



financial support that will be disbursed in that fiscal year will be a portion of that annual amount, or approximately \$52,428.

- **Upper Sandusky Municipal Court judgeship.** Starting in January 2008, the annual amount in GRF funding that the Supreme Court of Ohio will disburse in the form of state support for the judgeship in the Upper Sandusky Municipal Court will increase by an estimated \$27,085 which consists of: (1) \$22,200 in salary, (2) \$3,057 in PERS contributions, and (3) \$1,828 in miscellaneous other contributions. As the term of the judge actually begins roughly halfway through the state's FY 2008 (January 2008), the amount of state financial support that will be disbursed in that fiscal year will be a portion of that annual amount, or approximately \$13,543.
- **Compensation of a legislator appointed to judicial office.** As a result of the bill's provision relative to the compensation of a legislator appointed to judicial office, circumstances may occasionally arise wherein certain legislators appointed to judicial office would be paid less than the statutorily mandated amount of compensation in effect at the time of that appointment. Such an outcome most likely generates a savings in GRF moneys that would otherwise have been disbursed by the Supreme Court as state financial support for that judgeship. The magnitude of that potential savings is problematic to estimate and uncertain, as it depends on predicting the future behavior of various individuals and General Assemblies.
- **Incarceration costs.** It is possible as a result of the bill's penalty enhancements that, annually, a few more adult and juvenile offenders could end up being sentenced to prison or committed to the state, which would increase, respectively, the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's (DRC) annual incarceration costs and the Department of Youth Services' (DYS) annual care and custody costs. The number of additional adult and juvenile offenders that might actually be sentenced or committed to the state annually appears likely to be relatively small. Assuming that were true, then any related increase in DRC's annual incarceration costs and DYS' annual care and custody costs would be no more than minimal. For the purposes of this fiscal analysis, "minimal" means an estimated cost of no more than \$100,000 for the state per year.
- **Victims of Crime/Reparations Fund.** The state may gain some locally collected court cost revenue for the Victims of Crime/Reparations Fund (Fund 402). This is because the state court cost imposed on an offender and deposited to the credit of Fund 402 is slightly higher for a felony than it is for a misdemeanor: \$30 versus \$9. The amount of money that Fund 402 may gain annually, however, is likely to be negligible, as the number of affected criminal and juvenile cases appears to be relatively small. For the purposes of this fiscal analysis, "negligible" means an estimated gain of no more than \$1,000 for the state per year.

## ***Local Fiscal Highlights***

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	FY 2008	FY 2009	FUTURE YEARS
<b>Champaign County*</b>			
Revenues	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
Expenditures	- 0 -	Estimated \$6,195 increase related to local share of new judgeship plus approximately \$40,000 for additional court staff	Estimated \$8,260 annual increase related to local share of new judgeship plus approximately \$40,000 annually for additional court staff
<b>Hamilton County</b>			
Revenues	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
Expenditures	- 0 -	Potential savings, magnitude uncertain	Potential savings, magnitude uncertain
<b>City of Upper Sandusky (Wyandot County)**</b>			
Revenues	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
Expenditures	Estimated \$30,975 increase related to local share of full-time judgeship	Estimated \$30,975 increase related to local share of full-time judgeship	Estimated \$30,975 increase related to local share of full-time judgeship
<b>County Criminal and Juvenile Justice Systems</b>			
Revenues	Potential gain in court costs and fines, likely to be no more than minimal	Potential gain in court costs and fines, likely to be no more than minimal	Potential gain in court costs and fines, likely to be no more than minimal
Expenditures	Potential increase in criminal and/or juvenile justice system operating costs, likely to be no more than minimal	Potential increase in criminal and/or juvenile justice system operating costs, likely to be no more than minimal	Potential increase in criminal and/or juvenile justice system operating costs, likely to be no more than minimal
<b>Municipal Criminal Justice Systems</b>			
Revenues	Potential loss in court costs and fines, likely to be no more than minimal	Potential loss in court costs and fines, likely to be no more than minimal	Potential loss in court costs and fines, likely to be no more than minimal
Expenditures	Potential decrease in criminal justice system operating costs, likely to be no more than minimal	Potential decrease in criminal justice system operating costs, likely to be no more than minimal	Potential decrease in criminal justice system operating costs, likely to be no more than minimal

Note: For most local governments, the fiscal year is the calendar year. The school district fiscal year is July 1 through June 30.

