#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION FINAL ANALYSIS

**BILL #:** HB 701, 1st ENG.

**RELATING TO:** Road designations

**SPONSOR(S):** Representative(s) Bean and others

#### TIED BILL(S):

### ORIGINATING COMMITTEE(S)/COUNCIL(S)/COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERENCE:

- (1) TRANSPORTATION YEAS 12 NAYS 0
- (2) TRANSPORTATION & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS YEAS 11 NAYS 0
- (3)
- (4)
- (5)

### I. <u>SUMMARY</u>:

HB 701, 1<sup>st</sup> ENG., included two road designations. It would have designated a portion of State Road 16, from the northwestern city limits of Starke in Bradford County to the State Road 121 in Union County as the "Correctional Officers Memorial Highway." It also would have designated State Road 21, from the Georgia-Florida line in Baker County, to the city limits of Lake Butler in Union County as the "Ed Fraser Memorial Highway."

The bill also directed the Florida Department of Transportation (DOT) to erect road markers at either end of the designated segment. DOT expected to incur an estimated cost of \$1,000 to erect two road markers for each of the new designations.

HB 701, 1<sup>st</sup> ENG., would have taken effect upon becoming law.

(NOTE: HB 701 1<sup>st</sup> ENG., passed the House on May 3, 2001, by a vote of 110-1. It died in Senate Messages when the Legislature adjourned the following day. However, the text of HB 701, 1<sup>st</sup> ENG., was incorporated into CS/CS/HB 1053, 3<sup>rd</sup> ENG., which passed the Legislature.)

#### II. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

# A. DOES THE BILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES:

1.	Less Government	Yes []	No []	N/A []	
2.	Lower Taxes	Yes []	No []	N/A []	
3.	Individual Freedom	Yes []	No []	N/A []	
4.	Personal Responsibility	Yes []	No []	N/A []	
5.	Family Empowerment	Yes []	No []	N/A []	

For any principle that received a "no" above, please explain:

# B. PRESENT SITUATION:

Section 334.071, F.S., explains the process for legislative designations of transportation facilities for honorary or memorial purposes, or to distinguish a particular facility. The legislative designations do not erase the current names of the facilities, nor do they require local governments and private entities to change street signs or addresses. Some public roads and bridges have multiple or overlapping designations.

C. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

HB 701, 1<sup>st</sup> ENG., would have designated a portion of State Road 16, from the northwestern city limits of Starke in Bradford County to the State Road 121 in Union County as the "Correctional Officers Memorial Highway." It also would have designated State Road 21, from the Georgia-Florida line in Baker County, to the city limits of Lake Butler in Union County as the "Ed Fraser Memorial Highway."

DOT was directed to erect suitable markers.

D. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:

<u>Section 1:</u> Designates a portion of State Road 121, from the Georgia-Floida line in Baker County to the city limits of Lake Butler, in Union County, as the "Ed Fraser Memorial Highway." Directs DOT to erect suitable markers.

<u>Section 2:</u> Designates a portion of State Road 16 the "Correctional Officers Memorial Highway." Directs DOT to erect suitable markers.

<u>Section 3:</u> Specifies this act shall take effect upon becoming a law.

# III. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

- A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:
  - 1. <u>Revenues</u>:

N/one.

#### 2. Expenditures:

DOT expected to incur an estimated cost of \$500 to implement HB 701. Production and installation costs are estimated at \$250 per marker, and each designated facility gets two markers. DOT also would have been responsible for paying future indeterminate recurring costs of maintaining these signs and replacing them, over time.

- B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:
  - 1. <u>Revenues</u>:

None.

2. Expenditures:

None.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

- IV. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:
  - A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

The mandates provision is not applicable to an analysis of HB 701, 1<sup>st</sup> ENG., because the proposed bill does not require cities or counties to expend funds, or to take actions requiring the expenditure of funds.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

HB 701, 1<sup>st</sup> ENG., does not reduce the revenue-raising authority of counties or municipalities.

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

HB 701, 1<sup>st</sup> ENG., does not reduce the state tax revenues shared with counties or municipalities.

# V. <u>COMMENTS</u>:

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

Not applicable.

C. OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

	AGE NAME: h0701z.tr.doc : May 24, 2001 : 4		
VI.	AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:		
	Not applicable.		
VII.	<u>SIGNATURES</u> :		
	COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION:		
	Prepared by:	Staff Director:	
	Joyce Pugh	Phillip B. Miller	
	AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS:		
	Prepared by:	Staff Director:	
	Eliza Hawkins	Eliza Hawkins	
	AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS:		
	Prepared by:	Staff Director:	
	Eliza Hawkins	Eliza Hawkins	

# FINAL ANALYSIS PREPARED BY THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION:

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

Joyce Pugh

Phillip B. Miller