

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 3048H.03C  
Bill No.: HCS for HB 1457  
Subject: Judges; Courts; Crimes and Punishment; Criminal Procedure; Probation and Parole  
Type: Original  
Date: March 21, 2025

---

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to judicial security.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>				
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2026</b>	<b>FY 2027</b>	<b>FY 2028</b>	<b>Fully Implemented (FY 2030)</b>
General Revenue*	(Could exceed \$17,475)	(Could exceed \$64,168)	(Could exceed \$163,629)	(Likely to exceed \$329,129)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>(Could exceed \$17,475)</b>	<b>(Could exceed \$64,168)</b>	<b>(Could exceed \$163,629)</b>	<b>(Likely to exceed \$329,129)</b>

\*Oversight assumes \$0 to (Unknown) costs for LEF claims could exceed \$250,000 annually for all funds combined.

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>				
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2026</b>	<b>FY 2027</b>	<b>FY 2028</b>	<b>Fully Implemented (FY 2030)</b>
Other State**	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
Legal Expense*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Colleges and Universities**	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other State Funds</u></b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>

\*Income and payouts assumed to net to zero.

\*\*Oversight assumes \$0 to (Unknown) costs for LEF claims could exceed \$250,000 annually for all funds combined.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>				
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2026</b>	<b>FY 2027</b>	<b>FY 2028</b>	<b>Fully Implemented (FY 2030)</b>
Federal*	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All Federal Funds</u></b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>

\*Oversight assumes \$0 to (Unknown) costs for LEF claims could exceed \$250,000 annually for all funds combined.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>				
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2026</b>	<b>FY 2027</b>	<b>FY 2028</b>	<b>Fully Implemented (FY 2030)</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0 FTE</b>	<b>0 FTE</b>	<b>0 FTE</b>	<b>0 FTE</b>

Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.

Estimated Net Effect (savings or increased revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>				
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2026</b>	<b>FY 2027</b>	<b>FY 2028</b>	<b>Fully Implemented (FY 2030)</b>
<b>Local Government*</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>

\*Oversight assumes \$0 to (Unknown) costs for claims could exceed \$250,000 for all funds combined.

**FISCAL ANALYSIS**

**ASSUMPTION**

§§476.1300 - 476.1313, 575.095, and 575.260 – Modifies provisions relating to judicial security

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state §575.095 enhances the penalty for the offense of tampering with a judicial officer, adding to the existing class B felony the stipulation that no person convicted under this section shall be eligible for parole, probation, or conditional release. This means offenders will be required to serve 100% of those sentences in prison.

Section 575.260 enhances the penalty for the offense of tampering with a judicial proceeding, adding to the existing class D felony the stipulation that no person convicted under this section shall be eligible for parole, probation, or conditional release. This means offenders will be required to serve 100% of those sentences in prison.

There were six new court commitments to prison under §575.095 and one under §575.260 in FY 2024. The average length of those sentences was 4.5 years. On average, offenders serving sentences under these sections spend 0.3 years in prison prior to first release. (There have only been 3 first releases on sentences under these sections in the previous three fiscal years.) There were also two new probation cases assigned to the DOC under §575.095 in FY 2024.

The new legislation would take away the options of probation, parole or conditional release, and require the offenders serve the full 4.5 years of their sentence in prison.

The cumulative impact on the DOC is estimated to be 29 additional offenders in prison and 26 fewer offenders on field supervision by FY 2030.

**Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation**

	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030	FY2031	FY2032	FY2033	FY2034	FY2035
<b>New Admissions</b>										
Current Law	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
After Legislation	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
<b>Probation</b>										
Current Law	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
After Legislation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Change (After Legislation - Current Law)</b>										
Admissions	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Probations	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2
<b>Cumulative Populations</b>										
Prison	2	6	15	24	29	29	29	29	29	29
Parole		-2	-9	-16	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20
Probation	-2	-4	-6	-6	-6	-6	-6	-6	-6	-6
<b>Impact</b>										
Prison Population	2	6	15	24	29	29	29	29	29	29
Field Population	-2	-6	-15	-22	-26	-26	-26	-26	-26	-26
<b>Population Change</b>				<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

\* If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it could be due to an increase/decrease in the number of offenders, a change in the cost per day for institutional offenders, and/or an increase in staff salaries.

If the projected impact of legislation is less than 1,500 offenders added to or subtracted from the department's institutional caseload, the marginal cost of incarceration will be utilized. This cost of incarceration is \$28.73 per day or an annual cost of \$10,485 per offender and includes such costs as medical, food, and operational E&E. However, if the projected impact of legislation is 1,500 or more offenders added or removed to the department's institutional caseload, the full cost of incarceration will be used, which includes fixed costs. This cost is \$100.25 per day or an annual cost of \$36,591 per offender and includes personal services, all institutional E&E, medical and mental health, fringe, and miscellaneous expenses. None of these costs include construction to increase institutional capacity.

If the incarcerated population impact of any one piece of legislation, or combined impact of multiple pieces of legislation, results in a prison population that exceeds the current physical capacity of 26,835, the state would need to construct additional capacity. Based on current construction projects in other Midwest states, the department estimates the cost of constructing a new 1,500-bed maximum security prison at approximately \$825 million to \$900 million.

DOC's cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that are needed to cover its caseload. The DOC average district caseload across the state is 51 offender cases per officer. An increase/decrease of 51 cases would result in a cost/cost avoidance equal to the salary, fringe, and equipment and expenses of one P&P Officer II. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offender cases are assumed to be absorbable.

In instances where the proposed legislation would only affect a specific caseload, such as sex offenders, the DOC will use the average caseload figure for that specific type of offender to calculate cost increases/decreases.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for <b>prison</b>	Change in probation & parole officers	Total cost for <b>probation and parole</b>	# to probation & parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes 2% inflation)
Year 1	2	(\$10,485)	(\$17,475)	0	\$0	(2)	(\$17,475)
Year 2	6	(\$10,485)	(\$64,168)	0	\$0	(6)	(\$64,168)
Year 3	15	(\$10,485)	(\$163,629)	0	\$0	(15)	(\$163,629)
Year 4	24	(\$10,485)	(\$267,042)	0	\$0	(22)	(\$267,042)
Year 5	29	(\$10,485)	(\$329,129)	0	\$0	(26)	(\$329,129)
Year 6	29	(\$10,485)	(\$335,712)	0	\$0	(26)	(\$335,712)
Year 7	29	(\$10,485)	(\$342,429)	0	\$0	(26)	(\$342,429)
Year 8	29	(\$10,485)	(\$349,275)	0	\$0	(26)	(\$349,275)
Year 9	29	(\$10,485)	(\$356,260)	0	\$0	(26)	(\$356,260)
Year 10	29	(\$10,485)	(\$363,385)	0	\$0	(26)	(\$363,385)

**Oversight** has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present the fiscal impact of this proposal as provided by DOC.

Officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** state this proposal may have some impact but there is no way to quantify that amount currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

**Oversight** notes OSCA assumes this proposal may have some impact on their organization although it can't be quantified at this time. As OSCA is unable to provide additional information regarding the potential impact, Oversight assumes the proposed legislation will have a \$0 to (Unknown) cost to the General Revenue Fund. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight also assumes the impact will be under \$250,000 annually. If this assumption is incorrect, this would alter the fiscal impact as presented in this fiscal note. If additional information is received, Oversight will review it to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

Officials from the **Office of Administration (OA)** state §§476.1300 to 476.1313 of this bill provides restrictions on the use of a court-related officer's personal information and establishes civil remedies for violation, including costs and attorney fees. These provisions have the potential to increase costs to the Legal Expense Fund (LEF) if a claim were successfully brought against a state employee for violation of this legislation.

**Oversight** notes because this bill creates a possible new cause of action, Oversight will show a net \$0 direct fiscal impact for the LEF and a possible \$0 to (unknown) fiscal impact to General Revenue and other state funds. Oversight notes the possible litigation exposure as described by OA could also apply to colleges and universities, federal funds, as well as local political

subdivisions as the LEF does not cover costs for local political subdivisions or colleges and universities in most cases. For fiscal note purposes only, Oversight will range costs from \$0 to (Unknown) for all funds. Oversight will assume the unknown impact could reach the \$250,000 threshold.

Officials from the **Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District (MSD)** state the proposed legislation would impact MSD to the extent that staff time would be necessary to note accounts when written requests are received to not provide personal identifiable information, and also to redact that information from any future sunshine law requests received for that information.