\* The new judge will be elected in 2008 for a term to begin February 10, 2009.

\*\* The bill changes, on or after January 1, 2008, the status of the judge of the Upper Sandusky Municipal Court from part-time to full-time.

- ***Champaign County Court of Common Pleas judgeship.*** Starting with FY 2010, the annual salary and related payroll expenses for the new judge to be added to the Champaign County Court of Common Pleas will cost Champaign County an estimated \$8,260 per year. As the term of the new judge actually begins before FY 2010 (February 10, 2009), the amount of local financial support that will be disbursed in FY 2009 will be a portion of that annual amount, or approximately \$6,195.

- **Champaign County capital improvements.** The building that houses the Champaign County Court of Common Pleas is currently undergoing a renovation, the scope of which already includes the space necessary to accommodate the additional judge contained in this bill.
- **Champaign County court staffing expenses.** The staff for the new judgeship will primarily be composed of existing staff of the Probate-Juvenile division. An additional bailiff for the new judge will need to be hired at a cost, including benefits, of approximately \$40,000 annually.
- **Hamilton County Drug Court.** Presumably, existence of the Hamilton County Drug Court has allowed the county to more quickly and appropriately sanction certain drug offenders than would otherwise have been the case. If the authority for the Drug Court were allowed to sunset, then those efficiencies would most likely be lost, at least for the time being, until the local criminal justice system adjusted to a new way of handling drug cases. The bill would preserve those efficiencies permanently. Legislative Service Commission fiscal staff, however, has no easy way of quantifying the annual savings that those efficiencies currently produce.
- **Upper Sandusky Municipal Court judgeship.** Starting in January 2008, the annual salary and related payroll expenses for changing the judge of the Upper Sandusky Municipal Court from part-time to full-time status will cost the City of Upper Sandusky an estimated \$30,975 per year.
- **Local criminal and juvenile justice system expenditures.** The effect of the bill's penalty enhancement provisions on local governments will be to: (1) shift certain misdemeanor assault and menacing cases from a municipal court or a county court to a court of common pleas as felony assault and menacing cases, and (2) raise the possibility of more serious sanctions being imposed on juvenile offenders. As a result of the former effect, municipalities may shed some of their annual criminal justice system expenditures related to investigating, adjudicating, prosecuting, defending (if indigent), and sanctioning offenders who commit these assaults and menacing. Conversely, counties could experience an increase in their annual criminal justice system expenditures, as felonies are typically more time consuming and expensive to resolve and the local sanctioning costs can be higher as well. Annual costs to county juvenile justice systems to resolve certain assault and menacing cases and appropriately sanction the offending juvenile may rise as well. Given the number of criminal and juvenile cases that will be affected by the bill's penalty enhancements appear to be relatively small, any potential decrease in annual municipal criminal justice system expenditures and any potential increase in annual county criminal and juvenile justice system expenditures would likely be no more than minimal. For the purposes of this fiscal analysis, "minimal" means a change in expenditures estimated at no more than \$5,000 for any affected municipality or county per year.
- **Local court cost and fine revenues.** As the bill's penalty enhancements would shift certain assault and menacing cases involving adult offenders out of a county court or a municipal court (which handle misdemeanors) and into a court of common pleas (which handle felonies), this creates a potential loss of court cost and fine revenue for municipalities. Conversely, it creates the possibility that counties may gain court cost and fine revenue. It is also possible that juvenile offenders may be fined higher amounts than would otherwise have been the case under current law and sentencing practices. As the number of affected criminal and juvenile cases appears likely to be relatively small, the amount of annual court cost and fine revenue that municipalities might lose and counties might gain would be no more than minimal. For the purposes of this fiscal analysis, "minimal" means a change in revenue estimated at no more than \$5,000 for any affected municipality or county per year.

---

## ***Detailed Fiscal Analysis***

### **Overview**

For the purposes of this fiscal analysis, the bill most notably:

- Adds one judge to the Court of Common Pleas of Champaign County.
- Makes the Hamilton County Drug Court permanent.
- Changes the status of the judge of the Upper Sandusky Municipal Court from part-time to full-time.
- Specifies the compensation of a legislator appointed to judicial office.
- Increases the penalty for assault and aggravated menacing in a courthouse.
- Extends the deadline for the report of the Joint Committee to Study Court Costs and Filing Fees.

