

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 3284-01  
Bill No.: SB 758  
Subject: Children and Minors; Crimes and Punishment; Parks and Recreation  
Type: Original  
Date: February 4, 2008

---

Bill Summary: The proposal prohibits certain sex offenders from being present in a state park without permission of the superintendent.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
<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.  
This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2009</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

---

## **FISCAL ANALYSIS**

### ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office** and the – **Missouri State Highway Patrol** assume the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their agencies.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on the courts.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** assume there would be fiscal impact from this proposal because they would need to implement a tracking system to manage the information required by the proposal. There would also be costs associated with training employees tasked with collecting, maintaining, and distributing, if requested by the public, such required information. Officials assume the cost would not exceed \$100,000 per fiscal year.

**Oversight** assumes the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** could absorb the costs of the proposed legislation within existing resources. Oversight assumes any significant increase in the workload of the DNR would be reflected in future budget requests.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assume they cannot currently predict the number of new commitments which may result from the creation of the offense(s) outlined in this proposal. An increase in commitments depends on the utilization by prosecutors and the actual sentences imposed by the court.

If additional persons are sentenced to the custody of the DOC due to the provisions of this legislation, the DOC will incur a corresponding increase in operational cost through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY07 average of \$2.43 per offender per day, or an annual cost of \$887 per offender).

In summary, supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration would result in some additional costs, but it is assumed the impact would be \$0 or a minimal amount that could be absorbed within existing resources.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services (OPS)** state they are not aware of any estimates of the number of additional criminal cases that would be referred to county prosecutors for charges because of this proposed legislation. Additionally, the OPS is not otherwise able to establish a workable estimate of the number of additional criminal cases that would be referred to county prosecutors for charges, though it is not believed that a significant number of additional criminal case referrals would result. Notwithstanding these uncertainties, OPS assumes any fiscal impact would not be significant.

**Oversight** assumes the Office of Prosecution Services and county prosecutors could absorb any additional costs incurred as a result of the proposed legislation within existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** assume this new crime will require more SPD resources. While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional appropriations for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide competent and effective representation in all its cases.

**Oversight** assumes the Office of the State Public Defender (SPD) could absorb the costs of the proposed legislation within existing resources. Oversight assumes any significant increase in the workload of the SPD would be reflected in future budget requests.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2009 (10 Mo.)	FY 2010	FY 2011
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2009 (10 Mo.)	FY 2010	FY 2011
	<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

The proposed legislation appears to have no fiscal impact.

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

Office of State Courts Administrator  
Department of Natural Resources  
Department of Corrections  
Department of Public Safety  
    – Missouri State Highway Patrol  
    – Director's Office  
Office of Prosecution Services  
Office of the State Public Defender



Mickey Wilson, CPA  
Director  
February 4, 2008