

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 0773-02  
Bill No.: HCS for HB 495  
Subject: Notary Public; Secretary of State  
Type: Original  
Date: March 7, 2019

---

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies the law relating to notaries public.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
General Revenue	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>(Less than \$100,000)</b>	<b>(Less than \$100,000)</b>	<b>(Less than \$100,000)</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
Legal Expense (0692)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 8 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
<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>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
<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>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
<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 \$5,000. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the 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 the core budget. Therefore, the 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 require additional resources.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - General Services** assume section 486.805 appears to create a new cause of action and damages. If a claim were successfully brought against a state agency or a state employee alleging a violation of this legislation, the Legal Expense Fund could be required to pay such claim or claims. However, the number of potential claims, the severity of those claims, and the ultimate costs associated with any settlement or judgment resulting from those claims cannot be forecasted with any degree of assurance to their accuracy.

The state self-assumes its own liability under the state Legal Expense Fund, Section 105.711, RSMo. It is a self-funding mechanism whereby funds are made available for the payment of any claim or judgment rendered against the state in regard to the waivers of sovereign immunity or against employees and specified and individuals. Investigation, defense, negotiation or settlement of such claims is provided by the Office of the Attorney General. Payment is made by the Commissioner of Administration with the approval of the Attorney General.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Attorney General's Office** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

**Oversight** will reflect the potential liability to the state as described by OA as \$0 (State is not liable or no successful suits against the state) to an unknown loss to the State Legal Expense Fund.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** state they cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with any of the proposed new crimes regarding Notaries - all new Misdemeanors. In FY 2019, SPD did not have any cases under RSMo 486. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

**Oversight** notes over the last three fiscal years, the SPD has lapsed a total of \$152 of General Revenue appropriations (\$0 out of \$36.4 million in FY 2016; \$2 out of \$28.0 million in FY 2017; and \$150 out of \$42.5 million in FY 2018). Therefore, **Oversight** assumes the SPD is at maximum capacity and the increase in workload resulting from this bill cannot be absorbed within SPD's current resources.

Adding one additional Assistant Public Defender 1 (APD) with a starting salary of \$47,000, will cost approximately \$74,500 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. One additional APD II (\$52,000 per year; eligible for consideration after 1 year of successful performance at APD I) will cost the state approximately \$81,000 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. When expense and equipment costs such as travel, training, furniture, equipment and supplies are included, Oversight assumes the cost for a new APD could approach \$100,000 per year.

**Oversight** assumes the SPD cannot absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal within their existing resources and, therefore, will reflect a potential additional cost of (Less than \$100,000) per year to the General Revenue Fund.

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR)** state this legislation is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

**Oversight** assumes JCAR will be able to administer any rules resulting from this proposal with existing resources.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services, Department of Transportation, Department of Corrections, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration, Department of Public Safety-Office of the Director, Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol, Missouri Department of Conservation, and Office of State Courts Administrator** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Department of Public Safety-Capitol Police** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **City of Keytesville, Springfield Police Department, Monroe County Assessor, St. Louis County Department of Justice Services, and St. Louis County Police Department** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

**Oversight** notes that the St. Louis County Board of Elections, Jackson County Election Board, Mississippi County Recorder of Deeds, Buchanan County, City of Springfield, Springfield Police Department, St. Louis County Police Department, Boone County Sheriff's Department, and Jackson County Sheriff's Department have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for these agencies.

**Oversight** only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other cities, counties, police and sheriff departments were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. For a general listing of political subdivisions included in our database, please refer to [www.legislativeoversight.mo.gov](http://www.legislativeoversight.mo.gov).

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2020 (6 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
---	--------------------	---------	---------

**GENERAL REVENUE FUND**

<u>Costs</u> - Office of the State Public Defender (\$578.700)	(Less than <u>\$100,000</u> )	(Less than <u>\$100,000</u> )	(Less than <u>\$100,000</u> )
--	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b><u>(Less than \$100,000)</u></b>	<b><u>(Less than \$100,000)</u></b>	<b><u>(Less than \$100,000)</u></b>
---	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u> (continued)	FY 2020 (6 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
--	--------------------	---------	---------

**LEGAL EXPENSE FUND**

<u>Costs</u> - Potential state liability for damages caused by notaries	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>
---	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE LEGAL EXPENSE FUND</b>	<b><u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u></b>
---	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2020 (6 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
	<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

This bill repeals the current law regulating notaries public and replaces it with a new chapter.

A notary shall be liable to any person for all damages proximately caused that person by the notary's negligence, intentional violation of law, or official misconduct in relation to a

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

notarization.

A surety for a notary's bond shall be liable to any person for damages proximately caused that person by the notary's negligence, intentional violation of law, or official misconduct in relation to a notarization during the bond term, but this liability shall not exceed the dollar amount of the bond or of any remaining bond funds that have not been disbursed to other claimants.

An employer of a notary shall be liable to any person for all damages proximately caused that person by the notary's negligence, intentional violation of law, or official misconduct in performing a notarization during the course of employment, if the employer directed, expected, encouraged, approved, or tolerated the notary's negligence, violation of law, or official misconduct either in the particular transaction or, impliedly, by the employer's previous action in at least one similar transaction involving any notary employed by the employer.

A notary shall be guilty of a misdemeanor for knowingly failing to require the presence of a principal at the time of a notarial bill, failing to identify a principal through personal knowledge or satisfactory evidence, or executing a false notarial certificate.

Additionally, a notary who performs any other bill prohibited by this bill or fails to perform a required bill shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of no more than \$500 or imprisonment of not more than six months, or both.

Any person who is not a notary and who knowingly acts as or otherwise impersonates a notary shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable upon conviction by a fine not exceeding \$500 or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both.

Any person who knowingly obtains, conceals, defaces, or destroys the seal, journal, or official records of a notary or who knowingly solicits, coerces, or in any way influences a notary to commit official misconduct shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable upon conviction by a fine not exceeding \$500.

The provisions of this bill become effective January 1, 2020.

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 Administration-General Services  
Office of the State Public Defender  
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules  
Office of Prosecution Services  
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration  
Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol  
Department of Public Safety-Capitol Police  
Department of Public Safety-Office of the Director  
Department of Transportation  
Department of Corrections  
Missouri Department of Conservation  
Office of State Courts Administrator  
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations  
City of Keytesville  
City of Kansas City  
Springfield Police Department  
Monroe County Assessor  
St. Louis County Department of Justice Services  
St. Louis County Police Department



Kyle Rieman  
Director  
March 7, 2019

Ross Strobe  
Assistant Director  
March 7, 2019