

PLANNING, PROPERTY RIGHTS AND VALUE ISSUES FOR FLORIDA LANDOWNERS

Rodney L. Clouser
Department of Food and Resource Economics
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

PLANNING

Planning --- "a method of action or procedure... any method of thinking out acts and procedures beforehand" (Random House). A simple definition; an extremely difficult objective to accomplish. Everyone plans, including agricultural landowners. Plans, no matter if they are for simple tasks like daily activities, or for more complex issues such as land use; are dynamic --- they change over time. Flexibility is important in planning because of the dynamics of the process. Few are ever carried out until every "t" is crossed and every "i" is dotted like they were initially formulated. Some people view plans as a list of "thou shalt nots", while others view plans as broad objectives that should be strived for. It really doesn't matter how individuals perceive the issue of government planning in Florida. Planning is an everyday reality in Florida government and Florida agricultural landowners have a vested interest in state planning activities.

Why does agriculture have a vested interest in planning? Farmland represents the most valuable dollar resource in Florida agriculture. Cash receipts from Florida agriculture (Table 1) in 1987 exceeded \$5 billion (USDA) but the use value of land in agriculture for state taxation purposes exceeded \$7.6 billion (1988). The just value of agricultural land, or the value if sold as a fair market transaction, not necessarily in agricultural use, was estimated at \$29.5 billion by Florida property appraisers in 1988 (State of Florida, Department of Revenue, 1988). On the open market, land in agriculture is estimated to be almost six times greater in value than the sales of all major commodities produced by agriculture in the state. Couple that with the fact that about three-fourths of Florida's land area is covered by forests, pasture or cropland (Table 2) and it is easy to see why planning can have an enormous impact on the economic well-being of agricultural landowners.

Planning by state and local governments is not a "johnny-come-lately" endeavor in Florida. According to Bartley, the Florida Planning and Zoning Association introduced legislation to allow cities and counties to plan during the 1951 session of the Florida Legislature. However, a derivative of that planning act, which represents the first generation of planning legislation in Florida, was not passed until 1969 (County and Municipal Planning for Future Development Act). This was followed by the Environmental Land and Water Act of 1972, Chapter 380 F.S., that allowed for lands of critical state concern. That same year a State Comprehensive Planning Act was passed (Chapter 23 F.S.) which was strictly advisory in nature.

In 1975, the Local Government Comprehensive Planning Act, Chapter 163 F.S., was enacted. Adoption of this act was heavily influenced by the first environmental lands study committee (ELMS I) in the early 1970s which concluded that "less than half of Florida's counties exercised any kind of land use control authority" (O'Connell). Unlike the state

planning act, the local planning act was mandatory. It required units of local government to plan for the future. Originally these plans were to be completed by July 1, 1979 but that deadline was extended to July 1, 1981. This act represented a second generation of planning laws, but the first generation of mandatory planning in Florida. According to Everhart and Plummer, the only specific mention of agricultural lands in the plan were that the distribution, location and extent of uses for agriculture were to be designated on a future land use map. The major limitations of the 1975 legislation were that adequate funding required to complete the mandatory planning were not forthcoming from the state, many units of government did not have available staffs to assure a quality plan and once the plan was adopted there was little promise that it would be implemented as adopted (DeGrove, October 1985).

In 1982 Governor Bob Graham appointed a second environmental land management study committee, ELMS II. This group called for adoption of a state plan by the legislature. The state plan was to be combined with regional plans developed in 1980 and then local plans were to be developed that were consistent with state and regional plans. Legislation in 1984 was passed that called for development of a state plan that was to be submitted to the 1985 legislature. The State plan was adopted with minor modifications in 1985.

The state plan identifies broad goals and objectives for 25 different subject areas including agriculture. The state agriculture goal is simply stated: "Florida shall maintain and strive to expand its food, agriculture, ornamental horticulture, aquaculture, forestry and related industries, in order to be a healthy and competitive force in the national and international marketplace."

The third generation of planning laws were adopted in 1985. The Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act (LGCPLDRA), Chapter 163 of the Florida Statutes, is a major component of State Growth Management legislation. The 1985 Act completely overhauled prior local planning laws, and the LGCPLDRA requires consistency with state and regional plans as suggested by ELMS II.

