

Fiscal Note

State of Alaska
2015 Legislative Session

Bill Version: HB 106
Fiscal Note Number: _____
() Publish Date: _____

Identifier: HB106CS(STA)-ACS-TRC-03-19-15 Department: Judiciary
Title: UNIFORM INTER.CHILD SUPPORT;PARENTAGE Appropriation: Alaska Court System
Sponsor: RLS BY REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR Allocation: Trial Courts
Requester: House Judiciary Committee OMB Component Number: 768

Expenditures/Revenues

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below. (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY2016	Included in	Out-Year Cost Estimates				
	Appropriation Requested	Governor's FY2016 Request	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2016	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Personal Services							
Travel							
Services							
Commodities							
Capital Outlay							
Grants & Benefits							
Miscellaneous							
Total Operating	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Fund Source (Operating Only)

None							
Total	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Positions

Full-time							
Part-time							
Temporary							

Change in Revenues							
---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Estimated SUPPLEMENTAL (FY2015) cost: 0.0 *(separate supplemental appropriation required)*
(discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section)

Estimated CAPITAL (FY2016) cost: 0.0 *(separate capital appropriation required)*
(discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section)

ASSOCIATED REGULATIONS

Does the bill direct, or will the bill result in, regulation changes adopted by your agency? **No**
If yes, by what date are the regulations to be adopted, amended or repealed?

Why this fiscal note differs from previous version:

Initial version.

Prepared By: <u>Nancy Meade, General Counsel</u>	Phone: <u>(907)463-4736</u>
Division: <u>Alaska Court System</u>	Date: <u>03/19/2015 12:00 PM</u>
Approved By: <u>Nancy Meade for Christine Johnson, Administrative Director</u>	Date: <u>03/19/15</u>
Agency: <u>Alaska Court System</u>	

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA
2015 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB106

Analysis

The State Affairs Committee Substitute for House Bill 106 (version W) would incorporate the current Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA) into Alaska law, revising the version of UIFSA that Alaska previously adopted. The new uniform law generally expands on procedures for international child support cases; it provides jurisdictional guidelines, and expands the scope of support orders that can be registered in Alaska to include those issued by foreign countries that are signatories to the specified Hague Convention.

Sections 75-94 of CSHB 106 revise the existing statutes that direct the court to accept foreign support orders for registration and provide procedures for modification of support orders after registration. In general, the revisions to the existing statutes serve to expand the group of orders that can be registered with a state court, modified, and enforced to include those from additional foreign countries. The new procedures are not fundamentally different from those that the court currently follows for registering and handling support orders issued by other states.

Since this bill expands the scope of (and is therefore expected to increase the number of) foreign orders that can be registered with the court, it will have some impact on our operations. The statutes require the courts to perform certain tasks and follow a number of requirements when foreign orders are brought to the court for registration. For example, the court in which a person wishes to register his or her foreign support order is required to provide notice to the other party (sections 82-83). If the other party contests the validity of a registered order, the court must hold a hearing to determine the validity of the foreign order (sections 84-85). And if an order is registered and confirmed, and if jurisdictional requirements are met, the state court would then handle motions to modify that foreign support order.

Though this bill would affect our workload, the number of additional orders that will be registered with the court system is unlikely to be substantial. The court staff and judicial officers can absorb the increased work without a fiscal impact, and the court system therefore submits this zero fiscal note.