

NOTE: As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended only for use by the standing finance committees of the legislature. The Legislative Finance Committee does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of the information in this report when used in any other situation.

Only the most recent FIR version (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) is available on the Legislative Website. The Adobe PDF version includes all attachments, whereas the HTML version does not. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC’s office in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

FISCAL IMPACT REPORT



SPONSOR: Silva DATE TYPED: 02/04/02 HB 182/aHGUAC

SHORT TITLE: 2nd Judicial Court Files SB _____

ANALYST: Hayes

APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY02	FY03	FY02	FY03		
	\$1,000.0			Partial Non-recurring**	General Fund

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Second Judicial District Court
LFC files

SUMMARY

Synopsis of HGUAC Amendment

The House Government and Urban Affairs Committee amends SB182 by inserting a phrase which directs the Second Judicial District Court “to study the feasibility of scanning old court files” before contracting for the scanning of old court files.

Synopsis of Original Bill

House Bill 182 appropriates \$1 million from the general fund to the Second Judicial District Court to contract for the purpose of acquiring equipment to scan court files, for contracting professional services to scan old court files and to rent storage space for closed files.

Significant Issues

1. **The 2nd District’s court administrator states in her analysis that this appropriation is non-recurring. However, rental of storage space for file boxes would be a recurring item assuming that the court plans to store its files for more than one year.

2. Due to the vast number of records and files at the 2nd District, the administrator is unable to determine if the scanning and storage solution will require additional personnel in the future. Again, this may be part of potential recurring costs. The administrator's estimates show that the current volume of pages would take court staff 9 years to scan, which is not the best use of trained and skilled court staff. Does the court believe a contractor can complete the scanning project in one year?
3. Other courts, including the 1st District, are able to provide/contract for these services for less than \$100,000. Why is the cost so much higher at the 2nd District court (\$1 million)?
4. This funding request may be more appropriate in the capital budget request.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The appropriation of \$1,000.0 contained in this bill is a non-recurring expense to the general fund according to the 2nd Judicial District Court. Any unexpended or unencumbered balance remaining at the end of FY03 shall revert to the general fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

The short-term effects of this bill fall into two categories: One, the court will be able to formulate a solution to the problem of storage and retrieving records for the public. Two, the court will be able to begin the process of reducing the backlog of paper.

The long-term effects are significant according to the court administrator. The 2nd District is setting the stage for the future by moving forward with an updated method for document management. Their solution to document management may ultimately impact the judiciary's storage management policy.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

Recurring costs versus non-recurring costs need to be identified.

CMH/njw:ar