There are eight mandatory elements of all local government comprehensive plans and they include: future land use, traffic circulation, housing, sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, potable water, natural water and aquifer recharge, conservation, recreation and open space, intergovernmental coordination and capital improvements. Special elements for mass transit, port aviation and related facilities and coastal management are required for governments who serve a population in excess of 50,000 people. Optional elements can be added by the local government. Minimum criteria for compliance of local government comprehensive plans is established through Florida Administrative Codes, Chapter 9J-5.

Working knowledge of Chapter 9J-5 is essential to understand requirements of the LGCPLDRA, and the potential impacts of the legislation on agriculture. Consider the following examples. A future land use element is required where future land use patterns are to be placed on a map or a map series. Included among the land categories is agriculture. While that sounds like a simple task, it isn't. If this process had been undertaken just a few years ago there would be a series of maps for several north central Florida counties with a vast amount of acreage devoted to agriculture for citrus production. Much of that land today is not used for agriculture because of freezes. Likewise, the need

for pasture and cropland are dictated by personal, economic and weather conditions, and not by a map, nor a planner.

The conservation element of the plan has been another area causing concern among agricultural landowners. The element requires projections of water use by agriculture and other sectors, it is to contain policies for protection of native vegetation, and restricts activities known to adversely effect endangered or threatened wildlife. It has the potential to affect agricultural land use. It also has the potential to affect the competitive position of Florida agriculture if large land blocks have to be set aside to protect vegetation and wildlife species. Why? The fixed costs associated with land ownership are distributed among fewer units of production.

Time and space limitations prohibit detailed discussion about the plan and administrative rule 9J-5. Landowners do need to be aware, though, that all counties and municipalities in Florida are required to have a plan. Plans for all coastal counties and municipalities are due for review by the Department of Community Affairs by June 1, 1990 and for all other areas by July 1, 1991. Plans can only be amended by units of government two times per year except for special circumstances and funds can be withheld from units of government not in compliance. A concurrency clause requires that public services needed to support development be available prior to development so existing levels of services do not deteriorate from increased development.

Few agricultural landowners are familiar with Florida planning laws. Most agricultural landowners haven't taken the time to acquaint themselves with 9J -5. Surprising when you consider the fact that the LGCPLDRA could have a major impact on a \$29 billion resource. It's been said there are three types of people; those who make things happen, those who watch things happen and those who wonder what happened. Many people in Florida, including those involved in agriculture, fall into this third category when it comes to Florida's planning laws.

PROPERTY RIGHTS

The issue of planning and property rights can not be separated. Property right theory is based on the concept that parcels of property are composed of a bundle of rights. The types and number of property rights associated with land are not clearly defined but may include mineral rights, development rights, pesticide rights, cropping rights, air rights, etc. Actions by government, often through regulation of land use, can either augment or diminish the number of property rights on any given parcel.

Agricultural landowners are concerned with the issue of regulation and property rights because of impacts on land values and, in some cases, operating returns. This topic will be discussed later. Landowners are also concerned because, in many instances, there is no compensation for the change in asset value brought about by the regulation. In the legal profession this concern is known as the taking issue. For the remainder of this discussion I will concentrate on this single issue. It is poorly understood by many landowners.

The unjust taking or seizure of property is protected by both the U.S. and Florida Constitutions (Hamann, Juergensmeyer, Looney). Legal scholars often view the taking issue as a poorly defined area of constitutional law. For almost the first hundred years of

U.S. law, a taking of property did not occur unless "the government took actual, physical possession or title to land" for some type of public use (Hamann). This precedent has changed over time. According to Bosselman, *et al.*, "It is an American fable that a man can use his land anyway he pleases regardless of his neighbors. The myth survives, indeed thrives, although unsupported by the pattern of court decisions."

The theory of landownership most accepted today appears to be a social function or social doctrine of property. This theory of ownership has been attributed to Duguit (Juergensmeyer) and Ely (Looney). The social function theory of ownership is based on the concept that land is owned and maintained for societal interests. Ownership of the land then becomes a permitted right, protected by current laws, consistent with the needs of society at a given time. There are a series of court decisions that support this theory and include: Euclid v. Amber Realty Co., Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon, United States v. Willow River Power Company and Penn Central Transportation Company v. City of New York. Wunderlich and Bierman succinctly state that "all interests in land therefore, are held at the sufferance of society." In Florida, especially if you own land near the Cross Creek area, this social concept of who owns and controls the land is often expressed in the terms of Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings (Siemon):

"Who owns Cross Creek? The red-birds, I think, more than I, for they will have nests even in the face of delinquent mortgages. And after I am dead ... the human ownership of the grove and field are hypothetical. ... Houses are individual and can be owned, like nests, and fought for. But what of the land? It seems to me that the earth may be borrowed but not bought. It may be used, but not owned."

