

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 0444-01  
Bill No.: SB 159  
Subject: Agriculture and Animals; Crimes and Punishment  
Type: Original  
Date: February 2, 2009

---

Bill Summary: The proposal modifies the definition of livestock for which it is a crime to steal, makes stealing certain quail or pheasants a crime, and modifies the penalties for such offenses.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
<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 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
<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 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</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 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</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 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>	<b>FY 2012</b>
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

---

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture, Department of Public Safety – Missouri State Highway Patrol, – Director’s Office,** and the **Office of Prosecution Services** 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 this bill proposes to modify the definition of livestock for which it is a crime to steal, makes stealing certain quail or pheasants a crime, and modifies the penalties for such offenses. The penalty provision component of this bill, resulting in potential fiscal impact for DOC, has been enhanced to serving an 80% mandatory minimum prison term (MMPT) when priors exist and certain definitions are met.

DOC’s Division of Adult Institutions (DAI) received no cases for the theft of livestock valued at \$3,000 or more in the past two fiscal years. Considering additional time that would be served by an offender after the original sentence was served, any offender’s sentence to serve the 80% MMPT would begin after the third year of incarceration and is past the scope of this fiscal note. Considering there are no current cases in the system, it is unlikely DOC will receive any offenders sentenced pursuant to passage of 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 longer to the custody of the DOC due to the provisions of this legislation, the DOC will incur a corresponding increase in direct offender cost either through incarceration (FY08 average of \$15.64 per offender per day, or an annual cost of \$5,709 per inmate) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY08 average of \$2.47 per offender per day, or an annual cost of \$902 per offender).

In summary, supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration for the first three years of this fiscal note is assumed could be absorbed within existing resources; therefore, there is no fiscal impact to the DOC.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** assume increasing penalties on existing crimes, or creating new crimes, 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 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 Agriculture  
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  
Director  
February 2, 2009