# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

### FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 3739-02

Bill No.: Perfected SCS for SB 1045

Subject: Crimes and Punishment; Victims of Crime

<u>Type</u>: Original

<u>Date</u>: March 3, 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 OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

L.R. No. 3739-02

Bill No. Perfected SCS for SB 1045

Page 2 of 5 March 3, 2004

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

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

#### FISCAL ANALYSIS

### **ASSUMPTION**

Officials from the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations** and the **Department of Public Safety** – **Missouri State Highway Patrol** assume the proposed legislation 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 **Office of Prosecution Services** assume prosecutors could absorb the costs of the proposed legislation within existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** assume new crimes create new cases for the SPD. The exact number of cases affected is too uncertain to provide a definitive dollar amount of fiscal impact. Since the amount of impact is uncertain, the SPD assumes existing staff will be able to provide representation in these cases initially. However, once the true fiscal impact is determined, the SPD will reassess the impact of this legislation. Passage of more than one bill increasing existing penalties or creating new crimes will require increased appropriations for the SPD.

BLG:LR:OD (12/02)

L.R. No. 3739-02 Bill No. Perfected SCS for SB 1045

Page 3 of 5 March 3, 2004

#### <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assume this proposal makes it a crime to burn a cross or cause a cross to be burned if done with the intent to intimidate, as defined, any person or groups of persons. Penalty provisions, the component of the bill to have potential fiscal impact for DOC, is for a class A misdemeanor for the first offense and a class D felony when prior offenses exist.

Currently, the DOC cannot predict the number of new commitments which may result from the enhancement 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 (FY03 average of \$38.10 per inmate per day, or an annual cost of \$13,907 per inmate) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY03 average of \$3.15 per offender, per day or an annual cost of \$1,150 per offender).

The DOC does 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.

The following factors contribute to DOC's minimal assumption:

- ▶ DOC assumes 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.

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

L.R. No. 3739-02

Bill No. Perfected SCS for SB 1045

Page 4 of 5 March 3, 2004

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

The proposed legislation would prohibit burning a cross with the intent to intimidate any person or group of persons. A person violating this act would be guilty of a class A misdemeanor for the first offense and a class D felony for any subsequent offenses.

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

Office of State Courts Administrator
Department of Corrections
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Public Safety

– Missouri State Highway Patrol
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of State Public Defender

Mickey Wilen

L.R. No. 3739-02 Bill No. Perfected SCS for SB 1045 Page 5 of 5 March 3, 2004

> Mickey Wilson, CPA Director March 3, 2004