

Judicial Impact Fiscal Note

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Bill Number: 1885 P S HB 1885-S2_AMH_ KLIP_H2752.2 | Title: Property crimes, impacts of | Agency: 055-Admin Office of the Courts |
|---|---|--|

Part I: Estimates



No Fiscal Impact

The revenue and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Responsibility for expenditures may be subject to the provisions of RCW 43.135.060.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- ☐ If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- ☐ If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- ☐ Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Legislative Contact Yvonne Walker | Phone: 360-786-7841 | Date: 04/27/2015 |
| Agency Preparation: Kitty Hjelm | Phone: 360-704-5528 | Date: 04/28/2015 |
| Agency Approval: Ramsey Radwan | Phone: 360-357-2406 | Date: 04/28/2015 |
| OFM Review: | Phone: | Date: |

Request # 1885 H2752-1

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact on the Courts

None of the changes in this version of the bill would result in additional judicial impact.

The changes in sentencing requirements and seriousness levels would not result in additional workload for the courts .

Section 14(3)(g) would reduce the number of superior court judges serving on the sentencing guideline commission from four to two . This version of the bill would also remove the chief justice of the supreme court or the chief justice's designee as a new ex officio member of the sentencing guidelines commission.

2SHB 1885 judicial impact compared to SHB 1885 judicial impact:

2SHB 1885 no longer includes the requirement for Administrative Office for the Courts to establish a pretrial grant program . This new version of the bill would not have any judicial impact.

SHB 1885 would have:

- amended the Property Offense Sentencing Grid to:
 - increased the sentencing ranges in four cells;
 - included the median/midpoint of each range; and
 - included reference to community custody supervision in each applicable cell;
- increased theft of a motor vehicle, taking a motor vehicle without permission, and possession of a stolen vehicle to a seriousness level III; and
- required that the new sentences in the bill apply to those sentences imposed on or after July 1, 2015, regardless of the date of the offense.

The changes in sentencing requirements for property offenses would not result in additional workload for the courts .

Section 17 would require Administrative Office for the Courts (instead of the Washington Justice Ccommission) to establish a pretrial grant program.

Original Bill:

This bill addresses the property crime rate in Washington.

The bill responds to the findings of the state justice reinvestment task force by:

- Changing sentencing policy to require supervision of certain people convicted of property offenses;
- Providing treatment, if needed, and programs to reduce recidivism; and
- Providing additional support to local governments and victims of property crime.

New Section 7 would add new sentencing requirements for property offenses .

Section 8 creates a table identifying the seriousness level of property offenses . The seriousness level of the property offenses included in the new table come from the current table under RCW 9.94A.515.

Using different sentencing requirements for property offenses would not result in additional workload for the courts .

Section 13 would create the Washington justice commission and would require two superior court judges to be voting members . The chief justice of the supreme court or the chief justice's designee would be required to be an ex officio member .

Serving as a voting member of the commission would be considered part of current duties of the appointed superior court judges .

II. B - Cash Receipts Impact

II. C - Expenditures

Part III: Expenditure Detail

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact