

Exhibit A

Follow-up to CRC Identified Items of Input Received at Listening Sessions and Email

(Note that these are concerns or issues raised by members of the general public and that some proposals are general in nature, not specific.)

Legend: = Preempted or otherwise unconstitutional.
 = Portions might be constitutional but require further research or changes to be viable.

Amendment Proposed	Proposer	Notes
1. Amend § 306 of the Charter to address east side meetings of the Council. (C. Pante)	Public (Ormond Listening Session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow-up: The Charter already provides for meetings outside of the County seat, such as special meetings. Basically, regular meetings are at the County seat as the default and other meetings can be scheduled by the Council from time to time. At the beginning of each calendar year, the Council creates a meeting schedule. While not required by law, the County streams its meetings online for the public. This has required a capital investment in IT equipment. Off-site meetings will require additional expenditure of funds for capital improvements to another facility if the online streaming is continued and the meetings occur outside the County seat. The Charter provides that Council meetings shall be in the county seat but authorizes meetings elsewhere in the County as the Council determines time to time. Meetings outside the County seat have additional notice to the public requirements. See § 306.2, Charter.
2. Amend to require treated wastewater to be distributed to upland areas for filtration in native vegetation. (C. Pante)	Public (Ormond Listening Session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow-up: Upon further review, this idea is already regulated by state law governing water reuse. The treatment of reclaimed wastewater for beneficial reuse is permitted and managed by statute

Exhibit A

Follow-up to CRC Identified Items of Input Received at Listening Sessions and Email

(Note that these are concerns or issues raised by members of the general public and that some proposals are general in nature, not specific.)

Legend: **Red** = Preempted or otherwise unconstitutional.
Yellow = Portions might be constitutional but require further research or changes to be viable.

Amendment Proposed	Proposer	Notes
		<p>(§ 403.064, F.S.) and by rule. The state issues permits for wastewater treatment plants to use beneficial reuse under an approved reuse program by the Department of Environmental Protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> County can create reuse programs and require developers to comply with reuse programs. Florida Law, under Chapter 180, provides to municipalities the authority to provide, regulate, supervise, and control reclaimed water from municipal facilities in their service areas.
3. Require that county protected lands may be disposed (e.g. sold) by a supermajority vote of the Council. (C. Pante)	Public (Ormond Listening Session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow-up: Would need to know which properties are considered protected lands if pursued (i.e. lands acquired with Volusia Forever Funds). May be addressed in the Charter. The Charter requires legislative decisions (non-quasi-judicial) to be decided by majority vote. See § 308, Charter.
4. Mandate the Volusia Forever Program acquire 55% of the County for conservation. (C. Pante)	Public (Daytona Beach Listening Session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow-up: This is a subject that may be suited for the Council, rather than Charter. For example, is acquiring 55% of land achievable? What is the cost to the taxpayer? What is the impact on economy? These are types of matters that would require study.

Exhibit A

Follow-up to CRC Identified Items of Input Received at Listening Sessions and Email

(Note that these are concerns or issues raised by members of the general public and that some proposals are general in nature, not specific.)

Legend: **Red** = Preempted or otherwise unconstitutional.
Yellow = Portions might be constitutional but require further research or changes to be viable.

Amendment Proposed	Proposer	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The County is currently the second ranked county in the State of Florida for conservation land. The current goal is to acquire 50%. The Volusia Forever Program is a voter approved program but does not mandate the percentage of land to be acquired by the County. Conceptually this could be addressed in the Charter but would require additional research if pursued. Changes could not conflict with the ballot language for the Volusia Forever Program.
5. Remove the authority of the Council to directly purchase Volusia Forever properties. (C. Pante)	Public (Daytona Beach Listening Session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow-up: There is no direct expenditure program by Council for Volusia Forever under current rules. After going to the Forever advisory committee, purchases are approved by the Council. The Volusia Forever Program is a voter approved program. The rules of the program are recommended by the citizen Volusia Forever Committee and adopted by the Council. By follow-up email, Ms. Pante indicated she wants this prohibition to also apply to Volusia ECHO.
6. Mandate funding source for public transportation. (D. Morris)	Public (DeLand Listening Session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow-up: Do not recommend this be addressed in the Charter. This is a more appropriate subject to discussion of a voter approved discretionary local option sales tax

