

Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

123rd General Assembly of Ohio

BILL: **Am. Sub. S.B. 181** DATE: **April 5, 2000**
STATUS: **As Enacted - Effective September 4, 2000** SPONSOR: **Sen. Spada**
LOCAL IMPACT STATEMENT REQUIRED: **Yes**
CONTENTS: **Makes various changes to juvenile law, including penalty enhancements for truancy**

State Fiscal Highlights

STATE FUND	FY 2001	FY 2002	FUTURE YEARS
General Revenue Fund			
Revenues	Negligible gain	Negligible gain	Negligible gain
Expenditures	Increase, potentially in the tens of thousands of dollars	Increase, potentially in the tens of thousands of dollars	Increase, potentially in the tens of thousands of dollars
Crime Victim Reparations Fund (Fund 402)			
Revenues	Negligible gain	Negligible gain	Negligible gain
Expenditures	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -

Note: The state fiscal year is July 1 through June 30. For example, FY 2001 is July 1, 2000 - June 30, 2001.

- The State Public Defender's Office could incur additional GRF expenditures, potentially in the tens of thousands of dollars due to additional delinquency cases generated by the truancy provisions of the bill.
- There will be, at most, a negligible annual gain in locally collected state court costs that are generated for the GRF and the Crime Victim Reparations Fund.



Local Fiscal Highlights

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	FY 2000*	FY 2001	FUTURE YEARS
Counties			
Revenues	Minimal gain	Minimal gain	Minimal gain
Expenditures	Increase, at most \$200,000 statewide, plus additional increases in the tens of thousands of dollars per county	Increase, at most \$400,000 statewide, plus additional increases in the tens of thousands of dollars per county	Increase, at most \$400,000 statewide, plus additional increases in the tens of thousands of dollars per county
Municipalities			
Revenues	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
Expenditures	Increase, potentially in the thousands or tens of thousands of dollars	Increase, potentially in the thousands or tens of thousands of dollars	Increase, potentially in the thousands or tens of thousands of dollars

Note: For most local governments, the fiscal year is the calendar year. The school district fiscal year is July 1 through June 30.

*Assumes effective date of 7/1/00.

- Statewide costs to juvenile courts to provide notice to schools of certain offenses are expected to be at most \$400,000 annually.
- The truancy and parental responsibility provisions of the bill will likely result in increases in expenditures, potentially in the thousands or tens of thousands of dollars per county. Under the bill, more truant juveniles would be charged delinquent than is currently the case, increasing prosecution, indigent defense, adjudication, and sanctioning costs. Parents or guardians may be found in contempt of court on an infrequent basis, increasing expenditures for prosecution, adjudication, and sanctioning in these cases.
- Counties will likely experience minimal annual gains in fine revenue from the truancy and parental responsibility provisions of the bill.
- Counties may incur minimal increases in expenditures for providing reimbursements to advisory board members for expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

Detailed Fiscal Analysis

INTRODUCTION

The fiscal picture that it depicted in this document has been created despite the limited nature of the available data and the lack of a consensus among the various stakeholders as to how the bill will operate in practice. As a result, we have had to frequently rely on differing perspectives as to the bill's fiscal effects to establish a potential range of costs, and where possible, we have made out "best" estimate as to what a particular provision of the bill might cost the state and local governments.

TRUANCY & PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

Provisions of the Bill. The bill adds several definitions to truancy law, including definitions for habitual truants and chronic truants. Under the bill, a *habitual truant* has one or more of the following series of unexcused absences: 5 or more in 1 school week, 7 or more in 1 school month; or 12 or more in 1 school year. A juvenile who is *chronically truant* has one or more of the following series of unexcused absences: 7 or more consecutive school days, or 10 or more in 1 school month, or 15 or more in 1 school year.

Under the bill, a child who appears before juvenile court on a charge of habitual truancy and who previously has been adjudicated as a habitual truant may be charged as a delinquent. A juvenile found to be chronically truant is also subject to delinquency proceedings.

The bill makes several changes in definitions of delinquent and unruly children. The bill expands the definition of delinquent children to include: (1) a juvenile who is a habitual truant, and who previously has been adjudicated an unruly child for being a habitual truant, and (2) a juvenile who is a chronic truant. The bill expands the category of unruly child to include a juvenile who is persistently truant from home, and then adds a category for a juvenile who is a habitual truant from school and who has not been previously adjudicated as an unruly child for being a habitual truant.

If a juvenile is adjudicated an unruly child for habitual truancy, the juvenile court is given a series of sanctions, which may be used in lieu of or in addition to any other unruly child dispositional order. These include:

1. Ordering the board of education in the juvenile's school district to require the juvenile to attend an alternative school in that district, if such a school exists;
2. Requiring the juvenile to attend any academic or community service program;
3. Requiring the juvenile to attend a drug or alcohol abuse counseling program;
4. Requiring that the juvenile receive appropriate medical or psychological treatment or counseling;
5. Making any other order that the court finds proper to address the truancy problem, including issuing an order requiring that the child not be absent without legitimate excuse

from school for 5 or more consecutive days, 7 or more days in a month, or 12 or more days in a year;

6. Ordering the child to participate in a “truancy prevention mediation program.”

If a juvenile is adjudicated delinquent for chronic truancy, the court is authorized to issue a court order that requires the child not be absent without legitimate excuse from school for 5 or more consecutive days, 7 or more days in a month, or 12 or more days in a year.

The bill facilitates filing of truancy charges jointly against juveniles and parents. In a case in which a juvenile is alleged to be habitually or chronically truant, and that a parent or guardian failed to cause the juvenile’s attendance, the court must order the parent or guardian to appear at the hearing.

If the court finds that the parent or guardian failed to cause the juvenile to attend school, the court must hold a separate hearing to determine what sanctions are appropriate for the parent or guardian. The parent or guardian may be sentenced to community service if: (1) the juvenile is determined to be unruly through habitual truancy, (2) the juvenile is determined to be delinquent through chronic truancy, or (3) the juvenile is determined to be a second-time habitual truant. Criminal nonsupport charges may be filed against these parents if further incidents occur.

The bill also requires parents or guardians to attend court hearings regarding delinquents, unrulies, or juvenile traffic offenders. If the parent or guardian of the juvenile fails to attend, the parent or guardian may be charged with contempt of court. Courts would be required to hold additional hearings for these offenders. The penalties for contempt of court are as follows: (1) for a first offense, a fine not to exceed \$250, and/or a definite term of imprisonment not to exceed 30 days in jail, (2) for a second offense, a fine not to exceed \$500, and/or a definite term of imprisonment not to exceed 60 days in jail, and (3) for a third or subsequent offense, a fine not to exceed \$1,000, and/or a definite term of imprisonment not to exceed 90 days in jail.

LBO believes that parents or guardians frequently attend court hearings regarding their children under current law. However, the bill may generate some additional contempt cases, especially in larger jurisdictions. However, we expect increases in expenditures to generally be minimal in most jurisdictions.

Under current law, a parent who fails to send a child to school may be required by the court to give bond in the sum of \$100, conditioned that the child will attend school as required by the compulsory school attendance statute. Violators of section 3321.38 of the Revised Code are to be fined not less than \$5 or more than \$20. The bill increases the amount of the bond to be not more than \$500, and permits a court to fine a parent up to \$500 and may order the person to perform not more than 70 hours of community service work.

Prevalence of Truancy and Fiscal Effects. The Department of Education has indicated that truancy is a reasonably widespread problem. In any given year, the Department of Education estimates that approximately 4,000 juveniles are reported to their agency as truant. Additional cases likely do occur that are not reported to the Department of Education.

However, under existing law and practice, enforcement of truancy provisions has not been widespread or especially severe. Under existing law and the provisions of the bill, the onus of reporting truancy and bringing these cases to the attention of local prosecutors is still upon school boards. In many jurisdictions, LBO believes that relatively few parents of truant children are brought to the attention of prosecutors to face fine or imprisonment penalties. The bill permits persons other than school employees to bring truant juveniles and their parents to the attention of the court. By broadening the base of individuals who could report such activity, the bill will likely result in increased numbers of juveniles being found unruly or delinquent than is currently the case.

