

LOCAL VOICES MAKING LOCAL CHOICES

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, MOBILITY, AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MEETING DETAILS

DATE	Friday, November 13, 2026
TIME	10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. ET
ROOM	Key West
VENUE	Hilton Orlando
ADDRESS	6001 Destination Parkway, Orlando, FL 32819

FLC STAFF CONTACT

Rebecca O'Hara



Agenda

Intergovernmental Relations, Mobility, and Emergency Management
Legislative Policy Committee
Friday, November 13, 2026, from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Hilton Orlando – Meeting Room: Key West
6001 Destination Parkway, Orlando, Florida

AGENDA

I. Introduction and Opening Remarks..... **Chair Shaun Ferguson**
Councilman, City of Rockledge

II. Potential 2027 Priority and Policy Issues..... **Rebecca O'Hara, FLC Staff**

a. Municipal Recall
b. Clarification of SB 180
c. E-Bikes
d. Abandoned Telecommunication Lines

III. Committee Discussion..... **Chair Ferguson**

IV. Ranking of Proposed Policies..... **Chair Ferguson**

V. Additional Information..... **Chair Ferguson**

a. FLC Legislative Conference Registration
b. Key Legislative Dates
c. Key Contacts – Click HERE to sign up
d. 2026 Legislative Session Final Report
e. State Municipal Reporting Requirements

VI. Closing Remarks..... **Chair Ferguson**

VII. Adjournment

Breakfast and Lunch provided by the Florida League of Cities

Wi-Fi is Available
Network: FLCPC1126
Access Code: FLCPC1126



Committee Roster

FLORIDA LEAGUE OF CITIES

2026-2027 Intergovernmental Relations and Emergency Management Committee



CHAIR
Shaun Ferguson
Councilman
City of Rockledge



VICE CHAIR
Trish Pfeiffer
Commissioner
City of Bartow



STAFF SUPPORT
Rebecca O'Hara
FLC Deputy General Counsel

Molly Alleger
City Clerk
City of Jacksonville Beach

Linda Allen
Councilmember
Town of Hypoluxo



Liz Alpert
Commissioner
City of Sarasota



Michael Blake
Mayor
City of Cocoa

Keith Britton
Councilmember
City of Oviedo

Tonja Brown
Mayor
Town of Winter Springs

Debon Campbell
Intergovernmental Affairs Liaison
City of Miramar

James Carter
Councilmember
City of Lake City



Christopher Cloudman
Mayor
City of DeLand



Nancy Daley
Vice Mayor
City of Lake Alfred



Lisa DeVitto
Commissioner
City of Crescent City



Clifton Dollison
Commissioner
City of Winter Haven



Pete Emrich
Mayor
City of North Port



Mary Estimé-Irvin
Councilwoman
City of North Miami



Penelope Gold
Vice Mayor
Town of Longboat Key



Adam W. Greenway
Councilmember
City of Frostproof



Chevelle Hall
Village Clerk
Village of Wellington



Peter Hernandez
Commissioner
City of Hollywood



Steven M. Hunnicutt
Assistant Town Manager
Town of Dundee



Curtis Johnson
Commissioner
City of Ft. Pierce



Lekia Johnson
Commissioner
City of Haines City



Rahman Johnson
Councilmember
City of Jacksonville



Richard Johnson
Councilmember
City of Sanibel



Debra Jones
Council Vice President
City of Williston



Allan Kaulbach
Councilor
City of Atlantis



Joseph L. Kelley
Vice Mayor
City of Opa-locka



Heather Lindsay
Mayor
City of Milton



Rachelle Litt
Councilmember
City of Palm Beach Gardens

Kem Mason
Councilmember
Town of Lantana



David McAuley
Councilmember
City of Okeechobee

JohnPaul O'Connor
Mayor
City of Westlake

Marisol Ortega
Councilmember
Town of Lake Hamilton



Steve Osmer
Mayor
City of Satellite Beach



Nikesh Patel
Director of Public Works
City of Sarasota



William Petersen
Councilmember
City of Clermont

David Pickett
Councilman
City of Port St. Lucie

Cade Resnick
Deputy Mayor
City of Winter Springs



Daphnee Sainvil
Intergovernmental Affairs Manager
City of Fort Lauderdale



Kimberly Schmitz
Councilmember
Village of Palm Springs

James Sherman
Commissioner
City of Flagler Beach



Dan Shimasaki
Councilman
City of Center Hill



Jacob Smith
Assistant City Manager
City of DeBary



Michael Smith
Commissioner
City of Largo



Latisha Springer
Councilor
City of Seminole



April Sutton
Councilmember
City of Mary Esther



Greg Sutton
Councilman
City of Jacksonville Beach



Claudia Thomas
Commissioner
City of Sanford



David Thompson
Director of Government Affairs
City of St. Petersburg



Mary Lou Tighe
Executive Director
Broward League of Cities



Marieke vanErven
City Manager
City of Dade City



Lan Vaughan
Mayor
City of Indian Rocks Beach



Robert Walker
Vice Mayor
City of Dunedin



Nick Walsh
Assistant City Manager
City of Satellite Beach



Billy Weinshank
Emergency Operations Division Director
City of Port St. Lucie



Ian Whitney
Associate Director of Government Affairs
City of Tampa



Dianne Williams-Cox
Commissioner
City of Tallahassee



Don Willis
Councilmember
City of Cape Canaveral



Steve Wilson
Mayor
City of Belle Glade



Andrea Young
Mayor
City of West Melbourne



Brandon Young
Councilman
City of South Daytona



Municipal Recall

Municipal Recall

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation to amend section 100.361, Florida Statutes, relating to municipal recall, to require recall petitions be accompanied by a sworn affidavit attesting that the facts alleged in the petition are true.

Background:
Section 100.361, Florida Statutes, establishes a single, statewide, uniform process for voters to remove a member of a municipal or charter-county governing body through a petition and recall election. The statute expressly supersedes and repeals any municipal charter or special-act provision that sets out a different recall process — meaning local governments cannot adopt their own alternative recall procedures.

Grounds for Recall
A recall petition must include a statement of grounds, limited to 200 words, and the grounds must be limited to one or more of the following seven statutory categories:

- Malfeasance
- Misfeasance
- Neglect of duty
- Drunkenness
- Incompetence
- Permanent inability to perform official duties
- Conviction of a felony involving moral turpitude

Petition and Signature Requirements

- Municipalities with population under 25,000 -- Petition must be signed by 10% of registered electors
- Municipalities with population over 25,000 -- Petition must be signed by 5% of registered electors

Signature Validity Requirements

- Each signature must be made under oath, in ink or indelible pencil.
- Each signer must include a printed name, street address, and the date signed.
- Each signer must include a voter registration number, or alternatively a date of birth.

Timing and Filing Rules

- All signatures must be obtained within a 30-day period; petition forms must be filed at the same time, no later than 30 days after the first signature is obtained.
- Petitions may not be amended after being filed with the clerk.
- No petition for municipal recall may be filed during the first quarter of the official's term of office.

Election and Post-Recall Restrictions

- If the petition obtains the requisite number of signatures and the official subject to recall does not resign, a judge assigns a date for the recall election — which may coincide with a scheduled general or special election or may be set separately.
- No person removed from office by recall, or who resigns after a recall petition has been filed against them, is eligible to be appointed to the governing body within two years after the date of the recall or resignation.

A Noted Gap in the Statute

Section 100.361 does not require a recall petition to include a sworn affidavit or other proof that an elected official actually meets one of the seven statutory grounds for recall. As a result, voters may sign petitions containing false or unsubstantiated claims, and the municipality bears the full cost of any resulting recall election — Fort Myers Beach, for example, recently expended over $100,000 on a single recall election. A person subject to the recall petition may challenge the sufficiency of the petition in court, either at their own expense (if the conduct is outside of the person's official duties) or at taxpayer expense (if the conduct occurs in the course of the person's official duties). Judicial review does not protect an official or taxpayers from false allegations. Courts review the allegations to determine whether the allegations satisfy one of the specified statutory grounds for recall. Courts do not rule on the truth or falsity of the charges.

