

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 1004-03  
Bill No.: SCS for HCS for HB 547  
Subject: Attorneys; Courts; Crimes and Punishment; County Officials; Liability; Military Affairs; Veterans  
Type: Original  
Date: April 15, 2019

**Bill Summary:** This proposal provides alternative methods for the disposal of cases including through the use of treatment courts and prosecution diversion programs.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
General Revenue	(\$47,000 to \$143,109)	(\$47,000 to \$143,109)	(\$47,000 to \$143,109)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>(\$47,000 to \$143,109)</b>	<b>(\$47,000 to \$143,109)</b>	<b>(\$47,000 to \$143,109)</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
Drug Court Resources Fund (0733)*	\$0	\$0	\$0
Office of Prosecution Services Fund (0680)	Could exceed \$497,963	Could exceed \$597,556	Could exceed \$597,556
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>Could exceed \$497,963</b>	<b>Could exceed \$597,556</b>	<b>Could exceed \$597,556</b>

\*Distribution increases (decreases) net to zero.

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 11 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>	<b>FY 2022</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 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>	<b>FY 2022</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>	<b>FY 2022</b>
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>Could exceed \$497,963</b>	<b>Could exceed \$597,556</b>	<b>Could exceed \$597,556</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

#### §§56.765 & 557.014 - Prosecution diversion program for criminal cases

Officials at the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume a \$553,722 per year increase in court fees from this proposal. Based on DOR records, the total amount deposited into the Missouri Office of Prosecution Services Fund in Fiscal Year 2018 was \$138,430.40. This creates the notion that the total amount assessed as costs in each court proceeding filed in any court in the state in all criminal cases totaled \$276,860.80 (amount deposited into MO Office of Prosecution Services Fund x 2 due to only half of the fee is deposited into this fund). The DOR then estimates that the total amount collected, at a rate of five dollars, rather than the current rate of collection at one dollar, would be \$1,384,304 (\$276,860.80 (\$1 dollar) x \$5).

The DOR further estimates that the Missouri Office of Prosecution Services Fund will increase by \$553,721.60 ( $\$1,384,304 / 2 - \$138,430.40$ ) and the amount payable to the county treasurer's offices of each county from which such funds were generated will increase by \$553,721.60.

Assuming this proposed legislation would pass in August 2019, the DOR only estimates ten out of twelve months would collect the surcharge at the five dollar rate in the first fiscal year, or \$461,434.67 in FY 2020.

Officials at the **Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** state they believe increasing the funding in §56.765, RSMo, from \$1 to \$5 is necessary to continue operating MOPS and provide additional training funds for local prosecutors. This surcharge has not been increased for at least thirty years, perhaps even longer.

MOPS is funded through two primary revenue streams- bad check fees and the \$1 surcharge added to court costs in criminal and traffic cases. The revenue from bad check fees has been in a rapid decline for the past decade given the increased use of debit cards and other electronic payment options. The court cost surcharge has been at \$1 (50 cents to MOPS, 50 cents to the local prosecutor) for at least thirty years, if not longer. MOPS needs an increase in order to continue meeting its statutory obligations.

Current annual revenue from MOPS share of the \$1 court cost surcharge is approximately \$135,000 (which has also been declining slightly each year). It is anticipated that MOPS \$2 share of the total court surcharge increase will generate revenue of an additional minimum of \$135,000 a year to a possible maximum of an additional \$540,000 a year. This increase in funding ensures that for the foreseeable future MOPS can continue to fulfill its statutory duties including, but not limited to, providing training and other assistance to prosecutors, the ongoing implementation and maintenance of a uniform case management system for use by all prosecutor offices, and

ASSUMPTION (continued)

integrating that case management system with law enforcement and the courts. This increase will also assist in MOPS helping prosecutors develop and implement diversion and other new programs.

