FISCALESTIMATE DOA-2048 N(R10/98)	☒ ORIGINAL ☐ UPDATED ☐ CORRECTED ☐ SUPPLEMENTAL	1999 Session LRB or Bill No./Adm. Rule No. SB 25 (99-1466/1) Amendment No. if Applicable

Subject
Explanation to Juries

Fiscal Effect

State: ☐ No State Fiscal Effect
Check columns below only if bill makes a direct appropriation or affects a sum sufficient appropriation.

☐ Increase Existing Appropriation ☐ Increase Existing Revenues
☐ Decrease Existing Appropriation ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues
☐ Create New Appropriation

☒ Increase Costs – May be possible to Absorb Within Agency's Budget ☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Decrease Costs

Local: ☐ No local government costs

1. Increase Costs ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory
2. Decrease Costs ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory
3. ☐ Increase Revenues ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory
4. ☐ Decrease Revenues ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory

5. Types of Local Governmental Units Affected:
☐ Towns ☐ Villages ☐ Cities
☒ Counties ☐ Others ____
☐ School Districts ☐ WTCS Districts

Fund Sources Affected
☐ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG ☐ SEG-S

Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

This bill requires a court in civil actions to explain to the jury the legal conclusions that will follow from the jury's possible findings. It also allows counsel for each party to comment on the court's explanation.

In 1998 there were approximately 800 large claim civil jury trials in the circuit courts. It is impossible to predict how much additional court time would be needed for the judge to explain the legal conclusions to the jury and for counsel to comment on the explanation. In multiple party lawsuits this could be complicated and require a significant amount of time. Also additional motions for new trials and appeals can be expected. The amount of additional court proceedings is impossible to predict with the data available. Both state and county costs would be incurred.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Agency/Prepared by: (Name & Phone No.)	Authorized Signature/Telephone No.	Date
Director of State Courts	Sheryl Gervasi 6-6884	5/24/99

FISCAL ESTIMATE WORKSHEET

1999 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect DOA–2047 (R10/94)	XX ORIGINAL . UPDATED . CORRECTED . SUPPLEMENTAL	LRB or Bill No./Adm. Rule No. SB 25	Amendment No.

Subject

Explanation to Juries

I. One–time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):

II. Annualized Costs:	**Annualized Fiscal impact on State funds from:**	
	Increased Costs	**Decreased Costs**
A. State Costs by Category State Operations – Salaries and Fringes	$	$ –
(FTE Position Changes)	(FTE)	(– FTE)
State Operations – Other Costs		–
Local Assistance		–
Aids to Individuals or Organizations		–
TOTAL State Costs by Category	$	$ –
B. State Costs by Source of Funds	**Increased Costs**	**Decreased Costs**
GPR	$	$ –
FED		–
PRO/PRS		–
SEG/SEG–S		–
III. State Revenues – Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)	**Increased Rev.**	**Decreased Rev.**
GPR Taxes	$	$ –
GPR Earned		–
FED		–
PRO/PRS		–
SEG/SEG–S		–
TOTAL State Revenues	$	$ –

NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT

	STATE	LOCAL
NET CHANGE IN COSTS	$ + indeter.	$ + indeter.
NET CHANGE IN REVENUES	$	$

Agency/Prepared by: (Name & Phone No.)	Authorized Signature/Telephone No.	Date
Director of State Courts	Cheryl Daware	5/24/99