

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 1290-01
Bill No.: SB 253
Subject: Crimes and Punishment; Criminal Procedure; Uniform Laws
Type: Original
Date: March 8, 2013

Bill Summary: This proposal changes the laws regarding the criminal code.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
General Revenue	(\$1,188,363)	(\$1,196,658 to Unknown)	(\$1,210,381 to Unknown)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	(\$1,188,363)	(\$1,196,658 to Unknown)	(\$1,210,381 to Unknown)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Criminal Records	(\$314,081)	(\$121,158)	(\$122,389)
Highway Funds*	(\$3,343,234) or (\$22,843,234)	(\$376,320) or (\$19,876,320)	(\$376,320) or (\$19,876,320)
Highway Safety	\$0 or \$19,500,000	\$0 or \$19,500,000	\$0 or \$19,500,000
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	(\$3,657,315)	(\$497,478)	(\$498,709)

* This does not reflect the potential loss of federal-aid highway funds of \$32 million in FY 2014 and \$64 million in FYs 2015 and 2016 if Missouri is found to be substantially in noncompliance with Federal BAC laws.

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses. This fiscal note contains 17 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
General Revenue	18 FTE	18 FTE	18 FTE
Criminal Records	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	20 FTE	20 FTE	20 FTE

Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Local Government	(\$1,114,411)	(\$125,440)	(\$125,440)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (CTS)** state they will need to adopt the new charge codes and develop a new charge code schema. There may be some unknown costs associated with updating the JIS (statewide court automation) system used by the courts and developing a new charge code schema. We would not anticipate a fiscal impact in excess of \$100,000.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** state the current system by which charge codes are created will have to be rewritten. This will take a concerted effort between the Patrol's Criminal Justice Information Services Division, the Office of State Courts Administrator, and the Missouri Office of Prosecution Services. This is expected to be a long-term project that will take several years to fully implement. Currently, one Criminal History Specialist maintains the updates to the Missouri charge code manual. However, with a complete revision of the charge codes, this would involve more than reviewing and maintaining updated information.

Therefore, an additional two full-time FTEs would be needed to complete this task. These FTEs would serve as the primary liaison for the administration and publication of the Missouri charge code manual for use by all Missouri criminal justice agencies. This would involve the review of criminal history processes, updating criminal history databases, preparation of reports, and maintaining statistical data. They would also be responsible for updating the Missouri charge code system and coordinating the sharing of updates to all necessary state and local criminal justice systems.

2 Criminal History Specialists	\$65,808
Office Equipment/HW/SW per FTE	\$ 3,566
Recurring Costs	
Phone Charges per FTE	\$350
Office Supplies per FTE	\$300

Additionally, approximately 280 Livescan fingerprint devices used throughout the state would have to be updated with the new charge code scheme as well. The estimated cost for this system modification has been determined by MorphoTrack, the state AFIS vendor, to be a minimum of \$30,000.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

This proposed legislation makes changes to the charge codes. These changes will have a rippling effect on several components of our criminal justice programs and will impact other agencies and organizations that download and utilize the Charge Code Table. The following is a breakdown of these changes and the resulting cost and manhours for the Patrol:

150 hours - Discovery and Design
240 hours - Changes to the Uniform Charge Code Table Application and Database
300 hours - Other Database Changes to Adjust for Charge Code Changes
300 hours - Stored Procedure Code
300 hours - Forms--Messenger, CCH Client, UCT Editor, SOR, etc.
210 hours - Switch Transaction Changes
180 hours - Testing
90 hours - Project Management
1,770 hours

The Patrol estimates that approximately 1,770 consultant hours will be required at a rate of \$100 per hour ($1,770 \times \$100 = \$177,000$). The systems affected are components of a commercial system purchased by the Patrol and since the programming code is not available to the Patrol, all changes must be made by the vendor.

