

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0766-02
Bill No.: HB 252
Subject: Courts; Crimes and Punishment; Judges
Type: Original
Date: April 15, 2003

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
General Revenue	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
None			
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other 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 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
None			
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety – Missouri State Highway Patrol** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on their agency.

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 State Public Defender** assume existing staff could provide representation for those few cases arising where indigent persons were charged with the redefined crime of tampering with a judicial officer. The definition has been redefined to include juvenile officers, drug court and family court commissioners. Passage of more than one bill increasing penalties on existing crimes or creating new crimes would require the State Public Defender System to request increased appropriations to cover the cumulative cost of representing indigent persons accused in the now more serious cases or in the new additional cases.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

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 (FY02 average of \$35.52 per inmate per day, or an annual cost of \$12,965 per inmate) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY02 average of \$3.10 per offender per day, or an annual cost of \$1,132 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, it is assumed the impact would be less than \$100,000 per year for the DOC.

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services** did not respond to Oversight's request for fiscal impact. However, in response to a similar proposal, officials assumed prosecutors could absorb the costs of the proposed legislation within existing resources.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2004 (10 Mo.)	FY 2005	FY 2006
GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
<u>Costs – Department of Corrections Incarceration/Probation costs</u>	<u>Less than (\$100,000)</u>	<u>Less than (\$100,000)</u>	<u>Less than (\$100,000)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>Less than (\$100,000)</u>	<u>Less than (\$100,000)</u>	<u>Less than (\$100,000)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2004 (10 Mo.)	FY 2005	FY 2006
	<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

The proposal would expand the crime of tampering with a judicial officer to add family court commissioners, drug court commissioners, and juvenile court officers to the definition of “judicial officers.”


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 Public Safety
– Missouri State Highway Patrol
Office of State Public Defender

NOT RESPONDING

Office of Prosecution Services



L.R. No. 0766-02
Bill No. HB 252
Page 5 of 5
April 15, 2003

Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
April 15, 2003

BLG:LR:OD (12/02)