

SESSION OF 2015

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON HOUSE BILL NO. 2050

As Recommended by House Committee on
Corrections and Juvenile Justice

Brief*

HB 2050 would allow a court to continue or modify conditions of release for or impose a 120- or 180-day prison sanction on an offender who absconds from supervision, without having to first impose a 2- or 3-day jail sanction.

Background

The 2013 Legislature enacted HB 2170, which represented the recommendations of the Justice Reinvestment Working Group and included, among other provisions, various intermediate sanctions for violations of the conditions of release on probation, community corrections supervision, suspended sentence, or nonprison sanction. These intermediate sanctions are structured to become increasingly severe.

HB 2050 was introduced by the House Committee on Corrections and Juvenile Justice at the request of the Kansas Sentencing Commission. In the House Committee, the executive director of the Sentencing Commission testified in support of the bill, stating it would provide courts with greater flexibility in imposing intermediate sanctions on offenders who abscond from supervision. There was no other testimony.

According to the fiscal note prepared by the Division of the Budget on the bill, the Sentencing Commission indicates

*Supplemental notes are prepared by the Legislative Research Department and do not express legislative intent. The supplemental note and fiscal note for this bill may be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.kslegislature.org>

there would be an effect on prison admissions and bed space, but no data exist to make estimates.

If the bill creates the need for additional prison beds, there would be a fiscal effect for the Department of Corrections. As of January 12, 2015, available prison bed capacity is 9,636. Based upon the Sentencing Commission's most recent ten-year projection, the year-end population will exceed available male capacity by 85 inmates in FY 2015, 109 inmates in FY 2016, and 162 inmates in FY 2017.

The Office of Judicial Administration indicates the bill would have no fiscal effect on the Judicial Branch. Any fiscal effect of the bill is not reflected in *The FY 2016 Governor's Budget Report*.