

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0631-01
Bill No.: HB 78
Subject: State Attorney General; Consumer Protection; Political Parties;
Telecommunications
Type: Original
Date: March 13, 2007

Bill Summary: The proposal revises the definition of telephone solicitations to include automated telephone solicitations relating to political campaigns, prohibiting such calls to members of the no-call list.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
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 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator, Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office**, and the **Office of the State Public Defender** assume the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their agencies.

Officials from the **Office of the Attorney General** assume any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed within existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on the courts.

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services** assume the proposal would not have a significant direct fiscal impact on county prosecutors or the Office of Prosecution Services.

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 proposal for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes this is a small amount and does not expect additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the SOS can sustain with their core budget. Any additional required funding would be handled through the budget process.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2008 (10 Mo.)	FY 2009	FY 2010
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government

FY 2008
(10 Mo.)

FY 2009

FY 2010

\$0

\$0

\$0

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 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 Attorney General
Office of State Courts Administrator
Department of Corrections
Department of Public Safety
 – Director's Office
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Public Defender



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
March 13, 2007