

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Clerk of the Court Fees

Issue: Powers of Attorney

Bill Number(s): CS/HB 841

Entire Bill

Partial Bill:

Sponsor(s): Judiciary Committee, Rep. Powell and Others

Month/Year Impact Begins: Upon Becoming a Law

Date of Analysis: 5/6/2013

Section 1: Narrative

- a. **Current Law:** Section 28.222, F.S., provides for the clerk of the circuit court to be the recorder of all instruments required by law. Section 28.24 (12), F.S., provides service charges to be imposed by the clerks for recording, indexing, and filing instruments of not more than a certain size. Section 218.35(2), F.S., provides for the Clerk of the Court to function as clerk of the circuit and county courts and as clerk of the board of county commissioners and to prepare a budget in two parts: 1) necessary to perform court-related functions; and 2) necessary for all county funds and other county-related duties.
- b. **Proposed Change:** Among other things, this bill amends section 709.2105, F.S., relating to “validity of power of attorney,” to provide that an original power of attorney relied upon to affect the title to real property may be required for recording in the official records and that an original properly executed power of attorney may be presented to the clerk of the circuit court for recording in the official records as provided under s. 28.222, upon payment of the service charge provided in s. 28.24.

Section 2: Description of Data and Sources

Telephone interview with Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers (FCCC) Association staff

Section 3: Methodology (Include Assumptions and Attach Details)

According to FCCC staff, it is not common practice in Florida for power of attorney instruments to be recorded. There exists no readily available data regarding the number recorded statewide for any particular time period. Whether or not the language proposed in the bill will result in additional power of attorney instruments being recorded or not is unknown; however, it was not anticipated that any resulting increase in the number would be significant.

According to FCCC staff, the typical power of attorney instrument necessary to affect the title of real property would require approximately 3 pages. A power of attorney template downloaded from the internet required only 1 page, including principal, agent, and notary signature lines. The fee for a three page power of attorney instrument with 4 signatures or less would be as follows:

1 st page recording	\$5
2 nd page recording	\$4
3 rd page recording	\$4
1 st page additional Records Modernization Fund recording	\$1
2 nd page additional Records Modernization Fund recording	0.5
3 rd page additional Records Modernization Fund recording	<u>0.5</u>
TOTAL	\$15

Assuming 3 pages per power of attorney instrument, it would require an increase of more than 3,333 power of attorney instruments in any fiscal year to exceed \$50,000 ($50,000 / 15 = 3,333.33$). It was assumed that at least 1 additional power of attorney instrument would be recorded as a result of the proposed bill; therefore, the impact of the bill was assumed to be positive insignificant.

Section 4: Proposed Fiscal Impact

	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14 Local			*	*		
2014-15 Local			*	*		
2015-16 Local			*	*		
2016-17 Local			*	*		
2017-18 Local			*	*		

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Clerk of the Court Fees

Issue: Powers of Attorney

Bill Number(s): CS/HB 841

List of affected Trust Funds:

No state trust funds are affected.

Section 5: Consensus Estimate (Adopted: 05/08/2013) The conference adopted the proposed estimate.

	GR		Trust		Local/Other		Total	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	*	*	*
2014-15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	*	*	*
2015-16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	*	*	*
2016-17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	*	*	*
2017-18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	*	*	*

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Ad Valorem Tax
Issue: Real Property
Bill Number(s): CS/CS/HB277

Entire Bill:

Partial Bill:

Sponsor(s): Rep.Vasilinda

Month/Year Impact Begins: July 1, 2013 (Applying to assessments beginning January 1, 2014)

Date of Analysis: 5/8/2013

Section 1: Narrative

- a. Current Law:** section 4(i), Article VII of the Florida Constitution allows the legislature, by general law, to prohibit the consideration of any change or improvement due to the installation of a renewable energy source device in determining the assessed value of real property used for residential purposes. No current general law authorization exists.
- b. Proposed Change:** by general law, when determining the assessed value of real property used for residential purposes, any increase in the just value of the property attributable to the installation of a renewable energy source devices may not be considered. These provisions apply to installations, changes, or improvements for new and existing residential real property that are installed or made on or after January 1, 2013. CS/CS/HB277 does not require that the owner of the property file an application by a certain date with a property appraiser to preclude any renewable energy source device from the assessed value of the real property.

Section 2: Description of Data and Sources:

American Community Survey
Florida Public Service Commission (PSC)
Florida Solar Energy Center (FSEC)
Annual Industry Accounts, U.S Bureau of Economic Analysis
Millage Rates, Department of Revenue

Section 3: Methodology (Include Assumptions and Attach Details)

CS/CS/HB277 does not include language that requires the owner to apply to the property appraiser for the reduction of the assessed value. In the prior analysis (HB277), owners had to apply by March 1st to receive the reduction. Any applications that fell after March 1st did not receive the reduction until the following year.

In this analysis, the low impact is the adopted impact from the prior analysis. The high and the middle assume higher cohort levels earlier due to the application language being removed. The high assumes 10% of the cohorts receive the exemption a year earlier. The middle assumes that 5% of the cohort receives the exemption a year earlier.

Residential Solar Water Heaters and Solar Pool Heaters

The FSEC provided historical data and advice for the number of new residential systems and the average dollar amount of investment per installed residential system. Using 2012 as the base year, it was assumed that a new cohort would follow in each subsequent year. Due to the decreasing cost of solar power, the estimated cost of each new unit declines in the forecast.

Solar Energy/Photovoltaic (PV)

The Public Service Commission provided the number of Florida solar energy/PV customers participating in the net metering program from 2008-2011. Following conversations with the agency and industry, the data was reduced by 5% to account for the possibility of commercial and industrial customers and grown by a factor of 1.5 to account for customers not participating in net metering initiatives. Following these calculations, the estimated difference in the number of residential solar energy/PV customers from 2010 to 2011 was found to be 1,161, which was then multiplied by the 1.5 factor to obtain a revised customer count of 1,654. It was then assumed that a new cohort of 1,654 residential solar energy/PV customers, plus a growth rate of 13.0%, would follow in each subsequent year. The average dollar amount of investment per system decreases throughout the forecast period.

