## COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

#### FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 3284-02 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 665

Subject: Conservation Department; Crimes and Punishment

<u>Type</u>: Original

Date: December 8, 2005

# **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 3 pages.

L.R. No. 3284-02 Bill No. SB 665 Page 2 of 3 December 8, 2005

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	
<b>Local Government</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	

### FISCAL ANALYSIS

#### **ASSUMPTION**

Officials from the **Department of Conservation** and the **Office of State Courts Administrator** assume this proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organizations. Officials from the Department of Conservation also stated they not able to estimate the incidence of poaching while trespassing.

**Oversight** assumes there would be a limited number of convictions under the proposed statute, and that additional fines deposited to local governments would be minimal.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2007 (10 Mo.)	FY 2008	FY 2009
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2007 (10 Mo.)	FY 2008	FY 2009
	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u>\$0</u>

SS:LR:OD (12/02)

L.R. No. 3284-02 Bill No. SB 665 Page 3 of 3 December 8, 2005

#### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

#### **DESCRIPTION**

This proposal would increase the penalty for any individual who is illegally hunting while trespassing on private property. The penalty for such a violation would be a fine of \$500 and restitution for any property damage resulting in a lower property value. If the violator did not pay the fines and restitution ordered by the court, the court would submit the individual's name to the Conservation Commission whereby their permit to hunt could be suspended or revoked.

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 Conservation
Office of State Courts Administrator

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Mickey Wilen

Director

December 8, 2005