

**FISCAL NOTE**  
**Requested by Legislative Council**  
04/02/2009

Amendment to: Reengrossed  
SB 2042

**1A. State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium		2011-2013 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues						\$42,040
Expenditures			\$52,040			\$42,040
Appropriations						

**1B. County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium			2011-2013 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

**2A. Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill allows the courts to appoint a parenting coordinator to assist in resolving parenting time disputes by addressing circumstances which are not specifically addressed by an existing court order.

**B. Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

Section 11 of the bill provides for the creation of the parenting coordinator program. The Supreme Court is responsible for establishing qualifications and maintaining a public roster of individuals eligible to serve as a parenting coordinator.

The House amendment provides legislative intent that the parenting coordinator program be self-sufficient after the 2009-11 biennium and changes the expiration date of the program to June 30, 2013. In order to provide training to coordinators after the 2009-11 biennium, the courts will need to assess administrative fees. The Judicial Branch will need to request continuing appropriation authority to collect and spend fees for this purpose.

**3. State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

**A. Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

N/A

**B. Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

The courts are to assign the cost of the parenting coordinator between the parties in the case. The Supreme Court would be responsible for determining necessary qualifications and maintaining a list of parenting coordinators. The Supreme Court would incur costs for providing training and supervising the coordinators. Other incidental program costs would include phone, postage, travel and miscellaneous office supplies. The amendment has no additional fiscal impact.

**C. Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a*

*continuing appropriation.*

Funding for this program was added to the Judicial Branch budget in the Senate.

<b>Name:</b>	Don Wolf	<b>Agency:</b>	ND Supreme Court
<b>Phone Number:</b>	328-3509	<b>Date Prepared:</b>	04/02/2009