

**The Florida Senate**  
**BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

---

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Appropriations Committee

---

**BILL:** PCS/CS/SB 1392 (380674)

**INTRODUCER:** Appropriations Committee (Recommended by Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development); Transportation Committee; and Senator Brandes

**SUBJECT:** Transportation

**DATE:** February 29, 2016

**REVISED:** \_\_\_\_\_

| ANALYST  | STAFF DIRECTOR | REFERENCE | ACTION                   |
|----------|----------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| 1. Price | Eichin         | TR        | <b>Fav/CS</b>            |
| 2. Sneed | Miller         | ATD       | <b>Recommend: Fav/CS</b> |
| 3. Sneed | Kynoch         | AP        | <b>Pre-meeting</b>       |

**Please see Section IX. for Additional Information:**

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE - Substantial Changes

**I. Summary:**

PCS/CS/SB 1392 includes a number of transportation-related provisions. Specifically, the bill:

- Authorizes the transfer of the Florida Department of Transportation’s (FDOT) Pinellas Bayway System to become part of the turnpike system and, in such event, also requires the transfer of certain funds to be used to help fund the costs of repair and replacement of the transferred facilities.
- Clarifies the FDOT’s authority with respect to noncompliant traffic and pedestrian control devices.
- Extends the authorized term of certain airport-related leases.
- Requires signage at toll facilities notifying drivers if cash payment is not an option.
- Increases from three years to ten years the period after which a dormant prepaid toll account is presumed unclaimed.
- Increases the population ceiling in the definition of “small county” for purposes of the Small County Outreach Program.
- Expands the list of project types that the Tampa-Hillsborough County Expressway Authority is approved to finance with certain revenue bonds.
- Repeals obsolete bond language relating to the already-repealed Broward County Expressway Authority.

- Makes several statutory changes specific to the operation and regulation of autonomous vehicles, including:
  - Clarifies that the authorization for a person holding a valid driver license to operate an autonomous vehicle applies on the public roads of this state.
  - Revises provisions regarding the operation of autonomous vehicles on roads for testing purposes.
  - Revises equipment requirements for autonomous vehicles, requiring a system to alert an operator of a technology failure and to take control, or to stop the vehicle under certain conditions.
  - Provides an exemption from required minimum following distance, and from a prohibition on certain television-type equipment visible from a driver's seat, to users of driver-assistive truck platooning technology, as defined in the bill.
  - Requires metropolitan planning organizations to accommodate advances in vehicle technology when developing long-range transportation plans.
  - Requires the FDOT to accommodate advances in vehicle technology when updating the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Plan.
  - Authorizes television-type receiving equipment visible from the driver's seat if the vehicle is equipped with the autonomous technology and operated in autonomous mode.
  - Defines the term "Driver-Assistive Truck Platooning";
  - Requires the Florida Department of Transportation (DOT) to study, in consultation with the DHSMV, the use and safe operation of driver assistive truck platooning technology, and authorizes a pilot project to test vehicles equipped with such technology;
  - Requires manufacturers to provide certain insurance or security acceptable to the DHSMV before the start of the pilot project.
  - Provides an exemption from required minimum following distance, and from a prohibition on certain television-type equipment visible from a driver's seat, for purposes of the driver-assistive truck platooning technology pilot program.

This bill has potential fiscal impacts to the private sector. While the impacts of operating autonomous vehicles and the use of driver-assistive truck platooning technology are unknown at this time, positive economic benefits are expected in terms of improved safety and mobility, and cost and travel-time savings. With the addition of toll facility signage that provides information about alternative "no cash payment" routes, motorists may be able to avoid certain rental car company administrative charges. And while the transfer of the Pinellas Bayway System to the Florida Turnpike Enterprise may not have an immediate impact on the private sector, the construction of the replacement bridge is expected to result in more efficient travel for motorists.

The bill has an indeterminate, yet potentially significant, fiscal impact on state government. According to the FDOT analysis submitted on February 15, 2016, the toll facility signage requirements are projected to cost the department between *\$7.8 million* and *\$26.4 million*, depending on the number of retrofitted and new signs required. Any signage costs for toll facilities that are part of the Turnpike System would be paid from the Turnpike General Reserve Trust Fund; and any signage costs for FDOT-owned toll facilities that are not part of the Turnpike System would be paid from the State Transportation Trust Fund. See Section V.

The bill takes effect on July 1, 2016.

## II. Present Situation:

Due to the disparate issues in the bill, the present situation for each section is discussed below in conjunction with the Effect of Proposed Changes.

## III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

### Pinellas Bayway System (Sections 10 and 11)

#### *Present Situation*

The Pinellas Bayway System, currently owned by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), is a tolled system of bridges and causeways that provides an east-west link between St. Petersburg and St. Petersburg Beach via State Road 682. Tolls on the Pinellas Bayway System are collected by the Florida Turnpike Enterprise.<sup>1</sup> The system also serves Tierra Verde and Fort De Soto Park to the south via State Road 679. One of the bridges on State Road 679 over Boca Ciega Bay was classified as structurally deficient in 2013. “Structurally deficient,” according to the FDOT, “means that a bridge has to be repaired or replaced within six years.” The term does not mean that a bridge is unsafe.<sup>2</sup>

FDOT’s policy is to replace a structurally deficient bridge within six years of the deficient classification.<sup>3, 4</sup> The scope of the work for the bridge over Boca Ciega Bay is to replace the existing movable bridge with a high-level fixed bridge through a design-build contract, at a proposed cost of \$52.1 million.<sup>5</sup> However, no funds for replacement of the bridge are currently included in the FDOT’s District 7 work program. The FDOT advises that the balance of an existing reserve construction account for Pinellas Bayway improvements as of December 31, 2015, was \$7,326,346.13.<sup>6</sup>

#### *Bayway System Construction and Tolls*

In 1968, the predecessor of the FDOT entered into a settlement agreement in *Leonard Lee Ratner, Esther Ratner, and LEECO Gas and Oil Co., vs. State Road Department of the State of Florida*.<sup>7</sup> In the settlement agreement, the State Road Department agreed that owners and residents of real property in the Bayway Isles Development would have the right to purchase an

---

<sup>1</sup> See the Florida Transportation Commission’s *Transportation Authority Monitoring and Oversight Fiscal year 2014 Report*, at p. 95: <http://www.ftc.state.fl.us/reports/TAMO.shtm>. Last visited January 21, 2016.

<sup>2</sup> See the Bay News 9 article, “6 Bay area bridges “structurally deficient:” [http://www.baynews9.com/content/news/baynews9/news/article.html/content/news/articles/bn9/2016/1/13/tampa\\_bay\\_deficient.html](http://www.baynews9.com/content/news/baynews9/news/article.html/content/news/articles/bn9/2016/1/13/tampa_bay_deficient.html). Last visited January 21, 2016. See also the FDOT’s e-mailed response to committee staff questions re Pinellas Bayway dated January 5, 2016. (On file in the Senate Transportation Committee.)

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> Note that replacement of the old drawbridge on State Road 682 connecting St. Petersburg and St. Petersburg Beach was completed in 2014 at a cost of approximately \$41 million. See the 10 News article, “New Pinellas Bayway grand opening Friday:” <http://www.wtsp.com/story/news/traffic/road-warrior/2014/10/16/bayway/17352735/>. Last visited January 21, 2016.

<sup>5</sup> See the FDOT’s e-mailed response to committee staff questions re Pinellas Bayway System dated January 5, 2016. (On file in the Senate Transportation Committee.)

