

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 5065-02
Bill No.: Perfected SCS for SB 731
Subject: Cities, Towns, and Villages; Counties; Courts; Property - Real and Personal
Type: Original
Date: March 25, 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.

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

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials at the **Office of the Attorney General** assume 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 the fiscal impact of 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.

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

Officials at the **Department of Natural Resources** and the **Office of Prosecution Services** assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at **St. Louis County** and the **City of Columbia** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **City of Kansas City**, the **City of Jefferson** and **Cole County** 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.

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

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	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
Department of Natural Resources



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
March 25, 2014

Ross Strobe
Assistant Director
March 25, 2014