

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 63 Road Designations

SPONSOR(S): McBurney and others

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

	REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
1)	Roads, Bridges & Ports Policy Committee	12 Y, 0 N	Johnson	Miller
2)	Transportation & Economic Development Appropriations Committee		Fennell	Creamer
3)	Economic Development & Community Affairs Policy Council			
4)				
5)				

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Section 334.071, F.S., provides for legislative designations of transportation facilities for honorary or memorial purposes, or to distinguish a particular facility. The legislative designations do not “officially” change the current names of the facilities, nor does the statute require local governments and private entities to change street signs, mailing addresses, or 911 emergency telephone-number system listings.

The bill designates that portion of State Road 116 between State Road 9A east of Jacksonville and State Road 101 in Duval County as the “James E. ‘Jim’ King, Jr. Parkway.”

The bill also directs the Department of Transportation (DOT) to erect suitable markers designating the “James E. ‘Jim’ King, Jr. Parkway.”

Assuming that two markers are erected for the designation, DOT estimates the cost to be \$800. This expenditure is from the State Transportation Trust Fund and includes installation and maintenance costs.

The bill does not create any constitutional or other legal issues. It takes effect July 1, 2010.

HOUSE PRINCIPLES

Members are encouraged to evaluate proposed legislation in light of the following guiding principles of the House of Representatives

- Balance the state budget.
- Create a legal and regulatory environment that fosters economic growth and job creation.
- Lower the tax burden on families and businesses.
- Reverse or restrain the growth of government.
- Promote public safety.
- Promote educational accountability, excellence, and choice.
- Foster respect for the family and for innocent human life.
- Protect Florida's natural beauty.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Current Situation

Section 334.071, F.S., provides for legislative designations of transportation facilities for honorary or memorial purposes, or to distinguish a particular facility. The legislative designations do not “officially” change the current names of the facilities, nor does the statute require local governments and private entities to change street signs, mailing addresses, or 911 emergency telephone-number system listings.

The statute requires the Department of Transportation (DOT) to place a marker at each termini or intersection of an identified road or bridge, and to erect other markers it deems appropriate for the transportation facility. The statute also provides that a city or county must pass a resolution in support of a particular designation before road markers are erected. Additionally, if the designated road segment extends through multiple cities or counties, a resolution must be passed by each affected local government.

Effect of Proposed Change

The bill designates the portion State Road 116 between State Road 9A¹ east of Jacksonville and State Road 101 in Duval County as the “James E. ‘Jim’ King Jr., Parkway.”

The bill also directs DOT to erect suitable markers designating the “James E. ‘Jim’ King Jr., Parkway.”

The bill takes effect on July 1, 2010.

B. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1: Designates the “James E. ‘Jim’ King, Jr., Parkway;” directs DOT to erect suitable markers.

¹ According to DOT, the State Road 9A overpass is actually west of the western end of State Road 116 (Jane Street) and is actually Merrill Road in Jacksonville.

Section 2: Provides an effective date.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

None

2. Expenditures:

DOT estimates that the cost to erect two suitable road designating markers is approximately \$800; this assumes the placement of a marker at each end of the designated road segment. The expenditure is from the State Transportation Trust Fund and includes installation and maintenance costs.

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:

Not applicable because the bill does not appear to require the counties or cities to spend funds or take an action requiring the expenditure of funds; reduce the authority that cities or counties have to raise revenues in the aggregate; or reduce the percentage of a state tax shared with cities or counties.

2. Other:

None

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None

IV. AMENDMENTS/COUNCIL OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

None