Some jurisdictions may experience more substantial increases in expenditures stemming from the provisions of the bill. For example, in Franklin County Juvenile Court, 1,298 cases involving truant juveniles were referred to that court in FY 1998. Of these cases, there were 339 formal filings, and in excess of 700 are pending while the court is attempting to resolve these issues with the families involved before filing charges.

Under current law, the parents of these juveniles could face fines of between \$5 and \$20, or up to six months in jail or a fine of up to \$1,000 as first-degree misdemeanants. Discussions with the Franklin County Juvenile Court indicate that parents of truant juveniles are rarely charged with an offense; however, greater efforts are being made to charge these parents and bring them to court. LBO assumes that increasing the fine and bond levels up to \$500 would result in gains in county fine revenue, which LBO expects to be minimal.

LBO assumes that counties with higher caseloads would likely experience increases in expenditures associated with increased sanctioning costs for truant juveniles. However, LBO believes that school boards are generally reticent to bring charges and would prefer to work with parents for resolution, but the volume of cases reported to LBO by the Department of Education and the Franklin County Juvenile Court suggests that the bill may increase sanctioning costs in a substantial number of cases. LBO believes that truant juveniles are generally declared unruly as status offenders, and may be held in detention centers for up to 24 hours. LBO assumes that, by clarifying that this offense is a delinquency offense under the provisions of the bill, that counties may incur greater expenditures associated with sanctioning these juveniles more harshly than they otherwise may be able to do under current circumstances. LBO expects that these expenditures could extend into the thousands of dollars, depending on: caseload volume of the jurisdiction in question; willingness of schools to bring these cases to the attention of the court; and willingness of the court to seek alternative sanctions.

Additional public defender costs are likely to occur in these cases, as new criminal cases are likely to be generated. According to the 1997 Public Defender Annual Report, the average cost per juvenile case was \$347. Depending on caseload, these increases could be in the tens of thousands of dollars annually statewide. However, some of these increases are expected to be offset by the State Public Defender at a rate of up to 50 percent. The total increase in expenditures to the State Public Defender could be up to one-half of the total amount expended by counties, potentially in the tens of thousands of dollars. These expenses are expected to be incurred in the following GRF line items: 019-403 Multi-County Public Defense – State Share; 019-404 Trumbull County – State Share; and 019-501 County Reimbursement – Non-Capital Cases.

Under the bill, more populous jurisdictions may experience larger increases in net expenditures, perhaps in the thousands of dollars, associated with adjudicating and sanctioning these juveniles. LBO assumes that the per diem cost of housing a juvenile offender in a detention center to be approximately \$100 per day, and it is likely that these costs could add up quickly in many jurisdictions.

Holding Truants & Federal Funding. Currently the state receives formula grants through the Juvenile Justice Delinquency & Prevention (JJDP) Program that are specifically used for the rehabilitation of juveniles who have been charged with a status offense (an offense that would not be a criminal offense if committed by an adult, and which includes truancy). According to the Office of Criminal Justice Services, JJDP funding totaled approximately \$2.7 million in FY 1999. Of this amount, approximately \$500,000 is kept by OCJS, and \$2.2 million is passed on in the form of subgrants, some of which are awarded to local law enforcement, courts, and other entities that deal with juvenile delinquency. In order for the state to continue to receive JJDP funding, the state must be in compliance with JJDP standards, which specifically prohibit juveniles who are charged with status offenses to be placed in secure facilities.

