



*The Judiciary, State of Hawaii*

**Testimony to the House Committee on Finance**

The Honorable Marcus R. Oshiro, Chair  
The Honorable Marilyn B. Lee, Vice Chair

Thursday, March 25, 2010, 12:30 p.m. (Agenda #3)  
State Capitol, Conference Room 308

by  
Walter M. Ozawa  
Deputy Administrative Director of the Courts

---

**Bill No. and Title:** Senate Bill No. 2159, Relating to Traffic Abstract Fee.

**Purpose:** Increases the fee for a traffic abstract from \$7 to \$10 and increases the amount of the fee deposited into the general fund from \$5 to \$8.

**Judiciary's Position:**

The Judiciary strongly supports this bill, which is part of the Judiciary=s legislative package. This bill would increase the traffic abstract fee by \$3 which would be paid into the general fund.

Since 1996, the Judiciary charges \$7 for a certified traffic abstract. Five dollars (\$5) is deposited into the general fund and \$2 is deposited into the Judiciary Computer System Special Fund. From 1982 to 1994, the traffic abstract fee was \$2. In 1994, the fee was increased to \$5. The current request to increase the traffic abstract fee by \$3 for a total of \$10 is reasonable and would not place an undue burden on individuals, insurance companies and businesses who request the traffic abstract.

In other states around the country a certified traffic abstract ranges from Free to \$26. States specifically in the Pacific region (Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, parts of Idaho) and Alaska, have ranges for a traffic abstract as low as \$3 (Oregon) for a certified court record to \$10 (Washington and Alaska) for a certified traffic abstract. The \$3 increase requested by the Judiciary would put Hawaii on par with states like



Senate Bill No. 2159, Relating to Traffic Abstract Fee  
House Committee on Finance  
Thursday, March 25, 2010  
Page 2

Washington, Alaska and New Hampshire to name a few and lower than states like Idaho (\$26), Nevada (\$11) and Texas (\$20) to name a few.

Based on abstract statistics for the first half of Fiscal Year 2010, it is expected that about 500,000 traffic abstracts will be created in Fiscal Year 2010 which will generate \$2.5 million into the state general fund. With an increase in the traffic abstract fee of \$3 as proposed by this bill, an additional \$1.5 million could be added to the general fund.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on Senate Bill No. 2159.



Pauahi Tower, Suite 2010  
1003 Bishop Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  
Telephone (808) 525-5877  
Facsimile (808) 525-5879

**Alison Powers**  
Executive Director

## TESTIMONY OF ALISON POWERS

---

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE  
Representative Marcus R. Oshiro, Chair  
Representative Marilyn B. Lee, Vice Chair

Thursday, March 25, 2010  
12:30 p.m.

### **S.B. 2159**

Chair Oshiro, Vice Chair Lee and members of the Committee, my name is Alison Powers, Executive Director of Hawaii Insurers Council. Hawaii Insurers Council is a non-profit trade association of property and casualty insurance companies licensed to do business in Hawaii. Member companies underwrite approximately 45% of all property and casualty insurance premiums in the state.

Hawaii Insurers Council **opposes** S.B. 2159, which would increase the fee for traffic abstracts from \$7 to \$10, with one hundred per cent of this increase deposited into the general fund.

Hawaii has an antiquated motor vehicle records system in which accurate, real-time access is unavailable. Batch orders are available electronically, however results are not instantaneous. It takes 24 to 48 hours to receive information back. This bill adds 43% onto the already high cost of motor vehicle records of \$7 each.

This bill directly adds cost to the insured driver with no direct benefit. One hundred per cent of the increase goes directly into the general fund, which is an unfair burden on the insured driver and actually exceeds the cost of providing the motor vehicle record. In

addition, some insurers may order fewer motor vehicle records as a result of this cost increase and projected revenue may be less than anticipated.

We respectfully request that S.B. 2159 be held.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**GOODSILL ANDERSON QUINN & STIFEL**

A LIMITED LIABILITY LAW PARTNERSHIP LLP

## GOVERNMENT RELATIONS TEAM:

GARY M. SLOVIN  
ANNE T. HORIUCHI  
MIYOKO E. ITO  
CHRISTINA ZAHARA NOHALI PLACE, SUITE 1800 • 1099 ALAKEA STREET  
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813MAIL ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 3196  
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96801TELEPHONE (808) 547-5600 • FAX (808) 547-5880  
info@goodsill.com • www.goodsill.comINTERNET:  
gslovin@goodsill.com  
ahoriuchi@goodsill.com  
meito@goodsill.com  
cnoh@goodsill.com**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Representative Marcus R. Oshiro  
Chair, Committee on Finance  
*VIA FACSIMILE: 586-6001*

**FROM:** Anne Horiuchi

**DATE:** March 24, 2010

**RE:** **S.B. 2159 – Relating to Traffic Abstract Fee**  
**Hearing: Thursday, March 25, 2010 at 12:30 p.m., Room 308**

---

Dear Chair Oshiro and Members of the Committee on Finance:

I am Anne Horiuchi, testifying on behalf of USAA. USAA, a diversified financial services company, is the leading provider of competitively priced financial planning, insurance, investments, and banking products to members of the U.S. military and their families. USAA has over 82,000 members in Hawaii.

