

Senate Fiscal Agency  
P. O. Box 30036  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

**SFA**



**BILL ANALYSIS**

Telephone: (517) 373-5383  
Fax: (517) 373-1986  
TDD: (517) 373-0543

House Bills 4708 through 4715 (as passed by the House)  
House Bill 4716 (Substitute H-3 as passed by the House)  
House Bills 4718, 4719, and 4720 (as passed by the House)  
Sponsor: Representative Jennifer Faunce (House Bill 4708)  
Representative Marc Shulman (House Bill 4709)  
Representative Alan Sanborn (House Bill 4710)  
Representative Judith Scranton (House Bill 4711)  
Representative Sandra Caul (House Bill 4712)  
Representative Michael Kowall (House Bill 4713)  
Representative Andrew Richner (House Bill 4714)  
Representative Laura Baird (House Bill 4715)  
Representative Patricia Godchaux (House Bill 4716)  
Representative Gerald Van Woerkom (House Bill 4718)  
Representative Paul Wojno (House Bill 4719)  
Representative Martha Scott (House Bill 4720)

House Committee: Criminal Law and Corrections  
Senate Committee: Judiciary

Date Completed: 12-1-99

## **CONTENT**

The bills would amend various acts to modify procedures and conditions pertaining to domestic abuse and stalking personal protection orders (PPOs). The bills would do all of the following:

- Expand the scope of domestic violence PPOs.
- Revise provisions pertaining to the filing, notice, and service of both domestic violence and stalking PPOs.
- Limit stalking PPOs to situations in which there were actual allegations of stalking.
- Expand conditions under which peace officers may make a warrantless arrest in domestic violence or PPO violation situations.
- Require that health care providers or facilities report the perpetrator of a violent injury, if known, when reporting that injury to the police.
- Authorize the family division of circuit court (family court) in each county to provide a domestic violence victim advocate to assist victims of domestic violence in obtaining a PPO.
- Provide for certain information to be entered into, or removed from, as appropriate, the Law Enforcement Information Network and the Corrections Management Information System.
- Redefine "domestic violence" in the

domestic violence prevention and treatment Act, to include dating and sexual relationships, family relatives, and former relatives by marriage, as well as minor children of any of those included in the definition.

- Provide for conditions of release to be imposed when a person arrested for domestic violence was released on interim bond or recognizance.
- Prohibit schools and medical and mental health providers from releasing certain information to a person in violation of a PPO.

The bills would take effect on July 1, 2000.

House Bill 4708 would amend the Revised Judicature Act (RJA), which provides for the issuance of domestic violence and stalking PPOs. House Bill 4709 would amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. House Bill 4710 would amend Public Act 59 of 1935, which created and provides for the organization of the Michigan State Police. House Bill 4711 would amend the Michigan Penal Code. House Bill 4712 would amend the Revised Judicature Act. House Bill 4713 would amend the Michigan Penal Code. House Bill 4714 would amend the Department of Corrections law. House Bill 4715 would amend the domestic violence prevention and treatment Act. House Bill 4716 (H-3) would amend Public Act 44 of 1961, which provides for the release of misdemeanor

prisoners who give bond to the arresting officer in certain circumstances not inconsistent with public safety. House Bill 4718 would amend the Revised School Code. House Bill 4719 would amend the Mental Health Code. House Bill 4720 would amend the Public Health Code.

### **House Bill 4708**

#### Domestic Violence PPOs

Prohibited Activities/Conduct. A domestic violence PPO may restrain or enjoin a spouse, a former spouse, an individual with whom the PPO petitioner has a child in common, an individual with whom the petitioner currently has or formerly had a dating relationship, or an individual with whom the petitioner resides or has resided, from doing one or more of the following:

- Entering onto a premises.
- Assaulting, attacking, beating, molesting, or wounding a named individual.
- Threatening to kill or physically injure a named individual.
- Removing minor children from the individual having legal custody of the children, except as otherwise authorized by a custody or parenting time order issued by a court.
- Purchasing or possessing a firearm.
- Interfering with the petitioner's efforts to remove his or her children or personal property from premises that are solely owned or leased by the individual to be restrained or enjoined.
- Interfering with the petitioner at his or her place of employment or engaging in conduct that impairs the petitioner's employment relationship or environment.
- Any other specific act or conduct that imposes upon or interferes with personal liberty or that causes a reasonable apprehension of violence.