**Oversight** notes that the Missouri Office of Prosecution Service fund (0680) has had the following deposits made over the last 3 years:

FY 2018 - \$138,430.40  
FY 2017 - \$152,267.84  
FY 2016 - \$157,468.53

This would result in a 3 year average in deposits of \$149,389. Since this proposal will increase the fees collected on court cases by \$4 per case, there is a potential increase to this fund that could exceed \$597,556 ( $\$149,389 * \$4$ ) each year to the Office of Prosecution Services Fund and the County Treasurers' Funds in Local Governments. Therefore, Oversight will reflect an increase in revenue that could, in total, exceed \$597,556 for all of these funds for this proposal.

Officials at the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assume the proposed legislation allows for diversion supervision at the discretion of a prosecuting attorney for non-violent, non-sexual offenses. The program has the potential to divert offenders from supervision by the DOC. The DOC's impact estimate is based on the assumption that those from drug courts will not be diverted since they are already providing treatment, and the success of the prosecution diversion programs will be similar to that of drug courts.

In FY18, the DOC received 11,143 offenders for a nonviolent offense, of which the DOC supervised 336 for a court diversion program and 227 of those were new offenders. Because court and prosecution diversion programs are most likely to divert offenders sentenced to SIS probation, diversion programs are expressed as a percent of SIS probation sentences (7%). A similar calculation for drug offenders received in FY18 shows that diversion accounted for 12% of SIS probations. Therefore, the DOC is estimating that the prosecution diversion programs will increase the number of defendants with nonviolent offenses (excluding drug and DWI offenses) by 5% (12%-7%).

ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Nonviolent New Sentences in FY2018- Sentence Disposition and Supervision status at time of offense**

Supervision Status	Diversion	Probation				Prison	Total	Diversion/
		SIS	SES	120-day	SIS Prob.			Percent
New Sentence	227	2,940	2,190	482	955	6,794	7%	
Probation	105	616	1,375	367	992	3,455	15%	
Parole	4	54	261	126	449	894	7%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>3,610</b>	<b>3,826</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>2,396</b>	<b>11,143</b>	<b>9%</b>	

A 5% increase in diversion programs will result in 153 defendants being enrolled and 86 defendants completing the programs per year (using the court diversion program's success rate of 56%). The legislation does not state that the defendants will be supervised other than reporting to the prosecuting attorney, therefore, the impact on the DOC will be the diversion of three years of probation. Nonviolent offenders on probation with a five year term are expected to serve three years after earning compliance discharge credits. The impact on the DOC is a reduction of 257 on probation which will occur by FY2022 and there would be no cost/savings from this proposal.

**Impact of Prosecution Diversion Programs**

Diversion/ SIS Prob. Percent	Percent after Pros. Pgm.	Estimated diversion population	Success rate of program	Defendants completing programs	population reduction of 3 years
7%	12%	153	56%	86	257

	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029
<b>Probation</b>										
Current Law	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86
After Legislation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Cumulative Populations</b>										
Prison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parole	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Probation	-86	-172	-257	-257	-257	-257	-257	-257	-257	-257
<b>P&amp;P Officers + or -</b>	<b>0</b>									

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assume there may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials at the **Office of the Attorney General**, the **Office of the State Public Defender** and the **Missouri Veterans Commission** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

**Oversight** notes that the Department of Corrections, the Office of the State Courts Administrator, the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of the State Public Defender and the Missouri Veterans Commission each has 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.

Officials at the **City of Kansas City** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 398, officials at the **City of Excelsior-Springs** assumed this proposal would increase the court cost rate. The City's current rate is \$29.50 per case.

**Oversight** only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other cities and counties were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. For a general listing of political subdivisions included in our database, please refer to [www.legislativeoversight.mo.gov](http://www.legislativeoversight.mo.gov).

§478.001 - Requires each judicial circuit to establish a treatment court

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** assume the proposed legislation provides alternative methods for the disposal of cases including through the use of treatment courts and prosecution diversion programs.