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Ad Valorem Tax
Issue: Real Property
Bill Number(s): CS/CS/HB277

Geothermal Heat Exchange

Following conversations with the Florida Solar Energy Center, the following assumptions were made regarding the use of geothermal heat exchanges:

- A new cohort of 1,000 residential customers for each year throughout the forecast period;
- An average dollar amount of investment of \$19,000 per system throughout the forecast period.

Section 4: Proposed Fiscal Impact

Impact Value School:

	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14	(\$0m)	(\$5.6m)	(\$0m)	(\$5.5m)	(\$0m)	(\$5.4m)
2014-15	(\$2.4m)	(\$5.6m)	(\$2.3m)	(\$5.5m)	(\$2.2m)	(\$5.4m)
2015-16	(\$3.5m)	(\$5.6m)	(\$3.4m)	(\$5.5m)	(\$3.3m)	(\$5.4m)
2016-17	(\$4.5m)	(\$5.6m)	(\$4.5m)	(\$5.5m)	(\$4.4m)	(\$5.4m)
2017-18	(\$5.6m)	(\$5.6m)	(\$5.5m)	(\$5.5m)	(\$5.4m)	(\$5.4m)

Impact Value Non-School

	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14	(\$0m)	(\$7.4m)	(\$0m)	(\$7.3m)	(\$0m)	(\$7.2m)
2014-15	(\$3.1m)	(\$7.4m)	(\$3.0m)	(\$7.3m)	(\$3.0m)	(\$7.2m)
2015-16	(\$4.6m)	(\$7.4m)	(\$4.5m)	(\$7.3m)	(\$4.4m)	(\$7.2m)
2016-17	(\$6.0m)	(\$7.4m)	(\$5.9m)	(\$7.3m)	(\$5.8m)	(\$7.2m)
2017-18	(\$7.4m)	(\$7.4m)	(\$7.3m)	(\$7.3m)	(\$7.2m)	(\$7.2m)

List of affected Trust Funds: Ad Valorem Tax Grouping

Section 5: Consensus Estimate (Adopted: 05/08/2013) The conference adopted the low estimate.

	School		Non-School		Total Local/Other	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14	0.0	(5.4)	0.0	(7.2)	0.0	(12.6)
2014-15	(2.2)	(5.4)	(3.0)	(7.2)	(5.2)	(12.6)
2015-16	(3.3)	(5.4)	(4.4)	(7.2)	(7.7)	(12.6)
2016-17	(4.4)	(5.4)	(5.8)	(7.2)	(10.2)	(12.6)
2017-18	(5.4)	(5.4)	(7.2)	(7.2)	(12.6)	(12.6)

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVICES CALCULATIONS							
2								
3	Millage Rates:	School:	8.191	Asumptions:	High:	10%		
4		Non-School:	10.78		Middle:	5%		
5								
6								
7			2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
8	Residential Solar Water Heaters							
9	Number of New Residential Systems (HIGH)		-	1,220	1,210	1,310	1,410	1,510
10	Number of New Residential Systems (MIDDLE)		-	1,160	1,205	1,305	1,405	1,505
11	Number of New Residential Systems (LOW)		-	1,100	1,200	1,300	1,400	1,500
12	Average Investment Per Installed Residential System		4,000	4,000	3,780	3,572	3,376	3,190
13								
14	Total Investment (HIGH)		-	4,880,000	4,573,800	4,679,451	4,759,645	4,816,862
15	Total Investment (MIDDLE)		-	4,640,000	4,554,900	4,661,591	4,742,766	4,800,912
16	Total Investment (LOW)		-	4,400,000	4,536,000	4,643,730	4,725,888	4,784,962
17								
18	Cumulative Investment (HIGH)			4,880,000	9,453,800	14,133,251	18,892,896	23,709,757
19	Cumulative Investment (MIDDLE)			4,640,000	9,194,900	13,856,491	18,599,257	23,400,169
20	Cumulative Investment (LOW)			4,400,000	8,936,000	13,579,730	18,305,618	23,090,580
21								
22	Investment x Millage (HIGH)		School	\$0.04	\$0.08	\$0.12	\$0.15	\$0.19
23			Non-School	\$0.05	\$0.10	\$0.15	\$0.20	\$0.26
24	Investment x Millage (MIDDLE)		School	\$0.04	\$0.08	\$0.11	\$0.15	\$0.19
25			Non-School	\$0.05	\$0.10	\$0.15	\$0.20	\$0.25
26	Investment x Millage (LOW)		School	\$0.04	\$0.07	\$0.11	\$0.15	\$0.19
27			Non-School	\$0.05	\$0.10	\$0.15	\$0.20	\$0.25
28								
29			2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
30	Solar Pool Heaters							
31	Number of New Residential Devices (HIGH)			14,970	13,710	13,810	13,910	14,010
32	Number of New Residential Devices (MIDDLE)		-	14,285	13,705	13,805	13,905	14,005
33	Number of New Residential Devices (LOW)		-	13,600	13,700	13,800	13,900	14,000
34	Average Investment Per Installed Residential System		5,000	5,000	4,725	4,465	4,220	3,987
35								
36	Total Investment (HIGH)		-	74,850,000	64,779,750	61,663,376	58,693,845	55,864,430
37	Total Investment (MIDDLE)		-	71,425,000	64,756,125	61,641,051	58,672,747	55,844,493
38	Total Investment (LOW)	-	-	68,000,000	64,732,500	61,618,725	58,651,649	55,824,556
39								
40	Cumulative Investment (HIGH)			74,850,000	139,629,750	201,293,126	259,986,971	315,851,401
41	Cumulative Investment (MIDDLE)			71,425,000	136,181,125	197,822,176	256,494,923	312,339,416
42	Cumulative Investment (LOW)			68,000,000	132,732,500	194,351,225	253,002,874	308,827,430
43								
44	Investment x Millage (HIGH)		School	\$0.6	\$1.1	\$1.6	\$2.1	\$2.6
45			Non-School	\$0.8	\$1.5	\$2.2	\$2.8	\$3.4
46	Investment x Millage (MIDDLE)		School	\$0.6	\$1.1	\$1.6	\$2.1	\$2.6
47			Non-School	\$0.8	\$1.5	\$2.1	\$2.8	\$3.4
48	Investment x Millage (LOW)		School	\$0.6	\$1.1	\$1.6	\$2.1	\$2.5
49			Non-School	\$0.7	\$1.4	\$2.1	\$2.7	\$3.3
50								
51								
52								

