## Fiscal Estimate - 2015 Session

☑ Original ☐ Updated	Corrected	Supplementa	ıl		
LRB Number <b>15-1177/3</b>	Introduction Num	ber <b>AB-0290</b>			
Description Imposing residence restrictions on certain sex offenders, establishing conditions of release from civil commitment for certain sex offenders, and providing a criminal penalty					
Fiscal Effect					
Appropriations Reve	rease Existing to abenues	ease Costs - May be po bsorb within agency's b Yes rease Costs			
Permissive Mandatory Perm 2. Decrease Costs 4. Decr	ease Revenue  hissive Mandatory ease Revenue  hissive Mandatory	s of Local rnment Units ted owns Village Counties Others chool WTCS bistricts	Cities		
Fund Sources Affected  Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations  GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS					
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature	Date	<b>—</b>		
SPD/ Anna Oehler (608) 267-0311	Adam Plotkin (608) 264-8572 8/7/2015		2015		

## Fiscal Estimate Narratives SPD 8/7/2015

LRB Number 15-1177/3	Introduction Number	AB-0290	Estimate Type	Original	
Description					
Imposing residence restrictions on certain sex offenders, establishing conditions of release from civil					
commitment for certain sex offenders, and providing a criminal penalty					

## Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

The State Public Defender (SPD) is statutorily authorized and required to appoint attorneys to represent indigent defendants in criminal and certain commitment proceedings. The SPD plays a critical role in ensuring that the Wisconsin justice system complies with the right to counsel provided by both the state and federal constitutions. Any legislation has the potential to increase SPD costs if it creates a new criminal offense, expands the definition of an existing criminal offense, or increases the penalties for an existing offense.

This bill establishes residency restrictions for persons who have committed certain sex offenses. Under this bill, a high-risk sex offender who intentionally violates a restriction on his or her residency is guilty of a Class H felony and may be fined up to \$10,000 or sentenced to a term of imprisonment of up to six years, or both. This bill prohibits a city, village or town from enacting or enforcing an ordinance or resolution that affects the residence of any registered sex offender.

It is possible that given the new criminal charges, the SPD will see an increase in the number of cases in which it provides representation. We are unable, however, to quantify the number of cases that might occur due to the provisions in the bill and how many people would meet the eligibility requirements for SPD services. The SPD's average cost to provide representation with a private bar attorney in a felony case was \$551.02 in fiscal year 2014. Because of the annual caseloads for staff attorney positions specified for budgeting purposes under § 977.08(5), Stats., it would be more cost effective to add staff attorney positions if a significant number of SPD cases resulted from this provision of the bill.

It is also possible that there will be a slight decrease in the total number of cases related to supervised release and discharge under Ch. 980 if a standard statewide residency system creates consistency in being able to access supervised release or discharge from commitment.

Because probation or prison could be ordered upon conviction for the proposed crime, this change could indirectly lead to additional cases in which the Department of Corrections (DOC) would seek to revoke probation or extended supervision. The SPD provides representation in proceedings commenced by the Department of Corrections (DOC) to revoke supervision. Thus, the bill could indirectly increase the number of cases in which the SPD appoints attorneys in revocation proceedings. The average cost during fiscal year 2014 for SPD representation by a private bar attorney in a revocation proceeding was \$294.04.

This bill could also have a fiscal impact on counties. There are some defendants who, despite exceeding the SPD's statutory financial guidelines, are constitutionally eligible for appointment of counsel because it would be a substantial hardship for them to retain an attorney. The court is required to appoint counsel at county expense for these defendants. The counties could also incur additional costs associated with incarceration of defendants, both pending trial and after sentencing.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications