1999 Session FISCAL ESTIMATE			LRB Number -3528/1					
DOA-2048 N(R06/99) CORRECTED	Bill Number AB 465	Bill Number						
Subject	Amendment No. if	Amendment No. if Applicable						
Criminal Code Reclassification	Administrative Rul	Administrative Rule Number						
Fiscal Effect								
State: No State Fiscal Effect Check columns below only if bill makes a direct appropriation or affects a sum sufficient appropriation. Increase Existing Appropriation Increase Decrease Existing Appropriation Decrease Create New Appropriation	 Increase Costs - May be possible to Absorb Within Agency's Budget ☐ Yes ※☐ No ☐ Decrease Costs 							
Local: ☐ No local government costs 1. ☐ Increase Costs 3. ☐ Increa	ise Revenues	5. Types of Local Governmental Units Affected:						
1	rmissive	☐ Towns ☐ Villages ☐ Cities						
	ase Revenues rmissive		WTCS Districts					
☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory ☐ Permissive ☐ Permission ☐ Permissive ☐ Permissive ☐ Permissive ☐ Permissive ☐ Permission ☐ Permissive ☐ Permissive ☐ Permissive ☐ Permissive ☐ Permission ☐ Permissive ☐ Per	Affected C	hapter 20 Appropriations						
☑ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG	□ SEG-S 20.68	0(2)(a)						
Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate This bill implements the rec								
Penalties Study Committee which was created by 1997 Wisconsin Act 283. It reclassifies all felony offenses and some misdemeanor offenses, creates a sentencing commission to study sentencing practices and sunsets on 12/31/2004 and requires the commission to adopt advisory sentencing guidelines for use by judges for felonies committed on or after 12/31/99. It is expected that the Director of State Courts office will incur additional costs in assisting with the development of the advisory sentencing guidelines required under this bill. The Criminal Penalties Study Committee, in preparing its report, requested from the Office of Court Operations detailed information and analysis to compile two of the 11 crimes they established sentencing guidelines for. The analysis required two weeks of staff time. It is anticipated that the committee or the commission will also request similar information and analysis to compile guidelines on the remaining 484 crimes. Court Operations estimates that a project position will be needed for three years to comply with those requests. It is								
expected that such a position would cost: Long-Range Fiscal Implications								
See Narrative								
Prepared by: Sheryl Gervasi	Telephone No. 266-69	Sta	ency rector of ate Courts					
Authorized Signature: Shery Deman	Telephone No.	Dat	^{te} 9/22/99					

Salary	\$40,000
Fringes	12,700
Supplies	1,200
Total	\$53,900
One-time Costs	3,000

To complete the other nine guidelines the committee requested additional data from the Circuit Court Automation Program (CCAP). Based on the amount of additional contract programmer time that was needed it is estimated that a contract programmer would be needed for one year to finish guidelines for the remaining crimes. The cost would be approximately \$135,200 (\$65/hr.).

It should also be noted that the report assumes that three non-CCAP counties will be reporting data to CCAP so that statewide data will be available. Those three counties are Outagamie, Portage and Walworth. Their information systems would have to be changed to comply with the new reporting requirements. It is expected that this would take two to three weeks of county staff time at \$50/hr. to complete the changes.

It should be noted that with respect to the circuit courts the sentencing form that must be filled out by the court at the disposition of the case is longer than the previous form that was used several years ago. It is presumed for purposes of this fiscal note that most of the data required on the form would be supplied by the presentence investigators.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

In light of the fact that the Criminal Penalties Study Committee states that CCAP for many years will be the primary source of sentencing information for the courts and that the sentencing commission reports should have a different substantive theme each year it is expected that additional demands will be made on CCAP that are not included in this estimate. These requests could include such things as graphic output reports on data relating to sentence lengths, by geographical area, race or crime class and information on plead and proved penalty enhancers. Although it is impossible to predict the specifics of what additional resources CCAP will need until the new sentencing commission is functional, it is anticipated that CCAP will not be able to provide it with additional reports or data

while operating from its current funding and staffing base. Nor is it possible to estimate how long it will take or what additional resources will be required to link with other criminal justice informational systems that would facilitate such things as a common defendant identification number. Such a linkage is several years in the future.

FISC	AL ESTIMATE W	ORKSHEET							1999	Session
Deta	ailed Estimate of Annua -2047 (R06/99)					LRB Number 3528/1			endment No. if	
		ORIGINAL · CORRECTED	☐ UPDATED☐ SUPPLEMENTA	AL	-	Bill Number AB 465		Adn	ministrative Rul	e Number
Sub	pject									
	Criminal Co	ode Reclassi	fication						<u> </u>	
I.	One-time Costs o	r Revenue Im	pacts for State and/	or Local G	overn	ment (do not inc	lude in	annua	lized fiscal	effect):
						ITY - \$12,000 - \$				
II.	STATE - \$13 Annualized Costs	38,200 GPR s:			Annualized Fiscal impact on State funds from:					
······································					li li	ncreased Costs		Decreas	sed Costs	
A.	State Costs by Ca State Operation	aτegory ons - Salaries a	and Fringes		s	52,700	\$	-		
	(FTE Position					(1 FTE)		(-	FTE)	<u> </u>
		ons - Other Cos	sts			1,200		-		
	Local Assistan							_		
	Aids to Individ	duals or Organi	izations					_		
	TOTAL S	itate Costs by C	Category		\$	53,900	\$	-		
В.	State Costs by So	ource of Fund	S		l,	ncreased Costs		Decreas	sed Costs	
	GPR				\$	53,900	\$	_		
	FED							-		-
	PRO/PRS									
	SEG/SEG-S								19-11	
	State Revenues		only when proposal will inc revenues (e.g., tax increasense fee. etc.)			Increased Rev.		Decre	ased Rev.	
	GPR Taxes	UCOI COSC III III I	1150 100, 010.,	 	\$		\$			
	GPR Earned	·	-					•		 ·
	FED			- 1			-			<u>.</u>
	PRO/PRS				-			-		
	SEG/SEG-S									<u></u>
	TOTAL S	State Revenues	;	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$		\$	-		_
			NET ANNUAL	IZED FISC STATE	AL IM	PACT		LOCAL	=	
NET	CHANGE IN COST	S	\$		+ 5	<u>3,900</u> \$				
NET	CHANGE IN REVE	NUES	\$			\$				
Pre	epared by: Sheryl Gervasi			Telephone 608	e No. 8-266-	6984			State Co	ector of ourts
Aut	thorized Signature:	e Sen	uen	Telephone	e No.				Date 9/22	2/99