitute a change of ownership when the person entitled to the homestead does not change after the transfer of title.

When a homestead owner sells homestead property and purchases a new homestead, he or she is entitled to transfer a portion of the assessment limitation accrued on the prior homestead to his or her new homestead.<sup>5</sup> Property appraisers determine the amount of assessment limitation that can be transferred and, if the property owner disagrees, the property owner can appeal to the value adjustment board.<sup>6</sup> Property owners can appeal the value adjustment board decision to circuit court, but must do so within 15 days following the value adjustment board decision.<sup>7</sup>

### Proposed Change

For long-term lessees that qualify for homestead tax exemptions and limitations, the bill adds to the list of transfers that do not constitute a change of ownership a transfer of title that occurs when the person who is entitled to the homestead tax treatment is a long-term lessee entitled to homestead pursuant to s. 196.041(1), F.S., and that lessee continues to be entitled to homestead treatment after the transfer of title. This makes explicit in statute current practice by property tax administrators.

The bill extends the time for property owners to appeal value adjustment board decisions on transfers of assessment limitations from 15 to 60 days, which will align this court filing time frame with the general court filing time frame provided for challenges to tax assessments.<sup>8</sup>

## **Bioproduction Feedstocks**

### Current Situation

The production of bioproduction feedstocks is not treated specially by statutes pertaining to the valuation of property for taxation and assessment purposes. Bioproduction feedstocks and structures related to the production of bioproduction feedstocks subject to taxation and assessment therefore are valued pursuant to the general valuation methodology in s. 193.011, F.S., which requires an appraiser to take into account factors such as the present cash value of property, the highest and best use to which property can be put to, the location of the property, the quantity or size of the property, the replacement value of the property, the condition of the property, and the income and net profits derived from the sale of the property.

### Proposed Changes

The bill defines “bioproduction feedstocks” as aquatic organisms such as aquatic plants and algae that are utilized as a source material for biochemical processes that result in production of bioproduction products. A “bioproduction product” is defined as a higher value material such as fuels and chemical compounds produced through a biochemical process from lower value organic matter. The bill defines “bioproduction byproduct” as an incidental and extraneous materials and waste produced as a result of a bioproduction process.

---

<sup>2</sup> See generally Fla. Const. Art. VII, ss. 4 and 6.

<sup>3</sup> Lessees are entitled to homestead exemptions and assessment limitations if they use the property as a homestead and have a lease of at least 98 years (50 years if executed prior to June 19, 1973). See s. 196.041(1), F.S.

<sup>4</sup> Section 193.155(3)(a), F.S.

<sup>5</sup> See Fla. Const. Art. VII, s. 4(d)(8).

<sup>6</sup> Section 193.155(8)(1), F.S.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> See s. 194.171(2), F.S.

The bill provides that bioproduction feedstocks shall be considered as having no ascertainable value until they have reached maturity or a stage of marketability and have passed from the hands of the producer and/or are offered for sale. Personal property used in the inspection, storage, and growing of bioproduction feedstocks shall be deemed to have value for purposes of assessment for ad valorem property taxes no greater than its market value as salvage.

The bill provides that the production of bioproduction feedstocks shall be an agricultural purpose under s. 193.461, F.S. Accordingly, land that is used for the production of bioproduction feedstocks may be eligible to be classified as agricultural land. Structures or improvements used in the production of bioproduction feedstocks physically attached to the land shall be considered a part of the average yield per acre and shall have no separately assessable contributory value.

## **Homestead Exemption; Living Quarters for Parents and Grandparents; Application**

### Current Situation

Counties may provide a reduction in assessed value for living quarters constructed on homestead property for the purpose of providing living quarters for parents or grandparents (granny flats).<sup>9</sup> The authority for the granny flats reduction is in ch. 193, F.S.; thus, counties cannot use their current authority to waive the annual application requirement and the property owner must apply for the assessment reduction every year.

If a property owner claiming the granny flats reduction willfully makes a false statement when applying for the reduction, a civil penalty of not more than \$1,000 applies and the property does not qualify for the reduction for five years.

