COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 3609-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 802

Subject: Crimes and Punishment; Real and Personal Property

<u>Type</u>: Original

Date: January 14, 2008

Bill Summary: This proposal makes it a class D felony for a person to steal or appropriate,

without the consent of the owner, any energized or live wire, electrical

transformer, or any other device conducting electricity.

FISCAL SUMMARY

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

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

L.R. No. 3609-01 Bill No. SB 802 Page 2 of 5 January 14, 2008

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

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

- □ 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).

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

L.R. No. 3609-01 Bill No. SB 802 Page 3 of 5 January 14, 2008

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety – Missouri State Highway Patrol** and the **– Director's Office** 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 Corrections (DOC)** assume they cannot 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 either through incarceration (FY07 average of \$41.21 per inmate, per day or an annual cost of \$15,040 per inmate) or 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).

The following factors contribute to DOC's minimal assumption:

- DOC assumes the narrow scope of the crime will not encompass a large number of offenders:
- The low felony status of the crime enhances the possibility of plea-bargaining or imposition of a probation sentence; and
- The probability exists that offenders would be charged with a similar but more serious offense or that sentences may run concurrent to one another.

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.

L.R. No. 3609-01 Bill No. SB 802 Page 4 of 5 January 14, 2008

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services (OPS)** state any increase in the number of cases referred for criminal prosecution will have an additional fiscal impact on county prosecutors. However, officials from the OPS 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. It is therefore, not possible to determine if this proposal would have a significant direct fiscal impact on county prosecutors or the OPS.

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.

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

BLG:LR:OD (12/06)

L.R. No. 3609-01 Bill No. SB 802 Page 5 of 5 January 14, 2008

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 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

Mickey Wilen

Director

January 14, 2008