

Virginia Department of Transportation

2001 Fiscal Impact Statement

1. Bill Number: HB 1645 S 1

House of Origin ☐ Introduced ☒ Substitute ☐ Engrossed
Second House ☐ In Committee ☐ Substitute ☐ Enrolled

2. Patron: Jackson, T.

3. Committee: Senate Transportation

4. Title: Subdivision Streets

5. Summary/Purpose:

Advances from 7/1/88 to 7/1/1990 the qualifying date that old, substandard subdivision streets must meet in order to be eligible for addition (in qualifying counties) to the secondary system of state highways for improvement at public expense.

6. Fiscal Impacts are unavailable

6a. Expenditure Impact:

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Positions</i>	<i>Fund</i>
2000-01	\$0.00	0	
2001-02	\$0.00	0	
2002-03	\$0.00	0	

b. Revenue Impact:

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Positions</i>	<i>Fund</i>
2000-01	\$0.00	0	
2001-02	\$0.00	0	
2002-03	\$0.00	0	

7. Budget amendment necessary: NO

8. Fiscal implications: The mileage of roads under county jurisdiction that might qualify for addition and improvement as part of the secondary system is unknown, but is believed to be several hundred miles. This change will shift to the public an indeterminate cost for road improvements normally and traditionally borne by the developers of the land and the owners (home-buyers) of the land served. This bill increases established road improvement needs to include an unidentified mileage of roads developed, under county jurisdiction as privately maintained subdivision streets, between July 1, 1988 and the proposed cut-off date.

9. Specific agency or political subdivisions affected: VDOT and all counties (other than Arlington and Henrico) having approved subdivision ordinances as defined in §33.1-72.1B.

10. Technical amendment necessary: NO

11. Other comments: We can find no differences between the substitute bill and the original bill.

Continuing to advance the subject date creates an inequity between (a) taxpayers thought to benefit from lower cost property purchases and those that sustained the full cost of a quality road as part of the cost of their land and (b) counties that require quality roads for development vs those that allow sub-standard roads to serve new subdivisions.

This bill conveys the impression that the state will bear the cost of developing roads to acceptable standards that is normally a cost for which the developer and the buyers of the land are responsible.

Date: 02/05/2001

Document: filename here (v Document1)

cc: Secretary of Transportation

PDF Created 2/14/2001 10:12:32 AM