Property rights are defined and redefined by the courts. In a similar manner the courts define when a taking has occurred and if compensation is due the land owner. Another common misconception with taking is that diminution, or a decrease in land values, is the only factor to consider when evaluating if a taking has occurred. Hamann identified eight factors from U.S. Supreme Court cases on takings which the Court considered in their analysis. Those factors are: diminution in value, reasonable use, harm-benefit, nuisance-like effects, reciprocal benefits, existing uses, public trust and balancing.

Several of these "tests" are briefly reviewed. A more complete explanation is summarized in Constitutional Issues in Local Coastal Resource Protection (Hamann). The decrease in value that results from regulation or physical invasion of property is an important determinant when courts consider if a taking has occurred. However, decreases in value of and by itself does not result in a taking of property. In some decisions regarding takings a reasonable use test has been considered. The reasonable use test basically asks what types of uses are still available on the property in question. The general guideline has been that regulations that prohibit development are not a taking if other reasonable uses of the land remain. What has the court system decided were other reasonable uses? Activities like woodlands, grasslands, hunting, recreation, agriculture, etc. Hamann notes that "existing uses seem entitled to greater protection than speculative future uses." If the owner can use his land in a similar manner that he has in the past, then it is more difficult to prove a taking has occurred. Therefore, compensation is not due. The balancing test basically implies that no single factor of the eight previously identified explains the behavior of the court system with respect to taking rulings. There is some balance between all eight issues. My layman summary of Hamann's analysis is that the court system

operates on an ad hoc basis built around the eight factor tests identified.

All landowners in Florida, including agricultural landowners, can expect government involvement in particular land use decisions. The extent of government intervention, due to the various components of the state growth management act, will be on the front end of proposed land use changes. Rhodes noted that it used to be in Florida that the landowner "... made the first decision on what and when of development." That will no longer be the case.

It appears that current interpretations of the U.S. court system are that compensation for regulation of land use are limited and remote. However, there is an alternative approach that landowners may want to consider when addressing the issue of compensation. The petition of the landowner is ethical in nature and is based on the concept of the desirability of government to compensate for economic losses (Juergensmeyer). Sure, the courts say governments do not have to compensate for regulation in many instances, but is that the appropriate response to take when redistributing economic benefits and losses? Maybe the appropriate course of action for landowners seeking compensation is to make a stronger case to the unit of government that they have a moral responsibility to compensate landowners when costs of land regulation programs are borne primarily by the landowner. This would require a detailed accounting of costs and an educational program for decision makers that would help them understand the economic consequences of governmental actions.

Landowners need to remember that governmental land use decisions can have positive, as well as negative impacts on land values. It would be difficult to argue that many landowners on State Road 192 did not benefit from the governmental decision to allow Disney World development. Likewise, it would be difficult to argue that development of a regional mall, like Oaks Mall in Alachua County, did not result in land value increases for some agricultural property in the vicinity.

LAND VALUE

Land value, as mentioned earlier, can be affected by regulation of government and in several instances decreases in value are not due compensation. How large are the decreases in value that result from regulation and require no compensation? It varies considerably but let me cite a couple of examples from throughout the United States.

In the early 1900s the City of Los Angeles enacted a city ordinance that prohibited brick-making in selected areas of the city. The land in question consisted of a clay bed used to make bricks and was valued at \$800,000. The land had little use for other purposes due to the mining operations that had already been undertaken on the property. The Supreme court ruled, Hadacheck v. Sebastain, that the city ordinance was legal, and the owner was not due compensation even though the value of the property was reduced from \$800,000 to \$60,000, a 93 percent decrease (Hamann). A similar outcome was upheld by the Supreme Court in Miller v. Schoene in the late 1920s. In this case the state of Virginia enacted a law that required destruction of red cedar trees infected with cedar rust. Cedar rust does not destroy cedar trees but, since it could be airborne transmitted, it could destroy an important economic segment for Virginia -- the apple industry. The state destroyed the cedar trees and the owner declared an undue taking of property without compensation.

