

FISCAL ESTIMATE
DOA-2048 N(R10/94)

ORIGINAL UPDATED
 CORRECTED SUPPLEMENTAL

LRB or Bill No./Adm. Rule No.
AB 327, LRB-1853/1

Amendment No. if Applicable

Subject
Requiring motor vehicle owners to include their birth dates on applications for motor vehicle registration

Fiscal Effect

State: No State Fiscal Effect

Check columns below only if bill makes a direct appropriation or affects a sum sufficient appropriation.

Increase Costs - May be possible to Absorb Within Agency's Budget Yes No

Increase Existing Appropriation Increase Existing Revenues
 Decrease Existing Appropriation Decrease Existing Revenues
 Create New Appropriation

Decrease Costs

Local: No local government costs

1. Increase Costs
 Permissive Mandatory
2. Decrease Costs
 Permissive Mandatory

3. Increase Revenues
 Permissive Mandatory
4. Decrease Revenues
 Permissive Mandatory

5. Types of Local Governmental Units Affected:
 Towns Villages Cities
 Counties Others _____
 School Districts WTCS Districts

Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations

20.395(5)(cq)

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

This bill requires applicants for motor vehicle registration under Ch 341 to include on the application form for original registration the applicant's or registrant's birth date, among other information. The bill designates "birth date" as a personal identifier for purposes of registration lists which DMV is required to compile, and includes birth date among the personal identifiers that an applicant may direct DMV not to disclose when DMV issues its registration lists.

Further, the bill requires DMV to refuse to register a vehicle if the applicant for registration is under age 16.

This fiscal estimate assumes that DMV will not actually collect and store in the database the applicant's birth date. The birth date, shown on the registration application, is kept on the microfilmed application and is therefore available for future confirmation if needed. This fiscal estimate assumes that a processor will check the birth date and will refuse registration when the applicant is under age 16. Because the birth date is not collected in the database, DMV would not need to perform expensive data processing system modifications (if the birth date were collected and stored in the database, we would need to add a field in our current registration system, as well as program to suppress date of birth on registration lists, which would incur significant one-time costs).

On-going workload is increased, as processors must refuse to process the registration application and go back to obtain a legitimate applicant. A "go-back" requires about 3.4 minutes additional processing time or about 1 minute additional time talking with a customer at a Customer Service Center.

While we have no real way of knowing how many registration applications are currently presented by applicants under 16, this fiscal estimate assumes 10% of the number of Instructional Permits issued per year (most Instructional Permit holders are under 16). In 1998, there were about 85,000 Instructional Permits issued. Thus, we estimate perhaps 8,500 registration applications per year would be from applicants under age 16.

For 8,500 registration applications per year, we would experience about 350 additional work hours per year, which may be absorbed within DMV's current budget.

No revenue change is estimated since we assume that all vehicles will eventually be registered.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Agency/Prepared by: (Name & Phone No.)
Transportation/Carson P. Frazier (266-7857)

Authorized Signature/Telephone No.
266-2233



Date
5/17/99

FISCAL ESTIMATE WORKSHEET

1999 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect
DOA-2047 (R10/94)

ORIGINAL UPDATED
 CORRECTED SUPPLEMENTAL

LRB or Bill No./Adm. Rule No.
AB 327, LRB-1853/1

Amendment No.

Subject
Requiring motor vehicle owners to include their birthdates on applications for motor vehicle registration

I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):

None.

II. Annualized Costs:

Annualized Fiscal impact on State funds from:

A. State Costs by Category

Increased Costs

Decreased Costs

State Operations - Salaries and Fringes

\$

\$ -

(FTE Position Changes)

(FTE)

(- FTE)

State Operations - Other Costs

-

Local Assistance

-

Aids to Individuals or Organizations

-

TOTAL State Costs by Category

\$

\$ -

B. State Costs by Source of Funds

Increased Costs

Decreased Costs

GPR

\$

\$ -

FED

-

PRO/PRS

-

SEG/SEG-S

-

III. State Revenues - Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)

Increased Rev.

Decreased Rev.

GPR Taxes

\$

\$ -

GPR Earned

-

FED

-

PRO/PRS

-

SEG/SEG-S

-

TOTAL State Revenues

\$

\$ -

NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT

STATE

LOCAL

NET CHANGE IN COSTS

\$

-0-

\$

-0-

NET CHANGE IN REVENUES

\$

-0-

\$

-0-

Agency/Prepared by: (Name & Phone No.)
Transportation/Carson P. Frazier (266-7857)

Authorized Signature/Telephone No.
266-2233

Jane A. Gzesinski

Date
5/17/99