COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.:</u> 4148-01 <u>Bill No.:</u> HB 1538

Subject: Attorneys; Counties; Attorney General; Crimes and Punishment

Type: Original

Date: February 28, 2020

Bill Summary: This proposal provides that cases a prosecuting attorney determines not to

commence may be forwarded to the attorney general's office for review.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	
General Revenue	Could exceed (\$100,000)	Could exceed (\$100,000)	Could exceed (\$100,000)	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	Could exceed (\$100,000)	Could exceed (\$100,000)	Could exceed (\$100,000)	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 6 pages.

L.R. No. 4148-01 Bill No. HB 1538 Page 2 of 6 February 28, 2020

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	

Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	

L.R. No. 4148-01 Bill No. HB 1538 Page 3 of 6 February 28, 2020

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§56.071 - Cases forwarded to the Attorney General's Office

Officials from the **Attorney General's Office (AGO)** assume a negative fiscal impact of \$0 to Unknown.

In response to a similar proposal from 2019 (HB 541), officials from the AGO assumed the proposal would require four Assistant Attorneys General II (\$50,500 annually each), one Paralegal (\$42,000 annually), and one Legal Secretary (\$31,514 annually). These employees would be needed to address the increased workload resulting from the review of cases declined by local prosecutors.

Oversight assumes any additional litigation costs arising from this proposal will not be able to be absorbed with existing personnel and resources, and the AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation. Therefore, the impact to the AGO will be presented as \$0 to (Unknown).

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender** (**SPD**) state this proposed legislation could result in additional cases assuming the Attorney General files the case and the defendant is indigent. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight notes over the last three fiscal years, the SPD has lapsed a total of \$153 of General Revenue appropriations (\$2 out of \$28.0 million in FY 2017; \$150 out of \$42.5 million in FY 2018; and \$1 out of \$46.0 million in FY 2019). Therefore, Oversight assumes the SPD is at maximum capacity, and the increase in workload resulting from this bill cannot be absorbed with SPD's current resources.

Adding one additional Assistant Public Defender 1 (APD) with a starting salary of \$47,000, will cost approximately \$74,500 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. One additional APD II (\$52,000 per year; eligible for consideration after 1 year of successful performance at APD I) will cost the state approximately \$81,000 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. When expense and equipment costs such as travel, training, furniture, equipment and supplies are included, Oversight assumes the cost for a new APD could approach \$100,000 per year.

L.R. No. 4148-01 Bill No. HB 1538 Page 4 of 6 February 28, 2020

<u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

Oversight assumes the SPD cannot absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal within their existing resources and, therefore, will reflect a potential additional cost of (Less than \$100,000) per year to the General Revenue Fund.

Officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assume the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS.

Officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department** state the proposed legislation would require the department to update policy. Policy creation and updating would require eight hours of policy research and four hours of policy authorizing. The average hourly wage of the policy development position is \$46.69. Therefore, the total cost of policy development would be \$560.28.

Oversight assumes the St. Louis County Police Department is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes the St. Louis County Police Department could absorb the costs related to this proposal.

Oversight notes the Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol, the Office of State Courts Administrator, the Springfield Police Department, and the St. Louis Department of Justice Services have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other police and sheriff's departments and county prosecutors were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. A general listing of political subdivisions included in our database is available upon request.

L.R. No. 4148-01 Bill No. HB 1538 Page 5 of 6 February 28, 2020

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023
GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
<u>Costs</u> - AGO (§56.071) Potential increase in the number of cases to prosecute, may include additional personnel	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<u>Costs</u> - SPD (§56.071) Salaries, fringe benefits, and equipment and expense	<u>Less than</u> (\$100,000)	<u>Less than</u> (\$100,000)	<u>Less than</u> (\$100,000)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>Could exceed</u> (\$100,000)	<u>Could exceed</u> (\$100,000)	Could exceed (\$100,000)
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023
	<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

This bill specifies that law enforcement may forward a case to the Attorney General's office for review if, after law enforcement notifies the prosecuting attorney of a violation of state law for which there is probable cause of such violation, the prosecuting attorney decides not to commence a case against the person. After review, if the Attorney General determines there was probable cause of a violation of state law, the Attorney General may prosecute such case.

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. 4148-01 Bill No. HB 1538 Page 6 of 6 February 28, 2020

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Attorney General's Office
Department of Public Safety Missouri State Highway Patrol
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Office of State Courts Administrator
State Public Defender's Office
Springfield Police Department
St. Louis County Department of Justice Services
St. Louis County Police Department

Julie Morff Director

February 28, 2020

Ross Strope Assistant Director February 28, 2020

Company