

0A 5-2-94

27

IN THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF FLORIDA

ORIGINAL

IN RE: )  
)  
ADVISORY OPINION TO THE )  
ATTORNEY GENERAL -- SAVE OUR )  
EVERGLADES TRUST FUND )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

CASE NO. 83,301  
**FILED**  
SID J. WHITE  
APR 15 1994  
CLERK, SUPREME COURT  
By \_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Deputy Clerk

FLORIDA FARMERS FOR FAIRNESS COMMITTEE'S  
REPLY BRIEF

<sup>S.</sup>  
Arthur J. England, Jr., Esq.  
Florida Bar No. 022730  
Barry Richard, Esq.  
Florida Bar No. 105599  
Christopher L. Kurzner, Esq.  
Florida Bar No. 863742  
Greenberg, Traurig, Hoffman,  
Lipoff, Rosen & Quentel, P.A.  
1221 Brickell Avenue  
Miami, Florida 33131  
Telephone: (305) 579-0500

Counsel for Florida Farmers for  
Fairness Committee

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Authorities .....	ii
Introduction .....	1
Argument .....	2
I.    The amendment violates Article XI, section 3 of the Florida Constitution by containing more than one subject .....	2
A.    The Everglades petition substantially affects other provisions of the Florida Constitution .....	3
B.    The Everglades petition affects multiple functions of government .....	4
II.   The ballot title and summary violate Section 101.161, Florida Statutes, because they are misleading and because they are unfairly biased by the inclusion of partisan editorial comment .....	10
Conclusion .....	12
Certificate of Service .....	12

**Table of Authorities**

<b>Cases</b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<i>Carroll v. Firestone</i> 497 So. 2d 1204 (Fla. 1986) .....	7, 8
<i>Evans v. Firestone</i> 457 So. 2d 1351 (Fla. 1984) .....	2, 6, 10
<i>Fine v. Firestone</i> 448 So. 2d 984 (Fla. 1984) .....	3
<i>Floridians Against Casino Takeover v. Let's Help Florida</i> 363 So. 2d 337 (Fla. 1978) .....	7
<i>In re: Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General -- Restricts Laws Related to Discrimination</i> ___ So. 2d ___, 19 Fla. L. Weekly S109 (March 3, 1994) .....	3
<i>Missourians to Protect the Initiative Process v. Blunt</i> 799 S.W.2d 824 (Mo. 1990) .....	3

**Other Authorities**

Art. IV, § 9, Florida Constitution .....	8
Art. XI, § 3, Florida Constitution .....	2
Ch. 91-193, Laws of Florida .....	9
Ch. 92-293, Laws of Florida .....	9
§ 101.161, Fla. Stat. (1993) .....	10

## Introduction

The Committee's initial brief argued that the proposed amendment encompasses three distinct subjects, affects three distinct functions of state government, and affects multiple provisions of the constitution. In addition, it argued that the ballot title and summary are materially misleading and include biased political comment.

The drafters' arguments in support of the petition crystallize these defects. First, as to single subject, their brief discusses the petition in terms of at least two subjects -- the establishment of a tax, and the creation of a separate, non-governmental body of "citizen" trustees. It also discusses the effect of the petition on multiple provisions of the constitution. The importance of these inherent acknowledgements of a violation of single subject is magnified by the drafters' emphatic attempt to dispel the petition's usurpation of the legislature's power of appropriation.

Regarding the title and summary, the drafters' own stated chief purpose of the petition -- to create a trust to assist in the restoration and clean up of the Everglades -- is absent from the title. The drafters further admit that the levy imposed by the proposed amendment, which the summary labels a "fee," is in fact an "excise tax."

Equally important to the Court are omissions from the drafters' arguments; two are glaring. First, the drafters ignore the far-reaching effects of their petition on government when they suggest that the petition's "narrow and limited purpose . . . is to create a trust to assist in the restoration and clean up of the Everglades." This simplistic pronouncement minimizes the unique nature of their "citizen" trust as a separate constitutional body. It also masks the divestiture of any legislative control over the receipt or disbursement of the new tax to be derived from sugarcane processors. Second,

the drafters ignore the substantial portion of their ballot summary which is devoted to biased political commentary. The drafters treat the political rhetoric as if it didn't exist. The drafters failure to address this language renders their arguments regarding the summary and title suspect.

