COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.:5065-02Bill No.:SCS for SB 731Subject:Cities, Towns, and Villages; Counties; Courts; Property - Real and PersonalType:OriginalDate:March 7, 2014

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to nuisance ordinances and actions.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue				
Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

L.R. No. 5065-02 Bill No. SCS for SB 731 Page 2 of 5 March 7, 2014

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	

□ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

□ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

L.R. No. 5065-02 Bill No. SCS for SB 731 Page 3 of 5 March 7, 2014

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

In response to a previous version, officials at the **Office of the Attorney General** assumed that any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (CTS)** assume this proposal would not be in excess of \$100,000.

Oversight assumes that any costs from CTS relating to this proposal could be absorbed within their current appropriation level.

Officials at the Office of the State Public Defender assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **Office of Prosecution Services** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at **St. Louis County** and the **City of Kansas City** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **City of Jefferson**, **Cole County** and the **City of Columbia** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

Officials at the following cities: Clayton, Fulton, Harrisonville, Independence, Liberty, Springfield, St. Charles, St. Joseph and St. Louis did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

Officials at the following counties: Boone, Buchanan, Callaway, Camden, Cape Girardeau, Cass, Clay, Franklin, Greene, Jackson, Jefferson, Platte, St. Charles, St. Francois, and Taney did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2015 (10 Mo.)	FY 2016	FY 2017
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

L.R. No. 5065-02 Bill No. SCS for SB 731 Page 4 of 5 March 7, 2014

FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2015 (10 Mo.)	FY 2016	FY 2017
	<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.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no direct fiscal impact.

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

Office of the State Courts Administrator Office of the Attorney General Office of Prosecution Services Office of the State Public Defender St. Louis County Cole County City of Kansas City City of Jefferson City of Columbia

Mickey Wilen

Mickey Wilson, CPA Director March 7, 2014

L.R. No. 5065-02 Bill No. SCS for SB 731 Page 5 of 5 March 7, 2014

> Ross Strope Assistant Director March 7, 2014