<sup>6</sup> See the FDOT email to committee staff dated January 21, 2016. (On file in the Senate Transportation Committee.)

<sup>7</sup> Copy on file in the Senate Transportation Committee.

annual pass through the toll gate at the easterly terminus of the Bayway system in St. Petersburg for \$15 per vehicle. That agreement remains in place.

Chapter 85-364, L.O.F., required a toll of \$.50, following completion of widening to four lanes from the eastern toll booth to State Road 679, at the eastern and western toll plazas on State Road 682. The FDOT was required, after payment of annual operating costs and discharge of bond indebtedness, to establish a reserve construction account to be used for widening to four lanes State Road 682 from State Road 679 west to Gulf Boulevard. Continued collection of tolls was required upon completion of the widening to reimburse the FDOT for all accrued maintenance costs for the Pinellas Bayway. In addition, ch. 85-364, L.O.F., required the FDOT to allow any person to purchase an annual pass for each motor vehicle they own at a cost of \$50 per year which exempts the motor vehicle from any Pinellas Bayway System tolls during its term. Currently the \$50 pass remains available.

Chapter 95-382, L.O.F., required tolls collected to first be placed in the construction reserve account, after payment of operating costs and bond indebtedness, to be used for construction of Blind Pass Road, State Road 699 improvements in Pinellas County, *and then* for Phase II of the Pinellas Bayway widening to four lanes of State Road 682 from State Road 679 west to Gulf Boulevard. Tolls continue to be collected to reimburse the FDOT for all accrued maintenance costs.

Section 48 of ch. 2014-223, L.O.F., repealed reference to the Blind Pass Road/State Road 699 improvements and provided that funds in the reserve construction account be used for the widening of State Road 682 from State Road 679 west to Gulf Boulevard. These improvements have been completed. As noted, however, the bridge on State Road 679 over Boca Ciega Bay has been declared structurally deficient.

Currently, for a two-axle vehicle, the toll, other than for those that hold the \$15 or the \$50 annual pass, is:

- \$.53 for SunPass customers and \$.75 for cash customers, both westbound at the East Plaza and eastbound at the West Plaza, plus \$.53 and \$.75, respectively, for each additional axle.
- \$.26 for SunPass customers and \$.50 for cash customers southbound at the south plaza, plus an additional \$.26 and \$.50, respectively, for each additional axle.<sup>8</sup>

### *Effect of Proposed Changes*

**Section 10** creates s. 338.165(11), F.S., authorizing the FDOT to transfer the Pinellas Bayway System to become part of the turnpike system. The bill also preserves the provisions of the settlement agreement and final judgment by retaining the ability to purchase a \$15 annual pass. Additionally, the bill transfers the construction reserve account to the FDOT Turnpike Enterprise when ownership of the system is transferred to the Florida Turnpike Enterprise.

The FDOT advises that the transfer of the system would allow replacement of the structurally deficient bridge over Boca Ciega Bay on SR 679 to be moved up from 2020 to 2017 in the

---

<sup>8</sup> See the Florida Turnpike Toll Calculator, click on "Tampa Area," roll over hot buttons to select the Pinellas Toll Plazas: <http://www.floridasturnpike.com/TollCalcV3/index.htm>. Last visited January 21, 2016.

FDOT work program, and funded through a combination of the accrued reserve account revenues and other financing available to the Florida Turnpike.

**Section 11** repeals ch. 85-634, L.O.F., as amended by ch. 95-382 and section 48 of ch. 2014-223, L.O.F. The ability of the specified owners and residents to purchase the \$15 annual passage through the easterly terminus of the Bayway System will remain in place, pursuant to the 1968 settlement agreement. As a result of the repeal of ch. 85-364, L.O.F., the \$50 annual pass authorized in that law would no longer be available for purchase. Current holders of those passes would be required to pay tolls at all of the Bayway toll collection points.

### **Toll Facilities No Longer Owned by the FDOT (Section 10)**

#### *Present Situation*

The Beeline-East Expressway (renamed the Beachline East Expressway) became part of the Turnpike Enterprise on July 1, 2012, pursuant to ch. 2012-128, L.O.F.<sup>9</sup> The Navarre Bridge is now county-owned and no longer a state toll facility. The references to each facility in s. 338.165(4), F.S., are now obsolete.

#### *Effect of Proposed Changes*

**Section 10** amends subsection (4) of s. 338.165, F.S., to remove obsolete references to the Beeline-East Expressway and the Navarre Bridge within the FDOT's authority to request issuance of bonds secured by toll revenues from certain toll facilities, as the expressway and bridge are no longer owned by the FDOT. The reference to the Pinellas Bayway is also removed.

### **Uniform Traffic Control Devices/School Zones (Section 3)**

#### *Present Situation*

Section 316.0745, F.S., requires the FDOT to adopt a uniform system of traffic control devices for use on the streets and highways of this state. The FDOT has adopted the Federal Highway Administration's Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) by rule.<sup>10</sup> All official traffic control signals and devices purchased and installed in this state must conform to the MUTCD.<sup>11</sup> An "official traffic control device" includes all signs, signals, markings, and devices, not inconsistent with ch. 316, F.S., placed or erected by authority of a public body or official having traffic control jurisdiction for the purpose of regulating, warning, or guiding traffic. An "official traffic control signal" includes any device, whether manually, electrically, or mechanically operated, by which traffic is alternately directed to stop and permitted to proceed.<sup>12</sup>

Similarly, s. 316.1895, F.S., requires the FDOT, pursuant to its authority in s. 316.0745, F.S., to adopt a uniform system of traffic control and pedestrian control devices for use on the streets and highways in the state surrounding all schools, public and private. Each county and municipality in the state is required to install and maintain traffic and pedestrian control devices that conform

<sup>9</sup> See s. 338.165(10), F.S.

<sup>10</sup> See Rule 14-15.010, F.A.C.

<sup>11</sup> Section 316.0745(3), F.S.

<sup>12</sup> Sections 316.003(23) and (24), F.S.

to the MUTCD.<sup>13</sup> The FDOT is required to maintain school zones located on state-maintained primary or secondary roads. Counties are required to maintain school zones located outside of any municipality and on a county road, and municipalities are required to maintain school zones located within their municipal boundaries.<sup>14</sup>

The FDOT is currently authorized, after a hearing with 14 days' notice, to direct the removal of any purported traffic control device, wherever located, that fails to meet the MUTCD requirements. In such case, the public agency that erected or installed the device must remove it immediately and is prohibited from installing any device paid for with state revenues, for five years unless prior written approval is received from the FDOT. Any additional violation by a public body or official is cause for withholding of state funds for traffic control purposes until the public body or official demonstrates compliance.<sup>15</sup>

According to media reports, disputes have arisen over the FDOT's authority to require compliant school signage that is erected or installed in a municipal school zone.<sup>16</sup>

### ***Effect of Proposed Changes***

**Section 3** amends s. 316.0745(7), F.S., to clarify the FDOT's authority with respect to uniform signals and devices. The FDOT is authorized, *upon receipt and investigation of reported noncompliance*, and after a hearing with 14 days' notice, to direct the removal of any traffic control device that fails to meet the requirements of that section, wherever the device is located *and without regard to assigned responsibility under s. 316.1895, F.S.* The FDOT may allow the erecting or installing public agency to *immediately bring the device into compliance* or remove the device or signal at the FDOT's direction. The five-year prohibition against installing traffic control devices without the FDOT's written approval, and the penalty for any additional violation, remain unchanged. If the FDOT receives a report of noncompliance, it is authorized to investigate the noncompliance, provide the notice and hearing, and order that a device or signal be made compliant or order the removal of the device or signal, regardless of existing assignment of maintenance responsibility under s. 316.1895, F.S.

