

**LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD**  
**Austin, Texas**

**FISCAL NOTE, 84TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION**

**April 1, 2015**

**TO:** Honorable John Whitmire, Chair, Senate Committee on Criminal Justice

**FROM:** Ursula Parks, Director, Legislative Budget Board

**IN RE: SB393** by Burton (relating to the punishment for certain offenses against property or against public administration.), **Committee Report 1st House, Substituted**

The probable fiscal impact of implementing the bill is expected to be positive but it is indeterminate due to the unavailability of reliable data or information related to the exact amount of pecuniary loss for certain offenses against property or public administration. Depending upon the number of convictions that could be affected by the shifting punishment categories, there could also be an indeterminate revenue impact to the state.

The bill would amend the various codes as they relate to the punishment for certain offenses against property or public administration. Under the provisions of the bill, the pecuniary loss amounts aligned with certain punishment ranges would be increased. The bill would also expand the punishment range for fraudulent transfer of a motor vehicle to include additional felony punishments. Increasing the amount of pecuniary loss aligned with certain punishment ranges is expected to result in decreased demands upon the correctional resources of counties or of the state due to shorter terms of probation or shorter terms of confinement. The bill may have a positive fiscal impact by decreasing the number of people under felony community supervision or incarcerated within state correctional institutions. Whether the bill would result in a significant amount of savings to the state is indeterminate due to a lack of statewide data on the exact amount of pecuniary loss for those convicted of certain offenses against property or public administration. Expanding the punishment range for fraudulent transfer of a motor vehicle to include additional felony punishments is expected to result in increased demands upon the correctional resources of counties or of the state due to longer terms of probation or longer terms of confinement. This analysis assumes this provision of the bill would not significantly impact state correctional agencies. Depending upon the number of convictions that could be affected by the shifting punishment categories, there could also be an indeterminate revenue impact to the state.

**Local Government Impact**

Changes in costs relating to enforcement, prosecution, and confinement could likely be absorbed within existing resources. Changes in revenue from fines imposed and collected is not anticipated to have a significant fiscal impact.

**Source Agencies:** 304 Comptroller of Public Accounts

**LBB Staff:** UP, KJo, LM, ESi, KVe