

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0393-02
Bill No.: Perfected SB 26
Subject: Alcohol
Type: Original
Date: February 11, 2009

Bill Summary: This proposal prohibits the use or possession of alcoholic beverage vaporizers.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
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 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assume the proposal would not fiscally impact the courts.

Officials from the Department of Corrections, Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Public Safety - Director's Office and State Highway Patrol each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender** assume that existing staff could provide representation for those few cases arising where indigent persons were charged with the proposed new crime of possessing an alcoholic vaporizer. However, passage of more than one bill increasing penalties on existing crimes or creating new crimes would require the State Public Defender System to request increased appropriations to cover cumulative cost of representing the indigent accused in the now more serious cases or in the new additional cases.

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services (OPS)** did not respond to our request for fiscal impact. In response to a similar proposal from the 2006 legislative session (HB 1176), OPS assumed the proposal would not have a significant direct fiscal impact on county prosecutors, although it may lead to an increase in prosecutions/caseloads.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2010 (10 Mo.)	FY 2011	FY 2012
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2010 (10 Mo.)	FY 2011	FY 2012
	<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

Department of Public Safety
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of the State Public Defender
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Corrections

Not Responding:
Office of Prosecution Services



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
February 11, 2009