## **Airport and Airport-Related Lease Terms (Section 8)**

### ***Present Situation***

In addition to certain other powers,<sup>17</sup> a municipality that has or may establish an airport or other air navigation facilities, or that has acquired, set apart, or may acquire or set apart real property for such purposes, is authorized to:

---

<sup>13</sup> Section 316.1895(1), F.S.

<sup>14</sup> Section 316.0895(3), F.S. "Maintained" is defined to mean the care and maintenance of all school zone signs, markers, and traffic and pedestrian control devices.

<sup>15</sup> Section 316.0745(7), F.S.

<sup>16</sup> See the 10 News article, *Is city staff downplaying school zone speed traps?*, available at: <http://www.wtsp.com/story/news/investigations/2015/09/29/st-pete-council-not-getting-all-facts-on-school-zone-speed-traps/73049462/>. Last visited January 25, 2016.

<sup>17</sup> See ss. 332.01-332.12, F.S.

- Lease for a term not exceeding 30 years such airports or other air navigation facilities, or real property, to private parties, any municipal or state government or the national government, or any department of either, for operation.
- Lease or assign for a term not exceeding 30 years, to the same parties, space, area, improvements, or equipment on such airports.<sup>18</sup>

Lease terms reportedly vary, depending on when a lease is negotiated, the size of the tenant's investment, and the useful life of improvements made by a tenant. While there are no set rules, and different airports have differing guidelines based upon applicable state and local statutes, it is important to consider that leases that are too long in term may prevent land from being developed in the most advantageous manner. Conversely, a lease term that is too short may prevent the potential tenant from being able to fully amortize their initial investment for the necessary improvements, thus dissuading interested tenants from entering into airport development projects.<sup>19</sup>

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has opined that *most* tenant ground leases of 30 to 35 years are sufficient to retire a tenant's initial financing and provide a reasonable return for the tenant's development of major facilities.<sup>20</sup> However, leases of up to 50 years are allowed.<sup>21</sup> Concern has been raised that the current 30-year limitation is adversely impacting the ability of municipal airports to attract tenants due to the potential inability to fully amortize initial investments.

### *Effect of Proposed Changes*

**Section 8** amends s. 332.08(1)(c), F.S., to extend the allowable term of the specified leases from 30 years to 50 years. This revision may facilitate airport development and continued economic health by providing tenant confidence in a reasonable rate of return, thereby increasing the likelihood of tenants who are willing to make investments in municipal airports.

### **Toll Facility Signage (Section 9)**

#### *Present Situation*

As the use of electronic toll collection becomes more commonplace, some toll roads have reduced the availability of cash toll collection, and in the future cash toll collections could be eliminated entirely. As more and more toll roads eliminate a cash-payment option, frequent toll road users are likely to use SunPass or receive toll invoices by mail.

Drivers using rental cars are in a different category since the vehicle is not registered to the driver. Currently, rental car companies regularly charge their customers a daily fee for the

---

<sup>18</sup> Section 332.08(1)(c), F.S. A municipality may also confer the privileges of concessions of supplying upon its airports goods, commodities, things, services, and facilities.

<sup>19</sup> See the Airport Cooperative Research Program Report 47, *Guidebook for Developing and Leasing Airport Property*, at p. 17. (On file in the Senate Transportation Committee.)

<sup>20</sup> See the FAA Airport Compliance Manual, Order 5190.6B, Chapter 12, 12.3.b.(3), available at: [http://www.faa.gov/airports/resources/publications/orders/compliance\\_5190\\_6/](http://www.faa.gov/airports/resources/publications/orders/compliance_5190_6/). Last visited January 27, 2016.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

“convenience” of using the rental car’s SunPass transponder. Fees are also charged if the rental car is assessed a toll-by-plate charge. Renters can sometimes avoid such charges and fees by using the cash payment lanes at toll booths. However, as many toll roads move towards all-electronic toll collection and cash payment options dwindle, renters may find that they have no option other than to pay the rental car companies’ additional charges and fees, or choose non-tolled roads.

### *Effect of Proposed Changes*

**Section 9** amends s. 338.155, F.S., to require toll road operators such as the FDOT and expressway and bridge authorities to clearly and plainly alert drivers that no cash payment option is available. This signage posted at on-ramps will allow drivers to choose a non-tolled alternative route and avoid administrative charges associated with toll-by-plate. Drivers of rental cars could also choose an alternative non-tolled route, rather than be forced to pay the rental car companies’ additional charges and fees.

### **Turnpike Dormant Toll Accounts (Section 12)**

#### *Present Situation*

SunPass is the Florida Turnpike’s electronic prepaid tolls program. SunPass is accepted on all Florida toll roads and nearly all toll bridges. The system uses electronic devices, called transponders, which are attached to the inside of a vehicle’s windshield. The transponder sends a signal when the vehicle goes through a tolling location, and the toll is deducted from the customer’s pre-paid account. The pre-paid accounts may be set up and replenished with a credit card or with cash.<sup>22</sup>

Under current law, any prepaid toll account of any kind which has been inactive for three years is presumed unclaimed. The Department of Financial Services (DFS) is required to process any such inactive account in accordance with applicable provisions of ch. 717, F.S., relating to the disposition of unclaimed property, and the FDOT is directed to close such accounts.<sup>23</sup>

#### *Effect of Proposed Changes*

**Section 12** amends s. 338.231(3)(c), F.S., to increase the period after which a dormant prepaid toll account is presumed unclaimed from three years to ten years, thereby delaying disposition by the DFS and closing of the account by the FDOT. The FDOT advises:

[T]he deletion is desired because, with multi-state toll interoperability already implemented, and national toll interoperability mandated by federal law,<sup>24</sup> prepaid customers may live outside Florida and use their

---

<sup>22</sup> See the SunPass website, *Frequently Asked Questions*: <https://www.sunpass.com/faq>. Last visited January 25, 2016.

<sup>23</sup> Section 338.231(3)(c), F.S.

<sup>24</sup> The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (MAP-21) requires implementation of technologies or business practices that provide for the interoperability of electronic toll collection on all Federal-aid highway toll facilities by October 1, 2016. See the FHWA website, *Investment* heading, *Tolling [1512]* subheading: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/summaryinfo.cfm>. Last visited January 25, 2016.



Florida prepaid toll account only when vacationing or otherwise visiting the state.

We believe that the affected citizens and businesses would react positively to the proposal as funds on a prepaid toll account continue to be managed by the Department. This provides the customers that have had no activity on a prepaid toll account for the 10 year time with continued direct access to the same agency with whom they established the account.<sup>25</sup>

### **Small County Outreach Program (Section 14)**

#### ***Present Situation***

The Small County Outreach Program (SCOP) is authorized in s. 339.2818, F.S. The purpose of the program is to assist small county governments in repairing or rehabilitating county bridges, paving unpaved roads, addressing road-related drainage improvements, resurfacing or reconstruction of county roads, or construction capacity or safety improvements to county roads. A small county is defined as any county that has a population of 150,000 or less as determined by the most recent official population estimate as determined by the Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR).<sup>26</sup> However, for the 2015-2016 fiscal year, a small county is defined as any county with a population of 165,000 or less.<sup>27</sup>

Small counties are eligible to compete for funds designated for projects on county roads. The FDOT provides 75 percent of the cost of the projects funded under this program. Funds paid into the State Transportation Trust Fund pursuant to s. 201.15, F.S., for the purposes of the SCOP are annually appropriated for expenditure to support the program.<sup>28</sup>

#### ***Effect of Proposed Changes***

**Section 14** amends s. 339.2818, F.S., increasing the population ceiling in the definition of “small county” from 150,000 to 170,000. The increase allows Charlotte, Martin, and Santa Rosa Counties that currently exceed the current population limit of 150,000, to be eligible for the SCOP. Those counties would still have to compete for funding and priority using the program criteria. The bill also repeals the alternative 2015-2016 fiscal year definition of “small county,” which is set to expire on July 1, 2016.

