

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0981-02
Bill No.: SCS for SB 0267
Subject: Criminal Procedure; Courts; Revenue Dept.; Fees; Saint Louis County; Libraries;
Landlords and Tenants; Civil Procedure
Type: Original
Date: February 16, 2001

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 3 pages.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

In response to a prior version of this proposal, officials from the **Department of Revenue** assume no fiscal impact to their department from this proposal.

In response to a prior version of this proposal, officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** assumed the proposed legislation would make changes to the law on fingerprinting persons convicted of a crime and not previously fingerprinted; permit associate circuit judges to issue subpoenas; authorize direct transfer of orders of protection from the court automated system to MULES; provide for the originating county to cover costs in civil change of venues; modify closed records provisions; and, provide for direct distribution of parenting handbooks.

The proposed legislation would also make a number of technical and clarifying changes to statutes dealing with the operation and procedure in courts. While the provisions may result in making some things easier or more efficient, we would not anticipate any appreciable impact on the costs or revenues of the judiciary.

In response to a similar proposal in the prior session, officials from the **Department of Public Safety – Missouri State Highway Patrol (MHP)** assumed the proposal would have a significant impact on the rules relating to orders of protection that are entered into the MULES system. This information is currently entered by the chief law enforcement officer responsible for maintaining the MULES system. However, the proposal would allow orders of protection to be entered using a direct automated data transfer from the court's automated system. MHP assumes CTS could require their agency to comply with the provisions outlined in the proposal. Therefore, MHP would have to review the training and audit processes within the MULES program with MHP's Communications Division and appropriate MULES committee members. The process of validation of entries, clearing, modifying and deleting would have to be considered and addressed.

As a result of the change in procedure as outlined above, MHP assumes that any costs associated with this legislation will be provided through federal grant money that is currently available for such purposes. Accordingly, MHP assumed no additional costs would result from the proposal.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2002 (10 Mo.)	FY 2003	FY 2004
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2002 (10 Mo.)	FY 2003	FY 2004
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation would make changes to the law on fingerprinting persons convicted of a crime and not previously fingerprinted; permit associate circuit judges to issue subpoenas; authorize direct transfer of orders of protection from the court automated system to MULES; provide for the originating county to cover costs in civil change of venues; modify closed records provisions; and, provide for direct distribution of parenting handbooks.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Revenue
Office of State Courts Administrator



Jeanne Jarrett, CPA
Director
February 16, 2001