

**Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1631**

By Senators Umbarger and Teichman

5-4

10 A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION reactivating the task force created  
11 by ~~2007~~ **[2008]** Senate Concurrent Resolution No. ~~1603~~ **[1616]**  
12 formed to study the design and implementation of an electronic motor  
13 vehicle financial security verification system.

14  
15 WHEREAS, The Kansas Legislature created a task force to study the  
16 design and implementation of an electronic motor vehicle financial se-  
17 curity verification system which provided a report to the 2009 Kansas  
18 Legislature as required by Senate Concurrent Resolution No. ~~1603~~  
19 **[1616]**; and

20 WHEREAS, The report of the task force identified four goals for im-  
21 plementation of an electronic motor vehicle financial security verification  
22 system and considered various design features of such a system; and

23 WHEREAS, There continues to be a need for all drivers operating  
24 vehicles to have motor vehicle liability insurance as required by law yet  
25 an estimated ten percent or more of drivers are not in compliance with  
26 the state's mandatory financial security laws; and

27 WHEREAS, Since the acceptance of the task force report in 2009,  
28 several states have successfully enacted and are currently operating elec-  
29 tronic verification systems to increase compliance with financial security  
30 laws of those jurisdictions and which generate increased law enforcement  
31 revenues for their respective states and local governments: Now,  
32 therefore,

33 *Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, the House of Rep-*  
34 *resentatives concurring therein:* That the task force created by ~~2007~~  
35 **[2008]** Senate Concurrent Resolution No. ~~1603~~ **[1616]** continue its work  
36 on the subject of design and implementation of an electronic motor ve-  
37 hicle financial security verification system and report to the 2011 Kansas  
38 Legislature containing the following: A listing of all electronic verification  
39 systems currently being successfully operated in the various states; an  
40 evaluation of whether any such system will measurably reduce the inci-  
41 dence of driver noncompliance with Kansas motor vehicle financial se-  
42 curity laws; recommendations on a list of the design features essential for  
43 a successful operation of a system for the state of Kansas; a recommen-

1 dation of design features which minimize cost and inconvenience to driv-  
2 ers properly insured, law enforcement personnel, corrections facilities,  
3 private insurers, judicial systems and state agencies; recommendations on  
4 how such a system can be paid for; suggestions on what fines should be  
5 levied against persons apprehended by any such electronic verification  
6 system; estimates on how much such a system might generate for the  
7 state and local governments; suggestions on how enforcement revenues  
8 from such a new system should be distributed to state and local govern-  
9 ments; and suggestions for a time table for implementation of such a  
10 system.