---

<sup>25</sup> See the FDOT 2015 Legislative Proposal, *Dormant Accounts/Tolls/SunPass*. On file in the Senate Transportation Committee.

<sup>26</sup> Section 186.901, F.S., requires the EDR to provide annually on April 1 population estimates of local government units, using accepted statistical practice and employing the same general guidelines used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. See the EDR website for population and demographic data as of April 1, 2015, available at: <http://www.edr.state.fl.us/Content/population-demographics/data/index.cfm>. Last visited January 26, 2016.

<sup>27</sup> This provision allowed Charlotte and Santa Rosa counties to participate in the SCOP program and is set to expire on July 1, 2016. Section 339.2818(2)(b), F.S.

<sup>28</sup> Additional SCOP funding is provided under ss. 215.211, 320.072, and 339.0801, F.S.

## **Tampa-Hillsborough County Expressway Authority Bonding (Section 17)**

### ***Present Situation***

The Tampa-Hillsborough County Expressway Authority (THEA) is an agency of the state, created in s. 348.52, F.S., for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, improving, extending, repairing, maintaining, and operating the expressway system in the Tampa metropolitan area or within Hillsborough County.<sup>29</sup> With the consent of the county within whose jurisdiction the activities occur, THEA may also construct, operate, and maintain roads, bridges, avenues of access, thoroughfares, and boulevards and managed lanes and other transit supporting facilities within the jurisdictional boundaries of contiguous counties.<sup>30</sup>

Bonds may be issued on behalf of THEA pursuant to the State Bond Act, or THEA may issue revenue bonds for construction, reconstruction, improvement, extension, repair, maintenance, and operation of the expressway system.<sup>31</sup> In addition, THEA may issue revenue bonds to finance or refinance the following projects:

- Brandon area feeder roads.
- Capital improvements to the expressway system, including safety and operational improvements and toll collection equipment.
- Lee Roy Selmon Crosstown Expressway System widening.
- The connector highway linking the Lee Roy Selmon Crosstown Expressway to Interstate 4.<sup>32</sup>

THEA may also issue revenue bonds to refund any bonds outstanding, regardless of whether the bonds being refunded were issued by THEA or on behalf of THEA.<sup>33</sup> THEA is further authorized to issue bonds for the combined purpose of:

- Paying the cost of constructing, reconstructing, improving, extending, repairing, maintaining, and operating the expressway system.
- Refunding outstanding bonds.

THEA owns and operates the Lee Roy Selmon Crosstown Expressway (Selmon Expressway),<sup>34</sup> which is a 15-mile, four-lane limited access toll road crossing the City of Tampa from Gandy Boulevard and MacDill Air Force Base in the south, through downtown Tampa and east to Brandon. The Selmon Expressway connects St. Petersburg with Tampa and Brandon via the Gandy Bridge and a short segment of Gandy Boulevard. THEA also owns and operates the

---

<sup>29</sup> “Expressway system” or “system” means a modern highway system of roads, bridges, causeways, and tunnels in the metropolitan area of the City of Tampa, or within any area of Hillsborough County, with access limited or unlimited as the authority may determine, and such buildings and structures and appurtenances and facilities related thereto, including all approaches, streets, roads, bridges, and avenues of access for such system. Section 348.51(7), F.S.

<sup>30</sup> Section 348.54(15), F.S.

<sup>31</sup> Section 348.56, F.S.

<sup>32</sup> Section 348.565, F.S.

<sup>33</sup> Section 348.57, F.S.

<sup>34</sup> The Research and Innovative Technology Administration and the USDOT have designated THEA as a test bed for autonomous vehicle technology. The Reverse Express Lanes (REL) is reportedly the only test bed in the U.S. that has the ability to do real-time traffic tests and have a closed course environment in the same location. See the Florida Transportation Commission’s *Transportation Authority Monitoring and Oversight Fiscal year 2014 Report*, at p. 80: <http://www.ftc.state.fl.us/reports/TAMO.shtm>. Last visited January 21, 2016.

Brandon Parkway, a 3.1-mile set of non-tolled feeder roads, and Reverse Express Lanes (REL) within the median of the Selmon Expressway.<sup>35</sup>

### *Effect of Proposed Changes*

**Section 17** amends s. 348.565, F.S., to revise the list of specified THEA projects for which revenue bonds may be issued for financing or refinancing purposes. The bill adds *extensions* of the Selmon Expressway as eligible projects. It also adds capital projects that THEA is authorized to acquire, construct, reconstruct, equip, operate, and maintain pursuant to part II of ch. 348, F.S., governing THEA, including, without limitation, projects identified in s. 348.54(15), F.S.; *i.e.*, projects within the jurisdictional boundaries of a consenting, contiguous county, provided that any financing does not pledge the full faith and credit of the state.

### **Broward County Expressway Authority/Obsolete Bond Language (Section 12)**

#### *Present Situation*

The Broward County Expressway Authority built the Sawgrass Expressway, a 23-mile facility that extends from its junction with Interstate 75 in Weston to its interchange with Florida's Turnpike and Southwest 10<sup>th</sup> Street in Deerfield Beach. In 1990, the FDOT acquired the expressway, and it became a part of Florida's Turnpike System.<sup>36</sup> The Expressway Authority was abolished in 2011.<sup>37</sup> Section 338.221(5), F.S., authorizes the FDOT to pledge revenues from the turnpike system to the payment of Broward County Expressway Authority bond series 1984 and series 1986-A bonds. The bonds are no longer outstanding,<sup>38</sup> and the language is obsolete.

#### *Effect of Proposed Changes*

**Section 12** repeals the obsolete language in s. 338.231(5), F.S., relating to bonds of the abolished Broward County Expressway Authority.

### **Transportation Corridors (Section 16)**

#### *Present Situation*

Section 341.0532, F.S., enacted in 2003, defines "statewide transportation corridor" as a system of transportation infrastructure that collectively provides for the efficient movement of significant volumes of intrastate, interstate, and international commerce by seamlessly linking multiple modes of transport. That section also lists eight corridors deemed "Florida's statewide transportation corridors."

In the same year, the Legislature enacted the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) which collectively serves 56 percent of State Highway System traffic, 70 percent of State Highway System truck traffic, 89 percent of interregional bus and rail passengers, 99 percent of commercial air passengers and cargo, and 100 percent of rail and waterborne freight tonnage and

---

<sup>35</sup> *Id.* at p. 79.

<sup>36</sup> See the Florida Turnpike website: [http://www.floridasturnpike.com/about\\_system.cfm#7](http://www.floridasturnpike.com/about_system.cfm#7). Last visited January 25, 2016.

<sup>37</sup> See s. 18, ch. 2011-64, Laws of Florida.

