

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS**

**BILL #:** HB 675  
**SPONSOR(S):** Machek  
**TIED BILLS:**

Scripps Florida Funding Corporation  
**IDEN./SIM. BILLS:** SB 1572

---

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
1) <u>Economic Development, Trade &amp; Banking Committee</u>	<u>10 Y, 2 N</u>	<u>Carlson</u>	<u>Carlson</u>
2) <u>Utilities &amp; Telecommunications Committee</u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
3) <u>Local Government Council</u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
4) <u>Commerce Council</u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
5) <u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>

---

**SUMMARY ANALYSIS**

HB 675 gives the board of directors of the Scripps Florida Funding Corporation, Inc. (corporation), the exclusive right to select a provider or providers of water and wastewater facilities for the Scripps biomedical research institution and campus.

It allows any public agency in the county with legislative authority to provide service to submit service proposals and requires the invitation of all such proposals by the Corporation. The bill requires the board to consider the cost of utility service, current availability of existing facilities, and capital costs to a utility provider to extend such service to the institution and campus in its selection of a provider or providers.

The bill removes the authority of Palm Beach County to select the provider of such facilities.

The bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact.

The bill has an effective date of upon becoming law.

## FULL ANALYSIS

### I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

#### A. HOUSE PRINCIPLES ANALYSIS:

The bill does not appear to implicate any House Principles.

#### B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

##### Present Situation

Chapter 2003-420, L.O.F., created the Scripps Florida Funding Corporation, Inc., to facilitate the establishment and operation of a state-of-the-art biomedical research institution and campus in Florida by the Scripps Research Institute. That facility is currently planned for Palm Beach County.

Section 4 of ch. 2003-420, L.O.F., gave the county in which the biomedical research institution and campus are to be located the exclusive right to provide water and wastewater services to these projects to the extent deemed necessary by the governing body of the county. The law authorized the county to plan, acquire, construct, reconstruct, enlarge or extend, operate, and maintain water and wastewater systems and facilities within or without the boundaries of such projects for the provision of water and wastewater services.

##### Proposed Changes

HB 675 gives the board of directors of the Scripps Florida Funding Corporation, Inc., the exclusive right to select a provider or providers of water and wastewater facilities for the Scripps biomedical research institution and campus.

It allows any public agency in the county with legislative authority to provide service to submit service proposals and requires the invitation of all such proposals by the corporation. The bill requires the board to consider the cost of utility service, current availability of existing facilities, and capital costs to a utility provider to extend such service to the institution and campus in its selection of a provider or providers.

The bill removes the authority of Palm Beach County to select the provider of such facilities, repealing that authority as provided in s. 4 of ch. 2003-420, L.O.F.

#### C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1. Amends s. 288.955(6)(a), F.S., to empower the Scripps Florida Funding Corporation to select the provider of water and wastewater services.

Section 2. Repeals s. 4 of ch. 2003-420, L.O.F., which gave the right to select water and wastewater services providers to the county.

Section 3. Provides an effective date.

### II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

#### A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

The bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact on state government revenues.

2. Expenditures:

The bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact on state government expenditures.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

The bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact on local government revenues.

2. Expenditures:

The bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact on local government expenditures.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None.

### III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

The bill does not require a municipality or county to expend funds or to take any action requiring the expenditure of funds. The bill does not reduce the authority that municipalities or counties have to raise revenues in the aggregate. The bill does not reduce the percentage of state tax shared with municipalities or counties.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

### IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE & COMBINED BILL CHANGES

None.