COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0513H.01I Bill No.: HB 589

Subject: Agriculture; Animals; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies

Type: Original

Date: January 20, 2021

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to the confiscation of animals.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
Total Estimated Net			
Effect on General			
Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
Total Estimated Net			
Effect on Other State			
Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

L.R. No. 0513H.01I Bill No. HB 589 Page **2** of **7** January 20, 2021

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
Total Estimated Net			
Effect on All Federal			
Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
Total Estimated Net			
Effect on FTE	0	0	0

 \square Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
Local Government	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

L.R. No. 0513H.01I Bill No. HB 589 Page **3** of **7** January 20, 2021

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the Department of Agriculture, Department of Corrections, Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, Office of the State Courts Administrator and Attorney General's Office each assume the proposal will have no 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.

For the purpose of the proposed legislation, and as a result of excessive caseloads, the **Missouri State Public Defender (SPD)** cannot assume existing staff will be able to provide competent, effective representation for any new cases where indigent persons are charged with the proposed new crime(s) of a class B misdemeanor offense of improper euthanizing of a seized animal under Section 578.018, RSMo. An increase in caseload from this new crime is unlikely; however, if this offense was classified as a class D misdemeanor, it would not qualify for public defender representation because it would be punishable by a fine only, and therefore there would be no impact on SPD. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards. While the number of new cases may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide competent and effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight assumes the SPD will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the SPD for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assume the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS. The creation of a new crime creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors which may, in turn, result in additional costs, which are difficult to determine.

Officials from the Boone County Sheriff, Kansas City Police Department, Crestwood Police Department and Tipton Police Department each assume the proposal will have no 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.

Officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department** assume there will be a fiscal impact but did not state what that impact would be.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other sheriffs and police departments 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. 0513H.011 Bill No. HB 589 Page **4** of **7** January 20, 2021

Oversight assumes any confiscated animal care costs, should the animal owner be acquitted, has an inability to pay before the initial disposition hearing, or upon conviction, would be incurred by veterinarians, local government dog pounds, animal shelters, animal rescue facilities, or another third party with existing animal care facilities approved by the court.

FISCAL IMPACT –	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
State Government	(10 Mo.)		
	0.0	20	0.0
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
EICCAL IMDACT	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024
FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government	(10 Mo.)	1 1 2023	r 1 202 4
<u>Local Government</u>	(10 1/10.)		
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS			
Revenue - Animal Rescue Facilities - Bond or security for animal care costs from the animal owner	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Cost - Animal Rescue Facilities - Care of animals held until final disposition of charges and acquittal or inability to pay	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Cost - Law Enforcement Agencies - Increased duties in the animal confiscation process	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	<u>(Unknown)</u>	(Unknown)	<u>(Unknown)</u>

L.R. No. 0513H.01I Bill No. HB 589 Page **5** of **7** January 20, 2021

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

Small business animal shelters and veterinary facilities might incur additional costs as a result of this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This bill changes the laws regarding the confiscation of animals. In its main provisions, the bill:

- (1) Specifies that a warrant issued under the bill must be served in the presence of a law enforcement official;
- (2) Requires a person acting under the authority of a warrant to appear at a disposition hearing before the court through which the warrant was issued within 10 days of the confiscation, instead of being given a disposition hearing within 30 days of the filing of the request, for the purpose of granting immediate disposition of the animals. An animal cannot be sterilized before the completion of the disposition hearing unless it is necessary to save life or relieve suffering;
- (3) Allows a third party approved by the court to care for confiscated animals;
- (4) Specifies that the owner of any animal that has been confiscated cannot be responsible for the animal's care and keeping prior to a disposition hearing if the owner is acquitted or there is a final discharge without conviction;
- (5) Requires a reasonable bond or security to be posted within 72 hours of the disposition hearing in an amount sufficient to provide for the care of the animal and consistent with the fair market cost of boarding the animal in an appropriate retail boarding facility if the owner, custodian, or any person claiming an interest in an animal that has been confiscated because of neglect or abuse would like to prevent disposition of the animal while the case proceeds. Currently, the owner, custodian, or any person claiming an interest in an animal that has been impounded because of neglect or abuse may prevent disposition of the animal by posting bond or security in an amount sufficient to provide for the animal's care for at least 30 days, inclusive of the date on which the animal was taken into custody;
- (6) Specifies that all animals confiscated must receive proper care as determined by state law and regulations. Any facility or organization must be liable to the owner for damages for any negligent act or abuse of the animal which occurs while the animal is in its care, custody, and control;
- (7) Specifies that in the event that an animal owner is not liable for the costs incurred while the charges were pending, the costs of care and the liability for the life or death of the animal and medical procedures performed are the responsibility of the confiscating agency;

L.R. No. 0513H.01I Bill No. HB 589 Page **6** of **7** January 20, 2021

- (8) Allows an owner to demand the return of the animal held in custody if he or she posted a sufficient bond and is acquitted or there is a final discharge without a conviction unless there is a settlement agreement, consent judgment, or a suspended imposition of sentence. Any entity with care, custody, and control of the animal must immediately return it to the owner upon demand and proof of the acquittal or final discharge without conviction. The animal owner must not be liable for any costs incurred relating to the placement or care of the animal while the charges were pending unless there is a settlement agreement, consent judgment, or a suspended imposition of sentence;
- (9) Specifies that any person or entity that intentionally euthanizes, other than as permissible under the provisions of the bill, or intentionally sterilizes an animal prior to a disposition hearing or during any period for which a reasonable bond was secured for the animal's care will be guilty of a class B misdemeanor and is liable to the owner for damages including the actual value of the animal. Each individual animal for which a violation occurs is a separate offense. Any second or subsequent violation is a class A misdemeanor, and any entity licensed under state law must be subject to licensure sanction by its governing body;
- (10) Includes dogs confiscated by any member of the State Highway Patrol or other law enforcement officer that were involved in dog fighting to those animals covered under these provisions; and
- (11) Requires, in the event that the animal owner is not liable for the costs incurred, the confiscating agency to be responsible for the usual and customary veterinary costs and fair market boarding fees and be liable for the life or death of the animal and for medical procedures performed while the charges were pending.

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. 0513H.01I Bill No. HB 589 Page **7** of **7** January 20, 2021

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Agriculture
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Department of Corrections
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Public Defender
Attorney General's Office
Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol
Boone County Sheriff
Kansas City Police Department
Crestwood Police Department
Tipton Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department

Julie Morff Director

January 20, 2021

Ross Strope Assistant Director January 20, 2021