<sup>38</sup> See the FDOT email to committee staff dated February 26, 2015. On file in the Senate Transportation Committee.

cruise ship passengers.<sup>39, 40</sup> The corridors currently listed in s. 341.0532, F.S., with limited exception,<sup>41</sup> are also part of the SIS. Section 341.0532, F.S., is not referenced elsewhere in the Florida Statutes, and the FDOT advises that section is not used in performing any of its duties and responsibilities.<sup>42</sup> The statute appears to be obsolete.

### ***Effect of Proposed Changes***

Section 16 repeals s. 341.0532, F.S., which created Florida's statewide transportation corridors. The corridors continue to be managed through their inclusion in the SIS.

## **Autonomous Vehicles (Sections 4-7, 13, and 15)**

### ***Present Situation***

Autonomous or “self-driving” vehicles are those operated “without direct driver input to control the steering, acceleration, and braking and ... designed so that the driver is not expected to constantly monitor the roadway while operating in self-driving mode.”<sup>43</sup> According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), autonomous vehicles have the potential to improve highway safety, increase environmental benefits, expand mobility, and create new economic opportunities for jobs and investment.<sup>44</sup>

A review of material obtained via a simple Internet search reveals that common availability and use of such vehicles was not previously anticipated for at least a couple of decades. However, some expect increased availability and use in the relative near future, perhaps within the next five years.<sup>45</sup>

### ***Levels of Vehicle Automation and Evolving Federal Policy***

Self-driving cars are just one form of vehicle automation. The NHTSA in 2013<sup>46</sup> defined a range of vehicle automation, from vehicles with no automated control systems to fully automated vehicles.

---

<sup>39</sup> The Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) is the statewide network of high priority transportation facilities, including the state's largest and most significant airports, spaceports, deepwater seaports, freight rail terminals, interregional rail and bus terminals, rail corridors, urban fixed guideway transit corridors, waterways, and highways. The SIS is the state's highest statewide priority for transportation capacity improvements. See the FDOT SIS brochure, available at: <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/sis/Strategicplan/>. Last visited January 25, 2016.

<sup>40</sup> See the 2014 FDOT *Strategic Intermodal System Briefing*. (On file in the Senate Transportation Committee.)

<sup>41</sup> See the FDOT email, March 2, 2015. (On file in the Senate Transportation Committee.)

<sup>42</sup> *Id.*

<sup>43</sup> See the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's Press Release: *U.S. Department of Transportation Releases Policy on Automated Vehicle Development*, (May 30, 2013) available at:

<http://www.nhtsa.gov/About+NHTSA/Press+Releases/U.S.+Department+of+Transportation+Releases+Policy+on+Automated+Vehicle+Development> (last visited Jan. 25, 2016).

<sup>44</sup> See NHTSA, *Preliminary Statement of Policy Concerning Automated Vehicles*, [http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/rulemaking/pdf/Automated\\_Vehicles\\_Policy.pdf](http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/rulemaking/pdf/Automated_Vehicles_Policy.pdf) (last visited Jan. 25, 2016).

<sup>45</sup> See TechCrunch, *Autonomous Cars are Closer Than You Think* (Jan. 18, 2015), <http://techcrunch.com/2015/01/18/autonomous-cars-are-closer-than-you-think/> (last visited Jan. 25, 2016).

<sup>46</sup> See NHTSA's 2013 *Preliminary Statement of Policy Concerning Automated Vehicles*, at p. 4. (On file in the Senate Transportation Committee.)

The NHTSA also made several recommendations in its 2013 Policy Statement, including those for:

- Licensing Drivers to Operate Self-Driving Vehicles for Testing.
- State Regulations Governing Testing of Self-Driving Vehicles.
- Basic Principles for Testing of Self-Driving Vehicles.
- Regulations Governing the Operation of Self-Driving Vehicles.<sup>47</sup>

The increase in the general availability of autonomous vehicles has been the subject of much discussion. The NHTSA, however, recently updated its policy, acknowledging rapid development of emerging automation technologies and recognizing the feasibility of widespread deployment of partially and fully automated vehicles.<sup>48</sup> The NHTSA's administrator announced the NHTSA's use of available tools to accelerate deployment of technologies that can eliminate 94 percent of crashes involving human error. The NHTSA committed to working with state partners on a consistent national policy to provide options, now and in the future, for manufacturers to seek deployment of autonomous vehicles.

In an announcement on January 14, 2016, the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) outlined the following 2016 milestones:

- The NHTSA will work with industry and other stakeholders within six months of the announcement to develop guidance on the safe deployment and operation of autonomous vehicles, providing a common understanding of the performance characteristics necessary for fully autonomous vehicles and the testing and analysis methods needed to assess them.
- In the same six months, the NHTSA will work with state partners, the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, and other stakeholders to develop a model state policy on automated vehicles that offers a path to consistent national policy.
- Manufacturers are encouraged to submit rule interpretation requests where appropriate to help enable technology innovation.<sup>49</sup>
- When interpretation authority is not sufficient, manufacturers are encouraged to submit requests for use of the agency's exemption authority to allow the deployment of fully autonomous vehicles.<sup>50</sup> Exemption authority allows the NHTSA to enable the deployment of up to 2,500 vehicles for up to two years if the agency determines that an exemption would ease development of new safety features.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> NHTSA at that time recommended against states authorizing the operation of self-driving vehicles for purposes other than testing and suggested: "Should a state nevertheless decide to permit such non-testing operation of self-driving vehicles, at a minimum the state should require that a properly licensed driver (i.e., one licensed to drive self-driving vehicles) be seated in the driver's seat and be available at all times in order to operate the vehicle in situations in which the automated technology is not able to safely control the vehicle." *Id.*, at pp. 11-14.

<sup>48</sup> See NHTSA, *2016 Update to Preliminary Statement of Policy Concerning Automated Vehicles*, at p. 1: <http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/rulemaking/pdf/Autonomous-Vehicles-Policy-Update-2016.pdf> (last visited Feb. 10, 2016).

<sup>49</sup> As an example, the announcement links to a NHTSA response to a BMW request for an interpretation confirming that BMW's remote self-parking system meets the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards. The response notes that NHTSA does not provide approvals of vehicles or vehicle equipment or make determinations as to whether a product conforms to the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSSs) outside of an agency compliance test. Instead, federal law requires manufacturers to self-certify that a product conforms to all applicable FMVSSs in effect on the date of product manufacture. See the NHTSA response: <file:///C:/Users/One/Downloads/BMW-response-01042016.pdf>. Last visited January 23, 2016.

<sup>50</sup> See 49 C.F.R. Part 555.

<sup>51</sup> See 49 C.F.R., Subpart A, s. 555.6.

- The USDOT and the NHTSA will develop the new tools necessary for this new era of vehicle safety and mobility, and will consider seeking new authorities when they are necessary to ensure that fully autonomous vehicles, including those designed without a human driver in mind, are deployable in large numbers when they are demonstrated to provide an equivalent or higher level of safety than is now available.