The bill would add the petitioner's place of education to the place-of-employment provision and would include the following in the list of activities that may be restrained or enjoined:

- Having access to information in records concerning a minor child of both the petitioner and the respondent that would inform the respondent about the address or telephone number of the petitioner and the petitioner's minor child or about the petitioner's employment address.
- Engaging in conduct that would constitute stalking or aggravated stalking under the Michigan Penal Code.

Filing/Notice of PPO. Under the RJA, the clerk of a

court that issues a domestic violence PPO must do both of the following immediately upon issuance of a PPO and without requiring a proof of service on the individual to be restrained or enjoined:

- File a true copy of the PPO with the law enforcement agency designated by the court in the order.
- Provide the petitioner with at least two true copies of the PPO.

The bill would add to that list all of the following:

- If the respondent were identified in the pleadings as a law enforcement officer, notify the officer's employing agency, if known, about the existence of the PPO.
- If the PPO prohibited the respondent from purchasing or possessing a firearm, notify the concealed weapon licensing board in the respondent's county of residence about the existence and contents of the PPO.
- If the respondent were identified in the pleadings as a Department of Corrections employee, notify the Department about the existence of the PPO.

Service of PPO. The RJA specifies that a domestic violence PPO must be served personally or by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested and delivery restricted to the addressee at his or her last known address, or by any other manner provided in the Michigan Court Rules.

The bill specifies that, if the person to be restrained or enjoined had not been served, a law enforcement officer or court clerk who knew that a PPO existed could, at any time, serve that person with a true copy of the order or advise him or her about the existence of the PPO, the specific conduct enjoined, the penalties for violating the order, and where an individual restrained or enjoined could obtain a copy of the PPO.

In addition, the RJA provides that, if a person restrained or enjoined by a domestic violence PPO has not been served, a law enforcement agency or officer responding to a call alleging a violation of a PPO must serve the individual with a true copy of the order or advise him or her about the existence of the PPO, the specific conduct enjoined, the penalties for violating the order, and where he or she may obtain a copy of the PPO. That law enforcement officer also must enforce the PPO and immediately enter or cause to be entered into the Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN) that the restrained or enjoined individual has actual notice of the PPO. The bill, in addition, would require that the law enforcement officer file a proof of service or proof of oral notice with the clerk of the court that

issued the PPO.

### Stalking PPOs

Issuance of a PPO. A stalking PPO enjoins or restrains a particular individual from engaging in conduct that would constitute stalking or aggravated stalking under the Michigan Penal Code (MCL 750.411h & 750.411i). The bill would prohibit relief from being granted unless the petition for a stalking PPO alleged facts that constituted stalking as defined in those two sections of the Penal Code.

Filing/Notice of PPO. Under the RJA, the clerk of a court that issues a stalking PPO must do both of the following immediately upon issuance of a PPO and without requiring a proof of service on the individual to be restrained or enjoined:

- File a true copy of the PPO with the law enforcement agency designated by the court in the order.
- Provide the petitioner with at least two true copies of the PPO.

The bill would add to that list all of the following:

- If the respondent were identified in the pleadings as a law enforcement officer, notify the officer's employing agency about the existence of the PPO.
- If the PPO prohibited the respondent from purchasing or possessing a firearm, notify the concealed weapon licensing board in the respondent's county of residence about the existence and contents of the PPO.
- If the respondent were identified in the pleadings as a Department of Corrections employee, notify the Department about the existence of the PPO.

Service of PPO. The RJA provides that, if a person restrained or enjoined by a stalking PPO has not been served, a law enforcement agency or officer responding to a call alleging a violation of a PPO must serve the individual with a true copy of the order or advise him or her about the existence of the PPO, the specific conduct enjoined, the penalties for violating the order, and where he or she may obtain a copy of the PPO. That law enforcement officer also must enforce the PPO and immediately enter or cause to be entered into the LEIN that the restrained or enjoined individual has actual notice of the PPO. The bill, in addition, would require that the law enforcement officer file a proof of service or proof of oral notice with the clerk of the court that issued the PPO.

### Motion Fees

The RJA imposes a \$20 fee when a motion is filed in

the circuit court. The bill provides that, in conjunction with an action brought under the RJA's PPO sections, a motion fee could not be collected for a motion to dismiss the petition, a motion to modify, terminate, or rescind a PPO, or a motion to show cause for a violation of a PPO.