Exhibit A

Follow-up to CRC Identified Items of Input Received at Listening Sessions and Email

(Note that these are concerns or issues raised by members of the general public and that some proposals are general in nature, not specific.)

Legend: **Red** = Preempted or otherwise unconstitutional.
Yellow = Portions might be constitutional but require further research or changes to be viable.

Amendment Proposed	Proposer	Notes
		<p>for capital expenses, such as has been considered by Orange County.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The County currently funds public transportation resources, such as VOTRAN bus service and SunRail.
<p>7. Amend Charter to allow revenue raised by the Thoroughfare Road Impact Fee (Article II, Chapter 70 of the County Code of Ordinances) to be expended on alternative forms of transportation, including public transit, bike paths, bike trails, and pedestrian infrastructure, at a revenue split not below 70% for roadway capital improvement and 30% for capital improvements and service enhancements related to public transit, bike paths, bike trails, and pedestrian infrastructure, and to rename the impact fee as appropriate. (D. Morris)</p>	DeLand Listening Session & Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow-up: On October 15, 2025, the citizen contacted the County to suggest that this be the subject of an ordinance recommendation to the Council, rather than Charter amendment. This is an issue that elected county commissions and city commissions may consider when they adopt changes to impact fee ordinances. The responses below would still apply. The Florida Impact Fee Act (§ 163.31801, Florida Statutes) governs local government's implementation and use of impact fees. Such statute requires that impact fees be enacted by ordinance (see § 163.31801(4), F.S.). It cannot be enacted by Charter. The County's Thoroughfare Road Impact Fees are calculated based on the demand caused by new development on increasing the capacity of certain roads identified in the comprehensive plan and the expenditure of such fees must have a nexus to the collection. Mandating and adding an unrelated expenditure

Exhibit A

Follow-up to CRC Identified Items of Input Received at Listening Sessions and Email

(Note that these are concerns or issues raised by members of the general public and that some proposals are general in nature, not specific.)

Legend: **Red** = Preempted or otherwise unconstitutional.
Yellow = Portions might be constitutional but require further research or changes to be viable.

Amendment Proposed	Proposer	Notes
		<p>for transit is a violation of the dual rational nexus requirement in §§ 163.31801(4)(f) and (g), F.S.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Charter could, however, be amended to include alternative modes of transportation (multi-modal systems) be considered when the County updates its transportation impact fee ordinance; however, this would require amendment of the ordinance and the commission of a new study to account for the additional modes of transportation. Existing and collected fees cannot be expended on transit. Furthermore, the new impact fee could not be implemented until 2027 (see § 163.31801(6)(e), F.S. (restricting increases in impact fees to once every 4 years)). Because impact fees must be based upon studies using “recent and localized data,” a simple 70/30 split cannot be mandated, as transportation impacts will vary depending upon the type and location of developments. Further, such a mandate would fail the constitutional dual rational nexus test for the constitutionality of exactions, which ensures that there is a reasonable connection between the fees paid and benefits received by a development.

Exhibit A

Follow-up to CRC Identified Items of Input Received at Listening Sessions and Email

(Note that these are concerns or issues raised by members of the general public and that some proposals are general in nature, not specific.)

Legend: **Red** = *Preempted or otherwise unconstitutional.*
Yellow = *Portions might be constitutional but require further research or changes to be viable.*

L:\CHARTER\2026 Charter Review\DRAFT AMENDMENTS\Revised Exhibit A to reflect action of CRC on 10-13-2025.docx