Section 579.050 pertains to the manufacture, sale and use of imitation controlled substances such as K2 and bath salts. This is beginning to have more of a fiscal impact on the Division of Drug and Crime Control. Additionally, Section 565.090 makes the crime of first degree harassment a class E felony rather than a class A misdemeanor. This would enable the division to expand the list of crimes investigated as "special investigations". The fiscal impact would depend on the number of requests for this type of investigation. In Section 566.153 a person commits the offense of age misrepresentation with the intent to solicit a minor when he or she knowingly misrepresents his or her age with the intent to use the Internet "or any electronic communication" to engage in criminal sexual conduct involving a minor. In summary, the Division of Drug and Crime believes the impact for Sections 195.418, 565.090, 566.153, 579.050 will be minimal at this time and can be absorbed.

In summary, the MHP assumes a cost of approximately \$315,000 in FY 2014, and \$122,000 in FY 2015 and FY 2016.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** state additional Public Defenders would be required to provide representation to the indigent accused of the new crimes created that would potentially result in jail time, if found guilty.

RS:LR:OD

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The SPD states there are changes that should reduce the number of attorneys we need:

(1) Creation of additional fine only offenses (class D misdemeanors) for first time offenders, thus rendering these defendants ineligible for our services:

-- Misdemeanor Use of Drug Paraphernalia for first time drug offenders (195.233);

-- Stealing (570.030) and Receiving (570.080) Less Than \$150 for first time stealing offenders.

(2) Increase in felony threshold value for property crimes from \$500 to \$750. Most statistically relevant offenses affected are:

-- Stealing (570.030);

-- Receiving (570.080);

-- Passing Bad Checks (570.120);

-- Property Damage (569.100);

-- Fraudulent Use of Credit Device (570.130).

(3) Changing Stealing Third Offense to Stealing Fourth Offense.570.040

The SPD states there are also changes that should increase the number of attorneys we need:

(1) Creation of new felony Assault Third Degree (565.070) and a new felony Domestic Assault Third Degree (565.074).

(2) Creation of new felony Harassment First Degree (565.090).

Also, from the caseload protocol: a felony requires 14 hours, a misdemeanor requires 5 hours, an appeal requires 83 hours, a PCR requires 62 hours.

The estimate is that with these changes to stay at the level we are currently at, the SPD would need an additional 9 attorneys and the current level of support staff. SPD assumes a total need of 18.5 FTE (9.5 Assistant Public Defenders, 3 Investigators, 3 Secretaries, and 3 Legal Assistants)

RS:LR:OD

ASSUMPTION (continued)

to implement the changes in this proposal. SPD assumes a total cost of approximately \$1.20 million per year for these FTE to the General Revenue Fund.

In response to similar legislation filed this year (HB 210), officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state the bill proposes many changes to the criminal statutes, of which the most significant is the extension of the felony classes from four to five. The change is accomplished by creating a new felony class C with an overlapping sentence range. The current Class C and Class D felonies are renamed D and E.

Proposed authorized felony cases:

Current Class	Range	Proposed Class	Range
Class A	10-30 years, or life	Class A	10-30 years, or life
Class B	5-15 years	Class B	5-15 years
Class C	1 day - 7 years	Class C	3-10 years
Class D	1 day - 4 years	Class D	1 day - 7 years
		Class E	1 day - 4 years

Below are the two statutes that will result in a projection of additional costs during the first three years of the bill. Many of the other statute changes impact the assessment, but these two account for much of the initial increased costs and then the changeover to projected savings beyond three years.

Drug Offenses:

The most significant likely reduction in the institutional population is from the proposed changes to the drug statutes, most drug offenses are reduced by one felony class. The exception is Drug Possession, which will become a class D offense (old class C and unchanged). In last year's bill, HB1897, the proposed new class was E. Drug distribution/manufacturing will become a new class C from a B with a maximum sentence of 10 years, compared to 15 years at present. Drug trafficking offenses will generally be reduced by one felony class (from A to B or from B to the new C). In addition, the no parole restrictions will be removed when amounts of the controlled substances are over specified limits. The no parole restrictions currently require such offenders to serve to conditional release. The estimate is that the incarcerated drug population will be reduced by 497.

