

STORAGE NAME: h0159.tr.doc

DATE: December 27, 2001

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON
TRANSPORTATION
ANALYSIS**

BILL #: HB 159

RELATING TO: Road designations

SPONSOR(S): Representative(s) Bullard

TIED BILL(S):

ORIGINATING COMMITTEE(S)/COUNCIL(S)/COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERENCE:

- (1) TRANSPORTATION
 - (2) COUNCIL FOR READY INFRASTRUCTURE
 - (3)
 - (4)
 - (5)
-

I. SUMMARY:

Section 334.071, F.S., explains the process for the Legislature to designate roads, bridges and other transportation facilities for honorary or memorial purposes.

HB 159 proposes four such honorary designations along U.S. 1 in Miami-Dade County:

- ❑ That portion of U.S. 1, between S.W. 136th Street and S.W. 186th Street, would be designated "Steven Cranman Boulevard."
- ❑ That portion of S.W. 186th Street, between U.S. 1 and S.W. 107th Avenue, would be designated "Ethel Beckford Boulevard."
- ❑ That portion of State Road 5 (also known as U.S. 1, between S.W. 312th Street and S.W. 328th Street, would be designated "Phicol Williams Boulevard."
- ❑ That portion of S.W. 112 Avenue, from U.S. 1 to S.W. 230 Street, would be designated "Arthur Mays Boulevard."

The Florida Department of Transportation (DOT) estimates it would incur an initial cost of \$2,000 to produce and install the road markers bearing these honorary designations.

HB 159 takes effect upon becoming a law.

SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

A. DOES THE BILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES:

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 1. <u>Less Government</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. <u>Lower Taxes</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. <u>Individual Freedom</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. <u>Personal Responsibility</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. <u>Family Empowerment</u> | 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. PRESENT SITUATION:

Section 334.071, F.S., explains the process for legislative designations of transportation facilities for honorary or memorial purposes, or to distinguish a particular facility. The legislative designations do not erase the current names of the facilities, nor do they require local governments and private entities to change street signs or addresses. Some public roads and bridges have multiple or overlapping designations.

Based on DOT records, 969 honorary road and bridge designations have been approved since 1922, most of them by the Legislature.

C. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

HB 159 creates four honorary road designations in Miami-Dade County. They are:

- o That portion of U.S. 1, between S.W. 136th Street and S.W. 186th Street, would be designated “Steven Cranman Boulevard.”
- o That portion of S.W. 186th Street, between U.S. 1 and S.W. 107th Avenue, would be designated “Ethel Beckford Boulevard.”
- o That portion of State Road 5 (also known as U.S. 1, between S.W. 312th Street and S.W. 328th Street, would be designated “Phicol Williams Boulevard.”
- o That portion of S.W. 112 Avenue, from U.S. 1 to S.W. 230 Street, would be designated “Arthur Mays Boulevard.”

The bill also directs DOT to erect suitable markers conveying these designations.

D. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:

Section 1: Designates portions of roads in Miami-Dade County as “Steven Cranman Boulevard” and “Ethel Beckford Boulevard.” Directs DOT to erect markers.

Section 2: Designates a portion of a road in Miami-Dade County as “Phicol Williams Boulevard.” Directs DOT to erect markers.

Section 3: Designates a portion of a road in Miami-Dade County as "Arthur May Boulevard."
Directs DOT to erect markers.

Section 4: Specifies this act shall take effect upon becoming a law.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

DOT expects initially to incur an estimated cost of \$2,000 to implement the bill. Production and installation costs are estimated at \$250 per marker, and each designated road gets two markers. DOT also expects indeterminate recurring costs of maintaining these signs and replacing them, over time.

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. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

The mandates provision is not applicable to an analysis of HB 159 because the bill does not require cities or counties to expend funds, or to take actions requiring the expenditure of funds.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

The bill does not reduce the revenue-raising authority of counties or municipalities.

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

The bill does not reduce the state tax revenues shared with counties or municipalities.

STORAGE NAME: h0159.tr.doc

DATE: December 27, 2001

PAGE: 4

IV. COMMENTS:

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

HB 159 does not raise any constitutional issues.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

DOT has sufficient rulemaking authority to implement HB 159.

C. OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

V. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

Not applicable.

VI. SIGNATURES:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION :

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

Joyce Pugh

Phillip B. Miller