PREPARED BY: DATE PREPARED: PHONE: Sandy Sostad February 10, 2009 471-0054

**LB 106** 

Revision: 00

## FISCAL NOTE

## LEGISLATIVE FISCAL ANALYST ESTIMATE

ESTIMATE OF FISCAL IMPACT – STATE AGENCIES *						
	FY 2009-10		FY 2010-11			
	EXPENDITURES	REVENUE	EXPENDITURES	REVENUE		
GENERAL FUNDS						
CASH FUNDS						
FEDERAL FUNDS	See Below					
OTHER FUNDS						
TOTAL FUNDS						

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include any impact on political subdivisions. See narrative for political subdivision estimates.

LB 106 repeals provisions requiring that occupant protection system laws be enforced as a secondary action. The bill means violations of these provisions may be enforced as a primary action. The fine for such violation is \$25. The repeal of the enforcement of seat belt laws as a secondary action may mean that additional persons will be cited for offenses. Any increase in fine revenue will accrue to the county where the violation occurs for use by public schools.

The Department of Roads and Department of Motor Vehicles indicate there may be federal funds remaining from an allocation of incentive grants to states that enact, for the first time after December 31, 2002, a law where seat belt violations are enforced as a primary action. However, to receive any remaining incentive grant funds, the state must demonstrate that it has in effect and is enforcing seat belt violations as a primary offense by July 1, 2009. The remaining incentive grant funds are to be allocated to eligible states at that time. (Note that the bill does not have an emergency clause.)

It is possible the Department of Roads could receive \$7.4 million of one-time federal funding, if incentive grant funds remain and the bill is passed and enforced prior to July, 1, 2009. The majority of the grant award is to be used for projects that correct or improve or proactively address highway safety problems. At least \$1 million must be used for highway safety activities.

## DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

REVIEWED BY	Joe Wilcox	DATE 1/20/09	PHONE 471-2526			
COMMENTS						
No basis to disagree with Dept. of Motor Vehicles analysis.						
Concur with agency analysis for De	nt of Roads					