The USDOT also announced that the President’s budget proposal for fiscal year 2017 will include nearly \$4 billion to test connected vehicle systems in designated corridors throughout the county. The budget proposal will also allow funding to be used for working with industry leaders on a common multistate structure for connected and autonomous vehicles.<sup>52</sup>

### ***State Regulation of Autonomous Vehicles***

Nevada, in 2011, was the first state to authorize operation of autonomous vehicles.<sup>53</sup> Various legislation has also been enacted by the District of Columbia and five states, including Florida.<sup>54</sup> The Florida Legislature first enacted legislation relating to autonomous vehicles in 2012<sup>55</sup> that:

- Provided legislative intent,
- Defined relevant terms,
- Provided vehicle requirements and guidelines for testing,
- Added liability provisions, and
- Required the Florida Department of Highway Safety & Motor Vehicles (DHSMV) to submit a report on recommendations for the safe testing and operation of motor vehicles equipped with autonomous technology.<sup>56</sup>

Sixteen states introduced legislation related to autonomous vehicles in 2015, an increase from 12 states in 2014, nine states and the District of Columbia introduced such legislation in 2013, and six states did so in 2012.<sup>57</sup> The most recent development at the state level occurred in California in December of 2015. The California Department of Motor Vehicles released draft autonomous vehicle deployment regulations for public comment, in preparation for “the next step toward allowing the public to operate self-driving cars on California roadways in the future.”<sup>58</sup>

### ***Current Florida Law***

*Definitions:* Section 316.003(90), F.S., defines “autonomous vehicle” as any vehicle equipped with autonomous technology. That subsection also includes a definition of “autonomous technology,” which means technology installed on a motor vehicle that has the capability to

<sup>52</sup> *Supra* note 49.

<sup>53</sup> See the National Conference of State Legislatures website for additional detail on legislation already enacted by specified states: [http://www.ncsl.org/research/transportation/autonomous-vehicles-legislation.aspx#Enacted Autonomous Vehicles Legislation](http://www.ncsl.org/research/transportation/autonomous-vehicles-legislation.aspx#Enacted_Autonomous_Vehicles_Legislation). Last visited January 23, 2016.

<sup>54</sup> The other four states are California, Michigan, North Dakota, and Tennessee. *Id.*

<sup>55</sup> Chapter 2012-174, L.O.F. See also ch. 2014-216, L.O.F.

<sup>56</sup> See the report at: <http://www.flhsmv.gov/html/HSMVAutonomousVehicleReport2014.pdf>. Last visited January 24, 2016.

<sup>57</sup> *Supra* note 50.

<sup>58</sup> This followed California’s legislation directing the adoption of safety standards and performance requirements to ensure the safe operation and testing of autonomous vehicles. See the California Department of Motor Vehicles Press Release: [https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/dmv/detail/pubs/newsrel/newsrel15/2015\\_63](https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/dmv/detail/pubs/newsrel/newsrel15/2015_63). Last visited January 23, 2016.

drive the vehicle on which the technology is installed without the active control or monitoring by a human operator.<sup>59</sup>

*Operation:* Operation of autonomous vehicles is authorized in s. 316.85, F.S. A person who possesses a valid driver license may operate an autonomous vehicle in autonomous mode.<sup>60</sup> When a person causes the vehicle's autonomous technology to engage, regardless of whether the person is physically present in the vehicle while the vehicle is operating in autonomous mode, that person is deemed the operator of the vehicle.

*Testing:* Testing of vehicles equipped with autonomous technology is authorized in s. 316.86, F.S. Employees, contractors, or other persons designated by manufacturers of autonomous technology, or by research organizations associated with accredited educational institutions, are authorized to operate such vehicles on roads in this state to test autonomous technology. A human operator must be present in the vehicle being tested, with the ability to monitor the vehicle's performance and intervene, if necessary, unless the vehicle is being tested or demonstrated on a closed course.<sup>61</sup> Before testing, the entity performing the testing must submit an instrument of insurance, surety bond, or proof of self-insurance acceptable to the DHSMV in the amount of \$5 million.<sup>62</sup>

*Vehicle Requirements:* Section 319.145, F.S., requires an autonomous vehicle registered in this state<sup>63</sup> to meet federal standards and regulations for a motor vehicle. This section of law is expressly superseded when in conflict with NHTSA federal regulations. In addition, an autonomous vehicle must:

- Have a means to engage and disengage the autonomous technology which is easily accessible to the operator.
- Have a means, inside the vehicle, to visually indicate when the vehicle is operating in autonomous mode.
- Have a means to alert the operator of the vehicle if a technology failure affecting the ability of the vehicle to safely operate autonomously is detected while the vehicle is operating autonomously in order to indicate to the operator to take control of the vehicle.

---

<sup>59</sup> The latter definition does not include a motor vehicle enabled with active safety systems or driver assistance systems, including, without limitation, a system to provide electronic blind spot assistance, crash avoidance, emergency braking, parking assistance, adaptive cruise control, lane keep assistance, lane departure warning, or traffic jam and queuing assistant, unless any such system alone or in combination with other systems enables the vehicle on which the technology is installed to drive without the active control or monitoring by a human operator.

<sup>60</sup> The DHSMV will authorize a person who possesses a valid driver license to operate an autonomous vehicle in autonomous mode on a Florida roadway, but only if manufacturers of the technology designate the person as a driver for testing purposes. See the DHSMV publication, *Excellence in Service, Education, and Enforcement*, Summer 2012, heading "2012 Legislative Update," at p. 1: <http://www.flhsmv.gov/html/CJSummer2012.pdf>. Last visited January 24, 2016.

<sup>61</sup> The DHSMV will authorize operation of an autonomous vehicle in autonomous mode without a human physically present in the vehicle only on a closed course. See the DHSMV email to committee staff dated January 25, 2016. On filed in the Senate Transportation Committee.

<sup>62</sup> This section of the law also provides immunity from certain liability for the original manufacturer of a vehicle converted by a third party into an autonomous vehicle under specified conditions. Section 316.86(2), F.S.

<sup>63</sup> Chapter 320, F.S., reflects no vehicle registration provision specific to autonomous vehicles.

- Be capable of being operated in compliance with the applicable traffic and motor vehicle laws of this state.

### ***Television-Type Equipment in Motor Vehicles***

Section 316.303(1) and (3), F.S., currently prohibits operation of a motor vehicle if it is equipped with television-type receiving equipment that is visible from the driver's seat. However, an electronic display used in conjunction with a vehicle navigation system is not prohibited.

### ***Local Regulation of Autonomous Vehicles***

Current Florida law contains no provision addressing local regulation of autonomous vehicles.

### ***Transportation Planning and Autonomous Vehicles***

Section 339.175(7), F.S., requires metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to develop a long-range transportation plan addressing at least a 20-year planning horizon. The plans must be consistent, to the maximum extent feasible, with local government comprehensive plans of the local governments located within the jurisdiction of the MPO.

Section 339.64, F.S., requires the FDOT to develop and update every five years, in cooperation with MPOs, regional planning councils, local governments, and other transportation providers, a Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) Plan. The plan must be consistent with the Florida Transportation Plan.<sup>64</sup>

### ***Effect of Proposed Changes:***

**Section 4** amends s. 316.303(1) and (3), F.S., to authorize active display of moving television broadcast or pre-recorded video entertainment content visible from the driver's seat while the vehicle is in motion if the vehicle is equipped with autonomous technology and operated in autonomous mode.

**Section 5** amends s. 316.85, F.S., to expressly authorize a person holding a valid driver license to operate an autonomous vehicle in autonomous mode on roads in this state if the vehicle is equipped with autonomous technology, as defined in s. 316.003, F.S. Operation of an autonomous vehicle on roads in this state would no longer be limited to licensed drivers designated for testing purposes.

**Section 6** amends s. 316.86, F.S., to remove provisions regarding the operation of vehicles equipped with autonomous technology on roads for testing purposes, including the provisions:

- Authorizing employees, contractors, or other persons designated by manufacturers of autonomous technology, or by research organizations associated with accredited educational institutions, to operate such vehicles on roads in this state to test autonomous technology.