LBO assumes that the bill complies with JJDP standards by doing the following:

- Specifying that a person taking a juvenile into custody may hold him/her for processing purposes in a place where adults are held (i.e., jail) for no more than three hours if the juvenile is alleged to be delinquent for being a chronic truant or an habitual truant who previously has been adjudicated unruly for being a habitual truant, if the juvenile is beyond the range of touch of all adult detainees, if the juvenile is supervised by jail personnel at all times, and if the child is not handcuffed or otherwise secured to a stationary object.
- Permitting alleged or adjudicated truant delinquents to be held in a detention home only if the child violates a court order to not be absent without legitimate excuse from school for 5 or more consecutive days, 7 or more in a month, or 12 or more in a year. This would apply to juveniles who are alleged or adjudicated delinquent by reason of chronic truancy and to those who are alleged or adjudicated delinquent by reason of being an habitual truant who previously has been adjudicated unruly.
- Allows the court to make any order of disposition authorized for a juvenile adjudicated delinquent by reason of chronic truancy or by reason of habitual truancy with previous adjudications for habitual truancy, except that the court is prohibited from committing the juvenile to the custody of a facility operated for the care of delinquent children unless the juvenile violates a court order requiring school attendance as described above.

NOTICE TO SCHOOLS

Current Law. Under current law, within ten days of a juvenile's delinquency adjudication, the court must provide notice to the superintendent of a school system if the juvenile is at least 16 years old at the time of the offense, and the offense meets one of the following characteristics:

- The offense involves illegal conveyance or possession of a deadly weapon or dangerous ordinance on school premises;

- The offense involves carrying a concealed weapon committed on school premises;
- The offense was a drug trafficking or drug possession violation committed on school premises that is not a minor drug possession offense;
- The offense is one of the following, committed on school premises, if the victim is a school employee: aggravated murder, murder, voluntary manslaughter, involuntary manslaughter, aggravated assault, felonious assault, rape, or gross sexual imposition;
- Complicity in any of the above.

Provisions of the Bill. Under the provisions of the bill, within ten days of a juvenile's delinquency adjudication, the court must provide notice to both the superintendent of the school system and to the principal of the juvenile's school if the juvenile is at least 14 years old at the time of the offense, and the offense meets one of the following characteristics:

- The offense was a felony;
- The offense was an act of violence;
- The offender used or brandished a firearm;
- The offense was a misdemeanor sex offense (including corruption of a minor, sexual imposition, importuning, voyeurism, public indecency, soliciting, and prostitution);
- The offense was a misdemeanor for carrying a concealed weapon on school grounds;
- The offense was a misdemeanor for trafficking or possessing drugs on school grounds;
- Complicity in committing any of the above.

Clearly, the provisions of the bill greatly expand the notification requirements in existing law. LBO believes that a large number of offenses would qualify for these notification provisions. According to 1995 Uniform Crime Report (UCR) data, the last year for which Ohio juvenile arrests were readily available to LBO for disaggregating, there was a grand total of 115,050 arrests of juveniles for the Part I and Part II arrests. The 1995 UCR arrest data include a mix of felonies and misdemeanors, as shown in Table 1 below.

Caveat. The bill would only apply to adjudications, and not arrests, so it is likely that the numbers described below represent an overcount of the number of actual notices that would need to be generated. In 1995, the Ohio Courts Summary reported 90,188 new delinquency cases filed in juvenile courts statewide. For that same year, UCR data shows 115,050 total arrests. Based on this data, we then estimate that 78 percent of all juvenile delinquency arrests result in court filings ($90,188 \div 115,050 = 0.784$). Beyond this, LBO assumes that juvenile court filings have a high successful prosecution rate, and that the vast majority of juvenile court filings will result in conviction. However, the numbers presented below are likely to represent a slight overcount that includes those offenders found not guilty by the court.

We also assume that these numbers represent an overcount, due to the fact that current law allows for some notifications to occur to superintendents of school districts when certain offenses occur on school premises. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in 1995, about 14 percent of incidents of violent crime on a national basis occur at school. Therefore, LBO reduced the number of

incidents subject to the bill's notification provisions by 14 percent, to arrive at a closer estimate of local cost.

