

Amendment 1 and Housing



- The Sadowski State and Local Housing Trust Funds are funded with 16.19% of net doc stamp revenues. Amendment 1 requires 33% of net documentary tax revenues to be spent on a loosely defined set of land acquisition and water and land conservation programs;
- The Amendment 1 campaign literature stated that Amendment 1 would fund existing land and water programs and would not negatively impact other important programs such as housing;
- In a Paper entitled “Amendment 1 and Affordable Housing”, the proponents of the amendment stated:

“Amendment 1 Funds More Than Land Acquisition

Those who claim Amendment 1 would allocate more than has historically been used for conservation are considering the “doc” stamp allocations for the state’s land acquisition programs, Preservation 2000 and Florida Forever, alone. In fact, many other water and land conservation programs that historically received funding from “doc” stamps would be eligible for funding under Amendment [including] Florida Forever, Everglades restoration, Lake Okeechobee and estuary recovery, water quality programs, beach management, and state parks, and other public land management programs.”

- In an Op-Ed published August 14, 2014, Amendment 1 proponent Eric Draper stated, ***“This all raises a common-sense question: What programs get cut, who gets hurt, if the Legislature is constitutionally restricted from diverting dollars that historically have been spent on the environment? The answer: No one gets hurt, no taxes go up and no programs get cut”***
- Amendment 1 was promoted to voters as a way to force the legislature to spend a certain percentage of doc stamps at the same level as they had historically been getting. It was never couched as an expansion of state expenditures, or an initiative that would result in the state having to cut other programs or raise taxes to pay for other programs. It was consistently claimed to cause no harm to other programs.
- If the Florida legislature takes the approach of including all existing expenditures related to land acquisition AND other land and water preservation, improvement and management programs—they would be honoring the will of the voters and carrying out the promise of the Amendment 1 campaign. The legislature should not be criticized for taking this approach. It is the only way they can both honor the will of the voters and continue to fund other important programs such as the legislatively created Sadowski Affordable Housing Act.