

SF3969 - 1A - Grooming Criminal Offense Establishment

Chief Author: **Erin Maye Quade**
 Committee: **Education Finance**
 Date Completed: **4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM**
 Lead Agency: **Prof Educator Licensing Std Bd**
 Other Agencies:
 Children, Youth and Families Corrections Dept
 Education Department Metropolitan Council
 Public Defense Board Sentencing Guidelines Comm
 Supreme Court University Of Minnesota

State Fiscal Impact	Yes	No
Expenditures	X	
Fee/Departmental Earnings		X
Tax Revenue		X
Information Technology		X
Local Fiscal Impact	X	

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions shown in the parentheses.

State Cost (Savings)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Corrections Dept						
General Fund	-	-	-	13	35	
Education Department						
General Fund	-	-	1,455	1,444	1,446	
State Total						
General Fund	-	-	1,455	1,457	1,481	
Total	-	-	1,455	1,457	1,481	
Biennial Total			1,455		2,938	

Full Time Equivalent Positions (FTE)	Biennium			Biennium	
	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Corrections Dept					
General Fund	-	-	-	.1	.2
Education Department					
General Fund	-	-	7.5	7.5	7.5
Total	-	-	7.5	7.6	7.7

Lead LBO Analyst's Comment

I have reviewed this fiscal note for reasonableness of content and consistency with the LBO's Uniform Standards and Procedures.

LBO Signature: Chloe Burns **Date:** 4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM
Phone: 651-297-1423 **Email:** chloe.burns@lbo.mn.gov

State Cost (Savings) Calculation Details

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions are shown in parentheses.

*Transfers In/Out and Absorbed Costs are only displayed when reported.

State Cost (Savings) = 1-2		Biennium			Biennium	
Dollars in Thousands		FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Corrections Dept						
General Fund		-	-	-	13	35
Education Department						
General Fund		-	-	1,455	1,444	1,446
Total		-	-	1,455	1,457	1,481
Biennial Total				1,455		2,938
1 - Expenditures, Absorbed Costs*, Transfers Out*						
Corrections Dept						
General Fund		-	-	-	13	35
Education Department						
General Fund		-	-	1,455	1,444	1,446
Total		-	-	1,455	1,457	1,481
Biennial Total				1,455		2,938
2 - Revenues, Transfers In*						
Corrections Dept						
General Fund		-	-	-	-	-
Education Department						
General Fund		-	-	-	-	-
Total		-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total				-		-

SF3969 - 1A - Grooming Criminal Offense Establishment

Chief Author: **Erin Maye Quade**
 Committee: **Education Finance**
 Date Completed: **4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM**
 Agency: **Prof Educator Licensing Std Bd**

State Fiscal Impact	Yes	No
Expenditures		X
Fee/Departmental Earnings		X
Tax Revenue		X
Information Technology		X
Local Fiscal Impact		X

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions shown in the parentheses.

State Cost (Savings)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-

Full Time Equivalent Positions (FTE)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

LBO Analyst's Comment

I have reviewed this fiscal note for reasonableness of content and consistency with the LBO's Uniform Standards and Procedures.

LBO Signature: Chloe Burns **Date:** 3/27/2026 4:53:51 PM
Phone: 651-297-1423 **Email:** chloe.burns@lbo.mn.gov

State Cost (Savings) Calculation Details

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions are shown in parentheses.

*Transfers In/Out and Absorbed Costs are only displayed when reported.

State Cost (Savings) = 1-2		Biennium			Biennium	
Dollars in Thousands		FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
	Total	-	-	-	-	-
	Biennial Total			-		-
1 - Expenditures, Absorbed Costs*, Transfers Out*						
	Total	-	-	-	-	-
	Biennial Total			-		-
2 - Revenues, Transfers In*						
	Total	-	-	-	-	-
	Biennial Total			-		-

Bill Description

Section 1 Adds grooming to auto revocation offenses.

Section 2 Requires police departments and county sheriffs to report any teacher charged with an auto revocation crime to PELSB.

Section 3 Requires DCYF to develop mandatory reporter training.

Sections 4 -6 Remove 3-year limitation on maltreatment investigations

Sections 7 & 8 Define grooming

Sections 9 & 10 Make grooming a felony crime and set penalty.

Assumptions

This bill simply adds grooming to PELSB's auto revocation offenses and ensures incidents are reported to PELSB. It does not have a fiscal impact on investigations.

Expenditure and/or Revenue Formula

Long-Term Fiscal Considerations

Local Fiscal Impact

References/Sources

Agency Contact: Yelena Bailey (651-539-4196)

Agency Fiscal Note Coordinator Signature: Yelena Bailey

Phone: 651-539-4196

Date: 3/26/2026 2:56:42 PM

Email: yelena.bailey@state.mn.us

SF3969 - 1A - Grooming Criminal Offense Establishment

Chief Author: **Erin Maye Quade**
 Committee: **Education Finance**
 Date Completed: **4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM**
 Agency: **Children, Youth and Families**

State Fiscal Impact	Yes	No
Expenditures		X
Fee/Departmental Earnings		X
Tax Revenue		X
Information Technology		X
Local Fiscal Impact		X

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions shown in the parentheses.

State Cost (Savings)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-

Full Time Equivalent Positions (FTE)	Biennium			Biennium		
		FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

LBO Analyst's Comment

I have reviewed this fiscal note for reasonableness of content and consistency with the LBO's Uniform Standards and Procedures.

LBO Signature: Alyssa Holterman Rosas **Date:** 4/13/2026 10:16:05 AM
Phone: 651-284-6439 **Email:** alyssa.holterman.rosas@lbo.mn.gov

State Cost (Savings) Calculation Details

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions are shown in parentheses.

*Transfers In/Out and Absorbed Costs are only displayed when reported.

State Cost (Savings) = 1-2		Biennium			Biennium	
Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-
1 - Expenditures, Absorbed Costs*, Transfers Out*						
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-
2 - Revenues, Transfers In*						
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-

Bill Description

Section 1 makes no changes to existing law. This has no impact on DCYF.