This gap has prompted the League's proposal to amend the statute to require a recall petition be accompanied by a sworn affidavit attesting to the truth of the facts alleged in the petition. The State of Georgia's recall statute requires an application for a petition for recall to be accompanied by a sworn affidavit. *See* GA Code 21-4-5. Under the League's proposed revision, a municipal clerk may reject a recall petition if it is not accompanied by a sworn affidavit. The clerk is not required or authorized to assess the veracity of the statements in the petition or affidavit. Under current law, an official that is the subject of a recall petition may seek declaratory and injunctive relief if the official believes the petition does not meet statutory requirements. In such a proceeding, the circuit court could subject the affiant to fines for perjury if the sworn allegations are false. The penalty of perjury may be sufficient to deter frivolous petitions or petitions motivated solely by political or personal animus.



Clarification of SB 180

Revising Sections 18 and 28 of Ch. 2025-190, Laws of Florida (SB 180 – Emergencies)

The Florida League of Cities SUPPORTS legislation to clarify sections 18 and 28 of Ch. 2025-190, Laws of Florida, to limit applicability of this law to jurisdictions that experience measurable impacts from hurricanes, provide definitions for overbroad and vague terms, limit applicability of the preemptive language to storm-damaged properties, and clarify provisions relating to legal standing, pre-suit notice, and opportunity to cure.

Background
SB 180, passed in the 2025 legislative session and signed into law, has sparked controversy throughout Florida due to its sweeping restrictions on local government authority. SB 180 was introduced by house and senate sponsors as a hurricane preparedness and response measure. The bulk of SB 180 achieved these aims, and those provisions were supported by the League. Unfortunately, sections 18 and 28 of SB 180 as written do not support these purposes.

According to the bill sponsors, sections 18 and 28 were included because the sponsors were concerned that some local governments were using the cover of hurricane response to increase building permit fees and to enact regulations to make it harder for storm-damaged properties to rebuild. As such, the sponsors wanted to include measures to protect the owners of storm-damaged properties from local regulations that impeded their repair and rebuild efforts. The express language of sections 18 and 28 goes much farther than that.

Section 18 creates a "rolling preemption" that applies prospectively and in perpetuity, to all cities and counties entirely or partially within 100 miles of a hurricane's "track." For one year after "landfall," these governments are prohibited from adopting or enforcing any development moratorium, as well as more "restrictive or burdensome" comprehensive plan amendments, land development regulation, procedures. It authorizes a cause of action against local governments for "any person" to enjoin local government actions alleged to violate this section. The plaintiff must notify the local government before filing suit and the local government has 14 calendar days to withdraw the regulation. It awards attorney fees to a prevailing plaintiff.

Section 28 applies retroactively to every county (and municipalities within them) listed in the federal disaster declaration for hurricanes Milton, Debby, and Helene. It applies similar prohibitions on moratoria, comprehensive plan amendments, land development regulations, and procedures as Section 18. The prohibitions apply retroactively to August 1, 2024, and until October 1, 2027. It declares any local regulation in violation of this section void. It provides a similar cause of action (limited to "businesses and residents" and attorney fee recovery as Section 18.

SB 180 has largely brought comprehensive planning, flooding and stormwater management, and land use planning to a standstill. It prevents local governments from implementing statutorily-mandated updates to comprehensive plans and land development regulations, prevents enactment of measures to protect property owners from flooding due to hurricanes and other natural events, impedes local government compliance with state-mandated nutrient reduction requirements, prohibits concurrency-related moratoria, and jeopardizes measures to ensure growth pays for itself, such as impact and mobility fees. Moreover, the bill authorizes virtually any person, regardless of cognizable legal injury, to sue a local government and recover attorney's fees. The bill grants an illusory 14-day window for local governments to rescind a challenged regulation to avoid a suit. This window is illusory because statutory public notice and meeting requirements cannot be met within this 14-day period. The legal status of thousands of local regulations is uncertain because the bill voids all of them.

The bill abdicates policy-setting to the judiciary by not defining multiple subjective and vague terms, including the following: landfall, track of a hurricane, and burdensome and restrictive. The bill is overbroad (Section 28 applies to every city and county in Florida), granting carte blanche for the unchecked development of vacant land with zero storm damage. The bill's failure to provide an objective basis for local governments and property owners to decide whether the bill's terms apply to a situation means the judicial branch will be forced to define these terms. Local taxpayers will underwrite the cost of adjudicating the meaning of SB 180, lawsuit by lawsuit.

