## COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

### **FISCAL NOTE**

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 3194-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 878

**Subject**: Agriculture and Animals: Disabilities

<u>Type</u>: Original

Date: January 15, 2002

# **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS						
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005			
General Revenue	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)			
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)			

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005		
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0		

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005		
<b>Local Government</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0		

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

#### FISCAL ANALYSIS

#### **ASSUMPTION**

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assume they cannot 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 (FY 01 average of \$35.78 per inmate per day, or an annual cost of \$13,060) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY 01 average of \$3.34 per offender per day, or an annual cost of \$1,219 per offender).

The DOC is unable to determine the number of additional inmate beds that may be required as a consequence of passage of this proposal. Estimated construction cost for one new medium to maximum security inmate bed is \$55,000. Utilizing this per-bed cost provides for a conservative estimate by the DOC, as facility start-up costs are not included and entire facilities and/or housing units would have to be constructed to cover the cost of housing new commitments resulting from the cumulative effect of various new legislation, if adopted as statute.

In summary, supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration would result in additional unknown costs to the department. Eight (8) persons would have to be incarcerated per fiscal year to exceed \$100,000 annually. Due to the narrow scope of this new crime, the DOC assumes the impact would be less than \$100,000 per year.

For the purpose of this proposal, the **Office of the State Public Defender** has assumed that existing staff could provide representation for those few cases where indigent persons were charged with new crimes against service animals. However, passage of more than one bill increasing penalties for existing crimes or creating new crimes might require the State Public Defender System to request increased appropriations to cover the cumulative cost of representing affected indigents.

Officials of the Office of Administration - Division of Personnel, the Department of Transportation - Division of Resource Management, the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, the Department of Conservation, and the Office of Prosecution Services stated that the proposal would not cause their agencies or local governments to need significant new resources.

L.R. No. 3194-01 Bill No. SB 878 Page 3 of 5 January 15, 2002

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2003 (10 Mo.)	FY 2004	FY 2005
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	,		
<u>Cost</u> - Department of Corrections			
Incarceration/Probation	(Less than	(Less than	(Less than
	\$100,000)	\$100,000)	\$100,000)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>\$100,000)</u>	<u>\$100,000)</u>	<u>\$100,000)</u>

#### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

#### DESCRIPTION

This bill would prohibit discrimination based on use of a service animal in housing, employment, transportation, or public accommodations; requires motor vehicles to yield to service animals and their users; prohibits persons from harassing, interfering with, or assaulting service animals or their users; prohibit disguising or kidnaping service animals; and, hold owners of service animals responsible for controlling their animals and liable for actual damages caused by the animals.

The proposal contains penalty clauses.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space. This legislation would not affect Total State Revenue.

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Corrections
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Transportation
Missouri Department of Conservation

GVB:LR:OD (12/00)

L.R. No. 3194-01 Bill No. SB 878 Page 4 of 5 January 15, 2002

Office of Administration

L.R. No. 3194-01 Bill No. SB 878 Page 5 of 5 January 15, 2002

# SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Public Defender

Mickey Wilson, CPA Acting Director January 30, 2002