Section 2 requires local law enforcement to notify licensing boards when a teacher is charged with a number of specific crimes. This has no fiscal impact on DCYF.

Section 3 requires DCYF to develop a training module as part of mandated reporter training that applies specifically to professionals engaged in education. The training is to include the requirement to report allegations of maltreatment as well as addressing grooming and threatened sexual abuse. DCYF must consult with the Department of Education (MDE) in developing this guidance.

Sections 4-6 ensure that child protection screening check may include reports of alleged maltreatment that happened more than three years prior.

Sections 7-11 create and define the new criminal offense of grooming and establish penalties. This has no fiscal impact on DCYF.

Assumptions

DCYF assumes that the new training requirements in this bill would require curriculum and learning management system development by the Minnesota Child Welfare Training Academy (MNCWTA). It would include updating existing training with new definitions around grooming within mandated reporting as well as new module development. DCYF assumes that the adjustments to training would apply to training for all mandated reporters, not just that provided to educators. As this would require revisions to a current training program, these updates can be made as part of normal business and would not require any additional resources.

Existing Minnesota Child Maltreatment, Intake, Screening, and Response Path Guidelines, along with existing DCYF policy and practice, do not prohibit any screening processes from reviewing information from more than three years ago. DCYF therefore assumes that no changes will be required to these policies as a result of Sections 5-7 of this bill and there will therefore be no costs.

Expenditure and/or Revenue Formula

As explained above, DCYF anticipates no costs from this bill.

Long-Term Fiscal Considerations

N/A

Local Fiscal Impact

It is possible that this bill may require some policy changes for local entities, but DCYF is not in a position to know of any such impacts in detail. For one specific instance, the policy changes in sections 5-7 allow for background checks to include information from more than three-years prior. As noted in the assumptions section, DCYF currently does not prohibit this practice, but does not require it. It is feasible that local entities may change their practices and incur costs as a result of these provisions.

References/Sources

N/A

Agency Contact: Brian Hornbecker (651-539-8083)

Agency Fiscal Note Coordinator Signature: Marina Balleria

Phone: 651-272-6470

Date: 4/10/2026 10:45:49 PM

Email: marina.balleria@state.mn.us

SF3969 - 1A - Grooming Criminal Offense Establishment

Chief Author: **Erin Maye Quade**
 Committee: **Education Finance**
 Date Completed: **4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM**
 Agency: **Corrections Dept**

State Fiscal Impact	Yes	No
Expenditures	X	
Fee/Departmental Earnings		X
Tax Revenue		X
Information Technology		X
Local Fiscal Impact		X

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions shown in the parentheses.

State Cost (Savings)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
General Fund	-	-	-	13	35	
Total	-	-	-	13	35	
Biennial Total						48

Full Time Equivalent Positions (FTE)	Biennium			Biennium	
	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
General Fund	-	-	-	.1	.2
Total	-	-	-	.1	.2

LBO Analyst's Comment

I have reviewed this fiscal note for reasonableness of content and consistency with the LBO's Uniform Standards and Procedures.

LBO Signature: Jim Carlson **Date:** 4/6/2026 9:57:49 PM
Phone: 651-284-6540 **Email:** jim.carlson@lbo.mn.gov

State Cost (Savings) Calculation Details

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions are shown in parentheses.

*Transfers In/Out and Absorbed Costs are only displayed when reported.

State Cost (Savings) = 1-2		Biennium			Biennium	
Dollars in Thousands		FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
General Fund	-	-	-	-	13	35
Total	-	-	-	-	13	35
Biennial Total				-		48
1 - Expenditures, Absorbed Costs*, Transfers Out*						
General Fund	-	-	-	-	13	35
Total	-	-	-	-	13	35
Biennial Total				-		48
2 - Revenues, Transfers In*						
General Fund	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total				-		-

Bill Description

The bill requires schools and licensing boards to report when educators are investigated or charged with certain offenses, and it adds a new criminal offense of “grooming” involving minors. It expands mandatory reporting rules for law enforcement and school officials, requires statewide training on recognizing grooming, and ensures agencies can investigate maltreatment reports even if the alleged conduct occurred more than three years earlier. It also strengthens penalties when school personnel engage in solicitation, grooming, or related misconduct involving students. Finally, it requires that the Commissioner of Children, Youth, and Families develop an education-related mandated report training module on grooming by August 1, 2027.

Assumptions

Prison bed costs are based on a marginal cost per diem of \$53.93 for FY26, \$55.64 for FY27, \$58.43 for FY28, and \$58.14 for FY29. This includes marginal costs for all facility, private and public bed rental, health care, and support costs.

The annual cost is estimated by multiplying the number of prison beds needed by the subsequent annual per diem. Unless otherwise noted, prison beds are phased in on a quarterly basis.

Prison bed impact for the increase in the offender population assumes 80 percent of the ongoing bed impact is personnel-related and the average salary per FTE is \$132,000 per year, including benefits.

Expenditure and/or Revenue Formula

The Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission (MSGC) projects that 1 additional bed will be needed in 2028 and then 2 additional prison beds will be needed each fiscal year, beginning in Fiscal Year 2029, as a result of this legislation.

Cost of Prison Beds

Fiscal year	2026	2027	2028	2029
Number of Prison Beds	0	0	1	2
Cost of Prison Beds (in 000s)	\$0	\$0	\$13	\$35
FTE	0	0	0.1	0.2

Long-Term Fiscal Considerations

MSGC projects that this budget impact will continue beyond the current budget horizon.

Local Fiscal Impact

Unknown

References/Sources

MSGC

Department of Corrections staff

Agency Contact:

Agency Fiscal Note Coordinator Signature: Mark Besonen

Phone: 651-361-7200

Date: 4/6/2026 11:47:45 AM

Email: mark.besonen@state.mn.us

SF3969 - 1A - Grooming Criminal Offense Establishment

Chief Author: **Erin Maye Quade**
 Committee: **Education Finance**
 Date Completed: **4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM**
 Agency: **Education Department**

State Fiscal Impact	Yes	No
Expenditures	X	
Fee/Departmental Earnings		X
Tax Revenue		X
Information Technology		X
Local Fiscal Impact	X	

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions shown in the parentheses.