### **Champaign County Court of Common Pleas judgeship**

The bill creates a Domestic Relations-Juvenile-Probate Division for the Champaign County Court of Common Pleas and adds a judge to that division to be elected in 2008, for a term to begin February 10, 2009.

### **Judicial compensation-related costs**

**Base salary.** The annual salary of a judge of a court of common pleas consists of a state share paid and local share paid by the county as follows:

- The ***local share*** varies slightly depending on a county's population as determined by the decennial census. The local amount is based on 18 cents per capita in the county, but may not be less than \$3,500 or more than \$14,000.
- The ***state share*** is equal to the annual salary minus the local share. Substitute House Bill 712 of the 123rd General Assembly provided annual salary increases each year from 2002 through 2008. The annual salaries of the judges and justices of the court will increase by the lesser of 3% or the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) over the 12-month period ending on September 30 of the previous year. In the case of judges for whom a portion of the salary is paid locally, the entire amount of the increase is added to the state share.

Supreme Court of Ohio fiscal staff has estimated that, in 2008, the annual salary of a judge of a court of common pleas will be \$121,600. Absent a statutory change providing annual salary increases after the year 2008, that annual amount will not increase in the year 2009. This would mean, of that amount, based on the 2000 Census, Champaign County's local share will total \$7,000 (38,890 county population x 18 cents per capita) in the year 2009. The state will cover the balance of the annual salary,

which for the remainder of state FY 2009 (February 10, 2009 through June 30, 2009), amounts to \$42,975. For FY 2010, the first full state fiscal year of the judgeship, the state will expend \$114,600 plus whatever future cost-of-living increase may be authorized by the General Assembly.

**Retirement.** State and local elected officials are exempt from membership in PERS (Public Employees Retirement System), unless they choose to become members. Most do. Therefore, this analysis includes PERS payments, which assumes that the new judge added to the Champaign County Court of Common Pleas joins PERS. The state and local PERS contributions would work as follows:

- The state and Champaign County contribute at the rate of 13.77% and 13.55% of their share amounts, respectively. Under that PERS contribution formula, Champaign County will pay \$948 annually, while the state will contribute \$15,780 in FY 2010, the first full state fiscal year of the new judgeship.

**Other state and local contributions.** In addition to PERS, the state and Champaign County also make contributions for other purposes as follows:

- The state contributions total approximately 8.235%, which includes 1.45% of gross salary for Medicare for all employees hired after April 1986, 0.07% for workers' compensation, 0.295% for the Department of Administrative Services' payroll administration services, and 6.42% for health insurance. These miscellaneous annual contributions will cost the state \$9,437 (\$114,600 x 8.235%) in FY 2010, the first full state fiscal year of the new court of common pleas judgeship.
- Champaign County's contributions total approximately 4.45%, which includes 1.45% of gross salary for Medicare and 3.0% for workers' compensation. These miscellaneous annual contributions will cost Champaign County \$312 (\$7,000 x 4.45%).

**Summary of payroll-related costs.** The state and local shares of various payroll costs directly related to an additional court of common pleas judge are summarized in the table below.

<b>Champaign County Court of Common Pleas Judgeship Estimated Annual State and Local Judgeship Payroll-Related Costs</b>	
<b>Estimated Base Salary: \$121,600 (for a term to begin February 2009)*</b>	
<b><u>State Share (FY 2010)</u></b>	
Salary	\$114,600
PERS (13.77%)	\$15,780
Medicare (1.45%)	\$1,661
Workers' Compensation (0.07%)	\$81
Payroll Administration Services (0.295%)	\$338
Health Insurance (6.42%)	\$7,357
<b>State Total</b>	<b>\$139,817</b>
<b><u>Local Share (CY 2009)</u></b>	
Salary	\$7,000
PERS (13.55%)	\$948
Workers' Compensation (3.00%)	\$210
Medicare (1.45%)	\$102
<b>Local Total</b>	<b>\$8,260</b>

---

**Other Champaign County costs**

**Capital improvements.** The building that houses the Champaign County Court of Common Pleas is currently undergoing a renovation. This renovation began with the knowledge that a new court of common pleas judge could possibly be added in the future. As a result, the scope of this renovation has already incorporated the space necessary to accommodate the additional judge contained in this bill.

