COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 3112-02 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 561

Subject: Crimes and Punishment; Courts; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies

Type: Original

<u>Date</u>: January 30, 2020

Bill Summary: This proposal creates the offense of vehicle hijacking.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND								
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2025)				
General Revenue	(Could exceed \$115,965)	(Could exceed \$139,082)	(Could exceed \$159,796)	(Could exceed \$203,686)				
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	(Could exceed \$115,965)	(Could exceed \$139,082)	(Could exceed \$159,796)	(Could exceed \$203,686)				

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS							
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2025)			
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 8 pages.

L.R. No. 3112-02 Bill No. SB 561 Page 2 of 8 January 30, 2020

ES	TIMATED NET	EFFECT ON FEI	DERAL FUNDS	
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2025)
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 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2025)			
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	0			

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 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2025)			
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§§211.071, 556.061, and 570.027 - Vehicle hijacking

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this bill defines vehicle hijacking and makes it an offense punishable as a class B felony, or as a class A felony given certain conditions.

As this would be a new class B felony, the DOC will use the standard class B felony response to estimate a fiscal impact.

For each new class B felony, the DOC estimates three people will be sentenced to prison and four to probation. The average sentence for a class B felony offense is 8.7 years, of which 5.1 years will be served in prison with 3.4 years to first release. The remaining 3.6 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 15 additional offenders in prison and 12 on field supervision by FY 2025.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Change (After Legislation -	Current Law)									
Admissions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Probations	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	3	6	9	12	15	15	15	15	15	15
Parole						3	6	9	11	11
Probation	4	8	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Impact										
Prison Population	3	6	9	12	15	15	15	15	15	15
Field Population	4	8	12	12	12	15	18	21	23	23
Population Change	7	14	21	24	27	30	33	36	38	38

L.R. No. 3112-02 Bill No. SB 561 Page 4 of 8 January 30, 2020

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Section 211.071.1 requires a court having jurisdiction over a juvenile offender alleged to have committed the offense, hold a certification hearing in order to determine whether the juvenile should be tried as an adult. Presumably, more juvenile certification hearings will result in more juvenile offenders tried and sentenced as adults. The actual impact of section 211.071.1 is difficult to determine as it is unknown how many juveniles will be found guilty and sentenced to a term of adult incarceration for this offense. DOC reflected a cost each year of the additional prisoners in the table below (i.e. \$59,796 in year 3 for 9 prisoners) plus an unknown amount.

							Grand Total -
						Total cost	Prison and
				# to		for	Probation
	# to	Cost per	Total Costs for	probation	Cost per	probation	(includes a 2%
	prison	year	prison	& parole	year	and parole	inflation)
Year 1	3	(\$6,386)	(\$15,965)	4	absorbed	\$0	(\$15,965)
Year 2	6	(\$6,386)	(\$39,082)	8	absorbed	\$0	(\$39,082)
Year 3	9	(\$6,386)	(\$59,796)	12	absorbed	\$0	(\$59,796)
Year 4	12	(\$6,386)	(\$81,322)	12	absorbed	\$0	(\$81,322)
Year 5	15	(\$6,386)	(\$103,686)	12	absorbed	\$0	(\$103,686)
Year 6	15	(\$6,386)	(\$105,760)	15	absorbed	\$0	(\$105,760)
Year 7	15	(\$6,386)	(\$107,875)	18	absorbed	\$0	(\$107,875)
Year 8	15	(\$6,386)	(\$110,033)	21	absorbed	\$0	(\$110,033)
Year 9	15	(\$6,386)	(\$112,233)	23	absorbed	\$0	(\$112,233)
Year 10	15	(\$6,386)	(\$114,478)	23	absorbed	\$0	(\$114,478)

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 2019, 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 2020 fiscal notes. 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 would result in a change in costs/cost avoidance equal to the cost of one FTE staff person. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offenders are assumed to be absorbable.