State Cost (Savings) Dollars in Thousands	Biennium			Biennium	
	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
General Fund	-	-	1,455	1,444	1,446
Total	-	-	1,455	1,444	1,446
Biennial Total			1,455		2,890

Full Time Equivalent Positions (FTE)	Biennium			Biennium	
	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
General Fund	-	-	7.5	7.5	7.5
Total	-	-	7.5	7.5	7.5

LBO Analyst's Comment

I have reviewed this fiscal note for reasonableness of content and consistency with the LBO's Uniform Standards and Procedures.

LBO Signature: Alyssa Holterman Rosas **Date:** 4/10/2026 11:16:19 AM
Phone: 651-284-6439 **Email:** alyssa.holterman.rosas@lbo.mn.gov

State Cost (Savings) Calculation Details

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions are shown in parentheses.

*Transfers In/Out and Absorbed Costs are only displayed when reported.

State Cost (Savings) = 1-2		Biennium			Biennium	
Dollars in Thousands		FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
General Fund	-	-	1,455	1,444	1,446	1,446
Total		-	-	1,455	1,444	1,446
Biennial Total				1,455		2,890
1 - Expenditures, Absorbed Costs*, Transfers Out*						
General Fund	-	-	1,455	1,444	1,446	1,446
Total		-	-	1,455	1,444	1,446
Biennial Total				1,455		2,890
2 - Revenues, Transfers In*						
General Fund	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total				-		-

Bill Description

Sections of SF3969 1E (with the A8 amendment) directly affect the Minnesota Department of Education’s Student Maltreatment Program (SMP) and will be the focus of this fiscal note.

Sections 1 and 2 update grounds for license revocation (including grooming), strengthen mandatory reporting to licensing boards, and clarify coordination with law enforcement. Section 3 makes the section effective July 1, 2026.

Section 3 requires the Commissioner of DCYF to develop training for mandated reporters, including a module on grooming, threatened sexual abuse, and reporting obligations specific to education professionals.

Section 4 clarifies that screening guidelines must not limit an agency’s ability to screen in and investigate alleged maltreatment that occurred more than three years prior to the report date.

Section 5 allows investigation of maltreatment that occurred more than three years prior to the report date. (Note: This section does not directly impact SMP but aligns with Section 6’s removal of the three-year limitation.)

Section 6 requires immediate investigation of alleged maltreatment in facilities, including schools, with no time limit for screening or investigation.

Sections 7 through 10 create and define the offense of grooming and update penalties.

Assumptions

The provisions in this bill are expected to increase SMP intake volume, screening time, joint investigations with law enforcement, licensure coordination, and technical assistance workload. With statutory clarification of grooming, removal of perceived time barriers, and increased accountability requirements, reporting is expected to increase. These changes will require additional front-end screening capacity, investigator bandwidth, and supervisory oversight to maintain statutory timelines, manage caseload growth, and support coordinated investigative responses.

SMP is currently operating at or near full capacity, with existing screening volume and investigation demands exceeding available staffing resources. As a result, SMP is not able to absorb additional workload associated with this bill without additional staffing resources. This includes increased screening responsibilities, grooming-related investigations, and historical allegations that become newly reportable or actionable under the statute.

Current staffing in the SMP division includes one supervisor, five investigators (one investigator vacancy in the hiring process, for a total of 6.0 FTE investigators), two intake staff, and one support staff, for a total of 10.0 FTE. The projected average caseload may reach approximately 62 active cases per investigator by the end of this fiscal year, limiting the ability to consistently meet optimal timelines for trauma-informed investigations and coordination with law enforcement. Cost estimates are therefore based on a more sustainable caseload threshold of approximately 30 cases per investigator annually.

5.5 FTE Investigative Staffing Impacts (Education Consultant 3)

The bill is expected to increase SMP investigative workload through three primary drivers related to grooming definitions and reporting changes:

- **1.7 FTE Investigator** is required to account for increased complexity in the existing sexual abuse caseload. Approximately 100 sexual abuse investigations are projected annually. Applying a 1.5 complexity weighting to reflect grooming-related investigative requirements results in approximately 150 workload-equivalent cases, or 50 additional cases. At an average caseload of 30 cases per investigator per year, this equates to approximately 1.7 FTE. This impact reflects increased complexity within existing cases and does not include new grooming cases described below.
- **2.4 FTE Investigator** is required for new grooming-related cases under the expanded statute. Based on benchmarking from Chicago Public Schools, grooming represents approximately 4248 percent of sexual misconduct investigations. Applying this range to Minnesota's projected 100 sexual abuse cases results in approximately 4248 grooming cases. Applying a 1.5 complexity weighting results in approximately 6372 workload-equivalent cases, or 2.12.4 FTE. A request of 2.4 FTE reflects the upper range to ensure adequate capacity.
- **1.4 FTE Investigator** is required due to removal of the perceived three-year reporting limitation, which is expected to increase historical sexual abuse reports. Applying a conservative 2x increase to a baseline of 14 cases results in 28 additional cases. Applying a 1.5 complexity weighting results in approximately 42 workload-equivalent cases. At an average caseload of 30 cases per investigator per year, this equates to approximately 1.4 FTE.

Intake Staffing Impact

- **1.0 FTE Screening/Intake (Education Consultant 3)**
SMP currently operates with two intake staff and is expected to experience a significant increase in reports requiring screening under the bill. All reports must be reviewed within statutory timelines, typically within 24 hours. Based on projected increases in investigations related to grooming and historical sexual misconduct, SMP anticipates a corresponding rise in incoming reports. Using an average of approximately 2.5 hours per report, with complex cases requiring significantly more time, the additional workload exceeds existing capacity. In addition to formal reports, Intake staff manage consultations, referrals, and required cross-reporting to law enforcement, further increasing workload. This combined impact is estimated to require **1.0 FTE** to maintain timely screening and compliance with statutory requirements.

