### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE & CONSUMER AFFAIRS ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 1657

**RELATING TO:** Misbranded Food Products

**SPONSOR(S):** Representative(s) Ryan

TIED BILL(S): None

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

- (1) AGRICULTURE & CONSUMER AFFAIRS (CCC) YEAS 9 NAYS 0
- (2) GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS (FRC)
- (3) COUNCIL FOR COMPETITIVE COMMERCE
- (4)
- (5)

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

HB 1657 requires the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (department) to take certain actions when it determines that there has been a violation of the food labeling law. If a product is found to be in violation of Chapter 500, F.S., the department shall retest or reexamine the product after giving the manufacturer or vendor sufficient notice to correct the violation. If the product is found in violation again, the department shall test or examine the product for the third time after sufficient notice has been given. If the product is found in violation for the third time, the department shall issue a stop-sale or stop-use order, and impose additional sanctions. If a third test or examination is needed, the manufacturer must reimburse the department for the cost of the test or examination.

This legislation has no fiscal impact to state government. The effective date of this legislation is July 1, 2002.

# On February 20, 2002, HB 1657 was unanimously approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Consumer Affairs.

### II. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

A. DOES THE BILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES:

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

For any principle that received a "no" above, please explain: **Less Government:** The bill authorizes the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (department) to recover the costs of retesting, for the third time, a misbranded food product. The department is also allowed to impose additional sanctions for violations regarding misbranded food products.

B. PRESENT SITUATION:

Current statutes allow the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (department) to take action when a violation of the food labeling law occurs. However, this authority is permissive rather than mandatory.

C. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

HB 1657 requires the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (department) to take certain actions when it determines that there has been a violation of the food labeling law. If a product is found to be in violation of Chapter 500, F.S., the department shall retest or reexamine the product within 90 days after notification has been made to the manufacturer and to the firm at which the product was collected. If on further inspection, the product is again found in violation, the department shall test or examine the product for a third time within 60 days after the second notification.

The product manufacturer must reimburse the department for the cost of the third test or examination. If the product is found in violation for a third time, the department shall issue a stop-sale or stop-use order. The department also has the authority to impose additional sanctions for violations relating to s. 500.121, F.S.

D. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:

Please see Section C., Effect of Proposed Changes.

STORAGE NAME: h1657a.ag.doc DATE: February 20, 2002 PAGE: 3

### III. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

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

N/A

2. <u>Expenditures</u>:

N/A

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

N/A

2. Expenditures:

N/A

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

Manufacturers of products found for a third time to be in violation of labeling laws would be required to reimburse the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (department) for the cost of the test or examination.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

N/A

### IV. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

This bill does not require counties or municipalities to spend funds or to take action requiring the expenditure of funds.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

This bill does not reduce the authority that municipalities or counties have to raise revenue in the aggregate.

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

This bill does not reduce any state tax shared with counties or municipalities.

STORAGE NAME: h1657a.ag.doc DATE: February 20, 2002 PAGE: 4

- V. <u>COMMENTS</u>:
  - A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

N/A

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

N/A

C. OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

VI. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

None.

VII. <u>SIGNATURES</u>:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE & CONSUMER AFFAIRS:

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

Debbi Kaiser

Susan D. Reese