Assault:

The most likely short-term increase in the institutional population is from the proposed changes to the assault statutes. The legislation proposes four levels of assault and the creation of a special victim category to incorporate the offense of assault of a law enforcement officer. Most of the changes are not expected to impact sentencing severity but, because intoxication related offenses

ASSUMPTION (continued)

are included in the special victim category, the felony class for assault 2nd degree, intoxication is increased from Class C (new Class D) to a Class B. The new Assault 4th degree will make misdemeanor assault a new Class E offense (old class D). Based upon sentencing practice for assault 2nd degree it is estimated that 28% of assault 4th degree convictions will receive a prison sentence. This will add 130 new admissions with an average sentence of 3.5 years. Impact of assault changes is an increase in the population of 318. The extensive re-writing of the assault legislation could result in other changes that have not been identified.

Timing of the Impact:

Because of the complexity of the legislation it is difficult to estimate a time frame for when the changes will occur. Most of the identified changes occur from a change in existing legislation and so the changes will occur over time as offenders are either released earlier or later than under current legislation.

Projected Impact on the prison population:

Although the DOC has made some preliminary projections on the impact of this bill below, the actual impact is dependent on the implementation of the statute changes by the Courts and the prosecutors.

2014	0
2015	147
2016	55
2017	(237)
2018	(237)
2019	(237)
2020	(237)
2021	(197)
2022	(157)
2023	(117)

In general, the proposed changes that will reduce the prison population have shorter sentences and time served than those changes that will increase the prison population. The impact of the legislation will, therefore, change over time. The initial impact in the first few years may be an increase because of the admission of offenders who would have been sentenced to a misdemeanor assault. The population will then decline because of the earlier release of offenders sentenced to drug or stealing offenses.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

There will be a long-term negative impact due to changes in the statutes for consecutive sentences for sex offenses such as Forcible Rape, Forcible Sodomy, Statutory Rape 1st degree Statutory Sodomy 1st degree. The legislation will mandate consecutive sentences for the listed offenses and allows courts to sentence concurrently for other offenses. The current law allows courts the discretion to sentence consecutively for the listed offenses and mandates that other sentences should be concurrent. The change could result in more offenses being served consecutively. The impact of mandating consecutive sentences for the listed sex offenses is to increase the population significantly, but the majority of the impact will not take effect until beyond the 10-year scope of this bill.

For the range of years reflected in the fiscal note, DOC assumes an unknown cost to the General Revenue Fund for fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

In response to similar legislation filed this year (HB 210), officials from the **Department of Transportation (MoDOT)** state they believe the bill makes revisions to Repeat DWI offenders. The bill removes 577.023 and instead rewrites it in 577.010 but the language differs from what was in 577.023 because it leaves out the days of community service and only refers to the hours of community service, and therefore undoes the legislative fix that was enacted in 2011 to comply with federal law requiring a prior or persistent offender to perform a specified amount of community service along with completing a DWI court-ordered or other court-ordered treatment program. This would result in a transfer of \$19.5 million from the road fund to safety funds.

Oversight will range the fiscal impact of the proposal from \$0 (legislation would not impact Missouri's compliance with federal code) to the \$19.5 million penalty as stated by MoDOT.

In response to similar legislation filed this year (HB 210), officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** state the provisions of Section 302.304.13, RSMo, allow for the expiration of the \$20 reinstatement fee after two years from the effective date of any suspension or revocation imposed under chapter 302.

By moving suspensions and revocations from chapter 577 to chapter 302, the \$20 reinstatement fee may expire resulting in a substantial loss in revenue. The impact will be as follows:

- Chemical refusal revocations moved from Section 577.041, RSMo, to section 302.574, RSMo:

Based on a sweep of the Missouri Driver License System (MODL), there are currently 86,233 active revocations that will no longer require the \$20 reinstatement fee as of August 28, 2013. This will result in a potential loss of \$1,724,660 (86,233 X \$20).