The Supreme Court decided the state had been forced to choose between the preservation of the cedar trees or the state's apple industry and the apple industry had a greater economic value.² The decrease in value experienced by the landowner was 100 percent. Numerous examples can be found where land values decreased substantially as the result of regulation.

Analogous land regulation impacts can be calculated based on governmental actions. Consider a hypothetical situation in 1989 where a 100 acre block of land is being considered for purchase to develop into citrus groves. The only significant characteristic of the property is a small wetland area. Assume required alterations in the physical landscape were allowed by the purchaser and were not subject to governmental regulation. Using a maximum land bid model developed by Prevatt and Phillips it was estimated THAT³ IN CURRENT DOLLARS A PURCHASER COULD BID UP TO \$14,284 PER ACRE FOR THE 100 ACRE PARCEL WITHOUT REGULATIONS FOR A TOTAL PURCHASE PRICE OF \$1,428,400. WHAT HAPPENS TO THE VALUE OF THE PARCEL UNDER SOME LAND REGULATION SCHEMES? FIRST, ASSUME THERE IS A BOUNDARY SETBACK REQUIRED ON LAND TO PREVENT FUTURE PROBLEMS THAT MIGHT ARISE IF ADJOINING PARCELS WERE TO BE DEVELOPED INTO USES OTHER THAN AGRICULTURE. ASSUME THIS BOUNDARY SETBACK REQUIRES ABOUT 1.5 PERCENT OF THE 100 ACRES. IN ADDITION, THE WETLAND AREA ON THE PARCEL CAN NOT BE DESTROYED AND NEEDS TO BE BUFFERED FROM THE AGRICULTURAL PRACTICE. WETLANDS AND THE BUFFER ACCOUNT FOR ANOTHER 5.0 PERCENT OF THE PARCEL. FINALLY, ASSUME THAT INTENSIVE AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL USE REQUIRES CONSTRUCTION OF A RETENTION POND ON THE PROPERTY TO MAINTAIN WATER QUALITY STANDARDS. ASSUME THIS RETENTION AREA USES ABOUT 2.0 PERCENT OF THE PARCEL. IN TOTAL, ABOUT 8.5 PERCENT OF THE PARCEL USE HAS BEEN REGULATED AWAY FROM PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES. THE NEXT ASSUMPTION REQUIRED IS THAT NET RETURNS ON THE 100 ACRE PARCEL DROP BY AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO THE AMOUNT OF PROPERTY REMOVED FROM PRODUCTION. THE MAXIMUM BID A PURCHASER COULD AFFORD TO MAKE FOR THE LAND, WITH THE REGULATIONS NOTED, USING THE PREVATT-PHILLIPS MODEL IS ESTIMATED AT \$13,165. A DECREASE IN VALUE PER ACRE OF OVER \$1100, OR \$110,000 FOR THE 100 ACRE PARCEL.

THE ABOVE EXAMPLE IS NOT MEANT TO TRIVIALIZE THE LAND REGULATION PUBLIC POLICY PROCESS. WITHOUT A DOUBT, BENEFITS ARE DERIVED FROM PROGRAMS THAT PROTECT GROUNDWATER SUPPLIES AND RESULT IN HAPPY NEIGHBORS. HOWEVER, THE DISTRIBUTION AND COSTS OF THESE PROGRAMS APPEAR SKEWED. OBVIOUSLY, THE LANDOWNER ENJOYS SOME OF THE BENEFITS ALONG WITH ALL OTHER INDIVIDUALS IN SOCIETY. HOWEVER, IT IS THE LANDOWNER WHO BEARS THE COSTS OF THE PROGRAM TO PROTECT SOCIETY THROUGH A DECREASE IN LAND VALUES.

IN FLORIDA, LAND VALUES APPEAR TO BE HEAVILY INFLUENCED BY POPULATION GROWTH. THIS IS PROBABLY ONE REASON WHY LAND VALUES IN FLORIDA DID NOT SHOW THE DRAMATIC ROLLER COASTER EFFECT OF THE MIDWEST DURING THE FARM CRISIS OF THE MID 1980S. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION OPERATIONS OFTEN INCREASE LAND VALUES, BUT IT IS NOT ORANGE TREES NOR FOUR LEGGED CRITTERS THAT EXPLAIN LAND VALUE INCREASES IN FLORIDA. RATHER, THE TWO LEGGED FOLKS MIGRATING TO FLORIDA IN NUMBERS THAT INCREASE FLORIDA'S POPULATION BY ABOUT 900 PEOPLE PER DAY OR BY OVER 300,000 PEOPLE PER YEAR PROBABLY BETTER EXPLAIN FLORIDA LAND VALUES.

