

Judicial Impact Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 1885 P 2S HB 1885 S2AMH_KLIP_ H.2762_1	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: 04/28/2015
Agency Preparation: Kitty Hjelm	Phone: 360-704-5528	Date: 05/01/2015
Agency Approval: Ramsey Radwan	Phone: 360-357-2406	Date: 05/01/2015
OFM Review: Cheri Keller	Phone: 360-902-0563	Date: 05/01/2015

Request # 1885 P2SHB-1

Part II: Narrative Explanation

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

The only change between this version of the bill and version H-2752.2 of PS HB 1885, is the new seriousness levels and the new sentencing grid created for property offenses are deleted. As a result, the criminal penalties for property offenses would remain the same as in current law, however such offenders would be subject to a period of community supervision.

This would not result in any additional judicial impact.

None of the changes between version H-2752.2 of PS HB 1885 and 2SHB 1885 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 Commission) 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

Request # 1885 P2SHB-1

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