ASSUMPTION (continued)

- Abuse and lose suspensions and revocations moved from Section 577.510, RSMo, to Section 302.410, RSMo:
Based on a sweep of MODL, there are currently 4,529 active suspensions and revocations that will no longer require the \$20 reinstatement fee as of August 28, 2013. This will result in a potential loss of \$90,580 (4,529 X \$20).
- Ignition interlock revocations moved from Section 577.614, RSMo, to Section 302.462, RSMo:
Based on a sweep of MODL, there are currently 224 active revocations that will no longer require the \$20 reinstatement fee as of August 28, 2013. This will result in a potential loss of \$4,480 (224 X \$20).

The provisions of Section 302.541, RSMo, allow for the collection of a \$25 reinstatement fee for alcohol related suspensions and revocations imposed under Sections 302.505, 577.010, 577.012, 577.041, and 577.510, RSMo. Section 302.541, RSMo, was not revised to include the updated sections which will result in a substantial loss in revenue. The impact will be as follows:

- Chemical refusal revocations moved from Section 577.041, RSMo, to Section 302.574, RSMo:
Based on a sweep of the Missouri Driver License System (MODL), there are currently 100,082 active revocations that will no longer require the \$25 reinstatement fee as of August 28, 2013. This will result in a loss of \$2,502,050 (100,082 X \$25).
- Abuse and lose suspensions and revocations moved from Section 577.510, RSMo, to Section 302.410, RSMo:
Based on a sweep of MODL, there are currently 5,435 active suspensions and revocations that will no longer require the \$25 reinstatement fee as of August 28, 2013. This will result in a loss of \$135,875 (5,435 X \$25).

FY14

\$1,724,660 Loss of \$20 reinstatement fees for section 302.574 pursuant to 302.304.13.
+ \$90,580 Loss of \$20 reinstatement fees for section 302.410 pursuant to 302.304.13.
+ \$4,480 Loss of \$20 reinstatement fees for section 302.462 pursuant to 302.304.13.
+ \$2,637,925 Loss of \$25 reinstatement fees for sections 302.571 and 302.410 pursuant to 302.541.
\$4,457,645 Total loss in reinstatement fees upon implementation.

Assuming the number of suspensions and revocations would remain the same in subsequent fiscal years, based on FY12 statistics there were 912 suspensions and revocations pursuant to Section 577.510, RSMo, and 10,208 revocations pursuant to Section 577.041, RSMo, added to

RS:LR:OD

ASSUMPTION (continued)

MODL. Without changes to Section 302.541, RSMo, the \$25 alcohol fees will be lost as follows:

FY15 and FY16

11,120 # of suspensions and revocations added in FY12.

X \$25 Alcohol fee.

\$278,000 Revenue lost from the alcohol fee annually.

Assuming the number of suspensions and revocations would remain the same in subsequent fiscal years, based on FY12 statistics there were 912 suspensions and revocations pursuant to Section 577.510, RSMo; 10,208 revocations pursuant to Section 577.041, RSMo; and 68 revocations pursuant to Section 577.614, RSMo were added to MODL. Based on Section 302.304.13, RSMo, the \$20 reinstatement fees will be lost as follows:

FY15 and FY16

11,188 # of suspensions and revocations added in FY12.

X \$20 Reinstatement fee .

\$223,760 Revenue lost from the reinstatement fee each year.

Total Fiscal Impact for the new sections; 302.410, 302.462, and 302.574, RSMo, are as follows:

FY14 =	\$4,457,645
75% Highway Fund =	\$3,343,234
15% Municipalities =	\$668,647
10% Counties =	\$445,764

FY15 and FY16 =	\$501,760
75% Highway Fund =	\$376,320
15% Municipalities =	\$75,264
10% Counties =	\$50,176

Section 577.012.1(2) - Added to this section is 'operates a commercial motor vehicle while having four one-hundredths of a percent or more by weight of alcohol in his or her blood'. This is now an offense of driving with excessive blood alcohol content, whereas in Section 302.780, RSMo, this was a separate offense. This could potentially place the Missouri CDL program out of compliance with federal regulations as this is no longer a separate offense as required in 49 CFR 383.51.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Missouri federal-aid highway funds are subject to withholding if a state is found to be substantially in noncompliance. The first year of noncompliance the sanction is four (4) percent for a potential loss of \$32,000,000, the second and subsequent years the sanction is up to eight (8) percent for a potential loss of \$64,000,000.

