

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 5230 SB	Title: Motorcycle equipment
-----------------------------	------------------------------------

Estimated Cash Receipts

Agency Name						
	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total
Total \$						

Local Gov. Courts *						
Local Gov. Other **						
Local Gov. Total						

Estimated Expenditures

Agency Name	2003-05			2005-07			2007-09		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Washington State Patrol	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Traffic Safety Commission	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Total	0.0	\$0	\$0	0.0	\$0	\$0	0.0	\$0	\$0

Local Gov. Courts *									
Local Gov. Other **									
Local Gov. Total									

Prepared by: Garry Austin, OFM	Phone: 360-902-0564	Date Published: Revised 2/12/2003
---------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---

* See Office of the Administrator for the Courts judicial fiscal note

** See local government fiscal note

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 5230 SB	Title: Motorcycle equipment	Agency: 225-Washington State Patrol
-----------------------------	------------------------------------	--

Part I: Estimates

☒ No Fiscal Impact

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- ☐ If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- ☐ If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- ☐ Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- ☐ Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Dean Carlson	Phone: (360)786-7305	Date: 02/03/2003
Agency Preparation: Pouth Ing	Phone: (360) 753-0692	Date: 02/04/2003
Agency Approval: Diane C. Perry	Phone: 360-753-0221	Date: 02/06/2003
OFM Review: Garry Austin	Phone: 360-902-0564	Date: 02/06/2003

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Briefly describe, by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

Senate Bill 5230 amends RCW 46.37.530 by changing the state's current mandatory "motorcycle helmet law" from requiring all motorcycle operators to wear a helmet to requiring only operators under the age of 21 to wear a helmet. The proposal also removes the requirement for the Washington State Patrol to adopt motorcycle helmet standards, which now only requires that motorcycle helmets be commercially manufactured.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

II. C - Expenditures

Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

Since the State Patrol already enforces motorcycle helmet laws, the changes in this proposal are not expected to impact traffic law enforcement activities significantly. Removing the requirement for the agency to adopt motorcycle helmet standards will have minimal workload impact.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 5230 SB	Title: Motorcycle equipment	Agency: 228-Wash Traffic Safety Commission
-----------------------------	------------------------------------	---

Part I: Estimates

☒ No Fiscal Impact

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- ☐ If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- ☐ If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- ☐ Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- ☐ Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Dean Carlson	Phone: (360)786-7305	Date: 02/03/2003
Agency Preparation: Steve Lind	Phone: 360-753-6538	Date: 02/12/2003
Agency Approval: Steve Lind	Phone: 360-753-6538	Date: 02/12/2003
OFM Review: Garry Austin	Phone: 360-902-0564	Date: 02/12/2003

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Briefly describe, by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

Sec. 1. (3) modifies the current universal M/C helmet law that applies to riders of all ages and inserts language that would make the M/C helmet law applicable only to riders under the age of 21.

This change would not have a fiscal impact on the WTSC directly. However, based on data and research available to us, it appears the estimated increased expenditure from the state budget for hospitalization costs alone will exceed \$7 million per year. Other state expenditures, such as L&I, will increase the burden on the state budget further.

ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT OF CHANGING THE MOTORCYCLE HELMET LAW TO APPLY ONLY TO RIDERS UNDER AGE 21

BACKGROUND DATA:

1. NHTSA reports that states with universal helmet laws have helmet use rates of close to 100%. States with no laws or laws limited to minors have use rates of 34% to 54% (Source: NHTSA Traffic Safety Facts, 2000). Helmet use in Washington was about 50% before the 1990 helmet law and increased to about 98% following passage of the law.
2. In 1988-89 when the limited helmet law was in effect in Washington there were approximately 55 riders per year hospitalized with severe or critical head injuries (AIS = 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale). In 1991-92, following re-enactment of the full helmet law there were about 22 hospitalizations per year with severe/critical head injuries (Source: DOH hospital discharge data).
3. When the helmet law was repealed in 1977 motorcyclist deaths doubled to an average of 97 per year. When the helmet law was re-enacted, deaths dropped about 60% to an average of 41 per year. (Source: FARS).
4. Between 1996 and 2000, more than 400 motorcyclists were hospitalized each year and head injuries accounted for about half of these. (Source: DOH hospital discharge data).
5. In 1989-90, the cost of hospitalization for head injuries was about \$15,000 in Washington (Sources: DOH report on Head and Spinal Cord Injury). More than 50% of these costs were paid with public funds, i.e., Medicaid, Medicare, L&I, and other tax fund subsidies.
6. A Harborview study found an average cost of hospitalization and follow-up care of \$25,700 in 1988. Public funds paid 63% of these costs.

ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT.

Changing the helmet law to apply only to riders under age 21 would likely result in:

- Helmet use rates decreasing to about 50%.
- A doubling of the numbers of rider deaths and head injuries.
- Twice as many hospitalizations of injured motorcyclists, or about 800 patients per year.
- DOH estimates that the cost of hospitalization has doubled since 1990.
- In 2003 dollars, hospital charges for injured motorcyclists would increase from \$12 million per year to \$24 million per year. Public funds that subsidize these costs (60%) would increase from \$7.2 million to \$14.4 million per year.
- These costs do not include charges for follow-up care and rehabilitation.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

II. C - Expenditures

Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.