S.B. 2159 increases the fee for a traffic abstract from \$7 to \$10 and increases the amount of the fee deposited into the general fund from \$5 to \$8. USAA opposes this measure.

USAA, like other insurers, must order these abstracts in large numbers in order to conduct our business. USAA gave 14,000 quotes last year and issued 8,100 operator policies in Hawaii, for an internal cost of more than \$160,000 per year in total cost of traffic abstracts.<sup>1</sup> We also note that, when obtaining the abstracts through ehawaii.gov, an additional \$3 fee is assessed. Thus, a traffic abstract currently costs \$10. In light of the volume of abstracts ordered, an increase of \$3 will have a significant impact upon our business. For these reasons, we oppose this measure and respectfully request that it be held in committee.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this measure.

---

<sup>1</sup> Traffic abstracts are ordered for all quotes (not just for policies issued) and may be ordered for renewals. USAA purchases the abstracts from a vendor, who obtains the abstracts from the State.



**Property Casualty Insurers  
Association of America**

Shaping the Future of American Insurance  
1415 L Street, Suite 670, Sacramento, CA 95814-3972

To: The Honorable Marcus Oshiro, Chair  
House Finance Committee

From: Samuel Sorich, Vice President

Re: **SB 2159 – Traffic Abstract Fee**  
**PCI Position: Oppose**

Date: Thursday, March 25, 2010; **Agenda #3**  
12:30 p.m.; Conference Room 308

Aloha Chairman Oshiro and Committee Members:

The Property Casualty Insurers Association of American (PCI) opposes SB 2159 because the bill's higher fees will increase the cost of automobile insurance and the bill's higher fees are inconsistent with the principle that the amount of a fee must be proportionate to the cost of the service provided.

A person's driving record is an essential factor in an insurer's effort to make sure that the premium it charges reflect a driver's risk. Thus, obtaining a driving record is a necessary expense for insurers. It is an expense that insurers include in their rates.

SB 2159's higher fees would be reflected in higher automobile insurance rates. Consumers will ultimately have to pay the bill's increased costs in their insurance premiums. At this time when many families are struggling to obey the law that requires them to obtain automobile insurance coverage, the Legislature should not impose additional costs.

SB 2159's higher fees would be deposited in the general fund. None of the additional \$3.00 mandated by the bill would cover the cost of providing driving records. SB 2159 diversion of fees to the general fund is inconsistent with the Hawaii Supreme Court's 1999 ruling in State v. Medeiros which held that a fee must be related to the cost of providing the service.

PCI appreciates the committee's consideration of our request to defer this bill for the remainder of the session.

**HOUSE COMMITTEE ON  
FINANCE**

March 25, 2010

Senate Bill 2159 Relating to Traffic Abstract Fee

Chair Oshiro and members of the House Committee on Finance, I am Rick Tsujimura, representing State Farm Insurance Companies, a mutual company owned by its policyholders. State Farm opposes Senate Bill 2159 Relating to Traffic Abstract Fee.

The increase and structure of section 287-3 may be an unconstitutional tax. The Hawaii Supreme Court in State v. Medeiros, 89 Hawai'i 361, 973 P.2d 736 (1999), articulated the following test as to whether a fee was an unconstitutional tax.

"...whether the charge (1) applies to the direct beneficiary of a particular service, (2) is allocated directly to defraying the costs of providing the service, and (3) is reasonably proportionate to the benefit received."

In the instant bill, it does not appear that the fee "applies to the direct beneficiary of a particular service, nor is it allocated directly to defraying the costs of providing the service, and is not reasonably proportionate to the benefit received" as articulated by the Supreme Court, because \$8 of the \$10 fee is being diverted immediately to the general fund. Clearly the increase is a revenue generating measure more appropriately described as a tax.

In the instant bill if not the current statute it is clear that the monies are not used to defray the costs of the service, but rather goes into the general fund for the use of the whole taxpaying public, which is violative of the clearly articulated principles stated in Medeiros.

Furthermore we believe that the bill should be amended to clearly fall within the ambit of the Supreme Court's decision in Medeiros. The Supreme Court in HIC v. Lingle, dealt with the issue of whether monies from a fund made up entirely of "fees" can be transferred to the general fund. The Court stated that, "**We blanch at the State's basic contention that a user or regulatory fee, if initially assessed as such, can be transferred to a general fund when the same assessment would have been invalid had it been assessed initially with the express understanding that the funds would be transferred to the general fund.**" There is no doubt that the state can impose taxes, but it cannot impose a tax disguised as a fee, especially a fee delegated to the judiciary and collected by the judiciary and paid to the general fund. Moreover in the instant case the fee is not subject to discretion of the judiciary's agency but mandated an assessment of \$8 for the general fund. This language is violative of the Constitution on two levels as an unconstitutional delegation of taxing authority to the judiciary and a transfer on its face violative of the Supreme Court decision in Lingle which forbade the transfer of funds from the executive to legislative branch, and surely would forbid transferring funds from the judiciary to the legislature.

Without a doubt, the current language of section 287-3 on its face violates the decision of the Supreme Court. We would therefore request that this committee amend this measure by deleting the monies transferred to the general fund because it violates the clearly articulated decision of the Hawaii Supreme Court in HIC v. Lingle.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this testimony.