## House Bill 4709

### Source of Information

The Code of Criminal Procedure allows a peace officer to arrest a person, without a warrant, if the officer has received positive information by written, telegraphic, teletypic, telephonic, radio, or other authoritative source that another peace officer holds a warrant for the person's arrest. The bill would add information received by electronic source to that provision, and allow arrests with information from those sources that a peace officer or a court held a warrant for the person's arrest.

### Domestic Assault

An officer may arrest a person for simple assault or aggravated assault, regardless of whether the officer has a warrant or whether the violation was committed in his or her presence, if the officer has reasonable cause to believe that the violation occurred or is occurring and that the person resides or has resided in the same household as the victim or is the victim's spouse or former spouse. The bill also would allow such an arrest if an officer received positive information that another peace officer had reasonable cause to believe that either condition existed.

### PPO Violation

An officer may arrest a person, without a warrant, and take that person into custody when the officer has reasonable cause to believe that all of the following apply:

- A domestic violence or stalking PPO has been issued.
- The individual named in the PPO "is in violation of" the order. (The bill would change this condition to "is violating or has violated" the order.)
- The PPO states on its face that a violation of its terms subjects the person to immediate arrest and penalty.

The bill also would allow such an arrest if an officer received positive information that another officer had reasonable cause to believe that those conditions applied.

In addition, a person arrested for violating a PPO must be brought before the family court within 24 hours after arrest to answer a charge of contempt for violating the PPO. In circuits in which the circuit court judge may not be present or available within 24 hours after arrest, a person arrested for a PPO violation must be taken before the district court within 24 hours and the district court must set bond and order the defendant to appear before the circuit court

for a hearing on the charge. The bill specifies that, if the district court would not be open within 24 hours after arrest, a judge or district court magistrate would have to set bond and order the defendant to appear before the circuit court for a hearing on the charge.

Under the bill, if a criminal contempt proceeding for violating a PPO were not initiated by an arrest, but were initiated as a result of a show cause order or other process or proceedings, the court would have to do both of the following:

- Notify the party who procured the PPO and his or her attorney of record and direct the party to appear at the hearing and give evidence on the contempt charge.
- Notify the prosecuting attorney of the criminal contempt proceeding.

The Code requires the prosecuting attorney to prosecute a criminal contempt proceeding initiated by the court for a PPO violation, unless the party who procured the PPO retains his or her own attorney for the criminal contempt proceeding. The bill would extend this requirement to a criminal contempt proceeding for a PPO violation initiated by a show cause hearing, and would relieve the prosecutor of the responsibility to prosecute a criminal contempt proceeding if he or she determined that the PPO was not violated or that it would not be in the interest of justice to prosecute the criminal contempt violation.

The bill would prohibit a court from rescinding a PPO, dismissing a contempt proceeding based on a PPO, or imposing any other sanction for a failure to comply with a time limit prescribed in the Code's provisions for arrest and prosecution for a violation of a PPO.

### Domestic Violence Investigation

The Code requires that, after investigating or intervening in a "domestic dispute", a peace officer provide the victim with a copy of a notice regarding the victim's legal right to obtain a PPO. The bill would refer to a "domestic violence incident" rather than a "domestic dispute". "Domestic violence incident" would mean an incident reported to a law enforcement agency involving allegations of a violation of a domestic violence PPO and/or a crime committed by an individual against his or her spouse or former spouse, an individual with whom he or she had a child in common, or an individual who currently or formerly resided in the same household.

### Violation of Condition of Release

An officer may arrest, without a warrant, and take into custody a defendant whom the officer has reasonable cause to believe is violating or has violated a condition of release imposed by a court

under the Code. The bill would extend this authority to an officer who received positive information that another peace officer had reasonable cause, and would include conditions of release imposed under Public Act 44 of 1961 (which would be amended by House Bill 4716).

#### **House Bill 4710**

Public Act 59 of 1935 authorizes officers of the Department of State Police to exercise the powers of deputy sheriffs in the execution of civil bench warrants issued by a circuit court pursuant to any domestic relations matter. The bill would add to that provision the authority to serve a domestic violence or stalking PPO or arrest a person who was violating or had violated a domestic violence or stalking PPO.