L.R. No. 3112-02 Bill No. SB 561 Page 5 of 8 January 30, 2020

ASSUMPTION (continued)

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. For instances where the proposed legislation affects a less specific caseload, DOC projects the impact based on prior year(s) actual data for DOC's 44 probation and parole districts.

The DOC cost of incarceration is \$17.496 per day or an annual cost of \$6,386 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.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's impact for fiscal note purposes.

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** state they cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with the proposed new crime of vehicle-hijacking, a new class B felony. If the person is armed or if a child or special victim is a victim, the charge is escalated to a class A felony. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

As this is a newly defined crime, SPD does not have any statistics relating to the number of possible cases.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight notes over the last three fiscal years, the SPD has lapsed a total of \$153 of General Revenue appropriations (\$2 out of \$28.0 million in FY 2017; \$150 out of \$42.5 million in FY 2018; and \$1 out of \$46.0 million in FY 2019). Therefore, Oversight assumes the SPD is at maximum capacity, and the increase in workload resulting from this bill cannot be absorbed with SPD's current resources.

Adding one additional Assistant Public Defender 1 (APD) with a starting salary of \$47,000, will cost approximately \$74,500 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. One additional APD II (\$52,000 per year; eligible for consideration after 1 year of successful performance at APD I) will cost the state approximately \$81,000 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. When expense and equipment costs such as travel, training, furniture, equipment and supplies are included, Oversight assumes the cost for a new APD could approach \$100,000 per year.

L.R. No. 3112-02 Bill No. SB 561 Page 6 of 8 January 30, 2020

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes the SPD cannot absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal within their existing resources and, therefore, will reflect a potential additional cost of (Less than \$100,000) per year to the General Revenue Fund. Oversight also notes since this is a new crime, the SPD may need additional staff to provide representation for indigent persons charged with this proposed new crime and assumes if additional FTE are required in the future, the SPD will request additional funding through the appropriations process.

Officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assume the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS and no measurable impact to prosecutors since the proposed crimes have similar elements to the existing crimes of robbery in the first degree and robbery in the second degree.

Oversight notes the Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol, the Department of Social Services, the Office of State Courts Administrator, the Springfield Police Department, the St. Louis County Police Department, and the St. Louis County Department of Justice Services have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other police and sheriff's departments were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. A general listing of political subdivisions included in our database is available upon request.

L.R. No. 3112-02 Bill No. SB 561 Page 7 of 8 January 30, 2020

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2025)
GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
Costs - DOC (§§211.071, 556.061 and 570.027) Increased incarceration costs	(\$15,965 to Unknown)	(\$39,082 to Unknown)	(\$59,796 to Unknown)	(\$103,686 to Unknown)
Costs - SPD (§§211.071, 556.061 and 570.027) Salaries, fringe benefits, and				
equipment and expense	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND	(Could exceed \$115,965)	(Could exceed \$139,082)	(Could exceed \$159,796)	(Could exceed \$203,686)
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2025)
	<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. 3112-02 Bill No. SB 561 Page 8 of 8 January 30, 2020

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This act creates the offense of vehicle hijacking, which is committed when an individual knowingly uses or threatens the use of physical force upon another individual to seize or attempt to seize possession or control of a vehicle. This offense is punished as a Class B felony unless one of the aggravating circumstances listed in the act was present during the commission of the offense, in which case it is punished as a Class A felony.

Additionally, the definition of dangerous felony is modified to include the offense of vehicle hijacking when punished as a Class A felony.

Under this act, beginning January 1, 2021, if a person is charged with the offense of vehicle hijacking, and is between the ages of 12 and 18 then a mandatory hearing is conducted to determine if the case shall proceed in a juvenile court or a court of general jurisdiction.

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
Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol
Department of Social Services
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Office of State Courts Administrator
State Public Defender's Office
Springfield Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
St. Louis County Department of Justice Services

Julie Morff Director

January 30, 2020

Ross Strope Assistant Director January 30, 2020