Status
SB 840 (DiCeglie) (supported by FLC) would have amended sections 18 and 28 of SB 180 (Chapter 2025-190). The bills took different approaches to refining those limitations, resulting in distinct municipal impacts

SB 840 would have narrowed the definition of "impacted local government" from counties within 100 miles of a hurricane's track to those within 50 miles, and limited applicability to counties included in a federal major disaster declaration and municipalities within those counties. The bill also clarified the scope of actions an impacted local government may not enforce for one year after landfall to be:

- Actions that delayed the repair or reconstruction of hurricane-damaged improvements;
- Required repair or reconstruction of a hurricane-damaged property to comply with any comprehensive plan or land development regulation amendment that first became effective after landfall; or
- More restrictive procedural changes that extended development review timelines.

SB 840 clarified circumstances under which post-storm land use actions may still be enforced, including when an application was initiated by a private property owner for property they owned, when adoption was required to comply with state or federal law, when approved for an area of critical state concern, or when implementing floodplain management standards consistent with the National Flood Insurance Program. The bill

further limited these prohibitions to properties damaged to an extent that required a repair or reconstruction permit, and authorized local governments to require documentation demonstrating hurricane damage.

SB 840 removed the private right of action, injunctive relief, and one-sided attorney fee provisions previously included in section 18. The bill also clarified that this section may not be construed to restrict a local government from adopting or enforcing changes to the Florida Building Code or local technical amendments.

For section 28 of SB 180, SB 840 revised the temporary land-use freeze applicable to counties and municipalities affected by Hurricanes Debby, Helene, and Milton. The bill shortened the prohibition period, moving the end date for the moratorium and "more restrictive or burdensome" land-use and procedural restrictions from October 1, 2027, to June 30, 2026, and revised the section's expiration date accordingly. All other elements of section 28, including retroactive application to August 1, 2024, the nullification of noncompliant local actions, and the existing notice-and-cure framework, remained in place.

SB 840 passed the Senate but did not advance in the House.



E-Bikes

Electronic Bicycle Regulations

The League supports legislation to establish statewide, minimum operating requirements for electronic bicycles while maintaining authority for local governments to establish additional requirements based on local conditions.

Background
Under current law, Florida largely regulates e-bikes the same as regular bicycles. E-bikes may operate wherever bicycles are allowed: streets, shoulders, bike lanes and bike/multiuse paths. State law does not require the operator of an e-bike to possess a driver license, registration, or requirement of financial responsibility. Local governments may regulate e-bike operation on local streets, sidewalks, and sidewalk areas. A local government may restrict or prohibit e-bike use on bicycle paths, multiuse paths, beaches, and dunes under its jurisdiction. A local government may establish minimum age requirements, require government-issued photo identification, and provide for e-bike safety and traffic law training.

Status
CS/SB 382 (Truenow) would have created section 316.20655, F.S., to establish new statewide operating requirements for electric bicycles on shared-use pathways, sidewalks, and other pedestrian-designated areas. Under the bill, a person operating an electric bicycle must yield to pedestrians and give an audible signal when overtaking and passing a pedestrian. A person operating an electric bicycle in any area designated for pedestrian use must limit speed to 10 miles per hour when within 50 feet of a pedestrian. Violations were designated as noncriminal traffic infractions.

The bill also created the Micromobility Device Task Force within the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles to recommend improvements to state law and the regulatory framework governing micromobility devices. It defined the composition of the task force and the timeframes for its meetings. The bill also required the Florida Highway Patrol (FHP) and police and sheriff's offices to maintain detailed records of micromobility device crashes, beginning 30 days after the bill became law, and to submit a report of such crashes to the department by October 15, 2026, covering incidents through September 30, 2026. The bill directed the department to submit a report to the legislature by October 31, 2026, summarizing the information provided to it by the FHP and local law enforcement agencies.

CS/SB 382 was vetoed by the Governor based on concerns about the difficulty measuring the speed and proximity to pedestrian requirements, concerns about surveillance and enforcement, and the necessity of the task force.



Abandoned Telecommunication Lines

Abandoned Telecommunications Lines and Equipment

Summary

Across the United States, local governments increasingly face problems associated with abandoned telecommunications and cable facilities attached to utility poles, buildings, and other structures. Legacy copper telephone lines, inactive cable television facilities, obsolete broadband infrastructure, and associated attachments often remain in place long after they cease serving customers.

