

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 2344-03  
Bill No.: HB 930  
Subject: Business and Commerce; Charities; Consumer Protection  
Type: Original  
Date: March 26, 2007

---

Bill Summary: This proposal requires donation receptacles operating for profit to display on the receptacle that the donations are not for charitable organizations and will be resold for profit.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.  
This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

☐ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

☐ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assume the proposal would not fiscally impact the courts.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety** and the **Office of the State Public Defender** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Office of the Attorney General** assume that any potential costs arising from the proposal could be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state they could not predict the number of new commitments which may result from the creation of the offenses(s) outlined in this proposal. An increase in commitment depends on the utilization by prosecutors and the actual sentences imposed by the court.

If additional persons are sentenced to the custody of the DOC due to the provisions of this legislation, the DOC would incur a corresponding increase in operational cost through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY 03 average of \$3.15 per offender, per day or an annual cost of \$1,150 per offender per year).

Supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration would result in some additional costs, but it is assumed the impact would be \$0 or a minimal amount that could be absorbed within existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services** did not respond to our request for fiscal impact.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2008 (10 Mo.)	FY 2009	FY 2010
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government

FY 2008  
(10 Mo.)

FY 2009

FY 2010

\$0

\$0

\$0

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION


The proposed legislation appears to have no fiscal impact.

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

Office of the State Courts Administrator  
Office of the State Public Defender  
Department of Corrections  
Department of Public Safety  
Office of the Attorney General

**NOT RESPONDING: Office of Prosecution Services**



Mickey Wilson, CPA  
Director  
March 26, 2007