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
53						Average Growth:		13.0%
54	Solar Energy/Photovoltaic	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
55	Number of Additional Residential PV (HIGH)	1,654	1,870	2,351	2,418	2,733	3,088	3,489
56	Number of Additional Residential PV (MIDDLE)		1,870	2,232	2,403	2,715	3,068	3,467
57	Number of Additional Residential PV (LOW)	1,654	1,870	2,113	2,387	2,697	3,048	3,444
58	Average Investment Per System	32,165	25,000	22,250	19,803	17,624	15,686	13,960
59						Average Growth:		13.0%
60	Total Investment (HIGH)			\$52,315,352	\$47,886,366	\$48,159,318	\$48,433,827	\$48,709,899
61	Total Investment (MIDDLE)			\$49,659,631	\$47,579,099	\$47,850,300	\$48,123,047	\$48,397,348
62	Total Investment (LOW)			\$47,003,910	\$47,271,832	\$47,541,282	\$47,812,267	\$48,084,797
63						Average Growth:		13.0%
64	Cumulative Investment (HIGH)			\$52,315,352	\$100,201,718	\$148,361,036	\$196,794,863	\$245,504,762
65	Cumulative Investment (MIDDLE)			\$49,659,631	\$97,238,730	\$145,089,030	\$193,212,077	\$241,609,425
66	Cumulative Investment (LOW)			\$47,003,910	\$94,275,742	\$141,817,024	\$189,629,291	\$237,714,088
67								
68								
69								
70								
71								
72	Investment x Millage (HIGH)		School	\$0.4	\$0.8	\$1.2	\$1.6	\$2.0
73			Non-School	\$0.6	\$1.1	\$1.6	\$2.1	\$2.6
74	Investment x Millage (MIDDLE)		School	\$0.4	\$0.8	\$1.2	\$1.6	\$2.0
75			Non-School	\$0.5	\$1.0	\$1.6	\$2.1	\$2.6
76	Investment x Millage (LOW)		School	\$0.4	\$0.8	\$1.2	\$1.6	\$1.9
77			Non-School	\$0.5	\$1.0	\$1.5	\$2.0	\$2.6

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
80		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
81	Geothermal Heat Exchange							
82	Number of Additional Residential (HIGH)			1,100	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
83	Number of Additional Residential (MIDDLE)			1,050	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
84	Number of Additional Residential (LOW)			1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
85	Average Investment Per System			19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
86								
87	Total Investment (HIGH)			\$20,900,000	\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000
88	Total Investment (MIDDLE)			\$19,950,000	\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000
89	Total Investment (LOW)			\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000
90								
91	Cumulative Investment (HIGH)			\$20,900,000	\$39,900,000	\$58,900,000	\$77,900,000	\$96,900,000
92	Cumulative Investment (MIDDLE)			\$19,950,000	\$38,950,000	\$57,950,000	\$76,950,000	\$95,950,000
93	Cumulative Investment (LOW)			\$19,000,000	\$38,000,000	\$57,000,000	\$76,000,000	\$95,000,000
94								
95	Investment x Millage (HIGH)		School	\$0.2	\$0.3	\$0.5	\$0.6	\$0.8
96			Non-School	\$0.2	\$0.4	\$0.6	\$0.8	\$1.0
97	Investment x Millage (MIDDLE)		School	\$0.2	\$0.3	\$0.5	\$0.6	\$0.8
98			Non-School	\$0.2	\$0.4	\$0.6	\$0.8	\$1.0
99	Investment x Millage (LOW)		School	\$0.2	\$0.3	\$0.5	\$0.6	\$0.8
100			Non-School	\$0.2	\$0.4	\$0.6	\$0.8	\$1.0
101								
102								
103	TOTAL IMPACT OF ENERGY DEVICES							
104			HIGH					
105	Millage Rate:	8.191			FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18
106		10.78	School	\$1.3	\$2.4	\$3.5	\$4.5	\$5.6
107			Non-School	\$1.6	\$3.1	\$4.6	\$6.0	\$7.4
108								
109			MIDDLE					
110					FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18
111			School	\$1.2	\$2.3	\$3.4	\$4.5	\$5.5
112			Non-School	\$1.6	\$3.0	\$4.5	\$5.9	\$7.3
113								
114			LOW					
115					FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18
116			School	\$1.1	\$2.2	\$3.3	\$4.4	\$5.4
117			Non-School	\$1.5	\$3.0	\$4.4	\$5.8	\$7.2

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Alcoholic Beverage Tax

Issue: Alcoholic Beverages

Bill Number(s): CS/CS/HB347

Entire Bill

Partial Bill:

Sponsor(s): Representative Renuart

Month/Year Impact Begins: August 2013 (a one-month collection lag from the July 1, 2013 effective date)

Date of Analysis: May 1, 2013

Section 1: Narrative

a. Current Law:

Florida’s alcohol sales are currently regulated through a tied house evil structure as defined within the state’s Beverage Law. This three tiered system mandates products are specifically sold from the manufacturer through the wholesale distributor down to the vendor (retailer).

A state license tax of \$4,000 is required of manufacturers and distributors for each plant, establishment or branch through which they operate. Determinates for a vendor’s license tax are based upon population and intention of on/off premise consumption.

State license tax for vendors with on-premises consumption per population:

\$1,820	> 100,000
\$1,560	75,001 ≥ 100,000
\$1,300	50,001 ≥ 75,000
\$858	25,001 ≥ 50,000
\$624	≤ 25,000

The state license tax for vendors with off-premises consumption is equal to 75 percent of the tax that would be required relevant to on-premises consumption in the same size county.

