

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 593 Beach Improvement

SPONSOR(S): Carassas

TIED BILLS: **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:**

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
1) <u>Public Lands & Water Resources (Sub)</u>	<u>11 Y, 0 N</u>	<u>McKinnon</u>	<u>Lotspeich</u>
2) <u>Natural Resources</u>	<u>16 Y, 0 N</u>	<u>McKinnon</u>	<u>Lotspeich</u>
3) <u>Finance & Tax</u>	<u>20 Y, 0 N w/CS</u>	<u>Levin</u>	<u>Diez-Arguelles</u>
4) _____	_____	_____	_____
5) _____	_____	_____	_____

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

HB 593 with CS amends Section 125.0104, F.S., to prohibit any funds identified by a county as the local matching source for beach renourishment, restoration, or erosion control projects included in the state's Beach Management Plan's long range budget plan, or funds contractually obligated by a county in the financial plan for a federally-authorized shore protection project to the loaned or used for any other purposes.

This document does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill sponsor or House of Representatives.

STORAGE NAME: h0593d.ft.doc

DATE: April 2, 2003

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. DOES THE BILL:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 1. Reduce government? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Lower taxes? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Expand individual freedom? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Increase personal responsibility? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Empower families? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Current situation

Under the present law local tourist development tax monies may be used for a number of purposes, including various beach enhancements under Section 125.0104 (5)(a)4, F.S.

Effect of the proposed changes

HB 593 with CS provides that tourist development tax funds identified by a county as the local matching source for beach renourishment, restoration, or erosion control projects included in the state's Beach Management Plan's long range budget plan or funds contractually obligated by a county in the financial plan for a federally-authorized shore protection program may not be loaned or used for any other purpose.

C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1 Amends 125.0104, F.S., to prohibit the use of tourist development tax monies designated by a county for beach enhancements to be used for other purposes.

Section 2 Provides for an effective date.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues: None.
2. Expenditures: None.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues: None.
2. Expenditures: None.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR: None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS: None.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision: None.

2. Other: None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY: None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS: None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

On April 2, 2003 the Finance and Tax Committee adopted a CS which specifically limits the purposes for which funds identified by a county as the local matching source for beach renourishment, restoration, or erosion control or funds contractually obligated for a federally authorized shore protection project may be used. The language decreases local flexibility in the use of these funds once they have been identified of contractually obligated for the purposes enumerated in the amendment language.