



February 16, 2026

Via Email Delivery

The Honorable Dana Trabulsy
Florida House of Representatives
313 House Office Building
402 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Re: CS/HB 925 – Clerks of Court
2/16/2026 agenda, House Justice Budget Subcommittee

Dear Representative Trabulsy:

On behalf of the Florida League of Cities members, I respectfully express our concerns with CS/HB 925. While cities support efforts to ensure that court system funding remains stable and efficient, the proposed redistribution of revenues would have significant and unintended fiscal impacts on municipalities—particularly on law enforcement and public safety services.

Historic Revenue Shift

Under section 318.21(2)(g)2., Florida Statutes, when a violation occurs within a city, municipalities receive **50.8%** of the associated revenues, while clerks of court receive **5.6%**. This statutory framework has been in place since 2004 and uniquely requires cities—unlike other entities—to share their revenues with clerks of court. Section 4 of CS/HB 925 would fundamentally alter this long-standing structure by **reducing the municipal share by 44%**, from 50.8% to 28.2%, while **increasing the clerk's share by 403%**, from 5.6% to 28.2%. This dramatic reallocation represents a substantial shift of resources directly away from public safety, without any corresponding reduction in municipal responsibilities for enforcement or compliance.

Decreasing Funds Directed to Law Enforcement

Cities bear the direct and ongoing costs associated with violations occurring within their jurisdictions, including law enforcement, traffic control, code enforcement, and coordination with the judicial system. These costs are rising sharply: over the past three years, the cost of police equipment has increased by approximately 20%, vehicle costs by 12%, and dispatch-related costs by more than 250%. Revenues distributed pursuant to section 318.21(2)(g)2., Florida Statutes, help augment escalating expenses. Moreover, **under section 318.21(3), Florida Statutes, funds paid to a city must be used to support “local criminal justice training,” “municipal school crossing guards,” or “any other lawful purpose.”** Reducing this revenue stream will directly and adversely impact cities' ability to fund criminal justice training and other public safety services.

Cumulative Revenue Impacts on Cities

CS/HB 925 does not exist in isolation. During the 2026 Legislative Session, cities are facing dozens of proposals that reduce local revenues while simultaneously increasing municipal costs. The Office of Economic and Demographic Research estimates that CS/HB 925 alone will cost cities **\$8.2 million in the first year**, with losses increasing annually thereafter. While this impact may appear modest when viewed independently, the cumulative effect is alarming.



Cities are already confronting the projected elimination of the Local Business Tax (estimated at **\$188 million in losses in year one**), increased exposure under proposed changes to sovereign immunity limits (from **\$300,000 per incident to \$1.2 million**), and multiple proposals affecting property taxes—including measures estimated to reduce local government revenues by **at least \$18 billion annually**, with growth over time. Against this backdrop, it is fair to ask whether now is the appropriate time to further erode municipal revenues—and, specifically, to do so at the expense of public safety.

Conclusion

Cities support a fair and transparent funding structure for all components of the justice system. However, Section 4 of CS/HB 925 disproportionately shifts revenue away from municipalities—specifically from public safety—without addressing the local costs associated with violations occurring within city limits. We respectfully urge the removal of this provision and encourage a more balanced approach that preserves municipal revenue for law enforcement and public safety while addressing court system needs.

Sincerely,



Samuel A. Wagoner
Legislative Advocate
Florida League of Cities, Inc.

cc: Chair Maney and members of the House Justice Budget Subcommittee