**Staffing expenses.** Legislative Service Commission fiscal staff contacted Champaign County court personnel to determine if the addition of one judge will require any increase in court staff and was informed that the new judge/division will require the addition of a bailiff at an annual cost, including benefits, of approximately \$40,000.

**Hamilton County Drug Court**

The bill makes the Drug Court Judge of the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas permanent. The term of the current Drug Court Judge began on January 3, 1997, and is set to expire and be replaced by a successor general division judge on January 2, 2009.

The Drug Court currently costs Hamilton County in excess of \$700,000 annually to operate, which includes the payroll expenses of 18 county personnel, including the judge, a director, an administrator, a bailiff, a clerk, a court reporter, a prosecutor, three public defenders, and eight probation officers.

If the authority that allows the Drug Court to exist were allowed to sunset, these annual operating costs would not simply disappear; nor would its drug caseload simply disappear. These drug cases would be redistributed among all of the judges of the general division of the county's court of common pleas, including the former Drug Court judgeship that would become a member of the general division. The remaining county personnel that have been assembled around the existing Drug Court would probably not be just let go, they would most likely be reallocated around the criminal justice components of Hamilton County's common pleas court system to reflect the caseload effects of redistributing drug cases.

Even if the bill does not create a direct fiscal effect on Hamilton County, for example, by cutting annual operating costs associated with the Drug Court, it could still be argued that there is at least one likely indirect fiscal effect. Presumably, the existence of the Drug Court has allowed the county to more quickly and appropriately sanction certain drug offenders than would otherwise have been the case. If the authority for the Drug Court were allowed to sunset, then those efficiencies would most likely be lost, at least for the time being until the local criminal justice system adjusted to a new way of handling drug cases. The bill would permanently preserve those efficiencies. Legislative Service Commission fiscal staff, however, has no easy way of quantifying the annual savings that those efficiencies currently produce.

**Upper Sandusky Municipal Court judgeship**

The bill changes, on or after January 1, 2008, the status of the judge of the Upper Sandusky Municipal Court from part-time to full-time.

**Judicial compensation-related costs**

**Base salary.** The annual salary of a municipal court judge consists of a local and state share determined by statute as follows:

- The ***local share*** is \$35,500 per year for a part-time court municipal judge and \$61,750 per year for a full-time municipal court judge.
- The ***state share*** is equal to the annual salary minus the local share. Substitute House Bill 712 of the 123rd General Assembly provided annual salary increases each year from 2002 through 2008. The annual salaries of the judges and justices of the court will increase by the lesser of 3% or the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) over the 12-month period ending on September 30 of the previous year. In the case of judges for whom a portion of the salary is paid locally, the entire amount of the increase is added to the state share.

According to the Supreme Court of Ohio's web site, in 2008, the annual salary of a full-time municipal court judge will be \$114,100 and the annual salary of a part-time municipal court judge will be \$65,650. Absent a statutory change providing annual salary increases after the year 2008, that annual amount will not increase annually thereafter. For the purposes of changing the status of the judge of the Upper Sandusky Municipal Court from part-time to full-time, this means that the annual local and state shares of that judge's salary will increase by \$26,250 and \$22,200, respectively. As of this writing, it appears that the entire increase in the local share of the annual salary of the judge of the Upper Sandusky Municipal Court (\$26,250) and related operating expenses will be paid by the City of Upper Sandusky, which is located in Wyandot County.

**Retirement.** State and local elected officials are exempt from membership in PERS (Public Employees Retirement System), unless they choose to become members. Most do. Therefore, this analysis includes PERS payments, which assumes that the new judge added to the Champaign County Court of Common Pleas joins PERS. The state and local PERS contributions would work as follows:

- The state and the City of Upper Sandusky contribute at the rate of 13.77% and 13.55% of their share amounts, respectively. Under that PERS contribution formula, the City of Upper Sandusky will pay \$8,367 annually, while the state will contribute \$7,209 in FY 2009, the first full state fiscal year of the full-time municipal court judgeship. This represents an annual increase in PERS expenses over a part-time judge of \$3,557 for the City of Sandusky and \$3,057 for the state.

