Fiscal Note State of Alaska Bill Version: **SB 64** 2014 Legislative Session Fiscal Note Number: () Publish Date: Identifier: SB064CS(JUD)-ACS-TRC-02-17-14 Department: Alaska Court System Title: OMNIBUS CRIME/CORRECTIONS BILL Appropriation: Alaska Court System Sponsor: JUDICIARY Allocation: **Trial Courts** Requester: Senate Finance OMB Component Number: 768 **Expenditures/Revenues** Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below. (Thousands of Dollars) Included in FY2015 Governor's FY2015 Appropriation **Out-Year Cost Estimates** Requested Request **OPERATING EXPENDITURES** FY 2015 FY 2015 FY 2016 **FY 2017** FY 2018 FY 2019 FY 2020 Personal Services Travel Services Commodities Capital Outlay **Grants & Benefits** Miscellaneous 0.0 0.0 **Total Operating** 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Fund Source (Operating Only) None **Total** 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 **Positions** Full-time Part-time Temporary Change in Revenues Estimated SUPPLEMENTAL (FY2014) cost: (separate supplemental appropriation required) (discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section) Estimated CAPITAL (FY2015) cost: (separate capital appropriation required) (discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section) **ASSOCIATED REGULATIONS** Does the bill direct, or will the bill result in, regulation changes adopted by your agency? No If yes, by what date are the regulations to be adopted, amended or repealed? Why this fiscal note differs from previous version:

Initial version.

Prepared By:Nancy Meade, General CounselPhone:(907)463-4736Division:Alaska Court SystemDate:02/17/2014 04:00 PMApproved By:Nancy Meade for Christine Johnson, Administrative DirectorDate:02/17/14

Agency: Alaska Court System

Printed 2/17/2014 Page 1

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA 2014 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CSSB064(JUD)

Analysis

The CS for Senate Bill 64(JUD) would make numerous changes to Alaska's criminal and corrections statutes. The changes are not expected to have a fiscal impact on the Alaska Court System. which submits this zero fiscal note.

Sections 1-3 expand the definitions of the crime of custodial interference and the defenses available for charges of that crime. The number of cases that this will impact is expected to be small; the changes will not have any fiscal impact on the court system.

Sections 4-19 amend the definitions for the various theft/property crimes to raise the dollar threshold amount; Section 12 also clarifies how prior theft convictions will be counted. The increases in dollar amounts that have the potential to impact the court system are those that raise from \$500 to \$750 the value of property that must be stolen or damaged before a property crime is categorized as a felony. This will have the effect of recharacterizing thefts of property that is valued between \$500 and \$749, which is a Class C felony under current law, into a Class A misdemeanor instead.

These changes will impact the court if they result in a significant number of cases moving from the superior court, where felonies are handled and the relative cost per case is higher, to the district court, where misdemeanors are handled and the cost per case is lower. However, a review of available information shows that, because of the way cases in this category are prosecuted and processed, the majority of property crimes impacted by this bill are already resolved in the district court, or are dismissed or resolved early in the life of the case. Because of this, this bill will not have a measurable fiscal impact on the court system.

Section 20-22 allow a judicial officer to impose an additional specific condition on defendants who are released on bail if they are charged with serious crimes that are alcohol or drug-related, crimes involving domestic violence, drug crimes, or crimes of driving under the influence or refusal to take a chemical breath test. The condition would require the defendant to comply with a program established by the Department of Corrections (Section 26, new AS 33.05.020(g)) for daily testing of the person for alcohol or substance abuse (sometimes referred to as a "24/7 program"). Similarly, Section 24 allows a new condition of probation that would require the defendant to comply with the DOC's 24/7 testing program. Imposing this as a bail condition or condition of probation for appropriate defendants would not have a fiscal impact on the court system.

Section 23 of CSSB 64 clarifies the test for determining whether certain treatment programs qualify for credit against a sentence of imprisonment. The courts can apply the revised test without fiscal impact.

Under Section 26, DOC will establish not only the 24/7 program, but also a program for probationers to be more closely monitored and to be reported to the court within one business day if they violate the terms of their probation (referred to as a "PACE program"). This is expected to result in a higher number of court hearings on petitions to revoke probation. The court is unable to predict the number of increased court hearings that will result from this change, but anticipates that it can absorb the increase without a fiscal impact.

Sections 27-30 concern parole conditions, required risk assessments for prisoners, and a grant program administered by the Department of Corrections. These will not have a fiscal impact on the court system.

Section 31 creates a new Criminal Justice Commission to research Alaska's existing laws and policies relating to sentencing and other criminal justice issues, and to draft an annual report to the legislature. The Chief Justice or designee, a superior court judge, and a district court judge would serve on the Commission, which would be staffed by the Alaska Judicial Council (Sections 25 and 31). The court system would not have a fiscal impact from participating on the Commission.

(Revised 8/16/2013 OMB) Page 2 of 2