FLORIDA'S POPULATION GROWTH HAS BEEN STAGGERING. MORE PEOPLE WERE BORN

IN FLORIDA OR MOVED TO FLORIDA BETWEEN 1977 AND 1987 THAN RESIDED IN THE STATE IN 1950. OVER THE LAST THREE DECADES FLORIDA'S POPULATION HAS INCREASED BY 78.7, 37.2 AND 43.5 PERCENT RESPECTIVELY. FLORIDA'S POPULATION GROWTH IN THE DECADE BETWEEN 1980 AND 1990 SHOULD BE ROUGHLY EQUIVALENT TO THE CURRENT POPULATION OF COLORADO. THE GROWTH IN POPULATION DURING THE 1980-90 DECADE WILL BE LARGER THAN THE CURRENT POPULATION IN 22 STATES IN THE UNITED STATES (BUREAU OF ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS RESEARCH). ALL THESE PEOPLE NEED SOMEPLACE TO LIVE AND MANY ALSO NEED/WANT LAND WITH THEIR HOUSEHOLD.

MANY OF FLORIDA'S LARGEST POPULATED COUNTIES ARE EITHER MAJOR AGRICULTURE PRODUCTION CENTERS OR LOCATED ADJACENT TO MAJOR PRODUCTION CENTERS. A MAP WITH 1986 ESTIMATES OF THE VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL CASH RECEIPTS AND 1986 POPULATION ESTIMATES VERIFIES THE INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POPULATION AND AGRICULTURE CENTERS. CONTINUED GROWTH IS EXPECTED IN THESE AREAS AND LAND VALUES SHOULD REMAIN ROBUST UNLESS THE PLANNING AND PROPERTY RIGHTS ISSUES DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY ALTER THE COURSE.⁴

A LOOK AT THE FUTURE

LAND USE CONFLICTS WILL PERSIST AS AN IMPORTANT ISSUE IN FLORIDA. FRICTION BETWEEN THOSE WHO OWN LAND AND WANT TO CHANGE USE OF THE LAND, AND OTHER INDIVIDUALS RESIDING NEAR THE PROPERTY WHO DO NOT WANT THE USE CHANGED WILL BE THE MAJOR CULPRIT OF CONFLICT. MANY OF THE CONFLICTS MAY TAKE THE FORM OF AN URBAN/SUBURBAN VERSUS RURAL DISPUTE. WHY? SOME URBAN RESIDENTS VIEW LARGE OPEN BLOCKS OF LAND AS POTENTIAL OPEN SPACE, PASSIVE RECREATIONAL OUTLETS, AND AREAS OF SCENIC BEAUTY THAT SHOULD BE PRESERVED. MANY AGRICULTURAL LANDOWNERS WHO HOLD THIS TYPE OF LAND ON THE OTHER HAND, ESPECIALLY NEAR URBAN CENTERS, VIEW THE PROPERTY FOR FUTURE URBAN EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT.

FLORIDA LANDOWNERS FACE THE POSSIBILITY OF INCREASED LEGISLATION AND REGULATION BY GOVERNMENT. THE FREQUENCY OF INCREASED LEGISLATION AND REGULATION IN FLORIDA WILL PRESUMABLY BE HEAVILY INFLUENCED BY THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO FUND THE STATE'S GROWTH MANAGEMENT LAWS. INCREASED AVAILABILITY TO FUND GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS WILL MOST LIKELY ACCELERATE CONFLICTS BETWEEN LANDOWNERS AND OTHER INDIVIDUALS AND A LACK OF FUNDS WILL PROBABLY RESULT IN LESS STRINGENT REGULATION.

THE COURT SYSTEM WILL GRADUALLY MOVE TOWARDS A CLEARER DEFINITION OF THE TAKING ISSUE. A PRECISE DEFINITION IS PROBABLY NOT POSSIBLE, BUT THROUGHOUT TIME THERE HAS BEEN MOVEMENT TOWARD CLARIFICATION. LANDOWNERS MUST REMEMBER THAT THE U.S. LEGAL SYSTEM INTERPRETS LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT. THOSE LEGISLATIVE POLICY MAKERS ENACT LAWS THAT REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THEIR CONSTITUENTS AND SOCIETY IN GENERAL. IF AGRICULTURAL LANDOWNERS ARE GOING TO HAVE INFLUENCE IN SHAPING THOSE SOCIETAL VALUES, THEY MUST BECOME MORE INVOLVED IN THE POLICY MAKING PROCESS, NOT ONLY THROUGH STATE ASSOCIATIONS, BUT ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS.