**Oversight** has no information to the contrary. Oversight assumes the administrative impact of this proposal as provided by the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District would be minimal and absorbable within current staffing levels. Therefore, Oversight will present no fiscal impact for this organization for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assume any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation costs.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the AGO will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the AGO for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** state since most of the data and information retained by the DOR is confidential, and not considered publicly available information, this legislation will have minimal impact that will be absorbed.

**Oversight** has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present no fiscal impact for this proposal as provided by DOR.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Administrative Hearing Commission** and the **Division of Budget and Planning**, the **Department of Commerce and Insurance**, the **Department of Economic Development**, the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the **Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development**, the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Mental Health**, the **Department of Natural Resources**, the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**, the **Department of Public Safety**, **Divisions of: Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Capitol Police, Fire Safety, Director's Office, Missouri Gaming Commission, Missouri State Highway Patrol, Missouri Veterans Commission** and the **State Emergency Management Agency**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Office of the Governor**, the **Missouri Department of Agriculture**, the **Missouri Department of Conservation**, the **Missouri Ethics Commission**, the **Missouri National Guard**, the **Missouri Department of Transportation**, the **MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System**, the **Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund**,

the **Office of the State Public Defender**, the **Office of the State Treasurer**, the **University of Missouri System**, the **City of Kansas City**, the **Jackson County Election Board**, the **Kansas City Election Board**, the **Platte County Board of Elections**, the **St. Louis City Board of Elections**, the **St. Louis County Board of Elections**, the **Newton County Health Department**, the **Clay County Auditor**, the **Phelps County Sheriff**, the **Branson Police Department**, the **Kansas City Police Department**, the **St. Louis County Police Department**, the **County Employees' Retirement Fund**, the **Kansas City Civilian Police Employees' Retirement**, the **Kansas City Police Retirement System**, the **Kansas City Public School Retirement System**, the **Public Education Employees' Retirement System**, the **Sheriff's Retirement System**, the **Morgan County Public Water Supply District #2**, the **South River Drainage District**, the **St. Charles County Public Water Supply District #2**, the **Wayne County Public Water Supply District #2**, the **University of Central Missouri**, the **Office of the Lieutenant Governor**, the **Office of the State Auditor**, the **Missouri House of Representatives**, the **Joint Committee on Education**, the **Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement**, **Legislative Research**, the **Oversight Division**, the **Missouri Senate**, the **Missouri Lottery**, the **Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan**, the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services**, the **Missouri State Employee's Retirement System** and the **State Tax Commission** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

In response to the previous version of this proposal, officials from the **City of Osceola**, the **Osceola Water/Wastewater District** and the **Mid-Continent Public Library** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

#### Rule Promulgation

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assume this proposal is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** note many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$5,000. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the office can sustain with its core budget. Therefore, the SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

**Oversight** only reflects the responses received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other cities, counties, local election authorities, county health departments, county

recorders, nursing homes, county assessors, county auditors, county circuit clerks, county collectors, county prosecutors, county treasurers, county public administrators, local law enforcement agencies, fire protection districts, ambulance districts, retirement agencies, schools, utility districts, hospitals, colleges, electric companies and coops, solid waste management districts and public libraries were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. A listing of political subdivisions included in the Missouri Legislative Information System (MOLIS) database is available upon request.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>				
<u>Costs</u> – DOC (§§575.095 and 575.260) – increase in incarcerations p.4-6	(\$17,475)	(\$64,168)	(\$163,629)	(\$329,129)
<u>Costs</u> – OSCA (§§476.1300 - 476.1313, 575.095, and 575.260) – potential increase in costs p.6	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<u>Costs</u> – State agencies (§§476.1300 - 476.1313) – potential contributions to Legal Expense Fund for violations and payment of claims p.6-7	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b><u>(Could exceed \$17,475)</u></b>	<b><u>(Could exceed \$64,168)</u></b>	<b><u>(Could exceed \$163,629)</u></b>	<b><u>(Likely to exceed \$329,129)</u></b>
<b>OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>				
<u>Costs</u> (§§476.1300 - 476.1313) – potential contributions to Legal Expense Fund for violations and payment of claims p.6-7	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
<b>LEGAL EXPENSE FUND</b>				
<u>Income</u> – (§§476.1300 - 476.1313) - payments to cover potential costs of payouts for violations and payment of claims p.6-7	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
<u>Costs</u> (§§476.1300 - 476.1313) – payouts for violations and payment of claims p.6-7	<u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE LEGAL EXPENSE FUND</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>
<b>COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES</b>				
<u>Costs</u> – (§§476.1300 - 476.1313) – increase in potential judgements for violations and payments of claims p.6-7	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES</b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>
<b>FEDERAL FUNDS</b>				
<u>Costs</u> – (§§476.1300 - 476.1313) – increase in potential judgements for violations and payments of claims p.6-7	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown)</u></b>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
<b>LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>				
<u>Costs</u> – (§§476.1300 - 476.1313) – increase in potential judgements for violations and payments of claims p.6-7	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>	<u>\$0 to</u> <b>(Unknown)</b>	<u>\$0 to</u> <b>(Unknown)</b>	<u>\$0 to</u> <b>(Unknown)</b>	<u>\$0 to</u> <b>(Unknown)</b>