---

<sup>64</sup> The Florida Transportation Plan is a statewide transportation plan that considers the needs of the entire state transportation system and examines the use of all modes of transportation to meet such needs. The purpose of the plan is to establish and define the state's long-range transportation goals and objectives over a period of at least 20 years. See s. 339.155, F.S.



- Requiring a human operator to be present in the vehicle being tested, with the ability to monitor the vehicle's performance and intervene, if necessary, unless the vehicle is being tested or demonstrated on a closed course.
- Requiring the specified proof of insurance or surety bond before testing.

The original manufacture liability protections are not amended.

**Section 7** amends s. 319.145, F.S., to clarify that registered autonomous vehicles must meet *applicable* federal standards and regulations for such vehicles. This section also requires an autonomous vehicle to have a system to safely alert the operator if an autonomous technology failure is detected while the autonomous technology is engaged. When an alert is given, the system must:

- Require the operator to take control of the autonomous vehicle, or
- If the operator does not or is unable to take control, be capable of bringing the vehicle to a complete stop.

The latter revision replaces the currently required easily accessible means by which the operator engages and disengages the technology, and the required means to alert the operator of a described technology failure to indicate to the operator to take control of the vehicle.

Taken together, these sections of the bill authorize operation of autonomous vehicles equipped with the defined autonomous technology on the public roads of this state by any person holding a valid driver license, without the need to be designated by an autonomous vehicle manufacturer for testing purposes, and without any testing. The physical presence of an operator is no longer required. Autonomous vehicles registered in this state must continue to meet federal standards and regulations that apply to such vehicles. To the extent that any new provision in the bill regarding vehicle equipment is or becomes in conflict with federal law, the bill's provision would be superseded.

**Section 13** amends s. 339.175(3)(c)2., F.S., to include in an MPO's capital investment assessment the goal of improving safety while making the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities. In addition, MPOs are required to consider in developing long-range transportation plans infrastructure and technological improvements necessary to accommodate advances in vehicle technology, such as autonomous vehicle technology and other developments.

**Section 15** amends s. 339.64, F.S., to require the FDOT when updating the SIS Plan to coordinate with federal, regional, and local partners, as well as industry representatives, to consider infrastructure and technological improvements to the SIS necessary to accommodate advances in vehicle technology.

#### **Driver-Assistive Truck Platooning (Sections 1, 2, and 4)**

##### ***Present Situation***

In August of 2014, the NHTSA issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking, following the NHTSA's earlier announcement that the agency will begin working on a regulatory proposal to

require vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) devices in passenger cars and light trucks in a future year. V2V is a crash avoidance technology, relying on communication of information between nearby vehicles to warn drivers about dangerous situations that could lead to a crash.<sup>65</sup> The NHTSA advises that, “Using V2V technology, vehicles ranging from cars to trucks and buses to trains could one day be able to communicate important safety and mobility information to one another that can help save lives, prevent injuries, ease traffic congestion, and improve the environment.”<sup>66</sup>

One form of V2V technology is known as driver-assistive truck platooning (DATP), which allows trucks to communicate with each other and to travel as close as thirty feet apart with automatic acceleration and braking. A draft is created, reducing wind resistance and cutting down on fuel consumption.<sup>67</sup>

The DATP concept is based on a system that controls inter-vehicle spacing based on information from forward-looking radars and direct vehicle-to-vehicle communications. Braking and other operational data is constantly exchanged between the trucks, enabling the control system to automatically adjust engine and brakes in real-time. This allows equipped trucks to travel closer together than manual operations would safely allow. Platooning technology is increasingly a subject of interest in the truck community, with multiple companies developing prototypes.<sup>68</sup>

One such system uses integrated sensors, controls, and wireless communications for “connected” trucks. The system is cloud-based, determining in real time whether traffic conditions are appropriate to allow specific trucks to engage in platooning operations. Using V2V communications, the system synchronizes acceleration and braking between tractor-trailers, leaving steering to the drivers, but eliminating braking distance otherwise caused by lags in the front or rear driver’s response time. The following vehicle is provided video showing the lead truck’s line of sight while the lead vehicle is provided video showing the area behind the following truck. If another vehicle enters between platooning trucks, the system will automatically increase following distance or delink the trucks and then relink once the cut-in risk has passed. If data transfer between platooning trucks ceases, the driver is immediately notified that manual acceleration and braking control is about to resume.<sup>69</sup>

Currently, s. 316.0895, F.S., prohibits a driver of a motor vehicle to follow another vehicle more closely than is reasonable and prudent. It is unlawful, when traveling upon a roadway outside a business or residence district, for a motor truck, motor truck drawing another vehicle, or vehicle towing another vehicle or trailer to follow within 300 feet of another vehicle.

---

<sup>65</sup> See the USDOT Fact Sheet on Vehicle-To-Vehicle Communication Technology, *available at*:

[http://www.its.dot.gov/safety\\_pilot/pdf/safetypilot\\_nhtsa\\_factsheet.pdf](http://www.its.dot.gov/safety_pilot/pdf/safetypilot_nhtsa_factsheet.pdf). On file in the Senate Transportation Committee.

<sup>66</sup> See the NHTSA *Vehicle-to-Vehicle Communications*, <http://www.safercar.gov/v2v/index.html>. Last visited January 25, 2016.

<sup>67</sup> See the GBT Global News website: <http://www.gobytrucknews.com/driver-survey-platooning/123>. Last visited January 25, 2016.

<sup>68</sup> See the American Transportation Research Institute, *ATRI Seeks Input on Driver Assistive Truck Platooning* (Nov. 17, 2014), <http://atri-online.org/2014/11/17/atri-seeks-input-on-driver-assistive-truck-platooning/>. Last visited January 25, 2016.

<sup>69</sup> See Peloton, *FAQ*, <http://www.peloton-tech.com/faq/> (last visited Jan. 25, 2016).

Additionally, s. 316.303, F.S., prohibits the operation of a motor vehicle with television-type receiving equipment that is visible from the driver's seat. This prohibition does not apply to an electronic display used in conjunction with a vehicle navigation system.<sup>70</sup>

***Effect of Proposed Changes***

**Section 1** amends s. 316.003, F.S., to define the term “driver-assistive truck platooning technology.”

**Section 2** requires the FDOT to study, in consultation with the DHSMV, the use and safe operation of driver assistive truck platooning technology for the purpose of developing a pilot project to test vehicles equipped with such technology.

The bill authorizes the FDOT, upon conclusion of the study and in consultation with the DHSMV, to conduct a pilot project that tests the operation of vehicles equipped with driver-assistive truck platooning technology.<sup>71</sup> The pilot project may be conducted notwithstanding the traffic control provisions related to following too closely and television-type equipment in motor vehicles.<sup>72</sup> Prior to the start of the pilot project, manufacturers of driver-assistive truck platooning technology being tested in the pilot project must submit to the DHSMV an instrument of insurance, surety bond, or proof of self-insurance in the amount of \$5 million.

The DOT, in consultation with the DHSMV, shall submit the results of the study and any findings or recommendations from the pilot project to the Governor, Senate President, and Speaker of the House upon conclusion of the pilot project.

**Section 4** amends s. 316.303(3), F.S., to allow vehicles equipped and operating with driver-assistive truck platooning technology to be equipped with electronic displays visible from the driver's seat, and to authorize the operator of a vehicle equipped and operating with truck platooning technology to use an electronic display.

The bill takes effect July 1, 2016.

**IV. Constitutional Issues:**

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

---

<sup>70</sup> Section 316.303, F.S.

<sup>71</sup> The pilot project may be conducted in such a manner and at such locations as determined by the DOT.

