

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR **Fiscal Note**

Fiscal Note On: SB **252** SLS 14RS 297

Bill Text Version: **ENGROSSED**

Opp. Chamb. Action: Proposed Amd.:

2:50 PM **Date:** March 21, 2014

Sub. Bill For .: **Author: NEVERS**

Dept./Agy.: 22nd Judicial District Court

Analyst: Ryne Young

Subject: Presentence Investigation Assessment

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

EG +\$50,000 LF EX See Note

Page 1 of 1

Provides relative to the 22nd Judicial District Court's presentencing investigation assessment policy. (8/1/14)

Purpose of Bill: This bill clarifies existing law regarding the 22nd Judicial District Court's risk and needs assessment tool that is to be used when determining sentences. This bill also changes the mandated usage of this assessment to an optional usage of the tool. In addition, the bill provides changes in the administration of the assessment, including requiring that the assessment be administered after adjudication but prior to sentencing.

EXPENDITURES	2014-15	<u>2015-16</u>	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	5 -YEAR TOTAL
State Gen. Fd.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ded./Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Funds	<u>\$50,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>
Annual Total	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50,000
REVENUES	<u>2014-15</u>	<u>2015-16</u>	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	5 -YEAR TOTAL
State Gen. Fd.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ded./Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Funds	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Annual Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

EXPENDITURE EXPLANATION

This bill may increase local governmental expenditures by approximately \$50,000 for fiscal 2014-15.

An official with the 22nd Judicial District Court indicated that Court expenditures may increase by \$50,000 for fiscal year 2014-15 for startup costs (e.g., employee training costs) related to this assessment program.

Officials with the 22nd Judicial District Public Defender and District Attorney Offices indicated that the bill would not impact the expenditures of their respective offices as any additional workload resulting from this bill would be conducted by existing staff.

REVENUE EXPLANATION

There is no anticipated direct material effect on governmental revenues as a result of this bill.

<u>Senate</u>	<u>Dual Referral Rules</u>	<u>House</u>	6.8(F)(1) >= \$100,000 SGF Fiscal Cost {H & S}	A Side of the second	
13.5.1 >	= \$100,000 Annual Fiscal Cost {S	5&H}	$6.8(F)(2) >= $500,000 \text{ State Rev. Reduc. } \{H \& S\}$		2
13.5.2 >	= \$500,000 Annual Tax or Fee		6.8(G) >= \$500,000 Tax or Fee Increase	Joy Irwin	
_	Change {S&H}		or a Not Eco Docrosco (S)	Director of Advisory Services	