

HOUSE BILL 152

Introduced by Galvin, et al.

1/12	Introduced
1/12	Referred to Highways & Transportation
1/12	Fiscal Note Requested
1/12	First Reading
1/18	Hearing
1/18	Fiscal Note Received
1/18	Fiscal Note Printed
1/18	Tabled in Committee

1
2 INTRODUCED BY

House BILL NO. 152
Galvin Hogg
Peck Hogg

3
4 A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT RAISING THE PENALTY FOR
5 VIOLATION OF THE FUEL CONSERVATION SPEED LIMIT; AND AMENDING
6 SECTION 61-8-718, MCA."

7
8 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA:

9 **Section 1.** Section 61-8-718, MCA, is amended to read:

10 "61-8-718. Penalty for violation of fuel conservation
11 speed limit. (1) A person violating the speed limit imposed
12 pursuant to 61-8-304 is guilty of the offense of unnecessary
13 waste of a resource and upon conviction shall be fined \$5
14 \$30, and no a jail sentence may not be imposed. Bond for
15 this offense ~~shall be \$5~~ is \$30.

16 (2) A violation of 61-8-304 is not a misdemeanor
17 pursuant to 45-2-101, 61-8-104, or 61-8-711."

-End-

STATE OF MONTANA - FISCAL NOTE

Form BD-15

In compliance with a written request, there is hereby submitted a Fiscal Note for HB0152, as introduced.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION: An act raising the penalty for violation of the fuel conservation speed limit.

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. For the 12 month period ending 9/30/92, 72,000 fuel conservation summons were issued by the Highway Patrol. This level of offenses is assumed to generate \$360,000 in revenue with the current \$5 fine. It is assumed that the annual amount will decrease by 30% under the proposed law due to the increased fine. Therefore, it is assumed that 55,500 fuel conservation summons will be issued during FY94 and 50,000 during FY95.
2. It is assumed, absent a specific effective date, that the bill will be effective 10/1/93.
3. The bill does not address the disposition of the increased revenue so no expenditure impact is estimated.

FISCAL IMPACT:Revenues:

	FY '94			FY '95		
	Current Law	Proposed Law	Difference	Current Law	Proposed Law	Difference
County governments	180,000	607,500	427,500	180,000	750,000	570,000
General Fund	50,184	169,371	119,187	50,184	209,100	158,916
Fish & Game account (02)	16,362	55,222	38,860	16,362	68,175	51,813
Highways special rev (02)	21,168	71,442	50,274	21,168	88,200	67,032
Traffic education (02)	60,948	205,700	144,752	60,948	253,950	193,002
Dept. of Livestock (02)	1,026	3,463	2,437	1,026	4,275	3,249
Crime victims comp (02)	28,620	96,592	67,972	28,620	119,250	90,630
DFS battered spouse (02)	1,692	5,710	4,018	1,692	7,050	5,358
Total	360,000	1,215,000	855,000	360,000	1,500,000	1,140,000
Net General Fund impact:			119,187			158,916

EFFECT ON COUNTY OR OTHER LOCAL REVENUES OR EXPENDITURES:

County general fund revenue would increase by about \$427,500 in FY94 and \$570,000 in FY95 and subsequent years.

Dave Lewis 1-18-93

DAVE LEWIS, BUDGET DIRECTOR DATE
Office of Budget and Program Planning

PATRICK GALVIN, PRIMARY SPONSOR DATE

Fiscal Note for HB0152, as introduced

HB 152