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This bill amends the Judicial Privacy Act to replace the definition for "judicial officer" with a definition for "court-related officer", which includes various judges, prosecuting and circuit attorneys, circuit clerks, court administrators, deputy circuit clerks, division, clerks, municipal clerks, and juvenile officers and chief deputy juvenile officers.

The definition of "written request" is amended to exclude a court related officer's personal information. The bill specifies that the prohibition on a government agency publicly posting or displaying publicly available content of a court-related officer does not apply to a court-related officer's personal information that is included in any records of court proceedings of this State contained in any statewide court automation system.

This bill amends the offense of tampering with a judicial officer and the offense of tampering with a judicial proceeding to prohibit a person convicted of the offense or offenses from being eligible for parole, probation, or conditional release. (§§476.1300 - 476.1313)

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Attorney General’s Office  
 Office of Administration –

Administrative Hearing Commission  
Budget and Planning  
Department of Commerce and Insurance  
Department of Economic Development  
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development  
Department of Health and Senior Services  
Department of Mental Health  
Department of Natural Resources  
Department of Corrections  
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations  
Department of Revenue  
Department of Public Safety –  
    Alcohol and Tobacco Control  
    Capitol Police  
    Fire Safety  
    Director’s Office  
    Missouri Gaming Commission  
    Missouri State Highway Patrol  
    Missouri Veterans Commission  
    State Emergency Management Agency  
Department of Social Services  
Office of the Governor  
Missouri National Guard  
Missouri Department of Agriculture  
Missouri Department of Conservation  
Missouri Ethics Commission  
Missouri Department of Transportation  
MoDOT & Patrol Employees’ Retirement System  
Office of Administration  
Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund  
Office of the Secretary of State  
Office of the State Treasurer  
Office of the State Public Defender  
University of Missouri System  
City of Kansas City  
City of Osceola  
Jackson County Election Board  
Kansas City Election Board  
Platte County Board of Elections  
St. Louis City Board of Elections  
St. Louis County Board of Elections  
Newton County Health Department  
Clay County Auditor

Phelps County Sheriff  
Branson Police Department  
Kansas City Police Department  
St. Louis County Police Department  
County Employees Retirement Fund  
Kansas City Civilian Policier Employees' Retirement  
Kansas City Police Retirement System  
Kansas City Public School Retirement System  
Public Education Employees' Retirement System  
Sheriff's Retirement System  
Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District  
Morgan County Public Water Supply District #2  
Osceola Water/Wastewater District  
South River Drainage District  
St. Charles County Public Water Supply District #2  
Wayne County Public Water Supply District #2  
University of Central Missouri  
Office of the Lieutenant Governor  
Office of the State Auditor  
Missouri House of Representatives  
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules  
Joint Committee on Education  
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement  
Legislative Research  
Oversight Division  
Missouri Senate  
Missouri Lottery Commission  
Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan  
Missouri State Employee's Retirement System  
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services  
Office of the State Courts Administrator  
State Tax Commission  
Mid-Continent Public Library



Julie Morff  
Director  
March 21, 2025



Jessica Harris  
Assistant Director  
March 21, 2025