# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

### FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 0157-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 8

Subject: Courts; Criminal Procedure; Crimes and Punishment; Prisons and Jails

Type: Original

Date: January 18, 2019

Bill Summary: This proposal allows courts to depart from a statutorily required minimum

prison term when sentencing a defendant.

### **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND										
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)						
General Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$359,755	\$3,033,333						
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$359,755	\$3,033,333						

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS										
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)						
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses. This fiscal note contains 9 pages.

L.R. No. 0157-01 Bill No. SB 8 Page 2 of 9 January 18, 2019

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS										
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)						
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0						

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)									
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)					
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	0					

<sup>☐</sup> Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any Of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS										
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)						
<b>Local Government</b>										

L.R. No. 0157-01 Bill No. SB 8 Page 3 of 9 January 18, 2019

### FISCAL ANALYSIS

### **ASSUMPTION**

Officials at the **Department of Corrections** assume a direct impact from this legislation would result in a cost avoidance that would be fully implemented in FY2023 of \$3,033,333. The bill proposes to make the imposition of minimum prison terms discretionary for offenses that do not involve the use of force, result in serious physical injury, sexual conduct against a child, or the use of a firearm. For such eligible offenses, the court may depart from the minimum prison term if the court finds there are compelling reasons with regard to the circumstances of the offense and/or the history and character of the defendant.

The bill will affect the imposition of a minimum prison term as defined in 558.019 RSMo. Because of the exclusions outlined in a new section 558.400.1, the minimum prison term will remain mandatory for most dangerous felonies (excluding DWI 6th offense), sexual offenses against children (statutory rape 1st and 2nd degree, statutory sodomy 1st and 2nd degree and child molestation), and offenses where the offender was also found guilty of armed criminal action or any weapon offense in chapter 571. The impact of the bill is estimated to be the shorter time served by offenders when the mandatory prison term is not imposed, but who are now required to serve a minimum prison term of 40%, 50% or 80%. It should be noted that the minimum prison term is not imposed on drug offenses and all sex offenses are excluded from the impact because of the requirement to complete the Missouri Sex Offender Program (MOSOP). If sex offenders complete MOSOP, they are released on or near the conditional release date, otherwise they are released on the completion of the sentence.

In FY18 there were 1,773 offenders who had a parole hearing and were sentenced to a minimum prison term. The average sentence ranged from 5.5 years by offenders who had served one prior DOC incarceration and were required to serve 40% of the sentence to 6.4 years by offenders who had served three or more DOC incarcerations and were required to serve 80% of the sentence before parole eligibility.

The number of offenders who the courts will decide not to mandate a minimum prison term is difficult to establish, but the DOC completed a study in 2015 on the courts practice in enhancing prison sentences when offenders have prior felony convictions under 558.016. The statute states that the courts may sentence a person who has been found to be a persistent offender to an authorized term of imprisonment for the offense that is one class higher than the offense for which the person is found guilty. The DOC study found that the courts imposed the enhanced sentence in 21% of cases. The DOC is, therefore, estimating that the courts will impose a minimum prison term in 21% of cases, and in 79% of cases the Board of Probation and Parole will determine the time served. In FY18, the DOC estimates that 1,401 offenders would have had their release date determined by the Board with this assumption.

L.R. No. 0157-01 Bill No. SB 8 Page 4 of 9 January 18, 2019

### **ASSUMPTION** (continued)

### New admissions with parole hearings in FY18 Serving a minimum prison term, excluding dangerous felonies, sex offenses and weapon offenses

	THE PARTY OF	Courts will mandate MPT	Courts will not mandate MPT	Average Sentence	
Mininum Prison Term	Count	21%	79%	(years)	
40%	1,000	210	790	5.5	
50%	462	97	365	5.9	
80%	311	65	246	6.4	
Total	1,773	372	1,401	2.7	

The estimate of how many of the offenders who will no longer be required to serve a minimum prison term and will be released earlier is based upon the Board's calculation of a guideline release date. The Board has published guidelines that relate the percent of sentence to be served before parole to offender risk and to the severity of the offense. As offender risk and the severity of the offense increase so does the time served. The Board uses the guideline date to assist it in deciding the appropriate time served.