Supervisory Staffing Impact

- **1.0 FTE Manager/Supervisor (State Program Admin Manager Sr)**
SMP currently operates with one supervisor responsible for both Intake and Investigations, including oversight, quality assurance, consultation on complex cases, and administrative and HR functions. Under current conditions, this structure operates near capacity. The bill is expected to increase both volume and complexity of work across both functions. A second Manager/Supervisor FTE is needed to maintain appropriate supervisory span of control and ensure consistent oversight, timely decision-making, and adherence to quality and due process standards. This position would allow for functional separation of Intake (screening, consultation, triage) and Investigations (case assignment, management, and quality review).

Additional Statutory and Operational Assumptions

- Section 4 requires DCYF to consult with MDE in developing a training module. It is assumed that MDE's current staff can absorb this additional work.
- The prohibition on being alone with a student during field trips (including overnight trips) may generate additional reports and inquiries related to supervision practices. SMP assumes any incremental workload can be absorbed with the staffing increase requested. This provision is effective July 1, 2026.

Operating Costs (Per Staff 8.0 FTE Assumption)

Ongoing operating costs will increase as SMP adds 7.5 new staff members. Current operating expenses include employee development, travel, and cell phone costs. It is assumed each new staff member will require:

- Employee development: \$300 per staff = **\$2,400 total**
- Travel: \$1,300 per staff = **\$10,400 total**
- Cell phone: \$1,000 per staff = **\$8,000 total**

System and Training Costs

- Case tracking system access: \$2,000 per user annual fee = **\$16,000 total**
- First Witness/trauma-informed training: **\$2,625 annually**, based on rotating attendance so all staff are trained every four years
- Specialized forensic interviewing and trauma-informed practice training: **\$1,500 per staff**, totaling **\$12,000 in year one**, with refresher training every 35 years

Expenditure and/or Revenue Formula

SF3969 1E A8	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
1.0 Screening Intake FTE	185,122	185,342	185,571
5.5 Investigator FTE	1,018,173	1,019,383	1,020,642
1.0 State Program Admin Manager Sr.	200,072	200,292	200,521
Employee Development	2,400	2,400	2,400
Travel	10,400	10,400	10,400
Cell Phones	8,000	8,000	8,000
System Access	16,000	16,000	16,000
First Witness/Trauma Informed Training	2,625	2,625	2,625
Forensic/Trauma Informed Training	12,000		
Total Cost	1,454,792	1,444,443	1,446,160

Long-Term Fiscal Considerations

SMP’s current baseline is approximately 14 screened-out historical reports per year. Once the practical limitation on reporting, as historically applied by MDE, is removed, SMP expects an initial surge in reporting as historical cases are submitted, with volumes stabilizing after 1224 months once mandated reporter training is broadly completed and the historical reporting peak passes. Based on patterns observed when reporting barriers are removed, a reasonable estimate is that ongoing historical reports would level off at roughly 23 times the current baseline, or approximately 3045 reports per year. The proposed staffing level is designed to prevent backlogs, sustain immediate response requirements for schools, and maintain public trust in Minnesota’s capacity to protect students.

Local Fiscal Impact

LEAs may see an unknown increase in staff time for training and reporting.

References/Sources

- SMP Program Data (July 1, 2025present).

Intakes, screens, onsite openings, investigations closed, reconsiderations, hearings, active caseload, staffing.

- Maltreatment Reporting Policies: <https://www.casey.org/media/21.07-QFF-RFF-CW-policies-and-measurement-of-CM.pdf>

- Summary of "New Legislation Targets Grooming, but What About DPI Enforcement?"
Published by the MacIver Institute on February 25, 2026 | By Rebecca Draeger

Full Article found here: <https://www.maciverinstitute.com/perspectives/new-legislation-targets-grooming,-but-what-about-dpi-enforcement>

- Summary of "Texas Education Agency Names New Inspector General as Educator Misconduct Reports Surge"
By Amelia Mugavero | CBS Texas | February 19, 2026

Full Article found here: <https://www.cbsnews.com/texas/news/texas-education-agency-names-new-inspector-general-as-educator-misconduct-reports-surge/>

Articles on Grooming and sexual misconduct:

- Educator Sexual Misconduct: A synthesis of Existing Literature, 2004, published by the US Department of Education,
Link: <file:///C:/Users/EU01019567/OneDrive%20-%20State%20of%20Minnesota%20-%20MN365/OIG%20Leadership%20Folder/Legislation/2026%20Legislation/Fiscal%20Note%20reviews/HF3489-1A%20SQL,%20Grooming/ED483143.pdf>

- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0145213422005324>

- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0190740925000027>

- Office of Criminal Justice Programs: <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/252484.pdf>

- Caseload and Workload Management Child Welfare Information Gateway:
https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GOVPUB-HE23_1200-PURL-gpo8206/pdf/GOVPUB-HE23_1200-PURL-gpo8206.pdf

- Chicago Public Schools OIG Annual reports: <https://cpsoig.org/reports.html>

Agency Contact: Jennifer (JJ) Hoppenstedt (651) 582-8472

Agency Fiscal Note Coordinator Signature: Bettsey Hjelseth

Phone: 651-582-8242

Date: 4/10/2026 11:07:51 AM

Email: bettsey.hjelseth@state.mn.us

SF3969 - 1A - Grooming Criminal Offense Establishment

Chief Author: **Erin Maye Quade**
 Committee: **Education Finance**
 Date Completed: **4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM**
 Agency: **Metropolitan Council**

State Fiscal Impact	Yes	No
Expenditures		X
Fee/Departmental Earnings		X
Tax Revenue		X
Information Technology		X
Local Fiscal Impact		X

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions shown in the parentheses.

State Cost (Savings)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-

Full Time Equivalent Positions (FTE)	Biennium			Biennium	
	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-

LBO Analyst's Comment

I have reviewed this fiscal note for reasonableness of content and consistency with the LBO's Uniform Standards and Procedures.

LBO Signature: Laura Cecko **Date:** 4/4/2026 5:45:56 PM
Phone: 651-284-6543 **Email:** laura.cecko@lbo.mn.gov

State Cost (Savings) Calculation Details

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions are shown in parentheses.

