

Technical Changes and Efficiency Items

This recommendation contains requests for multiple technical and efficiency-based changes to Minnesota statute. The topics include confidential funds reimbursement, peace officer record keeping, unsealing criminal history records and vulnerable adult Order for Protection (OFP) dissemination.

Confidential funds reimbursement

Proposal: Change the statutory language in Minnesota Statutes 299C.065 from “grants” to “reimbursements,” to more accurately represent the funding and would lead to more timely reimbursement.

Background: Minn. Stat. 299C.065 authorizes the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA) to operate a special fund from which it makes “grants” to local law enforcement for specific investigative purposes. The primary reason local officials request and receive these “grants” is for partial reimbursement of local costs associated with unanticipated, intensive, long-term, multi-jurisdictional criminal investigations that exhaust available local resources. However, the statutory labeling of these reimbursements as “grants to local officials” under section 299C.065 causes major delays in processing and disbursement because government grant awards are subject to additional administrative procedures that reimbursements are not.

Peace officer record keeping

Proposal: Revise language in Minn. stat. 299C.12 to reflect today’s FBI crime reporting requirements.

Background: Minn. Stat. 299C.12 is an outdated statute related to the collection of felony and other offense data. It is not consistent with current FBI (NIBRS) reporting requirements or current practices. Local law enforcement agencies have not submitted these data in many years and BCA moved to mandatory NIBRS data collection and reporting for all local agencies in 2021. The BCA has received questions from local law enforcement about the impact of 299C.12 on their record keeping requirements and data submissions to the BCA. Minn. stat. 299C.05 and Minn. stat. 299C.12 require the BCA to collect a variety of data, including data to be submitted to the FBI. Revising 299C.12 will provide greater efficiency and clarity for law enforcement agencies required to submit the data and the BCA’s duties in collecting the data.

Unsealing criminal history records

Proposal: This proposal is a technical fix to Minn. stat. 609A.015 to provide a formal mechanism for the BCA and the Minnesota Judicial Branch to unseal records after the 60-day court review window.

Background: The Clean Slate Act (Minn. stat. 609A.015) directs the BCA to identify records eligible for



expungement, notify the Judicial Branch, and seal those records unless the Judicial Branch orders otherwise within 60 days. The statute is silent on any mechanism to unseal records identified in error for sealing after the 60 days has passed. Updating this language will allow the BCA and Judicial Branch to work together to unseal records that were sealed in error without petitioning for a Court Order and going through a much more lengthy, time-consuming process. This is a technical fix that will create efficiencies for both BCA and the Judicial Branch and allow the records to be updated more timely and ensure the accuracy of the records.

Vulnerable Adult Orders for Protection (OFP)

Proposal: Amend Minn. Stat. 609.2334 to clarify that the Minnesota Judicial Branch must send pertinent data about orders for protection against financial exploitation of a vulnerable adult that have been issued by a judge into the Minnesota Hot Files to ensure enforcement.

Background: The 2025 Legislature created a new order for protection (OFP) designed to safeguard vulnerable adults from financial exploitation. Judges were able to issue the orders starting Jan. 1, 2026. The BCA interprets the statute to imply that the Judicial Branch should submit these OFPs to the BCA as they do for other OFPs. However, Judicial Branch legal staff do not interpret the statute in the same way. Judicial Branch legal staff conveyed to the BCA that the courts do not believe themselves to be the entity statutorily responsible for disseminating these orders, and they do not intend to pass the orders to the BCA for access to law enforcement through the Minnesota Hot Files. BCA believes that as the issuing entity the Court system is the best way to pass these orders, just as it does for other, similar varieties of protection and restraining orders. The orders must be entered into the Minnesota Hot Files to be disseminated to law enforcement and enforced, protecting victims and potential victims from harm.