The multiple briefs of the parties, *including the drafters'*, compel the conclusion that this petition to Save Our Everglades cannot be saved.

### Argument

#### **I. The amendment violates Article XI, section 3 of the Florida Constitution by containing more than one subject.**

The Everglades petition violates the single subject limitation because it contains three subjects: (1) it establishes a tax; (2) it directs the administration of a water management project of vast proportions, involving the planning and carrying out of water control and distribution functions over the entire southern half of Florida; and (3) it creates a body of trustees *outside* the scope of existing Florida government, headed by persons who "shall not hold elected government office." The drafters, in their initial brief, recognize and discuss as important to them that all three of these disparate subjects be included in the petition, as well as the petition's effect on multiple provisions of the constitution. They suggest, however, that they all properly fall within the broad generality of "Save Our Everglades." The court previously has disapproved of the notion that a grand title can save a petition with multiple subjects. *See Evans v. Firestone*, 457 So. 2d 1351, 1354 (Fla. 1984) (Court considered a proposed amendment affecting multiple articles or sections of the constitution and declared "the defect is not cured by either application of an over-broad subject title or by virtue of being self-contained"); *see*

also In re: *Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General -- Restricts Laws Related to Discrimination*, \_\_\_ So. 2d \_\_\_, 19 Fla. L. Weekly S109, S110 (March 3, 1994).

**A. The Everglades petition substantially affects other provisions of the Florida Constitution.**

The Everglades petition is suspect simply by virtue of its admitted effect on other articles and sections of the constitution. *Missourians to Protect the Initiative Process v. Blunt*, 799 S.W.2d 824, 831 (Mo. 1990) (cited in drafters' brief). The drafters recognize that how an initiative proposal affects other articles or sections of the constitution "is an appropriate factor" to be considered in determining whether there is more than one subject. *Fine v. Firestone*, 448 So. 2d 984, 990 (Fla. 1984). (Brief at 10). Perhaps inadvertently, they admit that the petition affects multiple sections.

(1) They admit that it imposes a tax. (Brief at 18.) Therefore, the petition affects Article VII ("Finance and Taxation").

(2) They admit that it creates a new governmental body, which they term as executive. (Brief at 11). Therefore, the petition also affects Article IV ("Executive").

(3) They admit that if the petition divests the appropriation function from the legislature, it would affect the legislative function of

government. (Brief at 11-12). It does,<sup>1/</sup> and therefore affects Article III ("Legislative").<sup>2/</sup>

Despite admitting these effects on multiple sections, the drafters still suggest that the petition does not encompass more than one subject. Their suggestion is untenable.

**B. The Everglades petition affects multiple functions of government.**

No one can reasonably dispute that the Everglades petition would impose a tax on raw sugar brought to the sugar mills for refining.<sup>3/</sup> Further, no one disputes that the Everglades petition creates a new constitutional body. The drafters term this body as an executive body. No matter how it is termed, this separate body is a subject separate and apart from taxation. Thus, the drafters themselves have delineated two of the three separate subjects in the petition identified in the Committee's initial brief.

If there is any doubt whether a tax on sugarcane and the creation of the Save Our Everglades "citizen" trust are separate subjects, the Court should consider that the tax could have been levied in a proposed amendment that simply directed funds derived from the tax into a trust fund for an Everglades ecosystem restoration project, to be appropriated by the legislature. This would have created a revenue source to be utilized

---

<sup>1/</sup> The drafters deny such divestiture but cannot make the case from the face of the proposed amendment, as discussed below.

<sup>2/</sup> The drafters fail to mention other provisions identified in the Committee's initial brief, such as the five-year term for Everglades trustees which conflicts with the *four*-year restriction on the term for public officeholders contained in Article III, section 13.