*Transfers In/Out and Absorbed Costs are only displayed when reported.

State Cost (Savings) = 1-2		Biennium			Biennium	
Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-
1 - Expenditures, Absorbed Costs*, Transfers Out*						
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-
2 - Revenues, Transfers In*						
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-

Bill Description

SF3969-1E:

Section 1 updates teacher licensing laws to require automatic denial, suspension, or revocation of a license for educators convicted of certain serious offenses, including newly added conduct involving inappropriate behavior toward minors, and requires notification to the employing school district.

Section 2 strengthens mandatory reporting requirements by requiring schools and related entities to report disciplinary actions or resignations tied to misconduct to licensing boards, mandates cooperation in investigations, and requires coordination with law enforcement and the Attorney General when misconduct involving minors is suspected.

Section 3 directs the state to develop a training module for mandated reporters in education focused on recognizing and reporting grooming and maltreatment, including for older students receiving services.

Section 4 clarifies child protection screening guidelines, emphasizing that agencies must follow state standards and cannot limit their ability to review or act on reports, including older allegations.

Section 5 updates the duties of local welfare agencies, reinforcing coordination with law enforcement, assessment responsibilities, and proper documentation in cases involving potential harm to children.

Section 6 requires immediate investigation of alleged maltreatment in facilities and confirms that agencies may review incidents that occurred more than three years earlier.

Section 7 updates definitions related to prohibited conduct involving minors.

Section 8 creates a new felony offense of grooming, defined as a pattern of behavior intended to build trust with a child in order to engage in inappropriate conduct at a later time.

Section 9 establishes enhanced penalties for individuals connected to schools who commit these offenses when they have access to students through their position.

Section 10 sets penalties for violations, making grooming and related offenses punishable by imprisonment, a fine, or both.

SF3969-1A:

The amendment refines the definition of grooming to focus on patterns of behavior intended to build trust and influence a child over time, adding clearer examples of concerning conduct. It broadens enhanced penalties to cover individuals in positions of authority over minors, creates a separate provision specifically for licensed educators that can apply even when a student is an adult, and updates related statutory references.

Assumptions

This bill was reviewed and will have no fiscal impact on the Metropolitan Council and/or the Metro Transit Police Department.

Expenditure and/or Revenue Formula

This bill was reviewed and will have no fiscal impact on the Metropolitan Council and/or the Metro Transit Police Department.

Long-Term Fiscal Considerations

N/A

Local Fiscal Impact

N/A

References/Sources

Kristin Prescott (612) 373-6812

Agency Contact: Kristin Prescott (612) 373-6812

Agency Fiscal Note Coordinator Signature: Stewart McMullan

Phone: 651-602-1374

Date: 4/3/2026 12:22:07 PM

Email: stewart.mcmullan@metc.state.mn.us

SF3969 - 1A - Grooming Criminal Offense Establishment

Chief Author: **Erin Maye Quade**
 Committee: **Education Finance**
 Date Completed: **4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM**
 Agency: **Public Defense Board**

State Fiscal Impact	Yes	No
Expenditures		X
Fee/Departmental Earnings		X
Tax Revenue		X
Information Technology		X
Local Fiscal Impact		X

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions shown in the parentheses.

State Cost (Savings)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-

Full Time Equivalent Positions (FTE)	Biennium			Biennium		
		FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

LBO Analyst's Comment

I have reviewed this fiscal note for reasonableness of content and consistency with the LBO's Uniform Standards and Procedures.

LBO Signature: Susan Nelson **Date:** 4/6/2026 9:11:19 AM
Phone: 651-296-6054 **Email:** susan.nelson@lbo.mn.gov

State Cost (Savings) Calculation Details

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions are shown in parentheses.

*Transfers In/Out and Absorbed Costs are only displayed when reported.

State Cost (Savings) = 1-2		Biennium			Biennium	
Dollars in Thousands		FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
	Total	-	-	-	-	-
	Biennial Total			-		-
1 - Expenditures, Absorbed Costs*, Transfers Out*						
	Total	-	-	-	-	-
	Biennial Total			-		-
2 - Revenues, Transfers In*						
	Total	-	-	-	-	-
	Biennial Total			-		-

Bill Description

The bill establish the crime of grooming. Grooming being defined as a person 18 years of age or older who knowingly engages in a pattern of conduct that seduces or attempts to , solicit, lure, or entice, a child to engage or participate in unlawful sexual conduct. There is a felony penalty for a violation.

Assumptions

There is not enough information to determine an impact of this bill.

Expenditure and/or Revenue Formula

Long-Term Fiscal Considerations

Local Fiscal Impact

References/Sources

Agency Contact:

Agency Fiscal Note Coordinator Signature: Kevin Kajer

Phone: 612-279-3508

Date: 3/26/2026 8:20:28 AM

Email: Kevin.kajer@pubdef.state.mn.us

SF3969 - 1A - Grooming Criminal Offense Establishment

Chief Author: **Erin Maye Quade**
 Committee: **Education Finance**
 Date Completed: **4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM**
 Agency: **Sentencing Guidelines Comm**

State Fiscal Impact	Yes	No
Expenditures		X
Fee/Departmental Earnings		X
Tax Revenue		X
Information Technology		X
Local Fiscal Impact		X

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions shown in the parentheses.

State Cost (Savings)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-

Full Time Equivalent Positions (FTE)	Biennium			Biennium		
		FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

LBO Analyst's Comment

I have reviewed this fiscal note for reasonableness of content and consistency with the LBO's Uniform Standards and Procedures.

LBO Signature: Jim Carlson **Date:** 3/30/2026 1:51:05 PM
Phone: 651-284-6540 **Email:** jim.carlson@lbo.mn.gov

State Cost (Savings) Calculation Details

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions are shown in parentheses.

*Transfers In/Out and Absorbed Costs are only displayed when reported.

