

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 3567-01
Bill No.: HB 1432
Subject: Juvenile Courts; Crimes and Punishment; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies
Type: Original
Date: March 12, 2008

Bill Summary: The proposal expands the crime of tampering with a judicial officer to include juvenile officers and deputy juvenile officers.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
General Revenue	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0

☐ 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).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Social Services, Department of Public Safety – Missouri State Highway Patrol, – Director’s Office,** and the **Office of the State Public Defender** assume the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their agencies.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on the courts.

In response to a similar proposal from the current session (HB 1460, LR # 3634–01), officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assumed they cannot currently predict the number of new commitments which may result from the creation of the offense(s) outlined in this proposal. An increase in commitments 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 will incur a corresponding increase in operational cost either through incarceration (FY07 average of \$41.21 per inmate per day, or an annual cost of \$15,040 per inmate) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY07 average of \$2.43 per offender per day, or an annual cost of \$887 per offender).

At this time, the DOC is unable to determine the number of people who would be convicted under the provisions of this bill and therefore the number of additional inmate beds that may be required as a consequence of passage of this proposal. Estimated construction cost for one new medium to maximum-security inmate bed is \$55,000. Utilizing this per-bed cost provides for a conservative estimate by the DOC, as facility start-up costs are not included and entire facilities and/or housing units would have to be constructed to cover the cost of housing new commitments resulting from the cumulative effect of various new legislation, if adopted as statute.

In summary, supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration would result in additional unknown costs to the department. Seven (7) persons would have to be incarcerated per fiscal year to exceed \$100,000 annually. Due to the narrow scope of this new crime, it is assumed the impact would be less than \$100,000 per year for the DOC.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal from the current session (HB 1460, LR # 3634–01), officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services (OPS)** stated any increase in the number of cases referred for criminal prosecution will have an additional fiscal impact on county prosecutors. However, officials from the OPS are not aware of any estimates of the number of additional criminal cases that would be referred to county prosecutors for charges because of this proposed legislation. Additionally, the OPS is not otherwise able to establish a workable estimate of the number of additional criminal cases that would be referred to county prosecutors for charges. It is therefore, not possible to determine if this proposal would have a significant direct fiscal impact on county prosecutors or the OPS.

Oversight assumes the Office of Prosecution Services and county prosecutors could absorb any additional costs incurred as a result of the proposed legislation within existing resources.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2009 (10 Mo.)	FY 2010	FY 2011
GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
<u>Costs – Department of Corrections</u>			
Incarceration/probation costs	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>
<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2009 (10 Mo.)	FY 2010	FY 2011
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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


FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposal modifies provisions relating to juvenile courts and officers and expands the definition related to penalties. The penalty provision for this proposal is for a class C felony.

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 State Courts Administrator
Department of Corrections
Department of Social Services
Department of Public Safety
 – Missouri State Highway Patrol
 – Director's Office
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Public Defender



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
March 12, 2008