

Fiscal Estimate - 2007 Session

- Original
 Updated
 Corrected
 Supplemental

LRB Number 07-2068/4	Introduction Number SB-476
Description	
The effect of an order denying, limiting, discontinuing, or prohibiting parental visitation with a child who is adjudged to be in need of protection or services, who is the subject of a termination of parental rights petition, or who is in sustaining care following a termination of parental rights on visitation between the child and a sibling and requiring a child's permanency plan to include a statement as to whether visitation between the child and a sibling is in the best interests of the child and sibling when parental visitation is denied, limited, discontinued, or prohibited	
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"/> Decrease Existing Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Create New Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <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	
<input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEGS	
Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations	
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature
DOC/ Dawn Woeshnick (608) 240-5417	Robert Margolies (608) 240-5056
Date	
2/26/2008	

Fiscal Estimate Narratives

DOC 2/26/2008

LRB Number	07-2068/4	Introduction Number	SB-476	Estimate Type	Original
Description The effect of an order denying, limiting, discontinuing, or prohibiting parental visitation with a child who is adjudged to be in need of protection or services, who is the subject of a termination of parental rights petition, or who is in sustaining care following a termination of parental rights on visitation between the child and a sibling and requiring a child's permanency plan to include a statement as to whether visitation between the child and a sibling is in the best interests of the child and sibling when parental visitation is denied, limited, discontinued, or prohibited					

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Under this bill, a child adjudged to be in need of protection or services or for which termination of parental rights (TPR) is being sought or has been granted shall be granted, denied, or continued visitation based on the best interests of the child and sibling, regardless of whether parental visitation is denied, limited, discontinued, or prohibited. The bill also requires an agency preparing a permanency plan for a child to include a statement as to whether visitation between the child and any sibling of the child would be in the best interests of the child and sibling when parental visitation has been denied, limited, discontinued, or prohibited by the juvenile court or when the agency recommends that parental visitation be denied, limited, discontinued, or prohibited.

As part of preparation of a permanency plan for any child who would be impacted by this bill, county social workers/case managers would need to perform an assessment (likely in the form of an interview) on the child and his/her siblings to determine if it would be in the best interest of both to have visitation. Conducting these interviews, and including additional information in the permanency plan, would result in increased workloads for the county social worker/case manager. It is not possible to determine how many children this bill would impact, or how many siblings each of those children would have that would need to be interviewed. Therefore, it is not possible to determine if the increased workload would require counties 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.

Social workers working in the Department of Correction's juvenile correctional institutions would also see an increase in their workload since they would have the same responsibilities as county social workers/case managers. As with counties, it is not possible to determine how many of these interviews would need to be conducted, and whether the additional workload could be absorbed with the staff that currently exists.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications