

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 6432-02  
Bill No.: HB 2590  
Subject: Notary Public; Secretary of State  
Type: Original  
Date: March 12, 2018

---

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to notaries public.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2019</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2019</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 6 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2019</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2019</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2019</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** assume many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the office can sustain with our core budget. Therefore, SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

**Oversight** assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** assume there may be some fiscal impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender** assume for the purpose of the proposed legislation, and as a result of excessive caseloads, the Office of the State Public Defender cannot assume existing staff will provide competent, effective representation for any new cases where indigent persons are charged with any of the proposed new crimes regarding Notaries - all new Misdemeanors...The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

While the number of new cases may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the Office of the State Public Defender will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide competent and effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assume the proposal is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services** assume the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on their organization.

Officials from the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration, Missouri Department of Conservation, Department of Public Safety-Capitol Police, Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Office of Administration-Information Technology Services Division, Department of Transportation, and Department of Corrections** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Officials from the **Jackson County Election Board, St. Louis County Board of Election Commissioners, and City of Kansas City** both assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Officials from the Department of Public Safety did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

Officials from the following **cities**: Ashland, Belton, Bernie, Bonne Terre, Boonville, California, Cape Girardeau, Clayton, Columbia, Dardenne Prairie, Excelsior Springs, Florissant, Frontenac, Fulton, Grandview, Harrisonville, Independence, Jefferson City, Joplin, Kearney, Knob Noster, Ladue, Lake Ozark City, Lee Summit, Liberty, Louisiana, Maryland Heights, Maryville, Mexico, Monett, Neosho, O'Fallon, Peculiar, Pineville, Popular Bluff, Raytown, Republic, Richmond, Rolla, Sedalia, Springfield, St. Charles City Administrator, St. Louis City Budget Division, St. Robert, Sugar Creek, Sullivan, Warrensburg, Warrenton, Webb City, Weldon Spring and West Plains did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

Officials from the following **counties**: Andrew, Atchison, Audrain, Barry, Benton, Bollinger, Boone, Buchanan, Callaway, Camden, Cape Girardeau, Carroll, Cass, Christian, Clay, Clinton, Cole, Cooper, Davies, Dekalb, Dent, Franklin, Greene, Holt, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Laclede, Lawrence, Lincoln, Maries, Marion, McDonald, Miller, Moniteau, Monroe, Montgomery, New Madrid, Nodaway, Ozark, Perry, Pettis, Platte, Pulaski, Scott, St. Charles, St. Francois, Taney, Warren, Wayne, and Worth did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2019 (6 Mo.)	FY 2020	FY 2021
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2019 (6 Mo.)	FY 2020	FY 2021
	<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.

The proposal contains an effective date of January 1, 2019.

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 Secretary of State  
Office of State Courts Administrator  
Office of the State Public Defender  
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules  
Office of Prosecution Services  
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration  
Missouri Department of Conservation  
Department of Public Safety-Capitol Police  
Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol  
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations  
Office of Administration-Information Technology Services Division  
Department of Transportation  
Department of Corrections  
Jackson County Election Board  
St. Louis County Board of Election Commissioners  
City of Kansas City

Ross Strope



Acting Director  
March 12, 2018