HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 943 Relating to Probation and Community Control

SPONSOR(S): Rep. Zapata and others

TIED BILLS: None **IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** SB 488

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	
1) Corrections (Sub)		Cole	De La Paz	
2) Public Safety and Crime Prevention				
3)				
4)				
5)				

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Section 948.03, F.S., currently specifies that offenders on probation for certain types of offenses are prohibited from living within 1000 feet of a school, day care center, park, playground, or other place where children regularly congregate. The statute does not currently specify how that measurement be made.

The bill specifies that the measurement must be made from the offender's residence to the nearest property boundary line of any of the prohibited places in a straight line measurement. This clarification makes the area in which offenders must be excluded from as large as possible.

This document does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill sponsor or House of Representatives. STORAGE NAME: h0943.pscp.doc March 10, 2003

DATE:

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. DOES THE BILL:

1.	Reduce government?	Yes[]	No[]	N/A[X]
2.	Lower taxes?	Yes[]	No[]	N/A[X]
3.	Expand individual freedom?	Yes[]	No[]	N/A[X]
4.	Increase personal responsibility?	Yes[]	No[]	N/A[X]
5.	Empower families?	Yes[]	No[]	N/A[X]

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

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

By making the measurement from the offender's residence a straight line measurement of 1000', any challenge for arbitrariness or vagueness will be eliminated. Courts have ruled in several drug cases that also have the 1000' rule applied in certain situations, that the measurement must be in a straight line. The bill will remove any subjectivity on behalf of the person making the measurement since it must be done in a straight line.

C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1: Amends S. 948.03 F.S., relating to measurement of prohibited areas for persons on probation or community control.

Section 2: Provides 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

STORAGE NAME:

h0943.pscp.doc March 10, 2003 PAGE: 2

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

There appears to be no negative fiscal impact to state or local governments.

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

None

STORAGE NAME: DATE:

h0943.pscp.doc March 10, 2003