

**STORAGE NAME:** h0035.tr.doc

**DATE:** December 7, 2001

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE ON  
TRANSPORTATION  
ANALYSIS**

**BILL #:** HB 35

**RELATING TO:** Expressway authorities

**SPONSOR(S):** Representative(s) Allen

**TIED BILL(S):**

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

- (1) TRANSPORTATION
- (2) FISCAL POLICY & RESOURCES
- (3) COUNCIL FOR SMARTER GOVERNMENT
- (4)
- (5)

---

I. SUMMARY:

The Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority (OOCEA) is one of nine such authorities specifically created in law, although there are several other local road or bridge authorities that operate under the general auspices of Part I of Chapter 348, F.S. The majority of these transportation-related authorities must work through the State Board of Administration's Division of Bond Finance in order to issue bonds; exceptions include the Miami-Dade County Expressway Authority, the Santa Rosa Bay Bridge Authority and the Mid Bay Bridge Authority.

HB 35 amends several sections of Chapter 348, F.S., to update or clarify language related to the OOCEA, but the primary changes allow the expressway authority to issue its own revenue bonds. These bonds would be repaid through toll revenues. Also, the revenue bonds issued by the OOCEA would not pledge the full faith and credit of the State of Florida, meaning the state would not be legally required to repay them if OOCEA can not make the debt service payments.

There is no state appropriation in HB 35.

HB 35 takes effect upon becoming law.

SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

A. DOES THE BILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES:

- |                                   |                              |                                        |                                         |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 1. <u>Less Government</u>         | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input 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"/> |

HB 35 expands government activity because it would allow the OOCEA to issue its own bonds. (See "D. FISCAL COMMENTS" below.)

B. PRESENT SITUATION:

The Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority (OOCEA) was created by the Legislature in 1963. Its first project, the Beeline Expressway (State Road 528) opened to traffic four years later. Comprising the system are 90 total centerline miles, 11 main toll plazas, 42 ramp toll plazas, and 186 total toll lanes. More than 186 million motorists used the toll lanes in fiscal year 2000. OOCEA has adopted a 2025 Expressway Master Plan that includes expansions of the current system to better link with I-4, adding new lanes, and upgrading its toll plazas.

OOCEA's 2000 Annual Report indicated that for the seventh year in a row, the expressway authority experienced double-digit traffic and revenue growth. For example, total system revenues grew from \$112.4 million in 1999 to \$125.55 million in 2000. Forty-eight percent of the expressway authority's 2000 revenues were earmarked to pay debt service. The vast majority of OOCEA's revenues are from tolls charged to motorists who travel on its expressways.

Pursuant to the State Bond Act discussed in Chapter 215, F.S., and Chapter 348, F.S., the State Board of Administration's Division of Bond Finance issues revenue bonds for OOCEA's projects on behalf of the authority. The revenue bonds issued by the Division on behalf of OOCEA pledge the toll revenues generated by the authority's expressway system as repayment.

Some local-government transportation entities, such as the Miami-Dade County Expressway Authority, the Santa Rosa Bay Bridge Authority and the Mid Bay Bridge Authority, have specific authority to issue their own revenue bonds, independently of the Division of Bond Finance.

C. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Sections 348.0012, 348.754, 348.7543, 348.7544, 348.7545, 348.755, and 348.765, F.S., are amended in various ways to give the OOCEA authority to issue its own bonds, without having to seek the state's review and approval. OOCEA would retain the option of going through the Division of Bond Finance. A specific amendment to s. 348.755, F.S., specifies that the bonds sold by OOCEA "shall not pledge the full faith and credit of the state," meaning the State of Florida would not be legally liable for repaying them.

HB 35 also specifically lists in statutes a number of activities related to road construction and maintenance for which OOCEA's revenues may be used. For example, the OOCEA would specifically be able to "acquire, finance ... and equip" any extensions, additions or improvements to

its expressway system; current statutes give the OOCEA authority to construct or improve its system. The new language clarifies what OOCEA already has been doing.

D. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:

**Section 1:** Amends s. 348.0012, F.S., to delete confusing language and to recognize that some expressway authorities may extend into multiple counties.

**Section 2:** Amends s. 348.7544, F.S., to add that the OOCEA may refinance its Northwest Beltway Part A with bonds it issues.

**Section 3:** Amends s. 348.754, F.S., to broaden the type of construction-related activities on which the OOCEA may spend bond proceeds. Rewords the section for clarity.

**Section 4:** Amends s. 348.7573, F.S., to broaden the types of system improvements on which the OOCEA may spend bond funds.

**Section 5:** Amends s. 348.7545, F.S., to add that the OOCEA may refinance its Western Beltway Part C with bonds it issues.

**Section 6:** Amends s. 348.755, F.S., to allow the OOCEA to issue bonds on its own behalf. Specifies that such bonds shall not pledge the full faith and credit of the state. Restates that bonds may be issued on its behalf pursuant to the State Bond Act. Makes clarifying changes.

**Section 7:** Specifies that 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:

None.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

Indeterminate. See "D. FISCAL COMMENTS" below.

2. Expenditures:

Indeterminate. See "D. FISCAL COMMENTS" below.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

Indeterminate. See "D. FISCAL COMMENTS" below.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

Passage of HB 35 does not necessarily mean the OOCEA will rush to sell several bond issuances for new projects or improvements to existing toll roads and plazas. Theoretically at least, bond buyers favor low-risk investments, meaning those bonds that have secure financial backing. It would not be in OOCEA's best interests to stretch thin its projected toll revenues in order to issue a lot of bonds for new projects.

It is unknown how much more cost, if any, OOCEA would incur by selling its own bonds, or how much more it could receive in bond proceeds if HB 35 passes. Similarly, it is unknown whether construction companies that specialize in toll road or toll plaza projects will benefit from HB 35.

Finally, the state Division of Bond Finance generally cautions against allowing legislatively created authorities or entities to issue bonds -- even revenue bonds that do not pledge the full faith and credit of the State of Florida. In the view of Division staff, just because the state cannot legally be required to repay defaulted bonds, the negative fallout can mar Florida's financial reputation and could result in a lower bond rating for the state.

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 35 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:

HB 35 does not reduce the authority that municipalities or counties have to raise revenues in the aggregate.

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

HB 35 does not reduce the percentage of a state tax shared with counties or municipalities.

IV. COMMENTS:

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

HB 35 raises no constitutional issues.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

No rulemaking authority is required for the implementation of HB 35.

C. OTHER COMMENTS:

Statutory changes nearly identical to those in HB 35 passed during the 2001 legislative session in CS/CS/HB 1053, Enrolled, which was vetoed by the Governor for reasons unrelated to the OOCEA issues.

**STORAGE NAME:** h0035.tr.doc

**DATE:** December 7, 2001

**PAGE:** 5

V. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

The bill sponsor will offer a strike-everything-after-the-enacting clause to include additional, mostly technical, changes to existing statutes in Chapter 348, F.S.

VI. SIGNATURES:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION :

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

---

Joyce Pugh

---

Phillip B. Miller