COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 1302-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 256

Subject: Motor Vehicles; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies

<u>Type</u>: Original

Date: February 14, 2005

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	
General Revenue	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	
			_	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	
State School Moneys*	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds*	\$0	\$0	\$0	

^{*} Contains offsetting transfers.

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

L.R. No. 1302-01 Bill No. SB 256 Page 2 of 5 February 14, 2005

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Transportation**, **Department of Revenue**, **Department of Public Safety** – **Director's Office**, – **Missouri State Highway Patrol**, and the **Office of the State Public Defender** assume the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator (CTS)** assume there could be a significant increase in the number of cases filed, depending on the degree of enforcement. However, CTS has no way of estimating the increase. Any significant increase would be reflected in future budget requests.

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services** assume the proposal would not have a significant direct fiscal impact on county prosecutors.

L.R. No. 1302-01 Bill No. SB 256 Page 3 of 5 February 14, 2005

<u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** assume the proposal would give the Department of Public Safety the authority to adopt rules to implement the provisions of this act. These rules would be published in the Missouri Register and the Code of State Regulations. These rules could require as many as 8 pages in the Code of State Regulations and half again as many pages in the Missouri Register, as cost statements, fiscal notes, and the like are not repeated in the Code. The estimated cost of a page in the Missouri Register is \$23 and the estimated cost of a page in the Code of State Regulations is \$27. Based on these costs, the estimated cost of the proposal is \$492 in FY 06 and unknown in subsequent years. The actual cost could be more or less than the numbers given. The impact of this legislation in future years is unknown and depends upon the frequency and length of rules filed, amended, rescinded, or withdrawn.

Oversight assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which would require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process.

Officials from the **Springfield Police Department** assume the estimated revenues from the proposal to be approximately \$6,000 and the estimated costs to be \$4,000.

Oversight notes that increases in fines which would go to school districts would be offset by reduced payments to those districts through the State Foundation Formula.

Officials from the Columbia Police Department, St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department, and the Kansas City Police Department did not respond to Oversight's request for fiscal impact.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Savings – Reduced appropriations to State School Moneys Fund	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	(10 Mo.)		
FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008

BLG:LR:OD (12/02)

L.R. No. 1302-01 Bill No. SB 256 Page 4 of 5 February 14, 2005

STATE SCHOOL MONEYS FUND

Savings – Reduced distributions to school districts	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Losses</u> – Reduced appropriations from General Revenue Fund	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE SCHOOL MONEYS FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government SCHOOL DISTRICTS	FY 2006 (10 Mo.)	FY 2007	FY 2008
<u>Revenues</u> – Increased fines	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Losses</u> – Reduced distributions from State School Moneys Fund	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON SCHOOL DISTRICTS	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation would permit a law enforcement officer to enforce the seat belt law if the violation is clearly visible to the officer without stopping the vehicle. Noncompliance with the seat belt law would not constitute probable cause for a search of the driver, passenger, or vehicle.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

BLG:LR:OD (12/02)

L.R. No. 1302-01 Bill No. SB 256 Page 5 of 5 February 14, 2005

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of State Courts Administrator Department of Transportation Department of Revenue Department of Public Safety

- Director's Office
- Missouri State Highway Patrol

Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Public Defender
Springfield Police Department

NOT RESPONDING

Columbia Police Department St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department Kansas City Police Department

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Mickey Wilen

Director

February 14, 2005