<sup>3/</sup> The Florida Audubon Society brief abjures the label "tax," but without discussion or analysis. (Brief at 21).

by existing agencies each year, depending on need. The Legislature would determine the relative needs of each agency.

There is no need to create an entirely separate body to administer, allocate, and effectively appropriate the tax receipts. That is, unless, of course, the existing government of Florida is to be bypassed.<sup>4/</sup> The drafters clearly recognize this, as their entire argument hinges upon whether the petition usurps the legislature's power to appropriate the receipts from the tax.

It is important to pause and consider whether the petition does usurp the legislature's power to appropriate. The drafters devote the majority of their brief to an attempt to dispel the obvious goal of the petition, which is indicated in the petition itself, and in the publicity accompanying the petition, that the legislature is to have *no* control over the funds received from the sugarcane tax. The only plausible conclusion to be drawn from a comparison of the petition and the argument made in the brief is that the latter brings to the Court a characterization which is contrary to the clear language of the proposed amendment.

The drafters state that "the language provides for the legislature to set priorities and appropriate consistent with the legislative function," and that:

Under the SOE Initiative the legislature is free to review the priorities within the designated purpose of the trust and make its decisions in compliance with its own priorities within the constitutional purposes of the trust.

---

<sup>4/</sup> The complete removal of the Everglades clean up from Florida's government is expressly the drafters' objective, of course. See questions 4 and 9 in Appendix IV to the drafters' initial brief.



(Drafters' brief at 15, 16). These two statements fly directly in the face of the language of the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment makes only one reference to the legislature in proposed subsection (c) to Article X, section 16:

The Trust shall be funded by revenues which shall be collected by the State and deposited into the Trust, *all of which funds shall be appropriated by the Legislature to the Trustees to be expended solely for the purpose of the Trust.*

(Emphasis supplied). Proposed subsection (b) to the Article provides, in contrast to the argument in the brief, that "The Trust shall be administered by five Trustees." Thus, the reference to the funds being "appropriated" by the Legislature is illusory. The proposed amendment mandates that *all* of the funds be appropriated to the trust, and that the trust be administered solely by the five trustees. The job of administering is a broad one, described in subsections (a) and (b) to proposed Article X, section 16 as:

The Trust shall be administered by Five Trustees

(Section (b))

to expend funds to recreate the historical ecological functions of the Everglades Ecosystem by restoring water quality, quantity, timing and distribution (including pollution clean up and control, exotic species removal and control, land acquisition, restoration and management, construction and operation of water storage and delivery systems, research and monitoring.

(Section (a)). Thus, the legislature is simply a conduit of the funds into the trust, with no discretion whatever.

The significance of this linguistic shell game is brought home by a surprisingly telling statement in the drafters' brief. They attempt to distinguish *Evans v. Firestone*, 457 So. 2d 984 (Fla. 1984), in this way:

In addition to performing a legislative function, the proposed initiative proposed a constitutional mandate to the judiciary on summary judgment,

through direct constitutional language. The language dictates a decision and its result rather than empowering the court. The court said the initiative "*performs the functions*" of several branches, which, therefore, shows the affect on multiple subjects.

(Drafters' brief at 17 (emphasis in original)). The drafters' description of the defect in *Evans* is directly analogous to the defect in the drafters' proposed amendment, however. Just as the *Evans* proposal dictated a decision by the Court, so too the Everglades proposal would dictate a pass-through of all funds by the legislature. Both proposals usurp the power of a branch of Florida government. The reference to an "appropriation" by the legislature has obviously been inserted simply to give the appearance that the proposal makes no change in function. However, as this Court made clear in *Evans*, it is the true *effect* of the proposed amendment, not its *appearance*, which must control.

The drafters declare in the summary of their argument that they rely on the Court's decisions in *Carroll v. Firestone*, 497 So. 2d 1204 (Fla. 1986), and in *Floridians Against Casino Takeover v. Let's Help Florida*, 363 So. 2d 337 (Fla. 1978). That reliance highlights the failure of their petition. Those decisions provide them no support. To the contrary, the provisions analyzed in those cases provide a clear contrast with the provision here.