Relevant to Local Option Elections, a written application signed by one-fourth of the registered voters of a county is required to request an election. This election is to determine the sale of intoxicating liquors, wines or beer by the package or per drink intended for consumption on-premises at a regular or special meeting of a county’s board of commissioners.

b. Proposed Change:

The bill creates and defines “craft distilleries” as a new subset of distilleries. Qualification requires written notification of intent to the Division of Alcoholic Beverages & Tobacco (division) as well as a maximum production of 75,000 gallons of spirits distilled on the craft distillery’s premises per calendar year.

Additionally, a craft distillery would be allowed to sell directly to the consumer in face-to-face transactions at a maximum of two factory-sealed containers of spirits distilled and filled on its premises, provided that the sales occur on retail property associated with and contiguous to the licensed craft distillery and are intended for personal consumption off-premises.

If production exceeds the 75,000 gallon limit, the division must be notified in writing within five (5) days of reaching the limitation and sales to consumers are prohibited the day following.

Ownership affiliation is only allowed between craft distilleries. Any ownership affiliated interest with a non-craft distillery in-state, out-of-state, another territory or country is unlawful.

The bill further alters the Local Option Elections relating to the requirements relevant to the sale of intoxicating liquors, wines or beer for each county. If the sale by the package is authorized, then a determination of sale by the drink for consumption on premises shall be granted based on majority vote by the county commissioners or an application signed by one-tenth of the registered voters of that county.

Provisions related to craft distilleries and their effecting Florida’s three tiered system are non-severable.

Provisions related to the election process are considered severable.

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Alcoholic Beverage Tax

Issue: Alcoholic Beverages

Bill Number(s): CS/CS/HB347

Section 2: Description of Data and Sources

In addition to Florida statues, the Department of Business & Professional Regulation’s accounting database, LicenseEase, was utilized to determine the four currently licensed distillers that would qualify as craft distillers.

Section 3: Methodology (Include Assumptions and Attach Details)

The revised statutes were reviewed and a determination was made that there would not be an impact regarding potential revenue received as all current distillers, including the four distillers that could qualify, are licensed. Additionally, any LicenseEase coding or modifier changes necessary for the tracking of craft distillers could be absorbed by current staff.

Section 4: Proposed Fiscal Impact

	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**
2014-15	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**
2015-16	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**
2016-17	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**
2017-18	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**	0/**

List of affected Trust Funds:

Indeterminate at this time based on unknown distillers applying and being granted licenses in the future.

Section 5: Consensus Estimate (Adopted: 05/08/2013) The conference adopted positive insignificant for the impact.

	GR		Trust		Local/Other		Total	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14	*	*	*	*			*	*
2014-15	*	*	*	*			*	*
2015-16	*	*	*	*			*	*
2016-17	*	*	*	*			*	*
2017-18	*	*	*	*			*	*

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Court Costs

Issue: Costs of Prosecution, Investigation, and Representation

Bill Number(s): CS/HB 311

Entire Bill

Partial Bill:

Sponsor(s): Representative Ray

Month/Year Impact Begins: July 1, 2013

Date of Analysis: May 7, 2013

Section 1: Narrative

a. Current Law: Per section 938.27, F.S., all persons convicted of a misdemeanor or criminal traffic offense are required to pay a minimum of \$50 for the cost of prosecution. Persons convicted of a felony are required to pay at least \$100. Similarly, s. 938.29(1)(a), F.S. provides that convicted persons who have received the assistance of the public defender's office, a special assistant public defender, the office of criminal conflict and civil regional counsel, or a private conflict attorney, or who has received due process services after being found indigent for costs are liable for the assessed application fee under s. 27.52, F.S. (\$50) and for attorney's fees and costs. These costs are the same as for the cost of prosecution--\$50 for misdemeanors and criminal traffic offenses and \$100 for felonies.

Section 903.286, F.S. directs the clerks of the court to withhold court fees, court costs, and criminal penalties from the return of a cash bond posted on behalf of a criminal defendant. Currently, the costs of prosecution and representation are not withheld by the clerks of court when returning a cash bond.

b. Proposed Change: This bill adds the costs of prosecution and representation to s. 903.286, F.S. so that clerks of court will be required to withhold these costs, in addition to court fees, court costs, and criminal penalties, when returning a cash bond. Section 985.032, F.S. is also amended to require juveniles who are adjudicated delinquent (or have adjudication withheld) to pay costs of prosecution. However, if it is determined that the child is unable to pay, the court may order them to perform community service in lieu of payment.

Section 2: Description of Data and Sources

Telephone conversations and email correspondence with staff of the Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers Association (FCCC).

LAS/PBS Schedule I-Trust Funds Available

Florida Office of the State Court Administrator (OSCA), "Florida's Trial Courts Statistical Reference Guide, FY 2011-12" on Florida Courts website: http://www.flcourts.org/gen_public/stats/ReferenceGuide11-12/Cover.pdf and computer runs prepared for the February 2013 Criminal Justice Estimating Conference.

Section 3: Methodology (Include Assumptions and Attach Details)

Staff at FCCC indicated that, in consultation with the state attorneys and public defenders, the costs of prosecution and representation would be withheld from cash bonds after all other court fees, costs, and criminal penalties are withheld. Staff also indicated that these bonds are used primarily in misdemeanor cases and that the value is relatively low.

In order to determine the number of cases in which funds would be available from cash bonds to cover the cost of prosecution and representation, the FCCC sent out a short survey to each county clerk with questions prepared by EDR. The survey reference period was the 2011-12 state fiscal year. Clerks were asked to provide the number of criminal defendants who had cash bonds posted on their behalf, the total amount of these cash bonds, and the number of cases in which funds were returned to the person posting the bond after court fees, costs, and criminal penalties were paid.

