

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 1303-01  
Bill No.: HB 371  
Subject: Crimes and Punishment; Judges  
Type: Original  
Date: February 3, 2009

---

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

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
General Revenue	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund</b>	<b>(Less than \$100,000)</b>	<b>(Less than \$100,000)</b>	<b>(Less than \$100,000)</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
<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 5 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
<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 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
<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 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

---

## **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 Prosecution Services** 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.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state the penalty provision component of this bill, resulting in potential fiscal impact for DOC, is for a class C felony.

DOC records indicate 1 prison opening and 1 probation opening for this type of offense in FY07 and there were 0 in FY08.

Currently, the DOC cannot predict the number of new commitments which may result from the expansion 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 direct offender cost either through incarceration (FY08 average of \$15.64 per offender, per day or an annual cost of \$5,709 per inmate) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY08 average of \$2.47 per offender, per day or an annual cost of \$902 per offender).

The need for capital improvements is not anticipated at this time. It must be noted that the cumulative effect of various new legislation, if passed into law, could result in the need for additional capital improvements funding if the total number of new offenders exceeds current planned capacity.

In summary, supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration would result in additional unknown costs to the department. Eighteen (18) persons would have to be incarcerated per each 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)

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** assume increasing penalties on existing crimes, or creating new crimes, will require more SPD resources. 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.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2010 (10 Mo.)	FY 2011	FY 2012
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<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>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b><u>(Less than \$100,000)</u></b>	<b><u>(Less than \$100,000)</u></b>	<b><u>(Less than \$100,000)</u></b>
<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2010 (10 Mo.)	FY 2011	FY 2012
	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u><b>\$0</b></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 expands the crime of tampering with a judicial officer to include juvenile officers and deputy juvenile officers. 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  
February 3, 2009