New admissions with a parole hearing in FY18 MPT offenders likely to be released on the guideline date

Courts will not mandate MPT (79%)									
мрт	Courts will mandate MPT 21%	Release date is the MPT date and not ASAP	Guideline date is less than 90 days from Admission (ASAP)	Release date is a terthe MPT date	Releases Decisions	Percent Released on MPT date not ASAP			
40%	210	276	59	45.5	1,000	27.6%			
50%	97	158	32	175	462	34.2%			
80%	65	119	36	92	311	38.1%			
Total	372	552	126	722	1,773	31.1%			

L.R. No. 0157-01 Bill No. SB 8 Page 5 of 9 January 18, 2019

### ASSUMPTION (continued)

In FY18, there were 1,773 planned releases of offenders who had been required to serve a minimum prison term of which 552 (31.1%) are estimated to be offenders who could be released earlier. These are offenders who will be released on the MPT date and were not ASAP. ASAP offenders are offenders who had a guideline release date that was within the first 90 days of incarceration. This occurs when offenders are admitted with significant jail time that is credited to the time served. ASAP offenders (126) cannot be released on the guideline date because of the time required for the administrative tasks of holding a hearing and arranging for the release. The offenders who will be released after the MPT date (722) and are high risk offenders are also excluded from an early release if the MPT was removed.

# Average time served serving a MPT and the guideline term MPT offenders likely to be released on the guideline date

x x(300)	Released on MPT	Average Sentence	Average MPT	A verage Guideline/ Conditional Release	Guideline Percent	Reduction in time to first release	Increase in parole recidivism	Net reduction in time served	Total reduction in prison	
MPT	(not ASAP)	(years)	(years)	(years)	Served	(years)	(years)	(years)	population	
40%	276	5.5	2.1	1.5	27%	0.6	0.2	0.4	125	
50%	158	5.9	2.7	1.8	30%	0.9	0.3	0.6	102	
80%	119	6.4	5.1	2.2	35%	29	1.0	1.9	239	
Total	552	5.8	2.9	1.7	30%	1.2	0.4	0.8	466	

The calculation of the reduction in the time served is the difference between the MPT and the average guideline time served multiplied by the number of offenders to be released on the MPT date. The DOC is offsetting this reduction in time served by adding back 35% of the reduction as an estimate of increased recidivism from a longer period on parole. The estimate of 35% is the average time offenders discharged from parole in FY18 spent in prison after first release because their parole was revoked. After adding in the parole recidivism, the average reduction in time served is 0.8 years, resulting in a total reduction in the prison population of 466 which will be achieved by FY2023. The increase in the parole population is estimated to need an increase of one P&P officer.

L.R. No. 0157-01 Bill No. SB 8 Page 6 of 9 January 18, 2019

### ASSUMPTION (continued)

#### Change in prison admissions with the proposed legislation

	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
New Admissions										
Current Law	552	552	552	552	552	552	552	552	552	552
After Legislation	552	552	552	552	552	552	552	552	552	552
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Change (After Legislation	- Current Law	1)								
Admissions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Probations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cumulati ve Populations										
Prison			-55	-466	-466	-466	-466	-466	-466	-466
Parole			55	466	466	466	466	466	466	466
Probation										
Impact										
Prison Population			-55	-466	-466	-466	-466	-466	-466	-466
Field Population			55	466	466	466	466	466	466	466
Population Change										
P&P Officers + or -		0	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	10	10

If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it is because the Department of Corrections (DOC) has changed the way probation and parole daily costs are calculated to more accurately reflect the way the Division of Probation and Parole is staffed across the entire state

In December 2017, the DOC reevaluated the calculation used for computing the Probation and Parole average daily cost of supervision and revised the cost calculation to be used for 2019 fiscal notes. The new calculation estimates the increase/decrease in caseloads at each Probation and Parole district due to the proposed legislative change. For the purposes of fiscal note calculations, the DOC averaged district caseloads across the state and came up with an average caseload of 51 offender cases per officer. The new calculation assumes that an increase/decrease of 51 cases in a district would result in a change in costs/cost avoidance equal to the cost of one FTE staff person in the district. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offenders are assumed to be absorbable.