<sup>72</sup> Sections 316.0895 and 316.303, F.S.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

**Sections 4 through 7, 13, and 15:** The impact of the provisions in PCS/CS/SB 1392 relating to the operation of autonomous vehicles is unknown. The private sector may realize positive economic benefits in terms of improved safety and mobility, and cost and travel-time savings. The companies that sell vehicles with autonomous technology may experience more sales to the extent that the bill promotes wider use of such vehicles.

**Sections 1, 2, and 4:** Depending on the outcome of the pilot project, the bill may have an indeterminate positive fiscal impact on companies that sell or use driver-assistive truck platooning technology.

**Section 9:** The required toll facility signage may assist motorists in avoiding unwanted administrative expenses associated with toll-by-plate billing and rental car company charges for use of a company's electronic transponder, by notifying motorists that no cash payment option is available.

**Section 10:** Transfer of ownership of the Pinellas Bayway System from the FDOT to the Florida Turnpike Enterprise does not appear to have an immediate impact on the private sector but a positive fiscal impact may be realized upon construction of the replacement bridge in terms of more efficient travel.

C. Government Sector Impact:

**Section 9:** The additional required toll facility signage presents an indeterminate fiscal impact to the FDOT and expressway and bridge authorities. However, an analysis of the bill submitted by FDOT on February 15, 2016 states the following department concerns:<sup>73</sup>

The addition of requirements for signage notifying drivers if cash payment of a toll is not an available option at a facility results in an estimated fiscal impact between *\$7.8 million* and *\$26.4 million* (see following table) depending on the number of signs retrofitted versus placement of new signs. Increases in operation and

---

<sup>73</sup> See the FDOT 2016 analysis of Senate Bill 1392. On file in the Senate Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development.

maintenance costs on the Turnpike system will reduce the amount invested in construction projects by the amount needed to comply with the new law.

Cost estimates in the following table are not reflective of costs for non-department toll facilities within the state (e.g. authority or local toll facilities).

| <b>Location of Signage</b>                               | <b>Qty</b> | <b>Low End<sup>74</sup></b> | <b>Comments</b>                         | <b>Qty</b> | <b>High End<sup>75</sup></b> | <b>Comments</b>                         |
|--|------------|-----------------------------|---|------------|------------------------------|---|
| All Electronic Tolling facilities                        | 90         | \$140,400                   | place test on existing signs            | 90         | \$993,600                    | new multi-post signs                    |
| Roadways connecting to All Electronic Tolling facilities | 163        | \$804,000                   | new multi-post signs                    | 163        | \$18,452,400                 | new overhead cantilever sign structures |
| Ingress to Express Lane facilities                       | 88         | \$6,916,800                 | new overhead cantilever sign structures | 88         | \$6,916,800                  | new overhead cantilever sign structures |
| <b>Totals</b>  |            | <b>\$7,861,200</b>          |   |            | <b>\$26,362,800</b>          |   |

According to the FDOT, it is unknown at this time whether the department could pursue the Low End (existing signs) alternative or if the High End (new signs) alternative would be required. The department would have to assess this on a location by location basis considering visibility to the customer, traffic operations, design/engineering issues, and right-of-way concerns (existing land sufficient or require acquisition). These figures do not account for future All Electronic Tolling (AET) or Express Lane projects that are in the planning phase. Including such projects would increase the estimates above.

Any signage costs for toll facilities that are part of the Turnpike System would be paid from the Turnpike General Reserve Trust Fund; and any signage costs for FDOT-owned toll facilities that are not part of the Turnpike System would be paid from the State Transportation Trust Fund.

<sup>74</sup> According to FDOT, the Low End and High End figures represent calculated totals, i.e. unit prices multiplied by quantities. Supra note 73.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

**Section 10:** The transfer of ownership of the Pinellas Bayway System does not appear to have any immediate fiscal impact, as the transfer occurs without the expenditure of any funds. Aside from the project cost information on replacing the structurally deficient bridge over Boca Ciega Bay on SR 679 provided by the Florida Department of Transportation, the method by which replacement will be funded or financed is unknown.

**Section 14:** Increasing the population ceiling in the Small County Outreach Program definition of “small county” from 150,000 to 170,000 will allow Charlotte, Martin, and Santa Rosa Counties to be eligible to participate in the program. Those counties would still have to compete for funding and priority using the program criteria.

**Section 17:** The Tampa-Hillsborough County Expressway Authority bonding provisions pose no immediate fiscal impact. The fiscal impact of any potential bonding is unknown.

## **VI. Technical Deficiencies:**

The revision of the definition of “driver-assistive truck platooning” refers to compliance with NHTSA rules regarding vehicle-to-vehicle “*platooning*.” The definition should refer to rules for vehicle-to-vehicle “*communications*.”

## **VII. Related Issues:**

Under current law, the “operator” of an autonomous vehicle is the person who engages the technology. The identity of the “operator” of an unoccupied vehicle is unclear.

According to the FDOT, “Autonomous vehicle technology development and testing is being evaluated in a test track setting. Coordination with federal and local partners will be completed within existing resources. It may be several years before the department can estimate the infrastructure investment needed to support autonomous vehicle operations on state roads.”<sup>76</sup>

Further, the FDOT has indicated that the department and the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are directed to consider infrastructure and technological improvements during the development of the Five-Year Work Program and Long Range Transportation Plan, respectively. Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technological solutions are considered during this process. Consideration of autonomous vehicle technology introduces a new demand on funding. It is difficult to estimate the amount of future investments in technological solutions versus infrastructure solutions.<sup>77</sup>

## **VIII. Statutes Affected:**

This bill substantially amends the following sections of the Florida Statutes: 316.003, 316.0745, 316.303, 316.85, 316.86, 319.145, 332.08, 338.155, 338.165, 338.231, 339.175, 339.2818, 339.64, and 348.565.

---

<sup>76</sup> *Supra* note 73.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

This bill repeals section 341.0532 of the Florida Statutes.

This bill repeals ch. 85-364, as amended by ch. 95-382 and section 48 of ch. 2014-223, Laws of Florida.

## **IX. Additional Information:**

- A. **Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:**  
(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

### **Recommended CS/CS by Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Tourism, and Economic Development on February 17, 2016:**

The committee substitute:

- Revises the definition for driver-assistive truck platooning (DATP) technology and requires compliance with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) rules regarding vehicle-to-vehicle communications.
- Requires FDOT, in consultation with the DHSMV, to study the use and safe operation of DATP technology; authorizes a pilot project upon conclusion of the study to test vehicles equipped with the technology; requires insurance coverage by the manufacturers that participate in the pilot; and requires the findings to be submitted to the Governor and Legislature.
- Revises the provisions in the bill relating to television-type receiving equipment visible from the driver's seat in vehicles equipped with DAPT technology.

### **CS by Transportation on January 27, 2016:**

The CS modifies the bill by:

- Removing from the bill preemption of regulation and operation of autonomous vehicles to the state.
- Revising equipment requirements for autonomous vehicles by requiring a system to alert an operator of a technology failure and to take control, or to stop the vehicle under certain conditions.
- Extending the authorized term of certain airport-related leases.
- Requiring signage at toll facilities notifying drivers if cash payment is not an option.
- Transferring certain funds to be used to help fund the costs of repair and replacement of the Pinellas Bayway System.
- Increasing the population ceiling in the definition of “small county” for purposes of the Small County Outreach Program.
- Expanding the list of THEA project types approved to be financed by certain revenue bonds.

B. Amendments:

None.

---

This Senate Bill Analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's introducer or the Florida Senate.

---