

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 4244-01
Bill No.: SB 1145
Subject: Motor Vehicles; Public Safety Department; Roads and Highways; Transportation Department; Cities, Towns and Villages; Saint Louis.
Type: Original
Date: February 9, 2004

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
State School Moneys Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0
Highway	(\$8,965)	(\$10,764)	(\$10,764)
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	(\$8,964)	(\$10,764)	(\$10,764)

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 7 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Local Government	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Transportation** and the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (CTS)** state the proposed legislation would provide for automatic cameras to be used to photograph cars going through a red light in certain cities that adopt such an ordinance.

CTS assumes to the extent that an automated system would increase the number of speeders apprehended, there will be an increase in the workload of courts in counties where an automated system is installed. However, CTS has no way of estimating what that increase might be. CTS does not think that costs will exceed \$100,000 in any given year.

In response to a similar proposal from 2003, officials from the **Department of Revenue - Driver and Vehicle Services Bureau (DOR)** stated the proposal allows cities to enter into an agreement with DOR to prepare and mail summonses on behalf of the cities. DOR interpreted this differently from the requirements in proposals from previous years. DOR interpreted this proposal to mean DOR would perform the functions of obtaining registration records and prepare

summonses on behalf of the city.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

With this assumption, DOR assumed the need six FTE Office Support Assistants (each at \$20,472 annually), along with roughly \$243,000 annually in postage expense. DOR anticipated a total expense of roughly \$435,000 annually based upon the assumption that their agency would actually administer and process the traffic light violation summonses.

Oversight assumes that the city or county or the private vendors contracted to act on their behalf (and not DOR), will perform the operational and administrative tasks associated with the use of automated traffic control enforcement systems.

In response to a similar proposal from 2002, officials of the **Department of Revenue - Driver and Vehicle Services Bureau (DOR)** assumed that 10 cities or counties would initially adopt ordinances implementing automated traffic enforcement systems. Officials assumed that local law enforcement agencies would use their local systems for the initial search in order to determine the appropriate owners of vehicles. Officials assumed that approximately 10% of the searches would be done by DOR due to errors in the system. Officials assumed there would be 250 citations issued per day of which 10% or 9,125 record searches annually would be done by DOR. Officials assumed to process the "no record" searches would require 1,095 hours of overtime. Officials estimated based on the hourly rate of a Clerk Typist II, which is \$9.83 that for 10 months of the first fiscal year the amount of overtime requested would be \$8,965; and estimate overtime for each of the next two fiscal years at \$10,764.

Officials from the **City of Springfield** assume they would incur costs and revenues from this proposal only if they chose to pursue automatic traffic control enforcement systems.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City (CKC)** state the bill is an enabling statute and does not impose costs on a city, unless the city chooses to use the new enforcement technique. Fines and costs included in the processing of violators are designed to minimize any costs.

CKC states they could realize revenues if they utilize the system, however, the revenues depend upon the number of persons who violate the traffic laws which could not be estimated.

CKC also states savings could be realized as safer driving within the city as well as by police department officers being made available for things other than traffic light enforcement.

Officials from the **City of St. Louis, City of Independence, Kansas City Police Department,**

St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department and the **Independence Police Department** did not respond to our request for fiscal impact.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes the proposal is permissive and that local governments may adopt an ordinance authorizing the use of such a system. Income has been shown to the county and municipal court systems as well as to the State School Moneys Fund because county and municipal systems retain fines if the offense is not a state offense and certain cities with municipal systems retain revenue generated from fines. Income from court costs in addition to the fines has been shown to the municipal court systems to offset the costs of additional filings and trials, resulting in a net fiscal impact of zero to the municipal court systems. However, local school districts would still receive income disbursed from the State School Moneys Fund which would be fine money received from state court cases.

Oversight has prepared this fiscal note to show the fiscal impact should a city or county install an automated traffic system.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2005 (10 Mo.)	FY 2006	FY 2007
HIGHWAY FUND			
<u>Cost</u> - Department of Revenue			
Overtime cost for no record searches	<u>(\$8,965)</u>	<u>(\$10,764)</u>	<u>(\$10,764)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE HIGHWAY FUND	<u>(\$8,965)</u>	<u>(\$10,764)</u>	<u>(\$10,764)</u>

STATE SCHOOL MONEYS FUND

<u>Income</u> - fines from automated traffic control enforcement system	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
<u>Costs</u> - disbursements to local school districts	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO
 STATE SCHOOL MONEYS FUND**

	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2005 (10 Mo.)	FY 2006	FY 2007
<u>Income - Local School Districts</u>			
Fines from automated traffic control enforcement system	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
<u>Income - County/Municipal Court Systems</u>			
Fines from automated traffic control enforcement system	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
<u>Income - County/Municipal Court Systems</u>			
Court costs	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
<u>Costs - County/Municipal Court Systems</u>			
Additional filings/trials **	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<u>Costs - Counties / Municipalities</u>			
Automated traffic control enforcement systems and private vendors to perform operational and administrative tasks	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS*	<u>\$0 to UNKNOWN</u>	<u>\$0 to UNKNOWN</u>	<u>\$0 to UNKNOWN</u>

* Oversight assumes that income would exceed costs.

** Officials of the Office of the State Courts Administrator estimated costs not to exceed \$100,000 annually on a statewide basis.

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

DESCRIPTION

This proposal authorizes cities and counties with a population greater than 25,000 and the City of St. Louis to adopt ordinances authorizing the use of automatic traffic control enforcement systems to catch drivers who run red lights on highways or roads within their jurisdiction. The city or county adopting the ordinance may enter into an agreement with the state highways and transportation commission regarding the use of such a system on a state highway within the boundaries of the city or county. The vehicle owner is presumed to be the violator unless the owner can furnish evidence that the vehicle was stolen at the time of the violation or that the vehicle had not run the red light.

The city of St. Louis must designate the parking commission to be the system administrator of the automated traffic control system. No points shall be assessed for a violation obtained through the use of the automated traffic control system. The maximum fine imposed shall not exceed \$500. The city must give at least 30 days public notice before officially using the system. Signs must indicate the presence of the system and shall be visible to approaching traffic. This proposal has a sunset clause.

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

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Revenue
Department of Transportation
Department of Public Safety
Office of the State Courts Administrator
City of Kansas City
City of Springfield

NOT RESPONDING: City of St. Louis, City of Independence, Kansas City Police Department, St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department, Independence Police Department.

L.R. No. 4244-01
Bill No. SB 1145
Page 7 of 7
February 9, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mickey Wilson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "M".

Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
February 9, 2004