### Proposed Change

The bill amends the granny flats reduction to allow counties to waive the annual application requirement. Additionally, the bill requires property owners to notify the property appraiser when the property owner no longer qualifies for the reduction. The bill removes the civil penalty and five year disqualification provisions from the granny flats reduction, and inserts authorization to assess for any reductions improperly claimed for the prior 10 years, a penalty equal to 50 percent, and 15 percent interest per year. The bill imposes strict liability on a property owner who receives a reduction in assessed value under these provisions if the property owner was not entitled to such a reduction. The only affirmative defense provided is if the reduction was caused by a clerical mistake or omission by the property appraiser.

These penalties are the same as those for improperly claimed homestead exemptions. The property appraiser would be required to give the property owner 30 days to pay the assessment; after 30 days, the property appraiser must file a lien against all property of the property owner in the county.

## **Value Adjustment Board Evidence Exchange**

### Current Situation

Section 194.011(4), F.S., contains provisions related to the exchange of evidence between the property appraiser and a petitioner before a value adjustment board. Under s. 194.011(4)(a), F.S., a petitioner must provide the property appraiser, at least 15 days before the hearing, a list of evidence to be presented at the hearing, together with copies of all documentation to be considered by the value adjustment board and a summary of evidence to be presented by witnesses.

Under s. 194.011(4)(b), F.S., if the petitioner has provided the information required under s. 194.011(4)(a), F.S., and the petitioner requests it in writing, the property appraiser is required, no later than seven days before the hearing, to provide to the petitioner a list of evidence to be presented at the hearing, together with copies of all documentation to be considered by the value adjustment board and

---

<sup>9</sup> See s. 193.703, F.S.  
STORAGE NAME: h7159b.SAC  
DATE: 4/18/2013

a summary of evidence to be presented by witnesses. Failure of the property appraiser to timely comply with the requirements of this paragraph results in a rescheduling of the hearing.

#### Proposed Change

The bill amends s. 194.011(4)(b), F.S., to:

- Change the timeframe by which the property appraiser must provide evidence to the petitioner from seven days before the hearing to 10 days.
- Provide that the evidence provided by the property appraiser pursuant to the statute must include the property record cards for comparable property listed as evidence and a copy of the signed form on which the property appraiser reports, under s. 192.001(18), F.S., the adjustments made under s. 193.001(8), F.S.
- Provide that failure of the property appraiser to timely comply with the requirements of s. 194.011(b), F.S., results in the exclusion of the property appraiser's evidence from consideration by the value adjustment board, unless good cause is shown.
- Provide that "good cause" is defined as "circumstances beyond the property appraiser's control."
- Provide that if good cause is shown, the special magistrate must reschedule the hearing.<sup>10</sup>
- Provide that if good cause is not shown, the special magistrate may enter a recommendation in favor of the petitioner if there is competent, substantial evidence of value in the record which cumulatively meets the criteria of s. 193.011, F.S., and professionally accepted appraisal practices.<sup>11</sup>
- Provide that a property appraiser's request for information in the tax roll development process is not to be construed as a request for information in the challenge of a proposed assessment, and the taxpayer's failure to provide such information is not grounds for exclusion of evidence.

The bill creates s. 194.011(4)(c), F.S., which provides that provided it is relevant, rebuttal evidence may be submitted at the hearing by the petitioner and may be considered by the value adjustment board and admitted into evidence.

### **Homestead Exemption; Dependents Residing on the Property**

#### Current Situation

*Garcia v. Andonie*<sup>12</sup> is a property tax case involving the right to a homestead exemption when the owner of the property does not reside on the property, but the owner's dependent maintained permanent residence upon the property. Section 196.031(1)(a), F.S., provides in pertinent part that:

Every person who, on January 1, has the legal title or beneficial title in equity to real property in this state and who resides thereon and in good faith makes the same his or her permanent residence, or the permanent residence of another or others legally or naturally dependent upon such person, is entitled to an exemption ... as defined in s. 6, Art. VII of the State Constitution [homestead exemption]. (emphasis supplied)

Article VII, s. 6(a) of the Florida Constitution does not include the language requiring the owner to reside upon the property to qualify for the homestead exemption; however, the pre-1968 version of the Florida Constitution did contain the residency requirement.

In *Andonie*, the Florida Supreme Court found the residency requirement to be unconstitutional.

#### Proposed Change

The bill deletes the statutory requirement that the owner of a property must reside on it to qualify for a homestead exemption.

---

<sup>10</sup> See Drafting Issues and Other Comments in III.C.

<sup>11</sup> See Drafting Issues and Other Comments in III.C.

<sup>12</sup> 101 So.3d 339 (Fla. 2012)

## **Amendment 2 Approved by the Voters in November 2012**

### Current Situation

In November 2012, the voters approved a constitutional amendment regarding a property tax exemption for certain disabled veterans. Prior to the amendment, Florida provided a property tax exemption for disabled veterans' homestead property if the veteran was 65 or older, permanently disabled with a combat related disability, and was a resident of Florida at the time of entering United States military service.

Amendment 2 removed the requirement that the veteran be a resident of Florida at the time of entering military service.

### Proposed Change

The bill amends ss. 196.082(1) and (3), F.S., to conform to the changes made by amendment 2, which was approved by the voters.

## **Additional Homestead Exemption – Person Age 65 or Older – Amendment 11 Approved by the Voters in November 2012**

### Current Situation

Since 1999, cities and counties have been authorized to offer an additional homestead exemption of up to \$50,000 to certain low income seniors.<sup>13</sup>

In November 2012, the voters approved a constitutional amendment that authorized the Legislature to allow cities and counties to grant an additional homestead exemption for persons 65 years of age or older.<sup>14</sup> Amendment 11 allows an exemption equal to the assessed value of homestead property when the just value is less than \$250,000. The owner is still required to be 65 years of age or older and maintain a permanent residence on the property; however, the owner must have maintained a permanent residence thereon for a minimum of 25 years. The same income limitations apply to both exemptions.

In 2012, the Legislature passed a bill that would automatically implement amendment 11 upon voter approval;<sup>15</sup> however, a drafting oversight eliminated the “up to” language for the existing exemption. As such, the current statute would now allow cities and counties to offer an additional exemption to certain low income seniors of \$50,000 only. This oversight was inadvertent.

### Proposed Change

The bill amends s. 196.075(2)(a), F.S., to reinsert the “up to” language and correct the 2012 drafting error.

## **Ad Valorem Tax Exemption – Affordable Housing Property**

### Current Situation

Since 1999, Florida has provided an ad valorem tax exemption for affordable housing property when the property is wholly-owned by a non-profit corporation that qualifies as a charitable 501(c)(3) organization and meets certain other statutory requirements. In 2009,<sup>16</sup> the statute was amended to allow property to qualify if it was owned by a limited liability partnership and the only general partner of

---

<sup>13</sup> See Art. VII, sec. 6(d)(1) of the Florida Constitution and s. 196.075, F.S.

<sup>14</sup> Amendment 11, 2012 General Election. The amendment originated as CS/HJR 0169 (2012). The text of the amendment can be found on the website of the Florida Department of State at <http://election.dos.state.fl.us/initiatives/fulltext/pdf/10-89.pdf> (last visited March 18, 2013).

<sup>15</sup> Chapter 2012-57, L.O.F.

<sup>16</sup> The original 2009 legislation was ruled to have violated the unfunded mandate provision of the Florida Constitution, Article VII, section 18(a), and potentially the single subject rule of the Florida Constitution, Article III, section 6. See *City of Weston, Florida v. The Honorable Charlie Crist, et. al.*, 2009-CA-2639 (Fla. 1<sup>st</sup> Circuit 2010). The legislation was passed again in 2011. Ch. 2011-15, Laws of Florida.

the limited liability partnership was a non-profit corporation that qualified as a charitable 501(c)(3) organization. Since the change was enacted, several for-profit limited liability partnerships have restructured to take advantage of the tax exemption.

#### Proposed Change

The bill amends the affordable housing property exemption to remove the authority of a limited liability partnership that merely has a non-profit general partner that is a charitable 501(c)(3) organization to qualify for the exemption.

### **Educational Property**

#### Current Situation

An educational institution and its property are exempt from ad valorem tax in Florida.<sup>17</sup> Educational institutions often separate their property into separate corporate entities for business planning purposes. In an effort to address this situation, Florida also exempts property that is not directly owned by the educational institution as long as the property is used exclusively for educational purposes and is owned by the identical owners of the educational institution. A recent Attorney General's opinion concluded that this exemption does not apply when both the property and the educational institution are in separate corporations and those corporations are owned by the identical people.

#### Proposed Change

The bill extends the educational institution exemption to include situations when the property and the educational institution are owned by separate legal entities and those legal entities are owned by identical people.

### **Change of Boundary of St. Lucie County and Martin County; School Taxes**

#### Current Situation

In 2012, the boundary line between St. Lucie and Martin counties was adjusted, transferring the subdivision of Beau Rivage from St. Lucie County to Martin County.<sup>18</sup> The legislation requires Martin County to determine how much tax and assessment revenue the transferred property would have generated for St. Lucie County taxing authorities in Fiscal Year 2013-14 and requires Martin County to pay St. Lucie County a percentage of that amount for several years.<sup>19</sup> The first payment is 90 percent of the total and is required in Fiscal Year 2013-14. Thereafter, the payments are reduced by an additional 10 percent per year. The last payment is required in Fiscal Year 2022-23.

Any loss in the ability of St. Lucie County to generate its required local effort school funding because of the transfer of the subdivision to Martin County will be made up in the Florida Education Finance Program through the state portion of the total required per student funding.

#### Proposed Change

The bill amends ch. 2012-45, L.O.F., to exclude taxes levied by school districts from the calculation of the payment that Martin County must make to St. Lucie County.

#### **Effective Date**

Except as otherwise expressly provided in the bill and except for the effective date section, which takes effect upon the bill becoming a law, the bill takes effect July 1, 2013.

### **B. SECTION DIRECTORY:**

---

<sup>17</sup> Section 196.198, F.S.

<sup>18</sup> See Ch. 2012-45, L.O.F. The law was required because, although the subdivision was located in St. Lucie County, the geography of the area required all government services to traverse Martin County. For instance, due to the vicinity of Martin County schools, the students in the subdivision had attended Martin County schools for many years prior to the boundary shift.

<sup>19</sup> The apparent intent is to slowly transition the tax revenue between the counties.

- Section 1: Amends s. 192.047(1), F.S., clarifying that a commercial mail delivery postmark qualifies for determining when certain applications and returns have been officially filed.
- Section 2: Creates s. 192.048, F.S., allowing property appraisers and value adjustment boards to transmit certain documents electronically with taxpayer consent.
- Section 3: Amends s. 193.122(2), F.S., requiring notices related to tax roll certification to be provided on property appraiser websites.
- Section 4: Amends s. 193.155(3)(a) and (8), F.S., providing long-term lessees the ability to retain their homestead exemption and related assessment limitations and exemptions in certain instances.
- Section 5: Amends s. 193.451, F.S., providing for taxation and assessment of bioproduction feedstocks and certain personal property and providing definitions.
- Section 6: Amends s. 193.461, F.S., providing an assessment methodology for structures used in bioproduction feedstocks.
- Section 7: Amends s. 193.703(5) and (6), F.S., and creates s. 193.703(7), F.S., allowing for an automatic renewal for “granny flat” assessment reductions.
- Section 8: Amends s. 194.011(4), F.S., providing several changes to the evidence exchange between the property appraiser and the petitioner before a value adjustment board hearing.
- Section 9: Amends s. 196.031(1), F.S., eliminating an unconstitutional requirement to qualify for a homestead exemption.
- Section 10: Amends s. 196.075(2), F.S., fixing a glitch related to the implementation of amendment 11, approved by the voters in November, 2012.
- Section 11: Amends s. 196.082(1) and (3), F.S., removing a residency requirement that a senior disabled veteran must have been a Florida resident at the time they entered the service to qualify for certain property tax exemptions.
- Section 12: Amends s. 196.1978, F.S., repealing the ability for limited liability partnerships to qualify for the affordable housing property tax exemption.
- Section 13: Amends s. 196.198, F.S., exempting property used for educational purposes when the entities that own the property and the educational facility are commonly owned.
- Section 14: Amending ch. 2012-45, L.O.F., removing school property taxes from the calculation of the payments required to be made by Martin County to St. Lucie county pursuant to ch. 2012-45, L.O.F.
- Section 15: Provides effective dates.