The department is unable to determine what effect, if any, this entire proposal will have on Missouri's eligibility to obtain federal grant money relating to alcohol impaired driving in the reauthorization bill known as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act ("MAP-21").

DOR also assumes administrative costs (programming, letters, envelopes, postage, updating procedures, etc.) of approximately \$130,000 in FY 2014 to implement the proposal.

In response to similar legislation filed this year (HB 210), officials from the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** state this proposal removes Section 577.073.2, RSMo, which specified that no person was permitted to use park facilities, buildings, trails, roads or other state park property for commercial use except by written permission or concession contract with the department. This section also allows commercial and non-commercial organizations, without written permission or oversight of the department, the normal and customary use of roads and trails for the purpose of transporting persons, vehicles or canoes.

Under Section 253.080, RSMo, DNR is authorized to award by contract the right to operate public services within the parks and historic sites under the department's control, through a concessionaire contract. These contracts give concessionaires the exclusive rights to operate watercraft rentals, marinas, restaurants, lodging and other services within the state parks as authorized in the contract.

Allowing other organizations to do business on park property without the permission would remove our ability to maintain contracts which we have entered into with concessionaires that gave them exclusive rights to provide business services in Missouri's State Parks and Historic Sites and would jeopardize those concessionaire's ability to continue to operate and subject the department to unwanted legal action.

The Division of State Parks (DSP) receives revenue generated by these concessionaire contracts and parks where we have our own store and rental operations. Allowing other organizations to utilize state parks would take away revenue received by the department through the use of the concession contracts.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** state there is no anticipated state cost to the foundation formula associated with this proposal. To the extent fine revenues exceed 2004-2005 collections, any increase in this money distributed to school districts increases the deduction in the foundation formula the following year. Therefore, the affected districts will see an equal decrease in the amount of funding received through the formula the following year unless the affected districts are hold-harmless, in which case the districts will not see a decrease in the amount of funding received through the formula (any increase in fine money distributed to the hold-harmless districts will simply be additional money). An increase in the deduction (all other factors remaining constant) reduces the cost to the state of funding the formula.

Oversight assumes any increase or decrease in fine or penalty revenues generated cannot be determined. Therefore, the fiscal note does not reflect any fine or penalty revenues for the local school districts.

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health (DMH)** state their agency would be affected significantly by language relating to two areas of concern - matters relating to sexual offenses and the Substance Abuse Traffic Offender Program (SATOP). DMH assumes the proposal would not appear to create a fiscal impact to their agency. Nothing in the proposal appears to place any additional requirements or obligations upon DMH that would result in a fiscal impact.

Possible reductions in fees charged in the SATOP program are not considered as a loss of revenue because they merely pay for services provided.

Officials from the **Attorney General's Office** assume that any potential costs arising from this proposal could be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** state many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, we also recognize that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what our office can sustain with our core budget. Therefore, we reserve the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** state this proposal is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact to their agency beyond its current appropriation.

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services, Department of Agriculture, Department of Economic Development, Missouri Ethics Commission, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Missouri Gaming Commission, Office of the State Auditor, Administrative Hearing Commission, Missouri Department of Conservation, Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Social Services** and the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
GENERAL REVENUE			
<u>Costs</u> - Office of the State Courts Administrator - to update the JIS system	(Less than \$100,000)	\$0	\$0
<u>Costs</u> - Department of Corrections Increase incarceration/probation costs from changes within the proposal	\$0	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Costs</u> - Department of Revenue Administrative costs to make changes required from the proposal	(\$129,295)	\$0	\$0
<u>Costs</u> - Office of the State Public Defender			
Personal Service (18 FTE)	(\$590,850)	(\$716,110)	(\$723,271)
Fringe Benefits	(\$299,827)	(\$363,390)	(\$367,024)
Expense and Equipment	(\$168,391)	(\$117,158)	(\$120,086)
<u>Total Costs - SPD</u>	<u>(\$1,059,068)</u>	<u>(\$1,196,658)</u>	<u>(\$1,210,381)</u>
FTE Change - SPD	18 FTE	18 FTE	18 FTE
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>(\$1,059,068)</u>	(\$1,196,658) to <u>(Unknown)</u>	(\$1,210,381) to <u>(Unknown)</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change for the SPD	18 FTE	18 FTE	18 FTE

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2016
(continued) (10 Mo.)

CRIMINAL RECORDS

Costs - Missouri Highway Patrol

Personal Service (2 FTE)	(\$54,840)	(\$66,466)	(\$67,131)
Fringe Benefits	(\$44,026)	(\$53,359)	(\$53,893)
Expense and Equipment	(\$8,215)	(\$1,333)	(\$1,365)
Consultant Fees	(\$177,000)	\$0	\$0
MorphoTrack Modifications	<u>(\$30,000)</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<u>Total Costs - MHP</u>	<u>(\$314,081)</u>	<u>(\$121,158)</u>	<u>(\$122,389)</u>
FTE Change - MHP	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE
CRIMINAL RECORDS FUND**

(\$314,081) (\$121,158) (\$122,389)

Estimated Net FTE Change for the
Missouri Highway Patrol

2 FTE 2 FTE 2 FTE

HIGHWAY FUNDS

Loss - DOR - reinstatement fees (\$3,343,234) (\$376,320) (\$376,320)

Loss - MoDOT - some Federal funding \$0 or \$0 or \$0 or
would have to spent on Highway Safety if (\$19,500,000) (\$19,500,000) (\$19,500,000)
Missouri becomes non-compliant again

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO **(\$3,343,234) or** **(\$376,320) or** **(\$376,320) or**
HIGHWAY FUNDS* **(\$22,843,234)** **(\$19,876,320)** **(\$19,876,320)**

* This does not reflect the potential loss of federal-aid highway funds of \$32 million in FY 2014 and \$64 million in FYs 2015 and 2016 if Missouri is found to be substantially in noncompliance with federal BAC laws.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
(continued)	(10 Mo.)		

HIGHWAY SAFETY FUND

<u>Savings</u> - MoDOT - some Federal funding would have to be spent on Highway Safety if Missouri becomes non-compliant again	\$0 or <u>\$19,500,000</u>	\$0 or <u>\$19,500,000</u>	\$0 or <u>\$19,500,000</u>
--	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE HIGHWAY SAFETY FUND	\$0 or <u>\$19,500,000</u>	\$0 or <u>\$19,500,000</u>	\$0 or <u>\$19,500,000</u>
--	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
	(10 Mo.)		

CITIES AND COUNTIES

<u>Loss</u> - Cities - reinstatement fees	(\$668,647)	(\$75,264)	(\$75,264)
---	-------------	------------	------------

<u>Loss</u> - Counties - reinstatement fees	(\$445,764)	(\$50,176)	(\$50,176)
---	-------------	------------	------------

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO CITIES AND COUNTIES	(\$1,114,411)	(\$125,440)	(\$125,440)
--	----------------------	--------------------	--------------------

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This bill changes the laws regarding the criminal code.

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 the State Courts Administrator
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Public Defender
Department of Corrections
Attorney General's Office
Department of Social Services
Department of Revenue
Office of the State Auditor
Department of Economic Development
Department of Public Safety
Department of Transportation
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Missouri Ethics Commission
Department of Health and Senior Services
Administrative Hearing Commission
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration
Department of Mental Health
Office of the Secretary of State
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Missouri Gaming Commission
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Department of Agriculture
Department of Natural Resources
Missouri Department of Conservation



Ross Strope

L.R. No. 1290-01
Bill No. SB 253
Page 17 of 17
March 8, 2013

Acting Director
March 8, 2013

RS:LR:OD