

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 6780H.011
 Bill No.: HB 3017
 Subject: Crimes and Punishment; Criminal Procedure
 Type: Original
 Date: April 7, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal establishes the offense of permitting a public nuisance.

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)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	(\$9,269 to Unknown)	(\$22,691 to Unknown)	(\$23,145 to Unknown)

*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.

**OSCA potential unknown costs assumed to be less than \$250,000 annually.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS

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

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0

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
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** did not respond to **Oversight’s** request for a statement of fiscal impact for this proposal.

§577.900 – Offense of Permitting a Public Nuisance

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this proposal establishes the offense of Permitting a Public Nuisance.

Section 577.900 is created, in which the offense of permitting a public nuisance is established. Specifications are if a person knowingly permits, allows, or fails to prevent any illegal activity occurring on their property. The penalty is a class E felony.

As these are new crimes, there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, and as such, the DOC estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class E felony.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the DOC 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, with 1.4 years served in prison prior to first release. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

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

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for prison	Change in probation & parole officers	Total cost for probation and parole	# 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 DOC 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 DOC's current capacity (27,368) which is habitable, but the 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 DOC'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 has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present the fiscal impact of this proposal as provided by DOC.

Officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** state this proposal may have some impact but there is no way to quantify that amount currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Oversight notes OSCA assumes this proposal may have some impact on their organization although it can't be quantified at this time. As OSCA is unable to provide additional information regarding the potential impact, Oversight assumes the proposed legislation will have a \$0 or (Unknown) cost to the General Revenue Fund. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight also assumes the impact will be under \$250,000 annually. If this assumption is incorrect, this would alter the fiscal impact as presented in this fiscal note. If additional information is received, Oversight will review it to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** state per the recently released National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charge contemplated by the change to §577.900 would take approximately thirty-five hours of SPD work for reasonably effective representation. If one hundred cases were filed under this section in a fiscal year, representation would result in a need for an additional one to two attorneys. Because the number of cases that will be filed under this statute is unknown, the exact additional number of attorneys necessary is unknown. Each case would also result in unknown increased costs in the need for core staff, travel, and litigation expenses.

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 **Department of Public Safety - Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, City of Kansas City, Phelps County Sheriff, Branson 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. **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 cities and local law enforcement agencies 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
GENERAL REVENUE			
<u>Cost – DOC (\$577.900) Increase in incarceration and probation costs p.3-4</u>	(\$9,269 to Unknown)	(\$22,691 to Unknown)	(\$23,145 to Unknown)
<u>Cost – OSCA (\$577.900) Potential increase in court costs p.5</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	<u>(\$9,269 to Unknown)</u>	<u>(\$22,691 to Unknown)</u>	<u>(\$23,145 to Unknown)</u>

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

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This bill creates the offense of permitting a public nuisance, which a person commits if he or she knowingly permits, allows, or fails to prevent any illegal activity, defined in the bill, occurring on a property the person owns, rents, occupies, or controls. The offense is a class E felony. The person who owns, rents, occupies, or controls the property will be subject to arrest for permitting a public nuisance, as long as the requirements in the bill are satisfied, after three documented complaints to law enforcement or independent observations. If no lawful owner, occupant, or responsible party can be established or it is determined the owner of record is deceased and no responsible party has assumed control of the property, the governmental authority with jurisdiction will be authorized to secure, board, or otherwise restrict entry to the property to protect public safety and prevent further nuisance. Once the property is secured, a person found to be on or around the property is subject to arrest for trespassing.

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

Department of Corrections

Department of Public Safety

Alcohol and Tobacco Control

Missouri Highway Patrol

Office of the State Courts Administrator

Office of the State Public Defender

City of Kansas City

Phelps County Sheriff

Branson Police Department

Kansas City Police Department

St. Louis County Police Department



Julie Morff

Director

April 7, 2026



Jessica Harris

Assistant Director

April 7, 2026