

### Fiscal Estimate - 2005 Session

Original     
  Updated     
  Corrected     
  Supplemental

<b>LRB Number</b> <b>05-0338/1</b>	<b>Introduction Number</b> <b>AB-699</b>	
<b>Subject</b> Juvenile correctional facility changes		
<b>Fiscal Effect</b>		
<b>State:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> No State Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Create New Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs		
<b>Local:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> No Local Government Costs <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs      4. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Revenue <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Counties <input type="checkbox"/> Others <input type="checkbox"/> School Districts <input type="checkbox"/> WTCS Districts		
<b>Fund Sources Affected</b> <b>Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEGS            410(1)(ac), (3)(hm), (3)(cd), (1)(e), (3)(e), (3)(cg)		
<b>Agency/Prepared By</b> DOC/ Dawn Woeshnick (608) 240-5417	<b>Authorized Signature</b> Robert Margolies (608) 240-5056	<b>Date</b> 11/9/2005

## Fiscal Estimate Narratives

DOC 11/9/2005

LRB Number	05-0338/1	Introduction Number	AB-699	Estimate Type	Original
<b>Subject</b>					
Juvenile correctional facility changes					

### Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

This bill requires the Department of Corrections(DOC) to establish medium security correctional institutions on the grounds of Lincoln Hills School (LHS), Ethan Allen School (EAS), and Southern Oaks Girls School (SOGS) to house inmates under the age of 21. These institutions would be staffed in a manner similar to how the existing juvenile correctional institutions (JCI) are staffed. This bill would also authorize the DOC to set daily rates for short and long-term placements in JCIs by rule instead of by statute. DOC would be required to increase Youth Aids funding if daily rates were increased.

This bill and Federal regulations require adults and juveniles to be separated physically, and by sight and sound if they are housed within the same institution. The bill also requires that the average daily population (ADP) for LHS and EAS must be equal. The existing institution configurations at LHS and EAS do not provide adequate sight/sound separation. Fencing would need to be constructed at both institutions in order to provide the necessary separation, and 8 trailers would need to be purchased to provide adequate classroom space at each of the facilities. It is anticipated construction of fencing and the purchase and installation of trailers will take a minimum of one year to accomplish. The SOGS Annex, which does not currently house any girls, could be converted to a medium security institution with minimal construction and the purchase of 1 trailer for classroom space.

Approximately 1,200 male inmates under the age of 21 are currently housed in various prisons throughout the state, of which approximately 600 are medium security. Approximately \$1,203,700 and 21.00 FTE would be needed to staff a housing unit in a male JCI that could hold 50 inmates. For purposes of this fiscal estimate, it is assumed that 100 male inmates (2 housing units) would be added to each male JCI. The number of females under the age of 21 housed in adult prisons has varied over the past year from 24 to 50, of which an estimated 40% are at the medium security classification. For purposes of this fiscal estimate, approximately \$1,036,200 and 17.50 FTE would be needed to staff a portion of the housing areas in the SOGS Annex to hold up to 25 inmates. In addition, variable costs such as utilities, clothing, food, etc. are estimated to be \$2,267,700 annually for the increased populations at the three institutions. Finally, the population increases at each institution would require additional staff be added to the business office, security, grounds/maintenance, food service, health care, and treatment (mental health/AODA/sex offenders). It is believed that in addition to the staffing needed for the housing units, a minimum of 71.51 other positions at a cost of approximately \$3,899,800 would be necessary for the increased population.

If inmates were added to the JCIs, some operational costs currently associated with operating the institutions should be charged to a GPR appropriation that pays for adults instead of to counties and to the state serious juvenile offender (SJO) appropriation. These costs would include: administration, health care, business office, informational system charges, and fuel/utilities. If these operational costs were shared proportionally to the number of inmates and juveniles housed at each institution approximately \$1,282,000 could be charged to the adults. This would result in a reduction in the juvenile daily rate, resulting in reduced costs for counties and for the state's SJO appropriation.

The annual cost to operate 3 medium security institutions at the JCIs would be at least \$13,300,500 or \$59,100 per inmate. An additional \$3,328,200 for one-time costs, construction of the fencing, and purchase of the 9 trailers for classrooms would also be necessary. The cost to house inmates in JCIs would be partially offset by decreased costs in adult facilities. To the extent that there is contract bed funding available, moving inmates to JCIs would reduce the need for this funding. However, given current population projections, it is unlikely that there will be any contract bed funding available by the time that this bill could be implemented. As a result, it is

likely the only cost savings that will be seen in the adult facilities would be for food, health, and other expenses for 225 fewer inmates (approximately \$1,000,000). Any additional savings generated would be dependent on how the decrease in inmate population at the adult facilities is implemented, but it will be minimal given the small number of inmates that would be moving from adult prisons to JCI's.

Funding for these institutions would be provided by a newly created appropriation s.20.410(1)(ac), youthful offender facilities. The funds would be transferred to appropriation s.20.410(3)(hm), juvenile correctional services to pay for the services in a juvenile institution. Both of these appropriations would need to be increased under this bill. In the short-term, the daily rate should go down because some of the operational costs currently charged to counties would be shared with the adult inmates.

The bill also would change the way the daily rate for juveniles is established. The bill authorizes DOC to set rates by rule rather than statute, and the bill also permits DOC to set a short-term and long-term rate for these services. Neither of these changes should have much impact on counties since they would still be expected to pay the costs associated with the care of juveniles in juvenile correctional institutions. The bill requires DOC to increase the amount of Youth Aids funding allocated to counties if DOC increases the daily rate, but it does not provide a mechanism to receive additional GPR funds to support this rate increase. If DOC allocates new Youth Aids funds that matched a daily rate increase, at the current budgeted ADP of 660 a \$1.00 increase in the daily rate would result in a need for additional Youth Aids funding of \$240,900 per year.

**ONGOING COSTS:**

.Housing Units.....	\$5,851,000
..EAS.....100 inmates.....	70.33 FTE
..LHS.....100 inmates.....	69.93 FTE
..SOGS.....25 inmates.....	32.75 FTE
.Additional Staffing.....	\$3,899,800
.Variable and Other Costs.....	\$2,267,700
.Allocation of DJC Costs to GPR.....	\$1,282,000
<b>TOTAL:.....</b>	<b>\$13,300,500</b>

**ONE-TIME COSTS:.....\$3,328,200**

**Long-Range Fiscal Implications**

Construction would be required in order to provide sight/sound separation between the juveniles and adults. Bonding would be required for the projects and repaid through debt service. In addition, operational costs for the additional staff needed would be on-going. DOC would also need to be provided the funds to increase Youth Aids each time there was an increase to the JCI daily rate.