CONCLUSION

IT IS TIME FOR AGRICULTURAL LANDOWNERS TO BECOME MORE ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN THE PLANNING PROCESS. THIS WILL REQUIRE AN INCREASED EFFORT TO BECOME KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT EXISTING LAWS AND REGULATIONS, BE EDUCATED ABOUT FUTURE ISSUES, ATTEND NUMEROUS MEETINGS, HEARINGS AND WORKSHOPS AND TO EXPRESS POTENTIAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH PROPOSED PLANNING LAWS CLEARLY AND CONCISELY. THE VALUE OF THE LAND RESOURCE IN FLORIDA AGRICULTURE DICTATES THEIR INVOLVEMENT. THE LAND NOT ONLY PRODUCES COMMODITIES FOR FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL LANDOWNERS, BUT IT GENERATES COLLATERAL FOR OPERATING FUNDS AND IS AN INVESTMENT FOR THE LONG-TERM ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF THE LANDOWNER. LANDOWNERS CANNOT AFFORD TO IGNORE THE POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES OF LAND PLANNING LAWS AND REGULATION.

LITERATURE CITED

BOSELNAN, F., D. CALLIES AND J. BANTA. 1973. THE TAKING ISSUE.

BUREAU OF ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS RESEARCH. 1988. 1988 FLORIDA STATISTICAL ABSTRACT. GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

DEGROVE, JOHN M. 1986. "FLORIDA'S GROWTH MANAGEMENT SYSTEM: A BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE." FLORIDA ENVIRONMENTAL AND URBAN ISSUES, XIV:1. FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA.

DEGROVE, JOHN M. 1985. "THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF GROWTH MANAGEMENT IN FLORIDA." FLORIDA ENVIRONMENTAL AND URBAN ISSUES, XIII:3. FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA.

HAMANN, RICHARD G. 1986. "CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES IN LOCAL COASTAL RESOURCE PROTECTION." REPORT NUMBER 85, FLORIDA SEA GRANT COLLEGE. GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA.

JUERGENSMEYER, JULIAN CONRAD. 1984. "IMPLEMENTING AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION PROGRAMS: A TIME TO CONSIDER SOME RADICAL APPROACHES?" PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1984 FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL POLICY FORUM. FOOD AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA. GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA.

LOONEY, J. W. 1984. "PROPERTY RIGHTS AND GOVERNMENT CONTROLS." PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1984 FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL POLICY FORUM. FOOD AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA. GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA.

O'CONNELL, DANIEL W. 1984. "GROWTH MANAGEMENT IN FLORIDA: WILL STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS GET THEIR ACTS TOGETHER?" FLORIDA ENVIRONMENTAL AND URBAN ISSUES, XI:3. FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA.

PREVATT, J. WALTER AND SUSAN PHILLIPS. 1986. "LAND-BID: MAXIMUM BID PRICE ANALYSIS FOR AGRICULTURAL LAND PURCHASE." CIRCULAR 698, FLORIDA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE. GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA.

RANDOM HOUSE INC. 1979. THE RANDOM HOUSE COLLEGE DICTIONARY REVISED EDITION.

RHODES, ROBERT M. 1986. "GROWTH MANAGEMENT IN FLORIDA 1985 AND BEYOND." FLORIDA ENVIRONMENTAL AND URBAN ISSUES, XIII:2. FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA.

SIEMON, CHARLES. 1988. "THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1985: A BITTER PILL, BUT BETTER THAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT ANARCHY." ENVIRONMENTAL AND URBAN ISSUES, XVI:2. FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA.

STARNES, EARL M. 1984. "UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF POLITICS IN DETERMINING PROPERTY RIGHTS." PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1984 FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL POLICY FORUM. FOOD AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA. GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA.

STATE OF FLORIDA, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE. 1988. FLORIDA AD VALOREM VALUATIONS AND TAX DATA 1988. TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

STATE OF FLORIDA, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS. 1986. "MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLANS AND DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE." CHAPTER 9J-5, FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA.