#### **House Bill 4711**

The Michigan Penal Code requires certain medical providers and facilities to report to police incidents of violent injury, and makes failure to do so a misdemeanor offense. The report must state the name and residence of the person treated, the person's whereabouts, and the character and extent of the injury. The bill would require that the report also include the cause of the injury and the identification of the perpetrator, if known.

In addition, the bill specifies that, to the extent not protected by immunity conferred by the governmental immunity Act, a person who made a report of a violent injury in good faith, as required by the Penal Code, or who cooperated in good faith in a subsequent investigation, civil proceeding, or criminal proceeding would be immune from civil or criminal liability that the person otherwise would incur by making the report or cooperating in an investigation or proceeding. A person who made a report of a violent injury or who cooperated in an investigation or proceeding would be presumed to have acted in good faith and that presumption could be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence.

The immunity granted under the bill would extend only to the actions described in the bill and would not extend to another act or omission that was negligent or that amounted to professional malpractice, or both, and that caused personal injury or death.

The bill also specifies that the physician-patient privilege created under the RJA, a health professional-patient privilege created under Article 15 of the Public Health Code, and any other health professional-patient privilege created or recognized by law would not apply to a report made under the Penal Code's requirement, would not be valid reasons for failure to comply with the reporting requirement, and would not be a defense to a misdemeanor charge filed for failure to report the violent injury.

#### **House Bill 4712**

The bill would authorize the family court in each county to provide a domestic violence victim advocate to assist victims of domestic violence in obtaining a PPO. To provide that assistance, the court could use the services of a public or private agency or organization that had a record of service to victims of domestic violence. A domestic violence victim advocate could provide all of the following assistance:

- Informing a victim of the availability of, and assisting the victim in obtaining, serving, modifying, or rescinding a PPO.
- Providing an interpreter for a case involving domestic violence that included a request for a PPO.
- Informing a victim of the availability of shelter, safety plans, counseling, other social services, and generic written materials about Michigan law.

A domestic violence victim advocate could not represent or advocate for domestic violence victims in court. The bill also specifies, however, that providing assistance as a domestic violence victim advocate would not violate the RJA's prohibition against the unauthorized practice of law.

To the extent not protected by the immunity conferred in the governmental immunity Act, a person other than a court employee who provided assistance as a domestic violence victim advocate would be presumed to be acting in good faith and would not be liable in a civil action for damages for acts or omissions in providing assistance, except for acts or omissions that amounted to gross negligence or willful and wanton misconduct.

#### **House Bill 4713**

The Michigan Penal Code provides for enhanced penalties for simple assault and aggravated assault when the victim is the offender's spouse or former spouse, an individual with whom he or she has had a child in common, or a resident or former resident of "his or her" household. The bill would change the last condition in that provision to a resident or former resident of "the same" household.

#### **House Bill 4714**

The bill provides that, if a parole order contained a condition intended to protect one or more named persons, the Department of Corrections would have to enter those provisions of the parole order into the Corrections Management Information System (CMIS), accessible by the LEIN. If the parole board revoked such a parole order, the Department would have to remove the provision of that parole order from the CMIS within three business days.

### House Bill 4715

The bill would change the domestic violence prevention and treatment Act's definition of "domestic violence", define certain other terms pertaining to that proposed definition, and replace references to the former Department of Social Services with references to the Family Independence Agency.

Currently, "domestic violence" means a violent physical attack or fear of violent physical attack perpetrated by an assailant against a victim; in which the victim is a person assaulted by or threatened by assault by his or her spouse or former spouse or an adult person or emancipated minor assaulted by an adult person of the opposite sex with whom the victim cohabitates or formerly cohabitated; and in which the victim and assailant are or were involved in a consenting, sexual relationship.

Under the bill, "domestic violence" would instead mean the occurrence of any of the following acts that was not an act of self-defense:

- Causing or attempting to cause physical or mental harm to a family or household member.
- Placing a family or household member in fear of physical or mental harm.
- Causing or attempting to cause a family or household member to engage in involuntary sexual activity by force, threat of force, or duress.
- Engaging in activity toward a family or household member that would cause a reasonable person to feel terrorized, frightened, intimidated, threatened, harassed, or molested.

"Family or household member" would include any of the following:

- A spouse or former spouse.
- An individual with whom the person currently or formerly had resided.
- An individual with whom the person currently or formerly had a dating relationship.
- An individual with whom the person currently or formerly was engaged in a sexual relationship.
- An individual to whom the person was related or had formerly been related by marriage.
- An individual with whom the person had a child in common.
- The minor child of an individual described above.

