

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 3265-01
Bill No.: SB 956
Subject: Public Safety Department; Motor Vehicles; Agriculture and Animals.
Type: Original
Date: January 7, 2004

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - State Highway Patrol**, **Office of the State Public Defender** and the **Office of State Courts Administrator** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services** assume any additional costs arising from the proposal would be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of Secretary of State (SOS)** assume there would be costs due to additional publishing duties related to the Department of Public Safety's authority to promulgate rules, regulations, and forms. SOS estimates the division could require approximately 24 new pages of regulations in the Code of State Regulations at a cost of \$27.00 per page, and 36 new pages in the Missouri Register at a cost of \$23.00 per page. Costs due to this proposal are estimated to be \$1,476, however, the actual fiscal impact would be dependent upon the actual rule-making authority and may be more or less. Financial impact in subsequent fiscal years would depend entirely on the number, length, and frequency of the rules filed, amended, rescinded, or withdrawn. SOS does not anticipate the need for additional staff as a result of this proposal, however, the enactment of more than one similar proposal may, in the aggregate, necessitate additional staff.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process. Any decisions to raise fees to defray costs would likely be made in subsequent fiscal years.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** did not respond to our request for fiscal impact. However, in response to similar legislation from a previous year, DOC assumed they could not predict the number of new commitments which may result from the creation of the offense(s) outlined in 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 to the custody of the DOC due to the provisions of this legislation, the DOC will incur a corresponding increase in operational cost either through incarceration or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole.

The following factors contributed to DOC's minimal assumption:

- ▶ The DOC assumed the narrow scope of the crime will not encompass a large number of offenders;
- ▶ The low felony status of the crime enhances the possibility of plea-bargaining or imposition of a probation sentence; and
- ▶ The probability exists that offenders would be charged with a similar but more serious offense or that sentences may run concurrent to one another.

The DOC did not anticipate the need for capital improvements at this time. It must be noted that the cumulative effect of various new legislation, if passed into law, could result in the need for additional capital improvements funding if the total number of new offenders exceeds current planned capacity.

In summary, supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration would result in some additional costs, but it was assumed the impact would be \$0 or a minimal amount that could be absorbed within existing resources.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Department of Transportation (DOT)** state, in regards to Section 307.156 (airbags), that there would be no fiscal impact to the Office of Highway Safety. If the current law changes, the costs to modify any existing print material would be absorbed in the normal operating budget.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2005 (10 Mo.)	FY 2006	FY 2007
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2005 (10 Mo.)	FY 2006	FY 2007
	<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.

DESCRIPTION

This proposal allows persons operating animal-driven vehicles during the dark to use lamps or lanterns which comply with rules promulgated by the Department of Public Safety. The proposal also allows persons operating an animal-drawn vehicle to equip their vehicle with reflective material complying with rules promulgated by the Department of Public Safety rather than displaying the slow-moving triangle emblem (Sections 307.125 and 307.127).

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
Department of Transportation
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Public Defender

NOT RESPONDING: Department of Corrections



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
January 7, 2004