These abandoned facilities can create safety hazards, complicate utility-pole management, increase the cost and delay of infrastructure deployment, impede storm recovery efforts, and degrade community appearance. A recurring practical problem is that local governments may be unable to identify the owner of an abandoned line and may lack a clear, uniform process to compel its removal.

New Jersey enacted P.L. 2023, c. 293, codified at N.J.S.A. 48:3-122 through 48:3-127, to establish a statewide framework for abandoned above-ground telecommunications and cable lines. N.J.S.A. 48:3-123 imposes an affirmative duty on the owner of an abandoned line to correct the condition causing abandonment or remove the line from all points of attachment. N.J.S.A. 48:3-124 establishes a process through which pole and structure owners, municipalities, utilities, corporations, and members of the public may request review and removal of suspected abandoned lines.

Florida has no directly comparable statewide statutory program. A Florida proposal could establish a uniform definition, ownership-marking obligation, removal duty, complaint process, enforcement mechanism, and expedited treatment for storm-damaged facilities. Such provisions could be placed in chapter 337 (governs transportation rights-of-way but not private structures on private property), chapter 364 (telecommunications companies, non-cable), or chapter 610 (all communications providers), of the Florida Statutes.

Problems Associated with Abandoned Lines and Equipment

Public Safety Concerns

Unused telecommunications and cable facilities can become hazardous when:

- Lines sag into roadways, sidewalks, or private property.
- Attachments loosen or fail after storms or vehicle impacts.
- Obsolete facilities contribute to pole loading or complicate pole inspection.
- Unused equipment detaches from poles, buildings, or other structures.
- Emergency responders and public works personnel encounter unidentified lines.

Utility-Pole Congestion and Infrastructure Deployment

Communications providers commonly share utility poles with electric utilities and other communications attachers. Over time, poles may accumulate legacy copper telephone facilities, cable television lines, fiber facilities, wireless support equipment, and attachments associated with companies that have merged, transferred assets, or left the market. Abandoned facilities may complicate pole replacement, make-ready work, transfers, inspection, and installation of new broadband facilities.

Storm Recovery and Resiliency

Florida's exposure to hurricanes makes abandoned and unidentified aerial facilities a particular concern. Following a storm, damaged or inactive lines may complicate damage assessment,

debris removal, restoration sequencing, and reconstruction of poles and communications networks. A clear identification and removal framework could distinguish active facilities from obsolete infrastructure and provide an expedited path for hazards that interfere with recovery.

Aesthetic and Community Impacts

Local governments receive complaints about tangled overhead wires, hanging service drops, obsolete cabinets, and unused attachments. Residents may reasonably expect the local government to resolve these conditions, even when ownership is uncertain or the municipality lacks a clear statutory enforcement mechanism.

Ownership and Accountability Problems

Ownership can be difficult to determine when providers merge, sell assets, discontinue technologies, or cease operations. Without markings or reliable ownership records, a municipality, pole owner, or property owner may be unable to identify the entity responsible for inspection, repair, or removal. This uncertainty may leave obsolete facilities in place indefinitely.

New Jersey's Legislative Response

P.L. 2023, c. 293 created a statewide abandoned-line framework, codified at N.J.S.A. 48:3-122 through 48:3-127. The law addresses above-ground wire or cable attached to a pole, building, or other structure and used or useful for telecommunications or cable television service, together with associated equipment or facilities. The principal components are:

- A statutory definition of an abandoned line.
- An affirmative duty to correct or remove an abandoned line.
- Removal requirements when an entity ceases doing business in the state.
- Ownership-marking requirements for certain lines.
- A formal process for reporting and requesting removal of suspected abandoned lines.
- Regulatory oversight, reporting, and penalties.

Definition of an Abandoned Line

Under N.J.S.A. 48:3-122, a line may be treated as abandoned when it satisfies one of the statutory conditions, including when it is not terminated at both ends to equipment or customer premises, is not maintained in a safe condition, is not intended for future use, or has not been in operation for at least 24 consecutive months and the owner of the attached structure has submitted a removal request. The statute excludes overlashed lines from the definition.

