

Department of Planning and Budget 2004 Fiscal Impact Statement

1. Bill Number HB1430

House of Origin ☐ Introduced ☐ Substitute ☐ Engrossed
Second House ☒ In Committee ☐ Substitute ☐ Enrolled

2. Patron Kilgore**3. Committee** Courts of Justice**4. Title** Drug Treatment Court Act; created, report.

5. Summary/Purpose: Establishes statewide and local administrative oversight bodies for drug treatment courts.

6. Fiscal Impact Estimates are: Preliminary**6a. Expenditure Impact:**

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Positions</i>	<i>Fund</i>
2004-05	219,252	2	General Fund
2005-06	219,252	2	General Fund
2006-07	219,252	2	General Fund
2007-08	219,252	2	General Fund
2008-09	219,252	2	General Fund
2009-10	219,252	2	General Fund

7. Budget amendment necessary: Yes, Item 25.

8. Fiscal implications: According to the Supreme Court, the Drug Court Treatment Advisory Committee established by this legislation would require approximately \$14,514 for meeting and meeting related costs. In addition, two positions, one program manager and one administrative assistant would be necessary to insure the administrative oversight in the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court as outlined in this legislation. Personal services costs associated with these positions are approximately \$119,333. An additional \$27,485 will be required for a contract worker providing training and evaluation services. To provide training to the providers of administrative, case management and treatment services as outlined in this legislation will require an additional \$5,000.

This legislation also calls for the establishment of a Local Drug Treatment Court Advisory Committee for each jurisdiction or combination of jurisdictions that will continue or establish a drug treatment court. Costs associated with the meetings of such committees are estimated to be \$52,920 annually.

9. Specific agency or political subdivisions affected: Court System

10. Technical amendment necessary: Yes. On line 40 eliminate one of the references to the Department of Criminal Justice Services.

11. Other comments: There was a statement made on the House floor that this legislation had no fiscal impact. The Supreme Court has reevaluated the legislation and stands by the original estimates as stated above. This bill is similar to SB 636

Date: 02/20/04 / tmb

Document: f:\tmb\leg04\hb1430.doc