**Other state and local contributions.** In addition to PERS, the state and the City of Upper Sandusky also make contributions for other purposes as follows:

- The state contributions total approximately 8.235%, which includes 1.45% of gross salary for Medicare for all employees hired after April 1986, 0.07% for workers' compensation,

0.295% for the Department of Administrative Services' payroll administration services, and 6.42% for health insurance. These miscellaneous annual contributions will cost the state \$4,311 in FY 2009, the first full state fiscal year of the full-time municipal court judgeship. This represents an annual increase over a part-time municipal court judgeship of \$1,828 for the state.

- The City of Upper Sandusky's contributions total approximately 4.45%, which includes 1.45% of gross salary for Medicare and 3.0% for workers' compensation. These miscellaneous annual contributions will cost the City of Upper Sandusky \$2,748. This represents an annual increase in expenses over a part-time judge of \$1,168 for the City of Upper Sandusky.

**Summary of payroll-related costs.** The state and City of Upper Sandusky shares of various payroll costs directly related to the change in the judgeship are summarized in the table below.

<b>Upper Sandusky Municipal Court Judgeship Estimated Annual State and Local Judgeship Payroll-Related Costs</b>		
<b>Base Salary: \$114,100 (for a term to begin January 2008)*</b>		
<b><u>State Share (FY 2009)</u></b>		
Salary	\$52,350	
PERS (13.77%)	\$7,209	
Medicare (1.45%)		\$759
Workers' Compensation (0.07%)	\$37	
Payroll Administration Services (0.295%)	\$154	
Health Insurance (6.42%)	\$3,361	
<b>State Total</b>	<b>\$63,870</b>	
<b><u>Local Share (CY 2008)</u></b>		
Salary	\$61,750	
PERS (13.55%)	\$8,367	
Workers' Compensation (3.00%)	\$1,853	
Medicare (1.45%)		\$896
<b>Local Total</b>	<b>\$72,866</b>	

**Compensation of a legislator appointed to judicial office**

**State revenues and expenditures.** As a result of the bill's provision relative to the compensation of a legislator appointed to judicial office, circumstances may occasionally arise wherein certain legislators appointed to judicial office would be paid less than the statutorily mandated amount of compensation in effect at the time of that appointment. Such an outcome most likely generates a savings in GRF moneys that would otherwise have been disbursed by the Supreme Court as state financial

support for that judgeship. The magnitude of that potential savings is problematic to estimate and uncertain, as it depends on predicting the future behavior of various individuals and General Assemblies.

**Local revenues and expenditures.** This provision of the bill appears unlikely to affect the amount of the local share for any given judgeship. Thus, it would have no effect on local expenditures. This provision has no effect on local revenues.

**Penalty enhancement for assault and aggravated menacing in a courthouse**

The bill provides that the offenses of assault and aggravated menacing are felonies of the fifth degree if the offenses occur in a courthouse or another building or structure in which a courtroom is located. Generally, under current law, assault or aggravated menacing committed in a courthouse is a misdemeanor of the first degree unless the status of the victim elevates the penalty.

At this point in time, LSC fiscal staff has not uncovered any evidence to suggest that the bill's penalty enhancement provisions will alter, to any significant degree, annual state incarceration costs or local criminal and juvenile justice system expenditures, as discussed in more detail below.

**Felony and misdemeanor sentences and fines generally**

The table immediately below summarizes the existing sentences and fines, unchanged by the bill, for felony and misdemeanor offenses generally.

**Existing Sentences and Fines for Misdemeanor Offenses Generally**

<b>Offense Level</b>	<b>Potential Fine</b>	<b>Potential Period of Confinement</b>
Felony 1st degree	Up to \$20,000	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 year definite prison term
Felony 2nd degree	Up to \$15,000	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 year definite prison term
Felony 3rd degree	Up to \$10,000	1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 year definite prison term
Felony 4th degree	Up to \$5,000	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, or 18 month definite prison term
Felony 5th degree	Up to \$2,500	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12 month definite prison term
Misdemeanor 1st degree	Up to \$1,000	Up to 6-month jail stay
Misdemeanor 2nd degree	Up to \$750	Up to 90-day jail stay
Misdemeanor 3rd degree	Up to \$500	Up to 60-day jail stay
Misdemeanor 4th degree	Up to \$250	Up to 30-day jail stay
Minor misdemeanor	Up to \$150	Citation issued; No arrest

**Expenditures generally**

The bill's penalty enhancement provisions will affect local expenditures on certain criminal and juvenile assault and menacing cases in at least two ways.

