

SESSION OF 2011

**SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON HOUSE
SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 213**

As Recommended by House Committee on
Transportation

Brief*

House Sub. for SB 213 would include the Safety Belt Use Act in the Uniform Act Regulating Traffic. It would clarify that no court costs are to be applied to seat belt violations and would remove outdated language. It also would remove unnecessary language redundant to the Child Passenger Safety Act.

The bill would become effective upon publication in the *Kansas Register*.

Background

The original SB 213 would have defined a "lightweight roadable vehicle" and would have excluded that type of vehicle from the definition of "aircraft" in the statute that exempts business aircraft from property taxes.

Representatives Tom Burroughs, Rich Proehl, and Vince Wetta testified in support of HB 2192, and Representative Gary Hayzlett submitted written testimony as a proponent of the bill. A representative of AAA Kansas presented neutral testimony. A representative of the League of Kansas Municipalities submitted testimony opposing the bill.

Moving the Safety Belt Use Act into the Uniform Act Regulating Traffic would make penalty provisions for seat belt

*Supplemental notes are prepared by the Legislative Research Department and do not express legislative intent. The supplemental note and fiscal note for this bill may be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.kslegislature.org>

violations uniform throughout Kansas. The fine is \$10, and no court costs are to be added.

The House Committee on Transportation removed the provisions of SB 213 and replaced them with the provisions of HB 2192, resulting in House Sub. for SB 213.

The fiscal note prepared by the Division of the Budget on HB 2192 states that court cost charges for seat belt violations would decrease but, because a seat belt violation often is accompanied by another violation, the effect would be negligible. The League of Kansas Municipalities reported there would be a fiscal effect to cities that had adopted other fines and collected court costs for these violations, but it could not determine a precise fiscal effect on cities.