In instances where the proposed legislation would only affect a specific caseload, such as sex offenders, the DOC will use the average caseload figure for that specific type of offender to calculate cost increases/decreases.

The DOC cost of incarceration in \$17.224 per day or an annual cost of \$6,287 per offender. The DOC cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that would be needed to cover the new caseload.

### ASSUMPTION (continued)

							Grand Total -
				increased	Add'l	Total <b>cost</b>	Prison and
	fewer			# on	P&P	for	Probation
	# in	Cost per	Total Savings	probation	Officers	probation	(includes and
	prison	year	for <b>prison</b>	& parole	needed	and parole	2% inflation
					FTE		
Year 1	0	(\$6,287)	\$0	0	0	\$0	\$0
Year 2	0	(\$6,287)	\$0	0	0	\$0	\$0
Year 3	(55)	(\$6,287)	\$359,755	55	0	\$0	\$359,755
Year 4	(466)	(\$6,287)	\$3,109,066	466	1	\$75,732	\$3,033,333
Year 5	(466)	(\$6,287)	\$3,171,247	466	1	\$76,716	\$3,094,531
Year 6	(466)	(\$6,287)	\$3,234,672	466	1	\$77,715	\$3,156,957
Year 7	(466)	(\$6,287)	\$3,299,365	466	1	\$78,732	\$3,220,633
Year 8	(466)	(\$6,287)	\$3,365,353	466	1	\$79,766	\$3,285,587
Year 9	(466)	(\$6,287)	\$3,432,660	466	1	\$80,817	\$3,351,843
Year 10	(466)	(\$6,287)	\$3,501,313	466	1	\$81,887	\$3,419,426

**Oversight** has no information which contradicts DOC's response and will reflect a cost avoidance that is fully implemented in FY2023 of \$3,033,333. Oversight assumes the cost avoidance related to the DOC's estimate of 466 fewer prisoners may translate to a reduction in correctional officers that is part of their estimated savings. Therefore, Oversight will not reflect the additional FTE in the Probation and Parole Division because it may be offset by a reduction in FTE in the Adult Institutions Division.

Officials at the Office of the State Courts Administrator, the Office of the State Public Defender, the Office of Prosecution Services and the Department of Social Services each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

**Oversight** notes that the Office of the State Courts Administrator, the Office of the State Public Defender, the Office of Prosecution Services and the Department of Social Services have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for these agencies.

L.R. No. 0157-01 Bill No. SB 8 Page 8 of 9 January 18, 2019

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government  GENERAL REVENUE	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)
Cost - DOC - additional Probation and Parole Officer for decreased number of offenders				(075 722)
in prisons	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$75,733)
Cost Avoidance - DOC - reduction of prisoner population	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	\$359,755	\$3,109,066
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$359,755</u>	<u>\$3,033,333</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)
	<u>\$0</u>	<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.

L.R. No. 0157-01 Bill No. SB 8 Page 9 of 9 January 18, 2019

### FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This act creates the Justice Safety Valve Act, which allows the court to depart from a statutorily required minimum prison term when sentencing a defendant found guilty of an offense. The court may not depart from the statutory minimum sentence for certain offenses as specified in the act.

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 Corrections
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of the State Public Defender
Department of Social Services

Kyle Rieman

Director

January 18, 2019

Ke Rime

Ross Strope Assistant Director January 18, 2019