



Telephone 373-8080
Fax 373-5874

HOUSE FISCAL AGENCY

124 N. Capitol Avenue
4 – North, HOB Lansing, MI

HB4826 AS INTRODUCED

Sponsor: Rep. Scott Shackleton

Committee: HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS

Analyst(s): Jen, Kyle

Completed: 10/2/01

State Fiscal Impact

Cost: Increase
Revenues: None

Local Fiscal Impact

Cost: None
Revenues: None

House Bill 4826 would create a new act to provide for payment of a \$100,000 survivor benefit to the surviving spouse or dependents, or the estate, of a law enforcement officer (not including a State Police trooper) who dies as a direct result of a personal injury sustained in the line of duty. Certain restrictions regarding the conduct of the officer and/or the individual to whom the benefit would be paid would apply to this payment.

Based on figures from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of State Police, 26 law enforcement officers that would have been covered under the provisions of this bill (33 total officers less seven State Police troopers) were killed in the line of duty in Michigan during the period of 1990 to 1999. This translates to an average of 2.6 officers per year. On average, then, state costs would increase by \$260,000 per year under the bill. Based on the historical range of deaths per calendar year (zero to five), costs would range from \$0 to \$500,000 per year. The bill provides for the amount of the payment to be adjusted annually for the Consumer Price Index, so these costs could be expected to increase consistent with inflation over time.

The bill provides for an interim benefit of \$3,000 to be paid to the surviving spouse or dependents of a slain law enforcement officer, upon a showing of need, if it were determined that the benefit probably would be paid under the bill. This interim benefit would be deducted from any final benefit paid, and repayment would be required if a final benefit was not paid. The required repayment could be waived, however, if substantial hardship would result to the recipient. Assuming this hardship provision was implemented infrequently, the interim benefit provisions would have no substantial impact on the overall costs associated with the bill.

Finally, the bill provides that the payment of benefits would be subject to the appropriation of funds by the state.