OFFICE OF FISCAL ANALYSIS

Legislative Office Building, Room 5200
Hartford, CT 06106 ◇ (860) 240-0200
http://www.cga.ct.gov/ofa

sSB-509
AN ACT CONCERNING ADDRESS VERIFICATION REFORMS FOR REGISTRANTS.

AMENDMENT

LCO No.: 4618
File Copy No.: 596
Senate Calendar No.: 389

OFA Fiscal Note

State Impact:

Agency Affected	Fund-Effect	FY 27 $	FY 28 $
Judicial Dept. (Probation); Correction, Dept.	GF - Potential Savings	Minimal	Minimal
Resources of the General Fund	GF - Potential Revenue Loss	Minimal	Minimal

Note: GF=General Fund

Municipal Impact: None

Explanation

The amendment strikes the underlying bill and its associated fiscal impact, resulting in the fiscal impact described below.

The amendment creates an affirmative defense for uncontrollable circumstances leading to an offender's failure to verify their address, resulting in potential savings to the Department of Correction and the Judicial Department for decreased incarceration or probation[1] and a potential revenue loss from fines in FY 27 and FY 28 to the extent there are fewer convictions of these crimes. On average, the marginal cost to

[1] Between FY 22 and FY 25, there were a total of 4,152 offenses recorded and $10,700 in fines collected under CGS §§ 54-251 through 54-254. About 20 offenders are currently incarcerated under these statutes.

the state for incarcerating an offender for the year is $3,300[2] while the average marginal cost for supervision in the community is less than $600[3] each year for adults.

The amendment also makes other procedural changes to the address verification process which are not anticipated to result in a fiscal impact because the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection has the capacity to implement these changes at no expense.

The preceding Fiscal Impact statement is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for the purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose. In general, fiscal impacts are based upon a variety of informational sources, including the analyst's professional knowledge. Whenever applicable, agency data is consulted as part of the analysis, however final products do not necessarily reflect an assessment from any specific department.

[2] Inmate marginal cost is based on increased consumables (e.g., food, clothing, water, sewage, living supplies, etc.). This does not include a change in staffing costs or utility expenses because these expenses would only be realized if a unit or facility opened.

[3] Probation marginal cost is based on services provided by private providers and only includes costs that increase with each additional participant. This does not include a cost for additional supervision by a probation officer unless a new offense is anticipated to result in enough additional offenders to require additional probation officers.