

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 4002-01
Bill No.: HB 1448
Subject: Landlords and Tenants; Real and Personal Property
Type: Original
Date: March 3, 2010

Bill Summary: The proposal creates the crime of stealing leased property.

FISCAL SUMMARY

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 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.

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 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 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
| Local Government | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office** and the – **Missouri State Highway Patrol** assume the proposal 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 **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assume the penalty provision, the component of the bill to have potential fiscal impact for DOC, is for up to a class D felony.

DOC cannot currently 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 of direct offender costs either through incarceration (FY09 average of \$16.04 per offender per day, or an annual cost of \$5,855 per inmate) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY09 average of \$3.71 per offender per day, or an annual cost of \$1,354 per offender).

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 it is assumed the impact would be \$0 or a minimal amount that could be absorbed within existing resources.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services (OPS)** assume the potential fiscal impact on county prosecuting attorneys will depend on the extent to which law enforcement agencies choose to enforce this provision and/or are able to enforce this provision. If law enforcement agencies make arrests under this provision, there may be an impact based on the additional cases that may be filed. OPS assumes this legislation would not have any significant fiscal impact on the OPS.

Oversight assumes county prosecutors could absorb any increase in cases referred to prosecutors within existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** assume increasing penalties on existing crimes, or creating new crimes, will require more SPD resources. While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional appropriations for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide competent and effective representation in all its cases. SPD assumes a minimal unknown impact.

Oversight assumes the Office of the State Public Defender (SPD) could absorb the costs of the proposed legislation within existing resources. Oversight assumes any significant increase in the workload of the SPD would be reflected in future budget requests.

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u> | FY 2011 (10 Mo.) | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
|---|---------------------|------------|------------|
| | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> |

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u> | FY 2011 (10 Mo.) | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |
|---|---------------------|------------|------------|
| | <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.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of State Courts Administrator
Department of Corrections
Department of Public Safety
 – Director's Office
 – Missouri State Highway Patrol
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Public Defender



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
March 3, 2010