With a very short turn-around time of just a few days, responses were received from 38 clerks. Responses from 2 clerks were not used because they could not disaggregate the number of defendants and cash bonds to include only criminal defendants. The remaining 36 responses came from a variety of counties with 4/1/2012 population ranging from under 12,000 (Franklin County) to 1.3 million (Palm Beach). The population in the 36 responding counties represented 47.7% of the state population. The responding counties reported a total of 30,201 cash bonds with a value of \$46,112,087 (average=\$1,527). Usable responses to the question concerning the return of funds to bond holders were received from 33 respondents and indicated that funds, which under the new legislation could be applied to the cost of prosecution and representation, were returned to bond holders in 26.9% of the cases. The amount returned is not known.

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Court Costs

Issue: Costs of Prosecution, Investigation, and Representation

Bill Number(s): CS/HB 311

Based on data from OSCA, there were 196,151 felony filings and 141,544 guilty dispositions (72.2% of filings) in FY 11-12. At \$100 per case, these guilty dispositions could have generated a minimum of **\$14,154,400** in costs of prosecution. Applying the 72.2% guilty percentage to the 750,038 misdemeanor and criminal traffic filings results in an estimate of 541,527 convictions which, at \$50 per case, could have generated **\$27,076,350**. The sum of these two numbers is **\$41,230,750**. Costs of prosecution are deposited into the State Attorneys Revenue Trust Fund and costs of representation are deposited into the Public Defender’s Indigent Criminal Defense Trust Fund. Both are subject to the GR service charge. Actual deposits for FY 11-12 totaled \$22.4 million for the cost of prosecution and \$7.6 million for indigent criminal defense application fees. This suggests that the new legislation, to the extent that additional costs of prosecution can be withheld from cash bonds, could generate several million in additional dollars. In addition, there were 48,196 juvenile delinquency filings in FY 11-12. However, because the current bond amounts are often exhausted after paying court fees, costs, and criminal penalties, the amount available to be withheld is limited. In addition, the number of criminal defendants with cash bonds who are already paying the cost of prosecution and cost of representation, is unknown. For these reasons and due to other uncertainties (e.g. how successful payment plans or other means used to collect these costs will be; the number of juveniles who will be deemed unable to pay and will be ordered to do community service) the amount of additional cost of prosecution and cost of representation funds that will be collected in future years is indeterminate.

Section 4: Proposed Fiscal Impact

	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14			**	**		
2014-15			**	**		
2015-16			**	**		
2016-17			**	**		
2017-18			**	**		

List of affected Trust Funds:

State Attorneys Revenue Trust Fund

Public Defender’s Indigent Criminal Defense Trust Fund

Section 5: Consensus Estimate (Adopted: 05/08/2013) The conference adopted the proposed estimate.

	GR		Trust		Local/Other		Total	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14	**	**	**	**			**	**
2014-15	**	**	**	**			**	**
2015-16	**	**	**	**			**	**
2016-17	**	**	**	**			**	**
2017-18	**	**	**	**			**	**

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Drivers' License Fees

Issue: Voluntary Donations MV Registrations & DL & ID Card Applications(Homelessness)

Bill Number(s): CS/HB93

Entire Bill

Partial Bill:

Sponsor(s): Healthy Families Subcommittee, Rep. Reed and Others

Month/Year Impact Begins: 7/1/2013

Date of Analysis: 5/1/2013

Section 1: Narrative

- a. **Current Law:** Section 320.02(15), F.S., provides the language permitting voluntary contributions on the application form for motor vehicle registration or renewal of registration to the specified trust funds and organizations. Section 320.023, F.S., sets out the requirements to establish a voluntary check off on motor vehicle registration applications, including payment of an application fee not to exceed \$10,000. Section 322.08(7), F.S., provides for the application for driver licenses and the requirements for licenses and identification card forms including the provision of voluntary contributions. Section 322.18(9), F.S., provides for original driver license applications, driver license renewals, expirations, and delinquencies. Section 322.081, F.S., sets out the requirements to establish a voluntary check off on driver license applications, including payment of an application fee not to exceed \$10,000.
- b. **Proposed Change:** Amends sections 320.02(15), 322.08(7), and Section 322.18(9), F.S., to require the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV) to modify vehicle application and renewal forms and driver license and ID cards to allow a \$1 voluntary contribution to be made to aid the homeless. Contribution revenues received are to be deposited into the Grants and Donations Trust Fund of the Department of Children and Families for use as prescribed. The provisions of section 320.023, F.S., are notwithstanding expressly including that the \$10,000 application fee for motor vehicle registrations is not applicable. In addition, the provisions of section 322.081, F.S., relating to driver license applications are also notwithstanding. Finally, it is provided that contributions received as a result of a renewal issuance or renewal extensions provided in sections 320.08(7)(r) and 322.18(9), F.S., are deemed not to be income of a revenue nature and the service charge provided in s. 215.20, F.S., (8%) is not applicable.

Section 2: Description of Data and Sources

HSMV Data on MV & DL/ID Card voluntary contributions FY 2009-10 through March FY 2012-13.

Section 3: Methodology (Include Assumptions and Attach Details)

FY 2011-12 and 2012-13 year to date revenues from motor vehicle application, driver license and ID card application and motor vehicle and driver license and ID card application contributions were summed. The FY 2012-13 year to date revenues were annualized using the proportion those revenues were for the same period prior fiscal year.

The result was then divided by the number of distinct contribution types providing an average FY revenue amount per contribution type.

Contribution revenues resulting from the DL & ID card portion of Prevent Blindness Florida were removed from the data set as an outlier as has been done for a number of years due to the unique nature of the marketing plan of the organization and the order of magnitude higher revenues that result.

The average growth rate per contribution type was calculated for FY 2011-12 to the annualized amount for FY 2012-13 (-8%).

It was assumed the declining in growth in revenues was a result of the proliferation in contribution choices available to vehicle registration and driver license and ID card applicants in recent years.

The result of application of the methodology described is as follows:

FY 2011-12 Actual	FY 2012-13 Annualized	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
91,271	84,328	77,913	71,986	66,510	61,450	56,775

Although not expressly stated as in the language relating to s. 320.023, F.S., , it was assumed that the \$10,000 application fee for driver license application check off is not applicable due to the notwithstanding of section 322.081, F.S.