The relevant portions of the proposed amendments in those cases provided:

Taxes upon the operation of gambling casinos shall be collected by the State and appropriated to the several counties, school districts and municipalities for the support and maintenance of the free public schools and local law enforcement.

*Floridians*, 363 So. 2d at 338.

Net proceeds derived from the lotteries shall be deposited to a state trust fund, to be designated The State Education Lotteries Trust Fund, to be

appropriated by the Legislature. The schedule may be amended by general law.

*Carroll*, 497 So. 2d at 1205-1206. Neither of those proposed amendments created, as the Everglades proposal would, a separate constitutional body to administer the trust funds. The *Floridians* proposal simply earmarked use of the funds for the general purposes of education or law enforcement. The *Carroll* proposal merely labelled the trust fund, without any commitment to its usage.

Through the provisions approved in *Carroll* and *Floridians*, the legislature was left with total discretion, both as to the amount of funds to be appropriated from the trust fund being created and in the allocation of funds to various agencies and departments and for specific uses. In *Floridians* and *Carroll*, the money was truly allowed to be appropriated *from* the trusts by the legislature, to be administered pursuant to legislative directive. In the Everglades proposal, the legislature is mandated to "appropriate" the money *into* the trust, after which full administrative discretion is left to the new body of trustees.<sup>5/</sup>

Further evidence of misplaced reliance on *Carroll* and *Floridians* is the drafters' suggestion that there is some analogy between their proposed amendment and the Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission provision in Article IV, Section 9 of the Florida Constitution. The Everglades petition does, like the Commission provision, create a separate constitutional agency outside the other departments of the executive branch of

---

<sup>5/</sup> If the drafters were correct about the legislature's continuing role, then the ballot summary would be dramatically misleading, as is discussed below.

Florida government. There the similarity ends.<sup>6/</sup> All funds from the sugarcane tax are earmarked for spending each year by the trustees, with total discretion to determine where and how the funds are to be used. This directive in the proposed amendment for "appropriation" by the legislature is hollow.

In sum, the Everglades petition is fraught with single-subject defects -- from its admitted effect on multiple sections of the constitution, to its manifold effects on several governmental functions. It simply seeks to do too much within the confines of an initiative petition, and in reaching so broadly cannot pass judicial muster. The Court should not approve its placement on the ballot.

---

<sup>6/</sup> The Commission provision was adopted and later amended by proposals placed on the ballot by the *legislature*, pursuant to Article XI, section 1, not by initiative. H.J.R. 1-2X (1968); C.S./H.J.R. 637 (1973). Unlike the initiative provision in Article XI, section 3, the provision for amendments proposed by the legislature does not include a single subject limitation. More significantly, the Commission provision *does* repose in the legislature the power to provide by statute for the sources of revenue and the uses of such revenue "in the area of planning, budgeting, personnel management, and purchasing." The core of the appropriations function -- discretionary allocation of funds -- remains in the legislature under the Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission section of the constitution.

Proof of the very substantive difference between the provisions is provided by the drafters themselves, through Appendix III of their brief. There they display for the Court the line item appropriate to the Commission for fiscal 1993. But from year to year the legislature's appropriation to the Commission has differed, not only as to the dollars appropriated but as to the number of staff positions approved. See Laws of Florida, Ch. 91-193, 92-293, attached as exhibits to this reply brief. In 1991, for example, there were only 148 positions appropriated in the office of executive director and division of administrative service, compared with 158 in 1992 and 152 in 1993. As to patrol vehicle allocation, \$649,953 out of the state game trust fund was approved in 1991, while \$572,569 was approved out of the same fund in 1992. The legislature chose to provide funds out of the general revenue fund in addition to the funds out of the trust -- \$139,652 from the general revenue fund plus \$432,917 from the state game trust fund in 1993.

**II. The ballot title and summary violate Section 101.161, Florida Statutes, because they are misleading and because they are unfairly biased by the inclusion of partisan editorial comment.**

The Committee's initial brief noted that a substantial portion of the proposed ballot summary is devoted to political rhetoric, rather than to informing the voters of the legal effect of the proposed amendment. In their brief in support of the amendment, the drafters treat the political rhetoric as though it didn't exist. Their brief states:

The SOE ballot summary states that a trust is created to restore the Everglades, describes the source of funding, the amount of the fee, the duration of the fee, and states that the trustees will be citizens.

(Drafters' brief at 22). They describe only 41 of the 66 words in their ballot summary. The drafters ignore almost 40% of the summary -- the portion devoted to partisan political comment. The drafters' complete lack of effort to defend the political language in the summary is understandable. The language is indefensible. The Court has made clear that a ballot summary can be fatally tainted by what it says, as well as by what it fails to say. *Evans v. Firestone*, 457 So. 2d at 1355.

The Committee's initial brief also challenged the accuracy of the summary's reference to a "fee," when the levy imposed by the proposed amendment is actually a tax. The significance of this distinction with respect to misleading the voter -- the nature of a "fee" as opposed to the nature of a "tax" -- was discussed in detail in the initial brief.

It is now clear that there is no dispute about the true nature of the levy. The drafters flatly state that the amendment "is an excise tax." (Drafters' brief at 18). In their references to the proposed amendment and other provisions which they claim are analogous, the drafters use the terms "tax" and "excise tax" no less than eighteen times. Yet the word "tax" does not appear once in the ballot title or summary.

Throughout their brief, the drafters maintain that the proposed amendment leaves to the legislature the power to "set priorities and appropriate" the trust funds, and to "make its decisions in compliance with its own priorities within the constitutional purposes of the trust." (Drafters' brief at 15, 16). Were the Court to take the drafters at their word, it necessarily follows that the trustees perform a ministerial, administrative function in carrying out the legislative will. The ballot summary conveys no such impression.

The summary makes no reference to any legislative role in the use of the funds. Rather, it states that "Florida citizen trustees will control the Trust." The drafters cannot have it both ways; at least not without misleading the voters. If in fact the legislature sets the priorities and allocates the funds, limited only by purposes stated in the amendment, then it is false to tell the voters that the trustees *control* the funds. The issue of whether the funds will be controlled by a board of "citizen trustees" as stated in the ballot summary, or by the legislature as stated in the drafters' brief, can reasonably be expected to make a significant difference in the minds of many voters.<sup>2/</sup>

The drafters' discussion regarding legislative discretion and control points up the dilemma in their position. If the trust funds are controlled by the trustees, then the proposed amendment violates the single subject limitation by usurping the legislative appropriations function. If, on the other hand, the funds are controlled by the legislature, then the ballot summary is grievously misleading.

---

<sup>2/</sup> The Court is again asked to look at questions 4 and 9 on the question and answer sheet which the drafters are delivering to the public with their petition. (Drafters' App. IV).

**Conclusion**

The Court is respectfully urged to direct the Secretary of State to remove the Everglades petition from the November ballot.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur J. England, Jr., Esq.  
Florida Bar No. 022730

Barry Richard, Esq.  
Florida Bar No. 105599

Christopher L. Kurzner, Esq.  
Florida Bar No. 863742

Greenberg, Traurig, Hoffman,  
Lipoff, Rosen & Quentel, P.A.  
1221 Brickell Avenue  
Miami, Florida 33131  
Telephone: (305) 579-0500

Counsel for Florida Farmers for  
Fairness Committee

**Certificate of Service**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of this brief was mailed on April 14,  
1994 to:

The Honorable Robert A. Butterworth  
Attorney General  
The Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1050

Terry P. Cole, Esq.  
Oertel, Hoffman, Fernandez &  
Cole, P.A.  
P. O. Box 6507  
Tallahassee, Florida 32314-6507  
Attorneys for Florida Fruit &  
Vegetable Growers Association

Jon L. Mills, Esq.  
P. O. Box 2099  
Gainesville, Florida 32602  
Co-counsel for Save Our Everglades  
Committee

Judith S. Kavanaugh, Esq.  
Earl, Blank, Kavanaugh & Stotts  
1800 Second Street, Suite 888  
Sarasota, Florida 34236  
Co-counsel for Florida Sugar  
Cane League, Inc.

Robert P. Smith, Esq.  
Wade L. Hopping, Esq.  
Hopping Boyd Green & Sams  
123 South Calhoun Street  
P. O. Box 6525  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
Attorneys for Sugar Cane Growers  
Cooperative of Florida, Inc.

Julian Clarkson, Esq.  
Susan L. Turner, Esq.  
Holland & Knight  
P. O. Drawer 810  
Tallahassee, Florida 32302  
Attorneys for Associated Industries  
of Florida Service Corporation

Cass D. Vickers, Esq.  
Robert S. Goldman, Esq.  
Messer, Vickers, Caparello, Madsen,  
Lewis, Goldman & Metz, P.A.  
P. O. Box 1876  
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1876  
Attorneys for U.S. Sugar Corporation

Howard L. Ferguson, Esq.  
Landers & Parsons  
P. O. Box 271  
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-0271  
Co-counsel for Flo-Sun Corporation

Fletcher N. Baldwin, Jr., Esq.  
University of Florida  
College of Law, Holland Hall  
Gainesville, Florida 32611  
Co-counsel for Save Our Everglades  
Committee

Joseph W. Little, Esq.  
3731 N.W. 13th Place  
Gainesville, Florida 32605  
Co-counsel for Florida Sugar  
Cane League, Inc.

W. Dexter Douglass, Esq.  
Gary L. Printy, Esq.  
Douglass & Powell  
P. O. Box 1674  
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1674  
Attorneys for Florida Audubon  
Society

Cecilia F. Renn, Esq.  
Vice President & General Counsel  
Associated Industries of Florida  
Service Corporation  
316 North Adams Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Carol Sullivan  
Robert H. Buker, Jr.  
U.S. Sugar Corporation  
P. O. Box 1207  
Clewiston, Florida 33440-1208

Bruce S. Rogow, Esq.  
2441 S.W. 28th Avenue  
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33312-4554  
Co-counsel for Flo-Sun Corporation



William B. Killian, Esq.  
Steel Hector & Davis  
4000 First Union Financial Center  
200 South Biscayne Boulevard  
Miami, Florida 33131-2398  
Co-counsel for Flo-Sun Corporation

Kenneth R. Hart, Esq.  
Roy S. Peeler, Esq.  
Macfarlane, Ausley, Ferguson &  
McMullen  
P. O. Box 391  
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-0391  
Attorneys for Florida Chamber  
of Commerce

Stanley J. Brainerd, Esq.  
General Counsel  
Florida Chamber of Commerce  
136 South Bronough Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32302



Arthur J. England Jr.

GTH\KURZNERC\210457.7\04/14/94

**EXHIBITS**

**Index to Exhibits**

1. Laws of Florida, Ch. 91-193
2. Laws of Florida, Ch. 92-293

## Appendix Part 1

## SECTION 1

SPECIFIC  
APPROPRIATION

636	SPECIAL CATEGORIES GRANTS AND AIDS - PETROLEUM SITE CLEANUP FROM INLAND PROTECTION TRUST FUND . . . . .		1,350,000
637	SPECIAL CATEGORIES RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - WASTE TIRE ABATEMENT PROGRAM FROM SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND . . . . .		7,975,000
637A	SPECIAL CATEGORIES ELECTRIC AND MAGNETIC FIELDS RESEARCH FROM OPERATING TRUST FUND . . . . .		325,598
638	DATA PROCESSING SERVICES ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION CENTER - DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .	94,194	
	FROM AIR POLLUTION CONTROL TRUST FUND . . . . .		61,815
	FROM INLAND PROTECTION TRUST FUND . . . . .		499,540
	FROM OPERATING TRUST FUND . . . . .		25,820
	FROM POLLUTION RECOVERY TRUST FUND . . . . .		46,046
	FROM SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND . . . . .		39,736
	FROM WATER QUALITY ASSURANCE TRUST FUND . . . . .		633,027
639	DATA PROCESSING SERVICES OTHER DATA PROCESSING SERVICES FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .	111,700	
640	DATA PROCESSING SERVICES REGIONAL DATA CENTERS - STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FROM AIR POLLUTION CONTROL TRUST FUND . . . . .		5,000
	FROM OPERATING TRUST FUND . . . . .		50,000
GAME AND FRESH WATER FISH COMMISSION, FLORIDA			
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES			
641	SALARIES AND BENEFITS POSITIONS	148	
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .	725,747	
	FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . .		357,018
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		3,748,595
642	OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .	1,500	
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		282,433
643	EXPENSES FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .	2,000	
	FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . .		267,651
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		1,961,065
644	OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .	31,762	
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		67,546

SECTION 1

SPECIFIC APPROPRIATION

	645	NOT USED		
1,350,000	646	SPECIAL CATEGORIES PAYMENT OF REWARDS FROM ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES REWARD TRUST FUND . . . . .		5,000
7,975,000	647	DATA PROCESSING SERVICES ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION CENTER - DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		37,048
325,598		LAW ENFORCEMENT, DIVISION OF		
	648	SALARIES AND BENEFITS . . . . . POSITIONS 435 FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . . 15,504,782 FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		2,447,783
61,815 499,540 25,820 46,046 39,736 633,027	649	OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . . 15,451 FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		35,000
	650	EXPENSES FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . . 662,432 FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		1,020,942
	651	OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . . 19,628 FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		1,092
5,000 50,000	652	SPECIAL CATEGORIES ACQUISITION AND REPLACEMENT OF PATROL VEHICLES FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		649,953
	653	SPECIAL CATEGORIES OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PATROL VEHICLES FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . . 1,390,909 FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		459,585
357,018 3,748,595	654	SPECIAL CATEGORIES SALARY INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . . 241,866 FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		73,620
282,433	655	DATA PROCESSING SERVICES ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION CENTER - DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . . 30,637		
267,651 1,961,065		WILDLIFE, DIVISION OF		
67,546	656	SALARIES AND BENEFITS . . . . . POSITIONS 167 FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . . 737,458 FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . .		1,041,002

SECTION 1

SPECIFIC APPROPRIATION

	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		3,722,665		
657	OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES				
	FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . .		819,200		66
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		475,185		
658	EXPENSES				
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .	94,275			67
	FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . .		736,112		
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		2,090,851		
659	OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY				67
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .	139,652			
	FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . .		84,001		67
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		98,164		67
660	SPECIAL CATEGORIES				
	ENHANCED WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT				
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		400,000		
661	SPECIAL CATEGORIES				PUF
	MANAGEMENT AREA LEASE PAYMENTS				
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		1,100,000		67
662	DATA PROCESSING SERVICES				
	ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION				
	CENTER - DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES				67
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		72,875		
FISHERIES, DIVISION OF					
663	SALARIES AND BENEFITS	POSITIONS	168		
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		41,152		67
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			5,507,856	
664	OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES				
	FROM GRANTS AND DONATIONS TRUST FUND . . . . .			2,025,000	67
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			1,749,176	67
665	EXPENSES				
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			2,355,217	
666	OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY				
	FROM GRANTS AND DONATIONS TRUST FUND . . . . .			25,000	67
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			310,680	
GENERAL SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF					
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION					
667	SALARIES AND BENEFITS	POSITIONS	122		
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		683,806		
	FROM ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST FUND . . . . .			3,310,429	IN
668	OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES				
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		7,500		

## APPENDIX PART 2



## SECTION 01

SPECIFIC  
APPROPRIATION

652	DATA PROCESSING SERVICES		
	REGIONAL DATA CENTERS - STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM		
	FROM AIR POLLUTION CONTROL TRUST FUND . . .		5,000
	FROM OPERATING TRUST FUND . . . . .		50,000

## GAME AND FRESH WATER FISH COMMISSION, FLORIDA

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND DIVISION OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