S)))))))))q

¹INFORMATION PRESENTED BY BARTLEY DURING A WORKSHOP ON FLORIDA PLANNING LAWS, TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA.

²THE AUTHOR DOES NOT HAVE THE LEGAL BACKGROUND TO COMMENT ON DIFFERENCES IN THIS RULING CONCERNING COMPENSATION AND A RECENT RULING RELATED TO CITRUS TREES DESTROYED IN FLORIDA WHERE COMPENSATION WAS GRANTED.

³OTHER ASSUMPTIONS INCLUDE: ANNUAL EXPECTED NET RETURN GROWTH OF 2 PERCENT, A MARGINAL INCOME TAX RATE OF 28 PERCENT, A 20 PERCENT DOWN PAYMENT ON THE PARCEL, A NOMINAL INTEREST RATE OF 12 PERCENT, A 20 YEAR MORTGAGE AND AN INCREASE IN LAND VALUES YEARLY OF 1.5 PERCENT.

⁴ACCORDING TO INFORMATION RELEASED BY THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, THE SWIFT INCREASE IN FLORIDA'S POPULATION HAS NOT RAPIDLY ERODED THE AGRICULTURAL LAND BASE STATE-WIDE.

TABLE 1. FLORIDA NOMINAL AND REAL CASH RECEIPTS, FOR SELECTED AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, 1949-86.

S))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))Q

YEAR	CASH RECEIPTS	PERCENT CHANGE	REAL \$ CASH RECEIPTS 1972=(100)	PERCENT CHANGE
1949	428.2		815.77	
1950	488.0	14.0	911.13	11.7
1951	510.3	4.6	893.85	(1.9)
1952	520.9	2.1	899.34	0.6
1953	545.1	4.6	926.73	3.0
1954	558.7	2.5	938.20	1.2
1955	647.4	15.9	1,064.10	13.4
1956	681.4	5.3	1,085.20	2.0
1957	675.8	(0.8)	1,040.81	(4.1)
1958	724.9	7.3	1,097.67	5.5
1959	837.4	15.5	1,238.76	12.9
1960	779.1	(7.0)	1,134.06	(8.5)
1961	869.4	11.6	1,254.00	10.6
1962	914.5	5.2	1,295.14	3.3
1963	905.5	(1.0)	1,263.43	(2.4)
1964	1004.0	10.9	1,379.69	9.2
1965	998.3	(0.6)	1,342.52	(2.7)
1966	1043.3	4.5	1,359.17	1.2
1967	1123.7	7.7	1,421.33	4.6
1968	1220.3	8.6	1,478.43	4.0

S))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))Q

1969	1353.5	10.9	1,559.51	5.5
1970	1319.9	(2.5)	1,443.30	(7.5)
1971	1458.1	10.5	1,518.70	5.2
1972	1687.8	15.8	1,687.80	11.1
1973	2047.5	21.3	1,936.17	14.7
1974	2145.4	4.8	1,864.27	(3.7)
1975	2503.6	16.7	1,990.30	6.8
1976	2574.0	2.8	1,944.99	(2.3)
1977	2761.3	7.3	1,971.65	1.4
1978	3342.8	21.1	2,222.31	12.7
1979	3855.8	15.3	2,359.44	6.2
1980	4061.9	5.3	2,276.59	(3.5)
1981	4280.6	5.4	2,193.60	(3.6)
1982	4335.9	1.3	2,095.85	(4.5)
1983	4625.7	6.7	2,152.01	2.7
1984	4739.6	2.5	2,123.25	(1.3)
1985	4703.8	(0.8)	2,044.68	(3.7)
1986	4688.2	(0.3)	1,989.56	(2.7)
1987	5227.0	11.5	2,147.05	7.9

S))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))Q

SOURCE: DATA MAINTAINED BY THE AUTHOR FROM VARIOUS USDA AND DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PUBLICATIONS.

TABLE 2. MAJOR USES OF LAND, UNITED STATES AND FLORIDA

S))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))Q

PERCENT OF TOTAL

LAND USE U. S. FLORIDA

S))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))Q

CROPLAND 20.9 13.3

GRASSLAND PASTURE 26.2 16.9

FOREST 28.9 47.1

SPECIAL USES 11.9 11.6

OTHER LAND 12.1 11.1

S))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))Q

TOTAL LAND AREA 100.0 100.0

S))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))Q

SOURCE: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS 1984, TABLE 541.