It was also assumed that revenue resulting from donations for motor vehicle registration applications is also considered not income of a revenue nature and therefore also not subject to the service charge provided in s. 215.20, F.S.

It was assumed HSMV will not receive an insignificant amount (\$20,000) of non-recurring fee revenue from check off application fees (MV- \$10,000, DL & ID card - \$10,000).

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Drivers' License Fees

Issue: Voluntary Donations MV Registrations & DL & ID Card Applications(Homelessness)

Bill Number(s): CS/HB93

It is also assumed that revenues distributed to the DCF Grants and Donations TF will not be subject to the GR service charge and an insignificant recurring revenue loss will occur.

According to HSMV staff, the department can accomplish the administrative steps necessary for implementation so donations can begin July 1, 2013. Therefore, the FY 2013-14 cash amount was assumed to be the same as the recurring amount.

Section 4: Proposed Fiscal Impact

	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14 GR Ser. Ch. HSOTF DCF G&DTF			(*) (*) .1	(*) (*) .1		
2014-15 GR Ser. Ch. DCF G&DTF			(*) .1	(*) .1		
2015-16 GR Ser. Ch. DCF G&DTF			(*) .1	(*) .1		
2016-17 GR Ser. Ch. DCF G&DTF			(*) .1	(*) .1		
2017-18 GR Ser. Ch. DCF G&DTF			(*) .1	(*) .1		

List of affected Trust Funds:

DCF Grants & Donations Trust Fund

Highway Safety Operating TF

Section 5: Consensus Estimate (Adopted: 05/08/2013) The conference adopted \$0.1m impact to TF for all years.

	GR		Trust		Local/Other		Total	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14			.1	.1			.1	.1
2014-15			.1	.1			.1	.1
2015-16			.1	.1			.1	.1
2016-17			.1	.1			.1	.1
2017-18			.1	.1			.1	.1

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Local Taxes and Fees

Issue: Local Fees – Agricultural Land

Bill Number(s): CS/CS/HB203

Entire Bill

Partial Bill: Section 2

Sponsor(s): Representative Beshears

Month/Year Impact Begins: July 1, 2013

Date of Analysis: May 7, 2013

Section 1: Narrative

- a. **Current Law:** : A farm building, fence or sign is exempt from state and local business building codes and fees.
- b. **Proposed Change:** : CS for CS adds that a nonresidential farm building, farm fence, or farm sign that is located on lands used for bona fide agricultural purposes are exempt from state and local building business codes and fees.

Section 2: Description of Data and Sources

Section 3: Methodology (Include Assumptions and Attach Details)

Tightens the requirement that to receive an exemption from building code or fees, the farm building, fences or signs must be on land used for bona fide agricultural purposes. Southwest Ranches was proposing local ordinances to remove the town from the current statute due to complaints that residents were claiming ag exemptions when building barns, even though the land was not commercial agriculture. A local ordinance was not enacted to remove the town from the state laws. The fee for a building permit is \$90 + 3% of cost.

Section 4: Proposed Fiscal Impact

	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14			Insignificant	Insignificant		
2014-15			Insignificant	Insignificant		
2015-16			Insignificant	Insignificant		
2016-17			Insignificant	Insignificant		
2017-18			Insignificant	Insignificant		

List of affected Trust Funds: Local Fees

Section 5: Consensus Estimate (Adopted: 05/08/2013) The conference adopted the proposed estimate.

	GR		Trust		Local/Other		Total	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14					Insignificant	Insignificant	Insignificant	Insignificant
2014-15					Insignificant	Insignificant	Insignificant	Insignificant
2015-16					Insignificant	Insignificant	Insignificant	Insignificant
2016-17					Insignificant	Insignificant	Insignificant	Insignificant
2017-18					Insignificant	Insignificant	Insignificant	Insignificant

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Local Taxes and Fees
Issue: Low-Voltage Systems
Bill Number(s): CS/CS/CS/HB973

- Entire Bill**
 Partial Bill:

Sponsor(s): Representative Brodeur
Month/Year Impact Begins: October 1, 2013
Date of Analysis: 05/07/2013

Section 1: Narrative

- a. Current Law:** Local jurisdictions may require permits for basic hardwire installation, with permit fees ranging from \$0 to \$300. Not all jurisdictions require permits.
- b. Proposed Change:** Bill establishes a max rate of \$55 for low voltage system contractors (security alarm). Local governments who charged more than \$55 for alarm permits on January 1, 2013 may charge up to \$175 until January 1, 2015. After that all local governments must reduce their fee to \$55.

Section 2: Description of Data and Sources

ADT data provided to committee staff
 Security Distributing & Marketing Magazine
 Compendium online
 FEEC (02/2013)

Section 3: Methodology (Include Assumptions and Attach Details)

Assume 15% of homes have alarm systems.
 Assume private housing starts as a proxy for residential installations.
 Assumed 60% of alarm system installations are for residential homes.
 Assumes jurisdictions with permit fees under \$55 won't raise fees.
 Assumes a weighted average for permit fees using population.
 Assume the jurisdictions who currently charge over \$175 will incur a small negative impact first year cash.

Section 4: Proposed Fiscal Impact

	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14			(Insignificant)	\$ (0.1)		
2014-15			\$ (0.1)	\$ (0.1)		
2015-16			\$ (0.2)	\$ (0.2)		
2016-17			\$ (0.2)	\$ (0.2)		
2017-18			\$ (0.2)	\$ (0.2)		

List of affected Trust Funds: Local Revenues

Section 5: Consensus Estimate (Adopted: 05/08/2013) The conference adopted the proposed estimate.

