Fiscal Estimate - 2019 Session

☑ Original ☐ Updated	Corrected	Supplemental
LRB Number 19-5085/1	Introduction Num	ber SB-687
Description throwing or expelling a bodily substance at a public s	olic safety worker or prosecutor	
Fiscal Effect		
Appropriations Reve	ease Existing absorb	se Costs - May be possible to within agency's budget Yes No ase Costs
Permissive Mandatory Perm	ase Revenue issive Mandatory ease Revenue issive Mandatory Co	of Local Government ffected wns
Fund Sources Affected GPR FED PRO PRS		h. 20 Appropriations
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature	Date
CTS/ Nancy Rottier (608) 267-9733	Nancy Rottier (608) 267-973	3 2/10/2020

Fiscal Estimate Narratives CTS 2/10/2020

LRB Number 19-5085/1	Introduction Number SB-687	Estimate Type	Original	
Description				
throwing or expelling a bodily substance at a public safety worker or prosecutor				

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

This bill expands the categories of persons who may be ordered to undergo testing for communicable diseases if there is probable cause to believe that there was potential for transmitting a communicable disease to the victim of a crime. This bill allows a court to require such testing for any criminal defendant who throws or expels blood, semen, vomit, saliva, urine, feces, or other bodily substances at or toward a public safety worker or a prosecutor.

Based on court records, it is estimated that about 250 persons are charged each year with a violation of s. 941.375(2), Wis. Stats., the statutory violation that is being added by this bill. Under the terms of the bill, any person charged with this crime would be allowed a hearing before the court could order testing by a health care professional.

Additional court proceedings could be generated under the terms of this bill, but it is impossible to predict whether every case would require the hearing provided by s. 968.38(5). Additional proceedings require additional judge, court reporter, court staff and juror time. These costs are borne by both the state and the county. It is expected that existing court staff would be able to absorb any additional costs.

The bill does not specify who is responsible for paying the cost of testing, if it is ordered under s. 968.38(5), but it does appear the court has the authority to tax those costs against the defendant, pursuant to s. 973.06(1)(h).

Long-Range Fiscal Implications