

Fiscal Estimate - 2007 Session

Original Updated Corrected Supplemental

LRB Number 07-2891/2	Introduction Number AB-0856
Description Requiring consultation with a child in determining and reviewing his or her permanency plan; requiring agencies, in making reasonable efforts to place a child for adoption, with a guardian, with a relative, or in some other alternative permanent placement, to include efforts to place the child outside this state; requiring juvenile courts to take certain actions to expedite the interstate placement of children; requiring juvenile courts to give a child's out-of-home care provider the right to be heard in proceedings involving the child; requiring health care providers to report cases of infants with controlled substances in their bodily fluids to the agency responsible for investigating suspected child abuse or neglect; authorizing circuit court commissioners to conduct permanency plan reviews and hearings; providing that a juvenile court order is required to change the placement of a child, regardless of whether a hearing is held on the change in placement; requiring a juvenile court order placing a child in the care and placement responsibility of an agency whenever a child is placed outside the home; and eliminating permanency plan determination hearings when a consent decree maintains a child's placement outside the home	
Fiscal Effect State: <input type="checkbox"/> No State Fiscal Effect <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Create New Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs	
Local: <input type="checkbox"/> No Local Government Costs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Revenue <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Revenue <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory 5. Types of Local Government Units Affected <input type="checkbox"/> Towns <input type="checkbox"/> Village <input type="checkbox"/> Cities <input type="checkbox"/> Counties <input type="checkbox"/> Others <input type="checkbox"/> School Districts <input type="checkbox"/> WTCS Districts	
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEGS	
Agency/Prepared By DOC/ Dawn Woeshnick (608) 240-5417	Authorized Signature Robert Margolies (608) 240-5056
Date 2/29/2008	

Fiscal Estimate Narratives

DOC 2/29/2008

LRB Number	07-2891/2	Introduction Number	AB-0856	Estimate Type	Original
Description Requiring consultation with a child in determining and reviewing his or her permanency plan; requiring agencies, in making reasonable efforts to place a child for adoption, with a guardian, with a relative, or in some other alternative permanent placement, to include efforts to place the child outside this state; requiring juvenile courts to take certain actions to expedite the interstate placement of children; requiring juvenile courts to give a child's out-of-home care provider the right to be heard in proceedings involving the child; requiring health care providers to report cases of infants with controlled substances in their bodily fluids to the agency responsible for investigating suspected child abuse or neglect; authorizing circuit court commissioners to conduct permanency plan reviews and hearings; providing that a juvenile court order is required to change the placement of a child, regardless of whether a hearing is held on the change in placement; requiring a juvenile court order placing a child in the care and placement responsibility of an agency whenever a child is placed outside the home; and eliminating permanency plan determination hearings when a consent decree maintains a child's placement outside the home					

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

This bill requires an agency preparing a permanency plan for a child to include a statement as to whether the child's age and developmental level are sufficient for the child to be consulted when determining their placement. In addition, this bill requires that any permanency plan whose goal is to place a child for adoption, with a guardian, with a relative, or in some other alternative permanent placement include a statement as to whether that placement could be outside the state.

As part of preparation of a permanency plan for any child who would be impacted by this bill, county social workers/case managers and Department of Corrections (DOC) social workers would need to perform an assessment and write a statement as to whether the child is capable of being consulted by the courts during a hearing or a review of their permanency plan. In addition, information would need to be collected so that a statement could be written as to whether it may be in the best interests of the child to place him/her out of state.

Gathering additional information and conducting additional interviews, in order to complete permanency plans, would result in increased workloads for county social workers/case managers and DOC social workers. It is not possible to determine the amount of additional workload there would be if this bill passed since preparation of each child's permanency plan would require a different amount of time. Therefore, it is not possible to determine if the increased workload would require counties or DOC to hire additional staff to handle the additional assessments, or if they would be able to absorb the caseloads with the staff they currently have.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications