

## **Fiscal Impact Statement for Proposed Legislation**

## Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

# Senate Bill No. 219 (Patron – Petersen)

**LD#:** <u>14100385</u> **Date:** <u>12/23/2013</u>

**Topic:** Establishment of the Virginia Legislative Ethics Commission

#### **Fiscal Impact Summary:**

• State Adult Correctional Facilities: None (\$0)

- Local Adult Correctional Facilities: None (\$0)
- Adult Community Corrections Programs: None (\$0)
- Juvenile Correctional Centers: None (\$0)
- Juvenile Detention Facilities: None (\$0)

### **Summary of Proposed Legislation:**

The proposed legislation amends several sections of the *Code of Virginia* to create the Virginia Legislative Ethics Commission. This Commission would replace the current separate House and Senate Ethics Advisory Panels. The bill authorizes the seven-member Commission to review legislators' Statements of Economic Interests and receive and act on complaints that a legislator has violated the General Assembly Conflict of Interests Act.

Currently, under § 30-123, any legislator who knowingly violates a provision of the General Assembly Conflict of Interests Act (§§ 30-102 through 30-111) is guilty of a Class 1 misdemeanor. In addition, the disclosure form for General Assembly members contains an Affirmation that the information is full, true, and correct, which under current law must be notarized. Any person willfully swearing to a false statement on a notarized document can be prosecuted for perjury, which is punishable as a Class 5 felony under § 18.2-434.

#### **Analysis:**

1 III GI

According to General District Court Case Management System (CMS)<sup>1</sup> data for fiscal year (FY) 2012 and FY2013, no individuals were convicted of a misdemeanor under § 30-123 for violating the General Assembly Conflict of Interests Act.

Sentencing Guidelines data for FY2012 and FY2013 indicate that 50 offenders were convicted of a Class 6 felony for perjury under § 18.2-434 (in these cases, perjury was the primary, or most serious, offense at sentencing). More than half (54%) of these offenders did not receive an active term of incarceration to serve after sentencing. Approximately one-third (30%) of the offenders were given a local-responsible (jail) term, for which the median sentence was three months. The remaining 16% received a state-responsible (prison) term with a median sentence of 1.8 years. Data do not contain

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Formerly referred to as the Court Automated Information System (CAIS).

sufficient detail to identify the number of perjury cases involving notarized documents or a Statement of Economic Interests.

#### **Impact of Proposed Legislation:**

**State adult correctional facilities.** Because it does not expand the applicability of any felony penalties, the proposed legislation is not expected to increase the future state-responsible (prison) bed space needs of the Commonwealth.

**Local adult correctional facilities.** The proposal does not expand the applicability of any felony or misdemeanor penalties; therefore, it is unlikely to affect local-responsible (jail) bed space needs.

**Adult community corrections programs.** The proposal is not expected to have an impact on community corrections resources.

Virginia's sentencing guidelines. No adjustment to the guidelines would be necessary under the proposal.

**Juvenile correctional centers.** According to the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), the proposal will not increase juvenile correctional center (JCC) bed space needs.

**Juvenile detention facilities.** The Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) reports that the proposal will not increase the bed space needs of juvenile detention facilities.

Pursuant to § 30-19.1:4, the estimated amount of the necessary appropriation is \$0 for periods of imprisonment in state adult correctional facilities and is \$0 for periods of commitment to the custody of the Department of Juvenile Justice.

disclose23\_0385