COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.:0859-01Bill No.:HB 228Subject:Elections; Political Parties; Secretary of StateType:OriginalDate:March 12, 2009

Bill Summary: This proposal changes the laws regarding petition circulators.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	£0.	£0.	¢0.	
Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

L.R. No. 0859-01 Bill No. HB 228 Page 2 of 5 March 12, 2009

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	

□ 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 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	

L.R. No. 0859-01 Bill No. HB 228 Page 3 of 5 March 12, 2009

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator**, **Office of the Secretary of State** and the **Office of Prosecution Services** assume that there is no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **Office of the Attorney General** assume that any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** stated that they could not predict the number of new commitments which could result from the creation of the offense(s) outlined in the proposal. An increase in commitments would depend on the utilization of prosecutors and the actual sentences imposed by the courts. If additional persons were sentenced to the custody of the DOC due to the provisions of this legislation, the DOC would incur a corresponding increase in operational costs either through incarceration (FY 2008 average \$15.64 per inmate, per day or an annual cost of \$5,709) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY 2008 average \$2.47 per offender, per day or an annual cost of \$902). 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.
- 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 it is assumed the impact would be \$0 or a minimal amount that could be absorbed within existing resources.

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials at the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** cannot assume that existing staff will provide competent, effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with petition or election crimes which would be new misdemeanors.

Passage of bills increasing penalties on existing crimes, or creating new crimes, requires the State Public Defender System to further extend resources. While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this

JH:LR:OD

L.R. No. 0859-01 Bill No. HB 228 Page 4 of 5 March 12, 2009

ASSUMPTION (continued)

specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide competent and effective representation is all its cases.

Oversight assumes the SPD can absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2010 (10 Mo.)	FY 2011	FY 2012
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2010 (10 Mo.)	FY 2011	FY 2012
	<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.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no fiscal impact.

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

L.R. No. 0859-01 Bill No. HB 228 Page 5 of 5 March 12, 2009

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of the State Courts Administrator Office of the State Public Defender Office of the Secretary of State Department of Corrections Office of the Attorney General Office of Prosecution Services

Mickey Wilen

Mickey Wilson, CPA Director March 12, 2009