	GR		Trust		Local/Other		Total	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(Insignificant)	(0.1)	0.0	(0.1)
2014-15	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)
2015-16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)
2016-17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)
2017-18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)

Year	Private Housing Starts (1000s)	15% new homes install	60% of alarms are residential (add 40% for commercial)	60% of jurisdictions require permit (and fee).		Installs converted to FY	Revenue (Using avg. fee)	New Fee	Impact
2012	33.2	4980	6972	4183					
2013	49.6	7440	10416	6250	FY12/13	5216	\$ 342,457	\$ 286,902	\$ (0.1)
2014	68.8	10320	14448	8669	FY13/14	7459	\$ 489,696	\$ 410,256	\$ (0.1)
2015	98.4	14760	20664	12398	FY14/15	10534	\$ 691,531	\$ 579,348	\$ (0.1)
2016	128.6	19290	27006	16204	FY15/16	14301	\$ 938,861	\$ 786,555	\$ (0.2)
2017	141.9	21285	29799	17879	FY16/17	17042	\$ 1,118,774	\$ 937,283	\$ (0.2)
2018	151.4	22710	31794	19076	FY17/18	18478	\$ 1,213,074	\$ 1,016,285	\$ (0.2)

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Local Taxes and Fees

Issue: Real Property Liens and Conveyances

Bill Number(s): CS/HB 267

Entire Bill

Partial Bill

Sponsor(s): Representative Wood

Month/Year Impact Begins: October 2013

Date of Analysis: May 6, 2013

Section 1: Narrative

a. **Current Law:** A lien is a form of security interest to ensure payment of a debt or other obligation. In general, a lien or other encumbrance against real property is legally binding against the owner of the property from the time the lien is created. However, certain unrecorded liens may also affect the title to real property. A lien is not normally effective against the rights of another lienholder unless that lienholder has notice of the lien. A lienholder may comply with this notice requirement by recording the lien in the official records, which are retained by the clerk of court in the county where the property is located. The law recognizes the date a lien is recorded as the presumptive date the lien becomes effective against other parties, determining priority of the lien. Chapter 695, F.S., addresses the recording of conveyances of real estate. Section 28.24, F.S., specifies the service charges imposed by clerks of the circuit court in recording documents and instruments.

Governmental and quasi-governmental entities may impose liens on real property for improvements, services, costs of repairs, and associated fines and penalties, which are not recorded in the official records of the county. When a *hidden lien* is not recorded in the county’s official records, a general title or public records search may not reveal the lien’s attachment to the title of property. Because courts have upheld hidden liens in various circumstances, a number of local governments are of the opinion that the provisions of s. 695.01, F.S., which specify the recording of conveyances of real estate, do not apply.

b. **Proposed Change:** Section 2 of this bill creates s. 695.01(3), F.S., to require governmental or quasi-governmental entities to record liens that attach to real property in order for the liens to be effective against creditors or subsequent purchasers, thereby protecting purchasers of real property from hidden liens. The provision pertains only to governmental or quasi-governmental liens for an improvement, service, fine, or penalty, and does not apply to a lien for taxes, non-ad valorem or special assessments, or utilities. The lien must be recorded in the official records of the county in which the property is located, and a properly recorded lien must include the property owner’s name, the property’s description or address, and the property’s tax or parcel identification number.

Section 2: Description of Data and Sources

EDR staff conducted telephone interviews with Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers (FCCC) Association and the Florida Land Title Association (FLTA) staffs and exchanged e-mails with Florida Association of Counties (FAC) and Florida League of Cities (FLC) staffs.

Section 3: Methodology (Include Assumptions and Attach Details)

According to all staffs contacted, there exists no readily available data regarding the number of hidden liens statewide for any particular time period. According to the FCCC’s *Distribution Schedule of Court-Related Filing Fees, Service Charges, Costs, and Fines, including a Fee Schedule for Recording - Effective July 1, 2012* (available at www.flclerks.com/public_info.html), the charges to record a lien, as listed on page 79 of the Schedule, are as follows:

Service Charges to Record 1st Page

1. Recording Service Charge - s. 28.24(12)(a), F.S.	\$5.00
2. Additional Service Charge Paid to Clerk for Public Records Modernization TF - s. 28.24(12)(d)1., F.S.	\$1.00
3. Additional Service Charge Paid to Clerk - s. 28.24(12)(e)1., F.S.	<u>\$4.00</u>
a. \$0.10 for distribution to the Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers (FCCC)	
b. \$1.90 retained by Clerk for deposit in the Public Records Modernization TF	
c. \$2.00 for distribution to the Board of County Commissioners	
TOTAL	\$10.00

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Local Taxes and Fees

Issue: Real Property Liens and Conveyances

Bill Number(s): CS/HB 267

Service Charges to Record Each Additional Page

1. Recording Service Charge - s. 28.24(12)(b), F.S.	\$4.00
2. Additional Service Charge Paid to Clerk for Public Records Modernization TF - s. 28.24(12)(d)2., F.S.	\$0.50
3. Additional Service Charge Paid to Clerk - s. 28.24(12)(e)1., F.S.	<u>\$4.00</u>
a. \$0.10 for distribution to the Florida Court Clerks and Comptrollers (FCCC)	
b. \$1.90 retained by Clerk for deposit in the Public Records Modernization TF	
c. \$2.00 for distribution to the Board of County Commissioners	
TOTAL	\$8.50

All of these service charges reflect local funds with the exception of the \$0.10 portion of the \$4.00 Additional Service Charge, which is distributed to the FCCC.

According to the FCCC and FLTA staffs, the recording of a lien of this type would typically require a one-page instrument. Assuming a one-page instrument, a minimum of 5,000 liens (i.e., \$50,000 / \$10 = 5,000) would need to be recorded in any fiscal year for the \$50,000 insignificant/indeterminate threshold to be exceeded. Given the number of affected governmental entities in Florida, both the FCCC and FLTA staffs were of the opinion that at least 5,000 would be recorded in any fiscal year if this proposed legislation were to become law. Based on the available information, it is assumed here that the bill's impact would be positive indeterminate.

Section 4: Proposed Fiscal Impact

Local	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14			**	**		
2014-15			**	**		
2015-16			**	**		
2016-17			**	**		
2017-18			**	**		

List of Affected Trust Funds:

Not applicable – local funds only.

Section 5: Consensus Estimate (Adopted: 05/08/2013) The conference adopted the proposed estimate. The impact is at least \$.1m.