State Cost (Savings) = 1-2 Dollars in Thousands	Biennium			Biennium	
	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-		-
1 - Expenditures, Absorbed Costs*, Transfers Out*					
Total	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-		-
2 - Revenues, Transfers In*					
Total	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-		-

Bill Description

Sections 1 and 2 amend Minn. Stat. § 122A.20, to add the crime of grooming, established in section 8, to the list of crimes that, upon conviction, disqualify a teacher or candidate from licensure; and require law enforcement to notify the appropriate licensing board upon a teacher’s conviction of a listed offense, or an unlisted offense that requires predatory offender registration.

Section 3 amends Minn. Stat. § 260E.065 to mandate that by August 1, 2027, the Commissioner of Children, Youth, and Families must develop a training module as part of the Commissioner’s training to mandatory reporters to include a role for the Department of Education, and to include the topics of adult high school students and of grooming and threatened sexual abuse.

Sections 4, 5, and 6 amend Minn. Stat. §§ 260E.15, 260E.20, & 260E.28 to clarify that alleged maltreatment of a minor is not outside the scope of a maltreatment investigation solely because the alleged maltreatment occurred more than three years prior to the date of the maltreatment report.

Sections 7, 8, 9, 10, & 11 amend Minn. Stat. § 609.352 to establish three new felony crimes, each with the same 5 year/\$10,000 maximum penalty applicable to the existing crimes of soliciting a child under age 16 to engage in sexual conduct (subd. 2) and electronic solicitation of children under age 16 (subd. 2a).

The crime of grooming (new subd. 2c) is committed by an adult who engages in two or more instances of conduct that the adult intends to convince a child under age 16 to engage in sexual conduct with the adult at a future time. Prohibited conduct includes but is not limited to preparatory acts designed to establish a false trusting relationship that results in sexual intimacy such as emotional manipulation; attempts to create emotional dependency; intense validation; excessive flattery; artificial intimacy; constant contact; attempts to isolate the child from their support systems; undermining authority; boundary violations; enforced secrecy; normalizing inappropriate activities, communications, or content; testing limits; and use of coercion, threats, or control.

A new subd. 2d (“violations by persons in positions of authority”) establishes a felony penalty for committing an act prohibited in subds. 2 through 2c against a victim under age of 18 if committed by someone in a current or recent position of authority over, and more than 36 months older than, the victim.

A new subd. 2e (“school violations”) establishes a felony penalty for a licensed educator employed or contracted to provide service for an elementary, middle, or secondary school committing an act prohibited in subds. 2 through 2c against an enrolled student at the school, regardless of age.

Section 2 is effective July 1, 2026.

Assumptions

The remainder of the bill is effective August 1, 2026.

No assumptions are made regarding the impact of sections 1 through 6.

It is assumed that due to the COVID-19 health pandemic, the cases sentenced in 2020 and 2021 are not necessarily fair approximations of cases sentenced in the future.

One of the responsibilities of the Commission is to assign severity-level (SL) rankings to new felony offenses passed by the Legislature. The Commission bases its decisions, in part, on the level of harm caused and the culpability of the person. The statutory maximum is also considered.

With respect to ranking the new crime created by section 8 (subd. 2c, grooming), as the new crime shares a statutory maximum with and is of a similar nature to the existing crimes of soliciting a child under age 16 to engage in sexual conduct (subd. 2) and electronic solicitation of children under age 16 (subd. 2a), it is assumed that the Commission will rank grooming identically, at SL G.

With respect to the impact of section 8 (subd. 2c, grooming), it is assumed that much grooming behavior is already encompassed by the existing subds. 2 (soliciting a child under age 16 to engage in sexual conduct) and 2a (electronic solicitation of children under age 16), and most particularly the former provision (subd. 2). Subd. 2 and new subd. 2c differ in three ways:

First, subd. 2 requires the adult to solicit (i.e., to command, entreat, or attempt to persuade) the child, while subd. 2c requires the adult to intend to convince the child. While there is quite a bit of overlap between these requirements, subd. 2c's nonexclusive list of violative includes several examples of nonverbal, or indirect verbal, acts of grooming, while subd. 2 appears limited to direct, verbal solicitation (although, in the electronic context, subd. 2a does include some specific nonverbal acts). This difference makes subd. 2c broader than subd. 2.

Second, subd. 2c requires a pattern (defined as two or more instances of conduct) of grooming, while subd. 2 may be violated in one act of solicitation. This makes subd. 2c somewhat narrower than subd. 2.

Third, subd. 2 applies both to children under age 16 and people reasonably believed to be children under age 16, while subd. 2c applies only to children under age 16. This difference makes subd. 2c somewhat narrower than subd. 2.

Taking these differences into account, it is assumed that there will be some behavior encompassed by new subd. 2c (grooming) that is not presently encompassed by existing subd. 2 or 2a, and that section 8 will cause some increase in the number of felony convictions above the existing number of felony convictions under subds. 2 and 2a combined. The extent of that increase is not known. A 25-percent increase is assumed.

From 2015 through 2024, there were 566 sentences for violations of Minn. Stat. § 609.352, or an average of 57 sentences per year. Based on the previous assumptions, the new subd. 2c will result in an additional 14 sentences per year ($57 \times 25\%$).

With respect to section 9, it is assumed that "current or recent position of authority" has the meaning given in Minn. Stat. § 609.341, subd. 10. It is assumed that, while children are in school, teachers are charged with their supervision and therefore hold a position of authority over their students, and arguably over all students in the school. It is therefore assumed that someone who has been a teacher at a student's school within the previous 120 days likely qualifies as being in a current or recent position of authority of that student. Thus, significant overlap between sections 9 and 10 is assumed.

With respect to section 10, it is assumed that the phrase, "Notwithstanding the reference to the victim being a child in subdivision 2c," does not limit the application of the proviso that follows -- extending the subdivision's protections to enrolled students of any age -- to subdivision 2c; rather, it is assumed that the proviso applies to the term "child" as used in subd. 2 and 2a as well.

