NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

LEGISLATIVE FISCAL NOTE

BILL NUMBER: Proposed Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 233

SHORT TITLE:	Loop Funds -	TACs may r	redirect		
<pre>SPONSOR(S): etc.</pre>	Senators Hamilt	ton Horton,	Jr., J. M	ark McDaniel	l, Jr.,
	Expenditures: Revenues: No Impact () No Estimate Ava	Increase	() De		
FUND AFFECTED:	General Fund (Other Funds (${f x}$				
BILL SUMMARY: The to redirect funds metropolitan area	designated for		_	_	
EFFECTIVE DATE: T	he act is effec	ctive upon	ratificati	on	
PRINCIPAL DEPARTM	ENT(S)/PROGRAM	(S) AFFECTE	D:		
FISCAL IMPACT					
	FY FY	FY	FY	FY	
REVENUES: GENERAL FUND HIGHWAY FUND HIGHWAY TRUST F LOCAL EXPENDITURES	'UND				
POSITIONS:					
ASSUMPTIONS AND M substitute project does not increase December, 1994, D urban loops excl	ts for the loom the amount of OOT projected th	os intended money goir ne followir	d for theirng to a reg	area. The ion. As of	act

	Loop Amount	% Project Authorized
Asheville	\$ 99,300,000	0%
Charlotte	825,927,704	29.3
Durham	90,350,000	0
Greensboro	529,164,322	0
Raleigh	566,621,008	13.4
Wilmington	158,975,000	0
Winston-Salem	307,050,000	0

The local governments must stay within the estimated project cost of their loop when petitioning DOT to redirect funds to other projects. Only Raleigh and Charlotte have received construction funds to date.

While the total spending from the Trust Fund is capped by the DOT project estimates shown above, there is one potential cost of the bill. DOT could, unintentionaly, waste project funds if it commits funds for design and right-of-way acquisition on a loop, then the local government decides against loop construction. The bill does not address when a loop can be stopped and another project substituted. On the Durham, Wilmington, and Winston-Salem loops, \$4.2 million had been spent on preliminary engineering as of December, 1994. The local governments would have to act immediately after passage of this bill to decide whether to proceed with the loops or go to alternative projects in order to prevent DOT from investing further into project planning and design. This potential expense could be avoided if a deadline were imposed on local governments to act on whether or not to build a loop.

SOURCES OF DATA: Department of Transportation

TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

FISCAL RESEARCH DIVISION

733-4910

PREPARED BY: Richard Bostic

APPROVED BY: Tom L. Covington TomC

DATE: April 24, 1995

Official
Fiscal Research Division
Publication

Signed Copy Located in the NCGA Principal Clerk's Offices