	GR		Trust		Local/Other		Total	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14					**	**	**	**
2014-15					**	**	**	**
2015-16					**	**	**	**
2016-17					**	**	**	**
2017-18					**	**	**	**

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Motor Vehicle Fees

Issue: Specialty License Plates/ Freemasonry

Bill Number(s): CS/CS/CS/HB487

Entire Bill

Partial Bill:

Sponsor(s): Representatives Stone & Workman

Month/Year Impact Begins: October 1, 2013

Date of Analysis: 5/7/2013

Section 1: Narrative

a. Current Law: Florida Law provides for a number of specialty license plates for which an additional fee is charged. The additional fee is usually distributed to a non-profit entity.

Certain members of the general public may be eligible to apply for the special use license plates if they are able to document their eligibility pursuant to various sections of Chapter 320, F.S. This category of plates primarily includes special military license plates as well as plates for the handicapped.

b. Proposed Change: 320.08058(79)(a) is added to create a new specialty plate – Freemasonry License Plates.

Section 2: Description of Data and Sources

<http://www.msana.com/msastats.asp>

Section 3: Methodology (Include Assumptions and Attach Details)

It is unknown how many Floridians would purchase these types of plates. The freemasonry license plate use fee is \$25 and across the board the average number of transactions in a fiscal year for any specialty plate is approximately 3,400. That number varies widely from a minimum of zero transactions to a maximum of 91,262.

According to the Masonic Service Association of North America there are 44,437 masons in Florida. Assuming 50% purchased a plate the impact is \$555,462. At 10% purchasing, the impact would be \$111,093.

Section 4: Proposed Fiscal Impact

	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14	\$0.1m	\$0.1m			**	**
2014-15	\$0.1m	\$0.1m			**	**
2015-16	\$0.1m	\$0.1m			**	**
2016-17	\$0.1m	\$0.1m			**	**
2017-18	\$0.1m	\$0.1m			**	**

List of affected Trust Funds: Masonic Home Endowment Fund, Marketing

Section 5: Consensus Estimate (Adopted: 05/08/2013) The conference adopted the low estimate.

	GR		Trust		Local/Other		Total	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14			**	**			**	**
2014-15			**	**			**	**
2015-16			**	**			**	**
2016-17			**	**			**	**
2017-18			**	**			**	**

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

Tax: Other Taxes and Fees

Issue: Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

Bill Number(s): CS/CS/HB7023

Entire Bill

Partial Bill: Sections 3, 8, & 38-43

Sponsor(s): Representative Cummings

Month/Year Impact Begins: July 1, 2013

Date of Analysis: 05/08/2013

Section 1: Narrative

a. Current Law:

- Section 493.6113, F.S., “Renewal application for licensure” provides detailed information regarding the training requirements for renewal of a Class “G” (statewide firearms) license and therefore is excluded from s. 493.6115, F.S. In addition, the FDACS’ intent that the 4 hours of annual firearms training be completed and submitted to the Division in the year completed is not adequately reflected.
- Currently charities who receive less than \$25,000 in contributions must pay an annual registration fee of \$10.
- Sellers of Business Opportunities are required to register with the state, pay a \$300 registration fee, and file a bond. Franchises are exempt from the requirements of the business opportunity statute as long as they meet the Federal Trade Commission’s definition of a franchise. Many franchises voluntarily file with the Department if they are selling a franchise located in Florida or to Florida residents.

b. Proposed Change:

Section 3 – Allows for suspension of license if 4 hours of firearm training isn’t completed.

Section 8 – Exempts charities that have a total revenue of less than \$25,000, have no employees or members compensated to do fundraising, and that do not use a professional solicitor from the \$10 annual registration fee.

Sections 38-43 - Repeal business opportunity registration requirements.

Section 2: Description of Data and Sources

Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services data

Section 3: Methodology (Include Assumptions and Attach Details)

Assume no growth

Section 4: Proposed Fiscal Impact

	High		Middle		Low	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14			(\$0.1)	(\$0.1)		
2014-15			(\$0.1)	(\$0.1)		
2015-16			(\$0.1)	(\$0.1)		
2016-17			(\$0.1)	(\$0.1)		
2017-18			(\$0.1)	(\$0.1)		

List of affected Trust Funds: General Inspection Trust Fund and Division of Licensing TF with 8% GR service charge

Section 5: Consensus Estimate (Adopted:05/08/2013) The conference adopted the proposed estimate.

	GR		Trust		Local/Other		Total	
	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring	Cash	Recurring
2013-14	(Insignificant)	(Insignificant)	(0.1)	(0.1)	0.0	0.0	(0.1)	(0.1)
2014-15	(Insignificant)	(Insignificant)	(0.1)	(0.1)	0.0	0.0	(0.1)	(0.1)
2015-16	(Insignificant)	(Insignificant)	(0.1)	(0.1)	0.0	0.0	(0.1)	(0.1)
2016-17	(Insignificant)	(Insignificant)	(0.1)	(0.1)	0.0	0.0	(0.1)	(0.1)
2017-18	(Insignificant)	(Insignificant)	(0.1)	(0.1)	0.0	0.0	(0.1)	(0.1)

CS/CS/HB7023

Section	Issue	Change	Impact	\$	Distribution of fee
Section 3	Private investigator and security license renewals fees	Allows for suspension of licenses until proof of firearm recertification. Still allows waiver of requirements	Fee for renewal is \$112.	\$0.0	Ag staff believe the behavior would be corrected.
Section 8	Registration Exemptions	Charitable Organizations under \$25,000 in total annual revenue do not have to register.	Negative impact for loss of registration fee.	Fee is \$10 for organizations with revenue less than \$25,000, and no paid officers	5,352 registrations @ \$10 annually (\$53,520)
Sections 38-43	Business Opportunity Registrations	Repeal of Business Opportunity Filings	Negative impact from loss of annual fee.	\$300 annual fee	\$ (11,000)

Impact \$ FY13/14 (0.1) \$ FY14/15 (0.1) \$ FY15/16 (0.1) \$ FY16/17 (0.1) \$ FY17/18 (0.1)