## **II. 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:

The Revenue Estimating Conference has estimated impacts of four provisions in the bill expected to have a revenue impact on local government. The provision relating to property used for educational purposes would have a recurring negative impact of -\$0.1 million beginning in FY 2014-15. The provision relating to affordable housing would have a positive impact in FY 2013-14 of \$23.4 million (\$117.2 million recurring). The provisions relating to living quarters for a parent or a grandparent are expected to have a positive insignificant impact. The provisions related to taxation of bioproduction feedstocks are expected to have a negative fiscal impact of -\$0.4 million beginning in FY 2013-2014, projected to increase to -\$1.5 million by FY 2017-2018.

2. Expenditures:

There may be an undetermined fiscal impact on property appraisers who are required to publish on their websites notice and the date of extension and certification of tax rolls.

**C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:**

Unknown.

**D. FISCAL COMMENTS:**

None.

**III. COMMENTS**

**A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:**

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

The county/municipality mandates provision of Art. VII, section 18, of the Florida Constitution may apply because parts of the bill may have a negative fiscal impact on local government revenues. However, an exemption may apply because the fiscal impact on local governments related to those parts of the bill appears to be insignificant.

2. Other:

None.

**B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:**

None.

**C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:**

Other Comments: References to Special Magistrates:

As described above, the bill amends s. 194.011(4)(b), F.S., dealing with the evidence exchange between the property appraiser and the petitioner before a value adjustment board. In part, the bill provides that:

Failure of the property appraiser to timely comply with the requirements of this paragraph shall result in a rescheduling of the hearing the exclusion of the property appraiser's evidence from consideration by the value adjustment board, unless good cause is shown. The term "good cause" means circumstances beyond the property appraiser's control. If good cause is shown, the special magistrate shall reschedule the hearing. If the property appraiser fails to submit evidence to the petitioner in compliance with the timeline established in this

paragraph and good cause for such failure has not been shown, the special magistrate may enter a recommendation in favor of the petitioner, if there is competent, substantial evidence of value in the record which cumulatively meets the criteria of s. 193.011 and professionally accepted appraisal practices. (emphasis supplied)

Under s. 194.035, F.S., dealing with special magistrates, counties with a population of 75,000 or less are not required to have special magistrates. The change to s. 194.011(4)(b), F.S., proposed by the bill does not specify or appear to contemplate such circumstances.

Drafting Issues: Electronic Transmission of Certain Documents:

Lines 111-114 provide that before certain documents may be provided electronically, the sender must first verify the recipient's address by electronic correspondence. Lines 120-121 provide that a sender must renew consent to receive documents electronically and verification every five years. To the extent these provisions appear to be contradictory, the language could be clarified to provide that a sender is not required to verify a recipient's address each time the sender aims to send documents electronically.

#### **IV. AMENDMENTS/ COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES**

On April 3, 2013, the Finance and Tax Subcommittee adopted three amendments that:

- Removed the authority of a value adjustment board to order disclosure of certain confidential taxpayer information,
- Amended certain requirements related to evidence exchange prior to value adjustment board proceedings, and
- Amended a 2012 law that amended the boundaries of St. Lucie and Martin Counties to remove school taxes from the taxes required to be transferred from Martin County to St. Lucie under the 2012 law.

On April 16, 2013, the State Affairs Committee adopted four amendments and reported the bill favorably as a committee substitute.

The amendments remove statutory revisions related to public record exemptions (bar code numbers 084863 and 306295), make technical corrections (bar code numbers 471789 and 116695), define "bioproduction feedstocks" and related terms, provide that bioproduction feedstocks shall be considered as having no ascertainable value for tax assessment purposes and shall not be taxable until they reach maturity or a stage of marketability and have passed from the producer or are offered for sale. The amendments provide that personal property used in the inspection, storage, and growing of bioproduction feedstocks shall be deemed to have value for purposes of assessment for ad valorem property taxes no greater than its market value as salvage, and that the production of bioproduction feedstocks shall be considered an "agricultural purpose" for the purpose of s. 193.0461, F.S. The amendments also provide an assessment methodology for structures or improvements used in the production of bioproduction feedstocks (bar code number 091395).

This analysis is drafted to the committee substitute as adopted by the State Affairs Committee.