# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

## FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.:</u>	4723-01
Bill No.:	HB 2070
Subject:	Probation and Parole: Education, Elementary and Secondary
Type:	Original
Date:	April 8, 2008

Bill Summary: Prohibits certain sexual offenders from entering school property or attending school activities without the consent of the principal or administrator of the school

## FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	
General Revenue	\$0	Unknown	Unknown	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	Unknown	Unknown	

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

\*Offsetting Savings and Losses to State School Moneys Fund in FY 2010 and FY 2011

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses. This fiscal note contains 7 pages. L.R. No. 4723-01 Bill No. HB 2070 Page 2 of 7 April 8, 2008

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS						
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2009 FY 2010 FY 2010					
Total Estimated Net Effect on All						
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 Unknown		Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)	

L.R. No. 4723-01 Bill No. HB 2070 Page 3 of 7 April 8, 2008

#### FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** state this proposal has no fiscal impact on the Courts.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Office of the Director** and the **Missouri State Highway Patrol** state this proposal will have no fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state that, currently, DOC cannot predict the number of extended 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, DOC will incur a corresponding increase in operational cost either through incarceration (FY05 average of \$39.13 per inmate, per day or an annual cost of \$14,282 per inmate) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY03 average of \$3.15 per offender, per day or an annual cost of \$1,150 per offender).

In summary, supervision by 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 (OPS)** assume new criminal law creates the potential for an increase in the number of cases referred for prosecution. In the absence of any estimates of the number of additional criminal cases that would be referred to County Prosecutors for charges because of this proposed legislation, it is not possible to provide estimates concerning the extent of any fiscal impact. Additionally, the Office of Prosecution Services 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. Therefore the fiscal impact to County Prosecutors is unknown.

It is assumed this proposal would not have a significant direct fiscal impact on the Office of Prosecution Services.

**Oversight** assumes the additional workload for County Prosecutors could be absorbed within existing resources.

LMD:LR:OD (12/02)

L.R. No. 4723-01 Bill No. HB 2070 Page 4 of 7 April 8, 2008

### ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** cannot assume existing staff will provide competent, effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with the proposed new crime of being a registered sex offender and entering an elementary or secondary school without permission (a class A misdemeanor). The charges escalate as the number of assists increase. While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional appropriations for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide competent and effective representation in all its cases.

**Oversight** assumes the Office of the State Public Defender (SPD) could absorb the costs of the proposed legislation within existing resources. Oversight assumes any significant increase in the workload of the SPD would be reflected in future budget requests.

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DES)** assume there is no state cost to the foundation formula associated with this proposal. Should the new crimes and amendments to current law result in additional fines or penalties, DES cannot know how much additional money might be collected by local governments or the DOR to distribute to schools. To the extent fine revenues exceed 2004-2005 collections, any increase in this money distributed to schools increases the deduction in the foundation formula the following year. The affected districts will see an equal decrease in the amount of funding received through the formula the following year; unless the affected districts are hold-harmless, in which case the districts will not see a decrease in the amount of funding received through the formula (any increase in fine money distributed to the hold-harmless districts will simply be additional money). An increase in the deduction (all other factors remaining constant) reduces the cost to the state of funding the formula.

**Oversight** notes that local school districts would see an increase in fine revenue as a result of this proposal. As stated by DESE, this fine revenue would be a deduction the next year for some of the school districts. Oversight assumes an unknown amount of revenue would be realized each year by school districts and a corresponding decrease in school funding from the state the following year. Oversight assumes the fine revenue will fluctuate from year to year, therefore, the net fiscal impact to local school districts from FY 2009 on could be Unknown to (Unknown).

Officials from the **Springfield Police Department** and the **Boone County Sheriff's Department** state this proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective departments.

Officials from the Marshfield School District do not anticipate a fiscal impact to their district.

LMD:LR:OD (12/02)

L.R. No. 4723-01 Bill No. HB 2070 Page 5 of 7 April 8, 2008

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2009 (10 Mo.)	FY 2010	FY 2011
GENERAL REVENUE	()		
<u>Savings</u> - Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Reduced appropriations to the State School Moneys Fund (from deduction of fine revenue from previous year)	<u>\$0</u>	Unknown	Unknown
	<u> </u>		
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	<u>\$0</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>
STATE SCHOOL MONEYS FUND			
<u>Savings</u> - Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Reduced distributions to local school districts	\$0	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Losses</u> - Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Reduced appropriations from General Revenue Fund	<u>\$0</u>	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE SCHOOL MONEYS FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

L.R. No. 4723-01 Bill No. HB 2070 Page 6 of 7 April 8, 2008

FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2009 (10 Mo.)	FY 2010	FY 2011	
POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	(10 100.)			
<u>Revenues</u> - School Districts Income from fines	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	
<u>Losses</u> - School Districts Reduced distributions from State School Moneys Fund	<u>\$0</u>	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown to</u> (Unknown)	<u>Unknown to</u> (Unknown)	

### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

#### FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposed legislation prohibits any person who is required to register as a sexual offender from being on the grounds of any public or private elementary or secondary school or at any official school event without the consent of the school principal or head administrator if the victim of the offender's crime was younger than 17 years of age at the time of the offense. Any person violating this provision will be guilty of a class A misdemeanor.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

L.R. No. 4723-01 Bill No. HB 2070 Page 7 of 7 April 8, 2008

#### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of State Courts Administrator Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Department of Corrections Department of Public Safety Office of the Director Missouri State Highway Patrol Office of Prosecution Services Office of State Public Defender Local Law Enforcement Springfield Police Department Boone County Sheriff's Department School Districts Marshfield

Mickey Wilen

Mickey Wilson, CPA Director April 8, 2008

LMD:LR:OD (12/02)