Currently there are 45 out of 46 circuits currently providing treatment courts services with an estimated projection of 7,420 participants in FY 2019. While not all circuits have veterans treatment courts, veterans can participate in adult treatment courts. Potential treatment court participants may also utilize a treatment court in a nearby county when there is not a treatment court in their own county

Based upon FY 2018 expenditures for treatment courts using Treatment Court Resources Fund, cost per participant is \$1,739. There are many other factors that affect the operating costs associated with establishing and maintaining treatment courts which vary from county to county throughout the state.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Oversight** notes that §478.001.2 changes the word “may” to “shall” in this proposal. This section also states “A treatment court division shall be established by any circuit court...” A treatment court division is explained in §478.001.1(12) as including, but are not limited to, the following specialized courts: adult treatment courts, DWI court, family treatment court, juvenile treatment court, veterans treatment court, or any combination thereof.

Oversight notes, according to OSCA budget submissions, there are some circuits that have treatment courts in one or more counties, but not in all. For example,

8th Circuit	Carrol County is not served (Ray County is)
10th Circuit	Monroe County is not served (Marion and Ralls counties are)
30th Circuit	Polk, Dallas, and Hickory Counties are not served (Benton Co. is)
37th Circuit	Shannon, Carter, and Oregon Counties are not served (Howell is)
34th Circuit	Pemiscot County is not served (New Madrid County is)
43rd Circuit	Dekalb, Clinton, Daviess, Caldwell, and Livingston are not served

**Oversight** notes OSCA's FY 19 budget under section 12.370 for the Drug Court Resources fund (0733) has an appropriated amount of \$6,726,131 for funding treatment programs that is being transferred in from the General Revenue Fund. Currently, the 43rd circuit does not have any treatment courts within their circuit. There are 47 treatment court services (some circuits have more than one) being funded through the appropriated amount of \$6,726,131 which would average out to an appropriated amount of \$143,109 per treatment court service. The 43rd circuit is more similar in demographics to the 3rd circuit which has an appropriated budget request of \$47,000. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a cost range of \$47,000 to \$143,109 each year transferred out of the General Revenue Fund and netting to zero by the transferring into the Drug Court Resources Fund to fund a treatment court in the 43rd circuit.

Officials at the **Office of Prosecution Services** assume a minimal negative fiscal impact from this proposal.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<u>Transfer Out - to the Drug Court Resources Fund (§478.001)</u>	(\$47,000 to <u>\$143,109</u> )	(\$47,000 to <u>\$143,109</u> )	(\$47,000 to <u>\$143,109</u> )
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b>(\$47,000 to <u>\$143,109</u>)</b>	<b>(\$47,000 to <u>\$143,109</u>)</b>	<b>(\$47,000 to <u>\$143,109</u>)</b>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
<b>DRUG COURT RESOURCES FUND</b>			
<u>Transfer In</u> - from General Revenue (\$478.001)	\$47,000 to \$143,109	\$47,000 to \$143,109	\$47,000 to \$143,109
<u>Cost</u> - to establish a treatment court division in the 43rd circuit (\$478.001)	(\$47,000 to <u>\$143,109</u> )	(\$47,000 to <u>\$143,109</u> )	(\$47,000 to <u>\$143,109</u> )
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE DRUG COURT RESOURCES FUND</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>

**OFFICE OF PROSECUTION  
SERVICES FUND**

<u>Revenue</u> - 50% of additional revenue from increased court fees from \$1 to \$5 (\$56.765)	Could exceed <u>\$497,963</u>	Could exceed <u>\$597,556</u>	Could exceed <u>\$597,556</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OFFICE OF PROSECUTION SERVICES</b>	<b>Could exceed <u>\$497,963</u></b>	<b>Could exceed <u>\$597,556</u></b>	<b>Could exceed <u>\$597,556</u></b>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
<b>LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>			
<u>Revenue</u> - counties of the 43rd Circuit - state appropriation for treatment court	\$47,000 to \$143,109	\$47,000 to \$143,109	\$47,000 to \$143,109
<u>Revenue</u> - 50% of additional revenue from increased court fees from \$1 to \$5 (\$56.765)	Could exceed \$497,963	Could exceed \$597,556	Could exceed \$597,556
<u>Costs</u> - counties of the 43rd Circuit - to operate a treatment court	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>	<b>Could exceed <u>\$497,963</u></b>	<b>Could exceed <u>\$597,556</u></b>	<b>Could exceed <u>\$597,556</u></b>

### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

### FISCAL DESCRIPTION

#### §§56.765 & 557.014 - Prosecution diversion program for criminal cases

This act authorizes prosecuting attorneys to divert criminal cases to a prosecution diversion program.

This act increases a criminal case surcharge from one dollar to five dollars which is assessed equally for prosecutor services and prosecutor training.

Under this act, a prosecuting attorney, with the agreement of the accused or defendant, may divert a criminal case to a prosecution diversion program for a period of six months to two years. Prosecuting attorneys may divert cases out of the criminal justice system when they determine utilizing a prosecution diversion programs outweighs taking immediate court action. The statute of limitations for certain offenses shall be tolled during this time period. The period of a prosecution diversion program may be extended by a prosecuting attorney for purposes detailed in the act, yet no such extension shall be for a period exceeding two years.

Any prosecuting attorney, prior to or upon issuance of an arrest warrant or information of indictment, may forgo continued prosecution if the parties agree to a prosecution diversion program. This program must be in writing and for a specified period of time. While a prosecuting attorney has the authority to develop prosecution diversion programs, this act details the minimum requirements that a diversion program must meet. Additionally, a prosecuting attorney may impose conditions on the behavior of the accused or defendant that assures the safety and well-being of the community, as well as that of the accused or defendant. These conditions may be imposed at any time of the prosecution diversion program, and may include but are not limited to, requiring the accused or defendant to remain free of any criminal behavior during the entire period of prosecution diversion program.

The responsibility and authority on whether or not to screen and divert a case are completely within the discretion of the prosecuting attorney. This responsibility and authority shall be official duties of a prosecuting attorney. The decision of a prosecuting attorney regarding the diversion of a criminal case shall not be appealable, and may not be later raised as a defense in a criminal case involving the accused or defendant.

At any time a person participating in a prosecution diversion program shall have the right to insist on criminal prosecution for the offense which he or she is accused. Also, any person participating in a prosecution diversion program may have legal counsel present at all phases the diversion proceedings, but nothing in this act shall create a right to counsel. Criminal

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

proceedings may be re-initiated at time by a prosecuting attorney for cases that have been diverted to a prosecution diversion program.

The potential liability of any county, city, person, organization, or agency, or employee or agent thereof, involved with the supervision of activities, programs, or community service that are a part of a prosecution diversion program is limited by provisions of this act. Any person supervising or employing an accused or defendant under a prosecution diversion program shall report any violation of the terms of the prosecution diversion program to the prosecuting attorney.

Finally, this act provides once the accused or defendant completes a prosecution diversion program, to the satisfaction of the prosecuting attorney, the person shall be entitled to a dismissal or alternative disposition of charges against them. The individual shall be required to pay any associated costs prior to the dismissal of pending charges.

§478.001 - Requires each judicial circuit to establish a veterans' treatment court

Currently, treatment court divisions oversee veterans treatment courts, adult treatment courts, DWI courts, family treatment courts, and juvenile treatment courts. This bill requires each circuit court to establish a treatment court division before August 28, 2021, and preference will be given to combat veterans, defined in the bill. However, if it is not feasible to establish a veterans treatment court, the court may refer veterans to any existing court within its jurisdiction until there are enough resources to establish a veterans court.

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 Revenue  
Office of Prosecution Services  
Department of Corrections  
Office of the State Courts Administrator  
Office of the Attorney General  
State Public Defender  
Missouri Veterans Commission  
City of Kansas City  
City of Excelsior-Springs



Kyle Rieman  
Director  
April 15, 2019

Ross Strobe  
Assistant Director  
April 15, 2019