"Dating relationship" would mean frequent, intimate associations primarily characterized by the expectation of affectional involvement. Dating relationship would not include a casual relationship

or an ordinary fraternization between two individuals in a business or social context.

### House Bill 4716 (H-3)

Public Act 44 of 1961 provides that a person may not be released on an interim bond or on his or her own recognizance before being taken before a court, but must be held until he or she can be brought before a magistrate for arraignment or, if a magistrate is not available or immediate trial cannot be held within 24 hours, the person must be held for 20 hours, after which he or she may be released on interim bond or on his or her own recognizance if either of the following applies:

- The person is arrested without a warrant for simple or aggravated assault and has a child in common with the victim, resides or has resided in the same household as the victim, or is a spouse or former spouse of the victim.
- The person is arrested with a warrant for simple or aggravated assault and is a spouse or former spouse of a person who resides or has resided in the same household as the victim.

The bill would add to the second condition a person who had a child in common with the victim. The bill specifies that a person arrested under either condition could not be released on an interim bond or on his or her own recognizance but would have to be arraigned or have interim bond set by a judge or district court magistrate.

Under the bill, if a judge or district court magistrate set interim bond, the person could be released only subject to the condition that he or she not have or attempt to have contact of any kind with the victim.

If a judge or district court magistrate released a person subject to protective conditions, the judge or magistrate would have to inform the person on the record, either orally or by a writing that was personally delivered to the person, of the specific conditions imposed and that if the person violated a condition of release, he or she would be subject to arrest without a warrant and could have bond forfeited or revoked and new conditions of release imposed. Bond revocation and new conditions would be in addition to any other penalties that could be imposed if he or she were found in contempt of court.

An order or amended order of conditions of release imposed under the bill would have to state all of the following:

- The person's full name.
- The person's height, weight, race, sex, date of birth, hair color, eye color, and any other identifying information the judge or magistrate considered appropriate.
- The date the conditions would become effective.
- The date on which the order would expire.
- The conditions imposed.

The judge or district court magistrate immediately would have to direct, in writing, that a law enforcement agency within the court's jurisdiction enter an order or amended order of conditions of release into the LEIN. If the order or amended order were rescinded, the judge or magistrate immediately would have to order the law enforcement agency to remove the order or amended order from the LEIN. A law enforcement agency would have to enter or remove an order or amended order, immediately, as directed by a court under the bill.

The bill specifies that it would not limit the authority of judges or district court magistrates to impose protective or other release conditions under other applicable statutes or court rules.

#### **House Bill 4718**

The bill specifies that, if a school district, local act school district, public school academy, intermediate school district, or nonpublic school were the holder of records pertaining to a minor pupil, and if a parent of that minor pupil were prohibited by a domestic violence or stalking PPO from having access to information in records concerning the minor that would inform him or her about the minor's or other parent's address or telephone number or the other parent's employment address, and if the school district or school had received a copy of the PPO, the school district or school could not release that information to the parent who was subject to the PPO.

#### **House Bill 4719**

The bill specifies that, if a mental health professional had treated a patient who was a minor and the mental health professional were the holder of mental health records or other mental health care information pertaining to the minor, and if a parent of the minor patient were prohibited by a domestic violence or stalking PPO from having access to information in records concerning the minor that would inform the parent about the minor's or other parent's address or telephone number or the other parent's employment address, and if the mental health professional had received a copy of the PPO, the mental health professional could not release that information to the parent who was subject to the PPO unless the order expired or the mental health professional received a copy of a new or modified court order permitting access to the information.

The same prohibition would apply to a mental health facility, psychiatric hospital, or mental health center in which a minor had received health care treatment or services, that was the holder of mental health records or other mental health care information pertaining to the minor, and that had received a copy of the PPO.

A mental health professional, facility, hospital, or center that made a reasonable effort to comply with the bill's prohibition would not be civilly or criminally liable or subject to a remedy or penalty for failure to comply with it.

A holder of mental health records or other mental health care information pertaining to the minor could charge the person making the request for records a reasonable amount to redact information in the requested mental health records or information.