Mandatory Correction or Removal

N.J.S.A. 48:3-123 requires an entity owning an abandoned line either to correct the condition causing the line to be abandoned or to remove the line from all points of attachment, subject to the procedures in N.J.S.A. 48:3-124 and applicable federal law.

Providers Ceasing Operations

When an entity owning one or more lines ceases doing business in New Jersey, N.J.S.A. 48:3-123 requires removal of those lines from all points of attachment, except for a line transferred to another entity that is not otherwise deemed abandoned.

Ownership-Marking Requirements

N.J.S.A. 48:3-123 requires identifying markings on specified lines attached to buildings or structures so ownership can be readily and definitely ascertained. For preexisting lines, the law requires marking when the owner or maintainer discovers that the line lacks the prescribed identification; it does not require an affirmative search for all unmarked legacy lines.

Removal Request Process

N.J.S.A. 48:3-124 creates two principal pathways:

- The owner of a pole, building, or other structure may request that the entity owning a suspected abandoned line determine whether it is abandoned and, if so, remove it, subject to applicable federal law and pole-attachment agreements.
- Any person, municipality, utility, or corporation may submit a request to the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities for removal of a suspected abandoned line. The Board transmits the request to the entity that owns the line.

The request process is built around identifying information such as the pole number, address, or latitude and longitude, along with a photograph. The statute also establishes response and removal timelines and authorizes the Board to oversee implementation.

Enforcement and Administration

The broader statutory scheme authorizes Board administration, reports, and penalties for noncompliance. This state-level structure gives municipalities and other complainants a uniform forum rather than requiring each local government to create its own identification and enforcement process.

Comparison with Florida Law

Florida regulates telecommunications, communications services, pole attachments, and use of public rights-of-way through several statutory chapters and through federal, state, local, contractual, and permitting mechanisms. However, no directly comparable statewide Florida statute was identified that combines all of the following elements:

- A general statutory definition of an abandoned telecommunications or cable line.
- An affirmative statewide duty to remove an abandoned line from all attachment points.
- A broad ownership-marking requirement for aerial communications lines.
- A uniform municipal and public complaint process administered by a state agency.
- Specific timelines and administrative penalties directed to abandoned communications lines.

In the absence of a uniform statewide program, Florida local governments may need to rely on right-of-way permits, franchise or registration requirements, pole-attachment agreements, local code provisions, nuisance authority, emergency powers, and voluntary coordination with pole owners and communications providers. The applicability and legal sufficiency of those tools can vary with facility location, ownership, state preemption, federal pole-attachment law, and the terms of existing agreements.

Potential Florida Legislative Framework

Possible Statutory Placement

A Florida framework could be placed in one or more of the following chapters:

- Chapter 337, Florida Statutes, if the legislation is primarily directed to facilities in state and local transportation rights-of-way.
- Chapter 364, Florida Statutes, if the legislation is centered on telecommunications companies and Public Service Commission administration.
- Chapter 610, Florida Statutes, if the legislation is designed as a statewide communications-services obligation that includes cable and broadband facilities.
- A new standalone part applicable to all owners of above-ground communications lines, regardless of technology or legacy regulatory classification.

A standalone or cross-referenced approach may provide the broadest coverage because chapter 364 alone may not reach every cable, broadband, or communications-service provider,

while chapter 337 alone may not reach lines attached to private buildings or structures outside a public right-of-way.

Recommended Substantive Elements

A Florida bill could include the following components:

- Definitions. Define "abandoned," "entity," "line," "maintained in a safe condition," "pole owner," and "communications service."
- Removal duty. Require the owner to correct the condition causing abandonment or remove the line and associated equipment from every point of attachment within a specified period.
- Cessation of business. Require removal or lawful transfer of facilities when a provider ceases operations in Florida.
- Ownership identification. Require durable markings or another approved identification method for newly installed facilities and for unmarked legacy facilities when discovered during inspection, maintenance, transfer, or repair.
- Records. Require line owners and pole owners to maintain current contact information and ownership records sufficient to route a removal request.
- Complaint process. Authorize municipalities, counties, pole owners, structure owners, utilities, and members of the public to report suspected abandoned facilities through a uniform state process.
- Investigation and response. Establish deadlines for acknowledgment, ownership determination, inspection, written response, correction, and removal.
- Emergency authority. Permit expedited action for storm-damaged lines or equipment that present an immediate hazard or interfere with restoration, debris removal, transportation, or emergency response.
- Cost allocation. Assign removal costs to the facility owner and establish a process for cost recovery when the responsible owner fails to act or cannot be located.
- Enforcement. Authorize administrative orders, civil penalties, continuing fines, permit consequences, and recovery of reasonable enforcement costs, with appropriate notice and hearing rights.
- Coordination with pole owners. Preserve applicable pole-attachment agreements and require coordination so that removal does not damage active facilities or compromise the safety of the pole.
- Federal-law savings clause. Provide that the state law operates only to the extent consistent with federal communications and pole-attachment law.

Florida Considerations

Any proposed Florida legislation should address the following issues expressly:

- Agency selection. Determine whether the Florida Public Service Commission, Florida Department of Transportation, Department of Commerce, or another entity should administer the program, and whether local governments may enforce the law directly.
- Scope. Decide whether the law applies only in public rights-of-way or also to lines attached to private buildings and other structures.
- Technology neutrality. Cover copper, coaxial cable, fiber, service drops, and associated equipment without inadvertently reaching active facilities or facilities reserved for documented future use.
- Preemption. Reconcile the new law with existing limitations on local regulation of communications providers and rights-of-way, while preserving local authority to identify and report suspected abandoned facilities and respond to emergencies.
- Pole-attachment jurisdiction. Account for federal and state jurisdiction, pole-owner safety rules, collective make-ready work, and the rights of other attachers.

- Due process. Provide notice, a meaningful opportunity to contest abandonment or ownership, and emergency procedures tailored to immediate hazards.
- Hurricane response. Include accelerated deadlines and interagency coordination for facilities damaged during a declared emergency.
- Legacy infrastructure. Consider a phased inventory or amnesty period so providers can identify, mark, repair, transfer, or remove older facilities before penalties begin.

Recommended Approach

The most comprehensive approach would be a technology-neutral statewide statute applying to every entity that owns above-ground communications lines or associated equipment. The statute should establish baseline duties and a uniform state complaint process while preserving the ability of local governments and pole owners to report hazards, coordinate removal, and take narrowly defined emergency action.

The legislation should not depend exclusively on traditional telecommunications regulation because obsolete lines may be owned by cable companies, broadband providers, successors to legacy carriers, or entities whose regulatory classification has changed. Likewise, limiting the law to public rights-of-way would leave unresolved abandoned service drops and equipment attached to buildings or other private structures. A broad statute with carefully tailored jurisdictional and federal-law savings clauses would most closely reproduce the practical benefits of the New Jersey model.



Key Dates

FLORIDA LEAGUE OF CITIES

2026 - 2027 Key Legislative Dates

November 2026

13	FLC Legislative Policy Committee Meetings (Round 2), Hilton Orlando, 6001 Destination Pkwy, Orlando, FL 32819
17	Florida House and Senate Organization Session
18-21	NLC City Summit, Nashville, TN
30-Dec. 3	Florida House and Senate Interim Committee Meetings

December 2026

3-4	FLC Legislative Conference, Renaissance Orlando at SeaWorld, 6677 Sea Harbor Dr, Orlando, FL 32821 (Round 3 of Legislative Policy Committees will be on Dec. 3)

January 2027

4-7	Florida House and Senate Interim Committee Meetings
11-14	Florida House and Senate Interim Committee Meetings

February 2027

1-4	Florida House and Senate Interim Committee Meetings
8-11	Florida House and Senate Interim Committee Meetings
10-11	FAST Fly-In, Washington, D.C.
15-18	Florida House and Senate Interim Committee Meetings
23	FLC Legislative Session Preview Webinar, 2:00 p.m. ET

March 2027

2	Regular Legislative Session Convenes
8-10	FLC Legislative Action Days, Tallahassee, FL
15-17	NLC Congressional City Conference, Washington, DC

April 2027

30	Last Day of Regular Legislative Session

May 2027

5	FLC Legislative Session Review Webinar, 2:00 p.m. ET

For further details about the mentioned events or legislative information, contact *medenfield@flcities.com*.



Notes



Notes