First, it will shift criminal cases that would have been handled by a municipal court or a county court as misdemeanor assaults and menacing under existing law to a court of common pleas where they will be handled as felonies and offenders could be subjected to more serious sanctions. As a result, municipalities may shed some of their annual criminal justice system expenditures related to investigating, adjudicating, prosecuting, defending (if indigent), and sanctioning offenders who assault or menace persons in a courthouse. Conversely, counties could experience an increase in their annual criminal justice system expenditures, as felonies are typically more time consuming and expensive to resolve and the local sanctioning costs can be higher as well.

Second, offenders who are young enough to be processed through the juvenile courts would also face the possibility of more serious penalties and sentencing. As a result, the annual costs to county juvenile justice systems to resolve these assault and menacing cases and appropriately sanction the offending juvenile may rise.

Given the number of criminal and juvenile cases that will be affected by the bill's penalty enhancements appear to be relatively small, any potential decrease in annual municipal criminal justice system expenditures and any potential increase in annual county criminal and juvenile justice system expenditures would likely be no more than minimal. For the purposes of this fiscal analysis, minimal means a change in expenditures estimated at no more than \$5,000 per year for any affected local jurisdiction.

It is also possible as a result of the bill that: (1) additional adult offenders could be sentenced to prison, which theoretically increases the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's (DRC) annual incarceration costs, and (2) additional juvenile offenders could be committed to the state, which theoretically increases the Department of Youth Services' (DYS) annual care and custody costs. As of this writing, however, it would appear that very few additional adult and juvenile offenders will be sentenced to prison or committed to the state annually as a result of the bill's penalty enhancements and thus any related potential increase in DRC's annual incarceration costs or DYS's annual care and custody costs would be no more than minimal. For the purposes of this fiscal analysis, in the context of state expenditures, minimal means an annual cost increase estimated at less than \$100,000.

### **Revenues generally**

As the penalty enhancements would shift certain assault and menacing cases involving adult offenders out of a county court or a municipal court (which handle misdemeanors) and into a court of common pleas (which handle felonies), this creates a potential loss of court cost and fine revenue for municipalities. Conversely, it creates the possibility that counties may gain court cost and fine revenue. It is also possible that juvenile offenders may be fined higher amounts than would otherwise have been the case under current law and sentencing practices. As the number of affected criminal and juvenile cases appears likely to be relatively small, the amount of annual court cost and fine revenue that municipalities might lose and counties might gain would be no more than minimal. For the purposes of

this fiscal analysis, "minimal" means a change in revenues estimated at no more than \$5,000 per year for any affected local jurisdiction.

The state may also gain some locally collected court cost revenue for the Victims of Crime/Reparations Fund (Fund 402). This is because the state court cost imposed on an offender and deposited to the credit of Fund 402 is slightly higher for a felony than it is for a misdemeanor: \$30 versus \$9. The amount of money that Fund 402 may gain annually, however, is likely to be negligible, as the number of affected criminal and juvenile cases appears to be relatively small. For the purposes of this fiscal analysis, in the context of state revenues, negligible means an annual gain estimated at less than \$1,000.

### **Joint Committee to Study Court Costs and Filing Fees**

Pursuant to Section 6 of Sub. H.B. 336 of the 126th General Assembly, effective January 18, 2007, the Joint Committee to Study Court Costs and Filing Fees must submit written findings and recommendations not later than one year after the effective date of the act to the justices and Chief Justice of the Ohio Supreme Court, the General Assembly, and the Governor. The bill extends that deadline to one year and six months after the effective date of Sub. H.B. 336. This provision of the bill does not appear to have any direct fiscal effect on the revenues or expenditures of the state or its political subdivisions.

*LSC fiscal staff: Matthew L. Stiffler, Budget Analyst*

*SB0155HP/rh*