653	SALARIES AND BENEFITS	POSITIONS	158	
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		764,926	
	FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . .			470,233
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			4,100,508
654	OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES			
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		1,500	
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			302,433
655	EXPENSES			
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		6,256	
	FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . .			377,983
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			2,116,438
656	OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY			
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		31,762	
	FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . .			65,667
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			98,208
659	SPECIAL CATEGORIES			
	PAYMENT OF REWARDS			
	FROM ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES			
	REWARD TRUST FUND . . . . .			5,000
661	DATA PROCESSING SERVICES			
	ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION CENTER - DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES			
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			35,841

## LAW ENFORCEMENT, DIVISION OF

662	SALARIES AND BENEFITS	POSITIONS	432	
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		16,791,790	
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			1,453,269
663	OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES			
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		15,451	
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			35,000
664	EXPENSES			
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		361,644	
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			1,085,289
665	OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY			
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		19,628	

## SECTION 01

SPECIFIC  
APPROPRIATION

666	SPECIAL CATEGORIES ACQUISITION AND REPLACEMENT OF PATROL VEHICLES FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		572,569
667	SPECIAL CATEGORIES OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PATROL VEHICLES FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . . FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .	6,525	1,492,600
668	SPECIAL CATEGORIES SALARY INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . . FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .	241,866	73,620
WILDLIFE, DIVISION OF			
669	SALARIES AND BENEFITS POSITIONS 170 FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . . FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		1,163,797 4,637,799
670	OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES FROM FLORIDA PANTHER RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND . . . . . FROM GRANTS AND DONATIONS TRUST FUND . . . . . FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . . FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		25,000 300,000 1,330,813 339,025
671	EXPENSES FROM FLORIDA PANTHER RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND . . . . . FROM GRANTS AND DONATIONS TRUST FUND . . . . . FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . . FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		35,000 125,000 826,643 2,217,123
672	OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY FROM FLORIDA PANTHER RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT TRUST FUND . . . . . FROM GRANTS AND DONATIONS TRUST FUND . . . . . FROM NON-GAME WILDLIFE TRUST FUND . . . . . FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		64,000 75,000 165,518 202,523
673	SPECIAL CATEGORIES ENHANCED WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		400,000
674	SPECIAL CATEGORIES MANAGEMENT AREA LEASE PAYMENTS FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		1,100,000
675	DATA PROCESSING SERVICES ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION CENTER - DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .		76,215

SECTION 01

SPECIFIC APPROPRIATION

FISHERIES, DIVISION OF

676	SALARIES AND BENEFITS	POSITIONS	171		
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			5,873,028	
677	OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES				
	FROM GRANTS AND DONATIONS TRUST FUND . . .			1,800,000	
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			1,453,006	
678	EXPENSES				
	FROM GRANTS AND DONATIONS TRUST FUND . . .			200,000	
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			2,294,563	
679	OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY				
	FROM GRANTS AND DONATIONS TRUST FUND . . .			50,000	
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			345,518	
679A	LUMP SUM				
	MANAGEMENT OF FISHING TOURNAMENTS				
		POSITIONS	3		
	FROM STATE GAME TRUST FUND . . . . .			300,000	

Funds in Specific Appropriation 679A are contingent upon HB 107-H or similar legislation becoming law.

GENERAL SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION

680	SALARIES AND BENEFITS	POSITIONS	160		
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		396,011		
	FROM ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST FUND . . . . .			5,583,697	
681	OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES				
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		2,000		
	FROM ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST FUND . . . . .			773,010	
682	EXPENSES				
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		56,079		
	FROM ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST FUND . . . . .			1,155,417	
	FROM OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES ASSESSMENT TRUST FUND . . . . .			3,133	
683	OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY				
	FROM GENERAL REVENUE FUND . . . . .		808		
	FROM ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST FUND . . . . .			85,470	
686	DATA PROCESSING SERVICES				
	ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION CENTER - DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES				
	FROM ADMINISTRATIVE TRUST FUND . . . . .			41,279	

SECTION  
SPECIF  
APPROPI  
  
INFORM  
687  
  
688  
  
STATE  
688A  
  
688B