With respect to ranking the new crimes created by sections 9 & 10 (subd. 2d, violations by persons in positions of authority & subd. 2e, school violations), it is assumed that the intended and actual effect is to expand the protections of subds. 2 through 2c to 16- and 17-year-old victims to whom the adult gained access through a position of authority, including a position as a schoolteacher, and to expand the protections of subds. 2 through 2c to adult high school students to whom the adult gained access through a position as a teacher at the student's school. It is assumed that the Commission will regard these new violations of subds. 2, 2a, and new 2c to be no less serious, even if committed against victims older than 15 years, if committed by an actor with special access to the victim through work at the victim's school, and will therefore

also rank violations of subds. 2d & 2e at SL G.

With respect to the impact of sections 9 & 10, it is assumed that new subds. 2d and 2e will cause subds. 2, 2a, and 2c to encompass some cases involving 16- and 17-year-old victims -- as well as some young adult students -- that are not now encompassed by those subdivisions.

The extent of that increase is not known. It is assumed that most of the impact of subds. 2d and 2e will be the application of subd. 2, 2a, and 2c cases to people in a current or recent position of authority over 16- and 17- year old victims. It is assumed that the ratio of the volume of cases under subds. 2, 2a, and 2c to the volume of cases under subds. 2d and 2e will be similar to the ratio of the volume of criminal sexual conduct cases involving victims under age 16 (Table 1, Column A) to the volume of criminal sexual conduct cases involving perpetrators in a position of authority over, and more than 36 months older than, 16- and 17-year-old victims (Table 1, Column B).

Table 1. Select criminal sexual conduct offenses against children.

	Column A: Criminal sexual conduct offenses against victims under age 16, excluding cases involving force, coercion, personal injury, or extended time (Minn. Stat. §)	Column B: Criminal sexual conduct offenses against victims age 16 or 17 by someone 36 months older in a current or recent position of authority (Minn. Stat. §)
Offense dates on or after August 1, 2019, but before September 15, 2021	609.342, subd. 1(a), (b), & (g) 609.343, subd. 1(a), (b), & (g) 609.344, subd. 1(b) 609.345, subd. 1(b)	609.344, subd. 1(e) 609.345, subd. 1(e)
Offense dates on or after September 15, 2021	609.342, subd. 1a(e), (f), & (g) 609.343, subd. 1a(e), (f), & (g) 609.344, subd. 1a(b) 609.345, subd. 1a(b)	609.344, subd. 1a(e) 609.345, subd. 1a(e)

Limited to cases with offenses dates on or after August 1, 2019 (the effective date of the term “current or recent position of authority”), there were, from 2020 through 2024, 672 sentences for cases in Column A, and 18 sentences for cases in Column B. As previously noted, there are now 57 annual sentences for Minn. Stat. § 609.352, subds. 2 and 2a, plus an assumed 14 annual sentences for new subd. 2c, for an assumed total of 71 annual sentences for subds. 2, 2a, and 2c.

Applying the above assumptions -- that the ratio of Column A case volume to Column B case volume will equal the ratio of annual sentences for § 609.352, subds. 2, 2a, and 2c, to sentences for new subds. 2d and 2e -- results in the following formula to calculate the number of offenses under new subds. 2d and 2e: $71 \times (18 \div 672)$. This, however, fails to account for the additional impact of subd. 2e protecting some adults enrolled as secondary-school students, in addition to students age 16 and 17. The extent of this additional impact is not known. An additional ten-percent increase is assumed, resulting in a final formula of $(71 \times (18 \div 672)) \times 1.1$, or two new cases annually as a result of new subds. 2d and 2e. Adding these two cases to the previously assumed 14 annual sentences for the new subd. 2c yields an annual total of 16 new felony cases resulting from the bill.

It is assumed that these 16 new cases will follow similar sentence patterns to the existing § 609.352 offenses (subds. 2 and 2a), which now require eight estimated prison beds ($(1,394 \text{ total pronounced months of } \S 609.352 \text{ executed prison sentences from } 2015\text{-}2024 \times 2/3 \text{ term of imprisonment } \div 12 \text{ months per year } \div 10 \text{ years})$).

Using the imprisonment rate of 7.4 percent which is that for the existing § 609.352 offenses (subds. 2 and 2a) and the existing average prison duration of 33 months (serve 2/3 term of imprisonment = 22 mos.), an additional two estimated prison beds will be needed.

Expenditure and/or Revenue Formula

Long-Term Fiscal Considerations

Based on the assumptions above, there will be the need for two prison beds. Assuming one year for implementation, it is estimated that one bed will be needed in FY2028, and two beds will be needed in FY2029 and every year thereafter.

(16 cases annually × 7.4% imprisonment rate × 33 months per case × 2/3 term of imprisonment ÷ 12 months per year = 2.17 estimated prison beds.)

Local Fiscal Impact

There may be an increased need for felony probation and local jail usage statewide as a result of this bill, the extent to which was not estimated.

References/Sources

MSGC sentencing data, 2015 to 2024.

State v Pannier, No. C9-98-2283 (Minn. Ct. App. Dec. 21, 1999) (nonprecedential) (“While children are in school, teachers are charged with their supervision. Teachers hold a position of authority over their students.”) (retrieved March 26, 2029, at <https://mn.gov/law-library-stat/archive/ctapun/9912/2283.htm>).

Agency Contact:

Agency Fiscal Note Coordinator Signature: Jill Payne

Date: 3/30/2026 12:42:14 PM

Phone: 651-757-1725

Email: jill.payne@state.mn.us

SF3969 - 1A - Grooming Criminal Offense Establishment

Chief Author: **Erin Maye Quade**
 Committee: **Education Finance**
 Date Completed: **4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM**
 Agency: **Supreme Court**

State Fiscal Impact	Yes	No
Expenditures		X
Fee/Departmental Earnings		X
Tax Revenue		X
Information Technology		X
Local Fiscal Impact		X

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions shown in the parentheses.

State Cost (Savings)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-

Full Time Equivalent Positions (FTE)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

LBO Analyst's Comment

I have reviewed this fiscal note for reasonableness of content and consistency with the LBO's Uniform Standards and Procedures.

LBO Signature: Susan Nelson **Date:** 4/7/2026 10:41:23 AM
Phone: 651-296-6054 **Email:** susan.nelson@lbo.mn.gov

State Cost (Savings) Calculation Details

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions are shown in parentheses.

*Transfers In/Out and Absorbed Costs are only displayed when reported.

State Cost (Savings) = 1-2 Dollars in Thousands	Biennium			Biennium	
	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-		-
1 - Expenditures, Absorbed Costs*, Transfers Out*					
Total	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-		-
2 - Revenues, Transfers In*					
Total	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-		-

Bill Description

SF3969-1A (“the bill”) makes changes relating to educator training, licensing, reporting, and investigations; the bill also creates new criminal offenses related to grooming.

The bill modifies Minn. Stat. § 122A.20, subd. 1 to include the new grooming offenses among the listed offenses for which a conviction triggers license consequences, and under subdivision 2 requires law enforcement agencies to notify the appropriate licensing entity when a teacher is criminally charged with one of the listed offenses or an offense that requires registration as a predatory offender.

The bill modifies several provisions within chapter 260E (Reporting of Maltreatment of Minors) by allowing screenings and investigation of alleged maltreatment that occurred more than three years prior to reporting and requiring that the commissioner of education develop training for mandated reporters.

The bill modifies Minn. Stat. § 609.352 by creating three new felony offenses and adding language to the definition section related to those new offenses.

In a new subdivision 2c, titled “Grooming,” the bill prohibits persons 18 or older from engaging “in a pattern of conduct that is intended by the person to convince a child to engage in sexual conduct with the person at a future time” including “preparatory acts designed to establish a false trusting relationship that results in sexual intimacy” and the bill lists several examples of such conduct.

In a new subdivision 2d, the bill prohibits any of the acts in Minn. Stat. § 609.352, subd 2 through 2c by a person if: the person is in a current or recent position of authority over the victim; the person is more than 36 months older than the victim; and the victim is below the age of 18.

In a new subdivision 2e, the bill prohibits any of the acts in Minn. Stat. § 609.352, subd 2 through 2c by a person if the person is a licensed educator employed or contracted to provide services for an elementary, middle, or secondary school and the victim is enrolled as a student at the school. The new subdivision also states that notwithstanding the definition of a “child” as a person 15 years of age or younger, for purposes of this subdivision the victim may be any age, as long as the victim is enrolled as a student at the school.

Assumptions

It is assumed that case filings may increase because the bill creates new felony offenses and requires additional training and education that could increase awareness and mandated reporting. It is also assumed that much of the conduct prohibited under the provisions of the bill is already prohibited under the existing provisions of Minn. Stat. § 609.352. It is assumed that, in many instances, alleged violations of the provisions of this bill will be filed as additional charges in cases that would already be brought before the court under existing criminal statutes, rather than representing a true increase in

cases filed with the court. It is assumed that case filings under Minn. Stat. § 609.352 may increase by between 5 and 10% as a result of this bill. Even if case filings under Minn. Stat. § 609.352 increase by 25%, this bill is not expected to have a significant fiscal impact on the judicial branch.

Expenditure and/or Revenue Formula

Based on five years of judicial branch charging data (2021-2025), there were 994 charges filed under Minn. Stat. § 609.352, or an annual average of 199 charges. ($994 / 5 = 198.8$). A 5-10% increase in charges filed under Minn. Stat. § 609.352 due to the provisions of this bill would amount to an additional 10-20 charges annually.

If each charge represented a separate criminal case and filings increased by 25%, the result would be 50 additional felony cases annually ($199 * .25 = 49.75$). Judicial branch data used to measure judge and staff time to process various case types show that an additional 50 felony cases of this type would not require an additional judge or staff person statewide. Thus, the bill is not anticipated to have a significant fiscal impact on the judicial branch.

Long-Term Fiscal Considerations

None.

Local Fiscal Impact

References/Sources

Agency Contact:

Agency Fiscal Note Coordinator Signature: Anna Borgerding

Phone: 651-297-7579

Date: 4/3/2026 9:08:09 AM

Email: anna.borgerding@courts.state.mn.us

SF3969 - 1A - Grooming Criminal Offense Establishment

Chief Author: **Erin Maye Quade**
 Committee: **Education Finance**
 Date Completed: **4/13/2026 11:02:28 AM**
 Agency: **University Of Minnesota**

State Fiscal Impact	Yes	No
Expenditures		X
Fee/Departmental Earnings		X
Tax Revenue		X
Information Technology		X
Local Fiscal Impact		X

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions shown in the parentheses.

State Cost (Savings)	Biennium			Biennium		
	Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-

Full Time Equivalent Positions (FTE)	Biennium			Biennium		
		FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

LBO Analyst's Comment

I have reviewed this fiscal note for reasonableness of content and consistency with the LBO's Uniform Standards and Procedures.

LBO Signature: Adam Bolling **Date:** 4/13/2026 7:35:46 AM
Phone: 651-296-6053 **Email:** adam.bolling@lbo.mn.gov

State Cost (Savings) Calculation Details

This table shows direct impact to state government only. Local government impact, if any, is discussed in the narrative. Reductions are shown in parentheses.

*Transfers In/Out and Absorbed Costs are only displayed when reported.

State Cost (Savings) = 1-2		Biennium			Biennium	
Dollars in Thousands	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-
1 - Expenditures, Absorbed Costs*, Transfers Out*						
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-
2 - Revenues, Transfers In*						
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biennial Total			-			-

Bill Description

The bill establishes grooming as a criminal offense and expands mandatory reporting for law enforcement and requires the Commissioner of Children, Youth, and Families to develop a statewide mandated reporter training module. The A8 amendment defines prohibited conduct and grooming and school violations.

Assumptions

The University has reviewed this bill and does not anticipate a fiscal impact.

Expenditure and/or Revenue Formula

Long-Term Fiscal Considerations

Local Fiscal Impact

References/Sources

Shannon McGoffin, Support Services Director, University of Minnesota Department of Public Safety

Agency Contact: Keeya Steel

Agency Fiscal Note Coordinator Signature: Keeya Steel

Date: 4/13/2026 6:40:27 AM

Phone: 612-625-5512

Email: keeya@umn.edu