#### **House Bill 4720**

If a health care licensee or registrant had treated a patient who was a minor and the licensee or registrant were the holder of medical records or other health care information pertaining to the minor, and if a parent of the minor patient were prohibited by a domestic violence or stalking PPO from having access to information in records concerning the minor that would inform the parent about the minor's or other parent's address or telephone number or the other parent's employment address, and if the licensee or registrant had received a copy of the PPO, the licensee or registrant could not release that information to the parent who was subject to the PPO unless the order had expired or the licensee or registrant received a copy of a new or modified court order permitting access to the information.

The same prohibition would apply to a health facility or agency in which a minor had received health care treatment or services, that was the holder of medical

records or other health care information pertaining to the minor, and that had received a copy of the PPO.

regarding obtaining information on violent injuries.

A licensee or registrant or a health facility or agency that made a reasonable effort to comply with the bill's prohibition would not be civilly or criminally liable or subject to a remedy or penalty for failure to comply with it.

A holder of medical records or other health care information pertaining to the minor could charge the person making the request for records a reasonable amount to redact information in the requested medical records or information.

MCL 600.2529 et al. (H.B. 4708)

764.15 et al. (H.B. 4709)

28.6 (H.B. 4710)

750.411 (H.B. 4711)

600.916 et al. (H.B. 4712)

750.81 & 750.81a (H.B. 4713)

791.236 (H.B. 4714)

400.1501 (H.B. 4715)

780.582a (H.B. 4716)

Proposed MCL 380.1137a (H.B. 4718)

MCL 330.1746 et al. (H.B. 4719)

Proposed MCL 333.16290 & 333.20175a (H.B. 4720)

Legislative Analyst: P. Affholter

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

### **House Bill 4708**

The bill would have an indeterminate impact on the State and local units of government. In 1998 there were 47,808 new filings for personal protection orders. Increased enforcement costs and additional notification requirements would depend on the number of PPOs issued. The elimination of the motion fee for motions to dismiss modify, rescind, or terminate a PPO, or a motion to show cause would result in a loss of revenue to the State Court Fund and local units of government. Of the \$20 motion fee, \$10 is deposited in the State Court Fund.

### **House Bill 4709**

The bill would have an indeterminate impact on the State and local units of government. In 1998, there were 47,808 new filings for personal protection orders.

### **House Bill 4710**

The bill would have no fiscal impact on State or local government.

### **House Bill 4711**

The bill would result in administrative savings



**House Bill 4712**

The bill would have an indeterminate impact on local units of government, which would depend on the number of counties that decided to provide a domestic violence victim advocate to assist victims of domestic violence.

**House Bill 4713**

The bill would have an indeterminate fiscal impact on State and local government.

The table below shows the number and disposition of offenders convicted of various domestic violence offenses in 1997. There are no data available to determine if the change proposed in the bill would increase or decrease the number of offenders convicted of this crime.

Offenders Convicted in 1997

<u>MCL Section</u>	<u>Description*</u>	<u>Convictions</u>	<u>Prison</u>	<u>Probation</u>	<u>Jail</u>	<u>Other</u>
750.812	Domestic Violence	22	3	12	5	2
	Attempted	1	1			
750.813	2 <sup>nd</sup> Offense Domestic Violence	2		1	1	
750.814	3 <sup>rd</sup> Offense Domestic Violence	115	22	55	33	5
	Attempted	4		2	2	
750.81a3	2 <sup>nd</sup> Offense Aggravated Domestic Violence	14	1	9	4	

\*The description is for caption purposes only. For full crime detail refer to the section amended.

---

**House Bill 4714**

The bill would have an indeterminate fiscal impact on State government.

The inclusion of additional parole conditions into the Corrections Management Information System or the removal of the information upon revocation of a condition of parole would not require additional personnel. For fiscal year 1999-2000, the Legislature has appropriated 85.5 FTE positions and \$9.3 million for planning, research, and information systems in the Department of Corrections.

**House Bill 4715**

Fiscal information is not available at this time.

**House Bill 4716 (H-3)**

The bill would have an indeterminate impact on local units of government. The potential impact of reduced jail time cannot be estimated.

**House Bills 4718, 4719, and 4720**

The bills would have no fiscal impact on State or local government.

Fiscal Analyst: B. Bowerman  
B. Baker  
K. Firestone  
C. Cole  
J. Carrasco  
S. Angelotti  
M. Tyszkiewicz

S9900\4708sa

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.