Fiscal Estimate - 2011 Session

X	Original		Updated		Corrected		Supple	emental
LRB	Number	11-1589/1		Introd	luction Nu	mber S	SB-071	
Creatir	Description Creating a microstamping requirement for certain handguns, certification of compliance with the microstamping requirement, requiring the exercise of rule-making authority, and providing penalties							
Fiscal	Effect							
	No State Fisc ndeterminate Increase E Appropriat Decrease Appropriat Create Ne	e Existing tions Existing	Rever Decre Rever	ase Existing	to	crease Costs absorb withi Yes ecrease Cos	in agency	e possible 's budget \to No
	Indeterminate 1. Increase Increase Increase Increase Increase	e Costs sive 🔯 Mandato se Costs	3. ☐Increa	ase Revenue	Gov datory	pes of Local vernment Ur Towns Counties School Districts	nits Affect Village Others WTCS Distric	e 🛛 Cities
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations								
GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS								
Agend	y/Prepared i	Ву	1	Authorized S	Signature			Date
DOT/ Zachary Wyatt (608) 266-0403 Ste				tephanie LaSage (608) 267-3703				5/2/2011

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOT 5/2/2011

LRB Number 11-1589/1	Introduction Number SB-071	Estimate Type Original						
Description								
Creating a microstamping requirement for certain handguns, certification of compliance with the microstamping requirement, requiring the exercise of rule-making authority, and providing penalties								

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Beginning January 1, 2013, this bill prohibits the manufacture of semiautomatic handguns that do not produce a microstamp on each expended cartridge. The bill also prohibits the transfer (sale) of semiautomatic handguns manufactured on or after January 1, 2013 that do not produce a microstamp.

State Patrol:

State Patrol has approximately 600 semiautomatic handguns in service. The statutory change proposed by this bill would become relevant at such time that the State Patrol replaced its service handguns with new handguns subject to this law. There are no precise numbers for the cost of modifying a handgun to produce a microstamp. The technology owner cites a cost as low as \$0.50 per handgun, and as high as \$10 per handgun, depending on the volume of handguns to be modified.

For our purposes, we will assume the highest cost quoted by the technology owner: \$10 per handgun. Were State Patrol to replace its 600 service handguns at once, compliance with this law would cost State Patrol \$6,000 beyond the base cost of the handguns. However, the cost must ultimately be deemed indeterminate because there are no fixed costs associated with the technology. Furthermore, it is possible that State Patrol could offset the cost of this required modification by selecting a less expensive handgun in the first instance.

Local law enforcement:

It is unknown how many semiautomatic handguns are in service throughout the state. It can be assumed that local law enforcement agencies will incur as much as a \$10 increase in the cost of purchasing new handguns, if this law is in effect. As with State Patrol, this cost is indeterminate, and could well be offset depending on the handgun selected for modification.

Unlike State Patrol, local law enforcement agencies would also be impacted by the investigatory requirements of the proposed law. It is unknown how many resources are currently expended on conducting the ballistics analysis that microstamping is designed to obviate. In all but the largest municipalities, that work is typically handled by the State Crime Lab. For agencies that do conduct their own ballistics analysis, there would be an expected cost savings as a result of the microstamping requirement, as the technology is meant to streamline the process of handgun tracing.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

None.

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2011 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

X	Original		Updated		Corrected		Supplemental		
LRB	Number	11-1589/	' 1	Intro	duction Nu	mber	SB-071		
Creatin	Description Creating a microstamping requirement for certain handguns, certification of compliance with the microstamping requirement, requiring the exercise of rule-making authority, and providing penalties								
annua	I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):								
Assuming the highest cost quoted by the technology owner (\$10 per handgun), compliance with this law would cost State Patrol an additional \$6,000 each time it replaced its 600 semiautomatic handguns. This is, of course, not a true one-time cost, but it does not occur annually either.									
II. Anr	nualized Cos	ts:			Annualized F	iscal Imp	pact on funds from:		
					Increased Cos	sts	Decreased Costs		
	te Costs by								
Stat	e Operations	- Salaries and	d Fringes			\$	\$		
(FT	E Position Ch	anges)							
Stat	e Operations	- Other Costs	3						
Loca	al Assistance								
Aids	to Individual	s or Organiza	tions						
<u> </u>	OTAL State	Costs by Cat	egory			\$	\$		
B. Sta	te Costs by	Source of Fu	ınds						
GPF	3								
FEC)								
PRO	D/PRS								
SEG/SEG-S									
III. State Revenues - Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, ets.)									
					Increased R	ev	Decreased Rev		
GPF	GPR Taxes			\$		\$			
GPF	R Earned								
FEC)								
PRO	D/PRS								
SEC	S/SEG-S								
TOTAL State Revenues					\$	\$			
NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT									
					<u>Sta</u>	<u>ite</u>	Local		
NET CHANGE IN COSTS					\$	\$			
NET CHANGE IN REVENUE					\$	\$			
Agency/Prepared By Auth					thorized Signature Date				
DOT/ Zachary Wyatt (608) 266-0403 Ste					ephanie LaSage (608) 267-3703 5/2/20				