

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 3911H.011  
 Bill No.: HB 1712  
 Subject: Crimes and Punishment; Criminal Procedure  
 Type: Original  
 Date: February 6, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies the offense of tampering with electronic monitoring equipment.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
General Revenue*	(\$9,269 to Unknown)	(\$22,691 to Unknown)	(\$23,145 to Unknown)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>(\$9,269 to Unknown)</b>	<b>(\$22,691 to Unknown)</b>	<b>(\$23,145 to Unknown)</b>

\*DOC notes that current capacity will be met by July 2029 (FY 2030) or potentially much sooner. Therefore, Oversight has made the decision to reflect the marginal cost of incarceration up to an unknown cost if DOC needs to add staff and/or rehabilitate, expand or construct additional capacity. Oversight assumes the unknown cost has the potential to exceed \$250,000.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
<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.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

#### §575.205 – Offense of Tampering with Electronic Monitoring Equipment

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this proposal is modified to include failing to charge or otherwise attempting to disable an electronic monitoring device in the list of actions considered as an offense of tampering with electronic monitoring equipment. This creates a new class A misdemeanor offense if the offense for which the person was placed on electronic monitoring was a misdemeanor. Otherwise, it is a class E felony. Since misdemeanors fall outside the purview of DOC, there is no impact to DOC for the offense resulting in the class A misdemeanor.

As there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class E felony.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the department estimates one person could be sentenced to prison and two to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class E felony offense is 3.4 years, of which 2.1 years could be served in prison with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years could be on parole. Probation sentences could be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 2 additional offenders in prison and 7 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

The department assumes a marginal cost (times number of offenders) to unknown, depending on the underlying offender population. If DOC exceeds the current capacity, additional capacity will need to be constructed.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for <b>prison</b>	Change in probation & parole officers	Total cost for <b>probation and parole</b>	# to probation & parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes 2% inflation)
Year 1	1	(\$11,123)	(\$9,269)	0	\$0	2	(\$9,269)
Year 2	2	(\$11,123)	(\$22,691)	0	\$0	4	(\$22,691)
Year 3	2	(\$11,123)	(\$23,145)	0	\$0	7	(\$23,145)
Year 4	2	(\$11,123)	(\$23,608)	0	\$0	7	(\$23,608)
Year 5	2	(\$11,123)	(\$24,080)	0	\$0	7	(\$24,080)
Year 6	2	(\$11,123)	(\$24,561)	0	\$0	7	(\$24,561)
Year 7	2	(\$11,123)	(\$25,053)	0	\$0	7	(\$25,053)
Year 8	2	(\$11,123)	(\$25,554)	0	\$0	7	(\$25,554)
Year 9	2	(\$11,123)	(\$26,065)	0	\$0	7	(\$26,065)
Year 10	2	(\$11,123)	(\$26,586)	0	\$0	7	(\$26,586)

The department will assume a marginal cost (multiplied by number of offenders) for any projected increase or decrease in the incarcerated population. Marginal cost is \$30.47 per day or an annual cost of \$11,123 per offender which includes costs such as medical, food, wages and operational E&E. The unknown amount is a result of the uncertainty in the growth of the underlying offender population. The impact of any new legislation combined with the growth of the underlying population could result in the tiered approach below in order to meet the population demands.

1. Fully staffing the current capacity (27,368) which is habitable, but DOC does not have the staffing resources for all bed space.
2. Rehabilitating current space that is not currently habitable and obtaining staffing resources for that space (requires capital improvements).
3. Expanding new capacity by adding housing units or wings to existing prisons and obtaining staffing resources for that space (requires capital improvements).
4. Constructing a new prison and obtaining staffing resources. Based on current construction projects in other Midwest states, the department estimates the cost of constructing a new 1,500-bed maximum security prison at approximately \$825 million to \$900 million plus annual operating costs of approximately \$50 million (requires capital improvements).

The department's population projections indicate current physical capacity will be met by July 2029; however recent trends indicate that capacity could be met much sooner. Should new construction be the result of the increasing offender population, the full cost per day per offender would be used which is \$106.96 or an annual cost of \$39,040. This includes all items in the marginal cost calculation plus fringe, personal service, utilities, etc.

DOC's cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that are needed to cover its caseload. The DOC average district caseload across the state is 51 offender cases per officer. An increase/decrease of 51 cases would result in a cost/cost avoidance equal to the salary, fringe, and equipment and expenses of one P&P Officer II. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offender cases are assumed to be absorbable.

In instances where the proposed legislation would only affect a specific caseload, such as sex offenders, the DOC will use the average caseload figure for that specific type of offender to calculate cost increases/decreases.

\* If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it could be due to an increase/decrease in the number of offenders, a change in the cost per day for institutional offenders, and/or an increase in staff salaries.

**Oversight** does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's impact for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** state the proposed legislation creates a new offense under section 575.205 which could result in additional cases eligible for SPD representation. The number of additional cases is unknown and as a result the fiscal impact is unknown.

**Oversight** assumes this proposal will create a minimal number of new cases and that the SPD can absorb the additional caseload required by this proposal with current staff and resources. Therefore, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact to the SPD for fiscal note purposes. However, if multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties, the SPD may request funding through the appropriation process.

Officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assume any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation costs.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the AGO 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 AGO for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, Office of the State Courts Administrator, Phelps County Sheriff's Department, Blue Springs Police Department, Kansas City Police Department, and St. Louis County Police Department** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation, HB 130 (2025), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

**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 local law enforcement were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. Upon the receipt of additional responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval to publish a new fiscal note. A general listing of political subdivisions included in our database is available upon request.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
<b>GENERAL REVENUE</b>			
<u>Cost – DOC (\$575.205) Increased incarceration costs p.3-5</u>	(\$9,269 to <u>Unknown</u> )	(\$22,691 to <u>Unknown</u> )	(\$23,145 to <u>Unknown</u> )
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE</b>	<b>(\$9,269 to <u>Unknown</u>)</b>	<b>(\$22,691 to <u>Unknown</u>)</b>	<b>(\$23,145 to <u>Unknown</u>)</b>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

TAMPERING WITH ELECTRONIC MONITORING EQUIPMENT (Section 575.205)

This bill adds to the offense of tampering with electronic monitoring equipment intentionally failing to charge or otherwise disabling the electronic monitoring equipment. The bill specifies that the offense of tampering with electronic monitoring equipment when a person intentionally fails to charge or otherwise disables the equipment is a class E felony, unless the offense for which the person was placed on electronic monitoring was a misdemeanor, in which case it is a class A misdemeanor.

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

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

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

Julie Morff  
Director



Jessica Harris  
Assistant Director  
February 6, 2026