Table 1: 1995 UCR Data for Arrests of Ohio Juveniles

Offense	Number of Reported Cases	Approximate Penalty Equivalent	<i>LBO case estimate</i>		
			Low estimate	High estimate	Best estimate
Murder	97	Felony	97	97	97
Rape	320	Felony	320	320	320
Robbery	1,814	Felony	1,814	1,814	1,814
Aggravated Assault	2,268	Felony	2,268	2,268	2,268
Burglary	4,602	Felony	4,602	4,602	4,602
Larceny*	16,331	Felony & Misdemeanor	0	16,331	3,103
Motor Vehicle Thefts	3,004	Felony	3,004	3,004	3,004
Arson	524	Generally felony	524	524	524
Other assault	9,628	Generally felony	9,628	9,628	9,628
Forgery and counterfeiting*	245	Felony & Misdemeanor	0	245	47
Fraud*	96	Felony & Misdemeanor	0	96	17
Embezzlement*	12	Felony & Misdemeanor	0	12	2
Having stolen property**	3,060	Felony & Misdemeanor	0	3,060	2,662
Vandalism	4,631	Felony	4,631	4,631	4,631
Weapons***	1,726	Felony & Misdemeanor	0	1,726	1,001
Prostitution/Vice	45	Generally misdemeanor	45	45	45
Sex offenses	541	Generally felony	541	541	541
Drug abuse+	6,541	Felony & Misdemeanor	0	6,541	4,710
Drug possession+	4,782	Felony & Misdemeanor	0	4,782	3,443
Gambling	117	Misdemeanor	0	0	0
Offenses against family++	3,788	Felony & Misdemeanor	3,788	3,788	3,788
DUI	586	Generally misdemeanor	0	0	0
Liquor law violations	5,661	Misdemeanor	0	0	0
Drunkenness	586	Misdemeanor	0	0	0
Disorderly conduct	6,193	Misdemeanor	0	0	0
Vagrancy	70	Misdemeanor	0	0	0
All other except	25,000	Felony &	0	25,000	12,500

traffic +++		Misdemeanor			
Suspicion	142	Felony & Misdemeanor	0	142	0
Curfew	9,750	Misdemeanor	0	0	0
Runaway	7,612	Misdemeanor	0	0	0
Total Arrests:	115,050		27,474	89,197	58,747
Total Likely Court Filings: #	89,739		21,430	69,574	45,823

*In Franklin County in 1997, there were 773 felony theft cases and 3,254 misdemeanor thefts, for a total of 4,027. If we then assume that this proportion applies to juvenile theft and fraud offenses, then approximately 19% of all thefts and frauds are felonies.

**In Franklin County in 1997, there were 1,274 felony receipts of stolen property and 187 misdemeanor charges, for a total of 1,461. If we apply the same logic, then 87% of receipts of stolen property should be felonies.

***In Franklin County in 1997, there were 424 felony charges of carrying concealed weapons and 304 misdemeanor charges, for a total of 728. Therefore, 58% of these offenses are estimated to be felonies.

+ In Franklin county in 1997, there were 2,922 felony drug abuse charges and 1,123 misdemeanor charges, for a total of 4,045 drug abuse charges. Therefore, 72% of drug abuse charges should be felonies.

++ Includes domestic violence.

+++ LBO decided to split this miscellaneous category by 50% for the final estimate.

Based on 78% court filing rate.

Low Estimate of Affected Cases. LBO's low estimate of affected cases only includes those available offense categories that are *entirely* comprised of felonies. The low estimate, which likely represents a gross undercount of affected cases because it excludes many felonies and misdemeanors, is approximately 21,430 cases annually statewide.

High Estimate of Affected Cases. LBO's high estimate of affected cases includes those available offense categories that include *any* felony offenders. This count likely represents a gross overestimation of the number of cases addressed by the bill, because it includes many misdemeanor arrests not covered by the bill. The high estimate is approximately 69,574 cases annually statewide.

LBO's Best Estimate. LBO's best estimate attempts to take into account the proportion of offenses in each category, which are likely to be felonies and misdemeanors. LBO has reviewed the 1997 Franklin County Municipal Court report, which shows breakdowns of the numbers of felonies and misdemeanors for theft, receipt of stolen property, concealed weapons, and drug abuse. LBO then applied these proportions to the UCR offense categories, providing us with a more likely estimate of around 46,000 cases that would fall under the notification provisions of the bill annually statewide.

Cost for Processing Notifications. In 1993, the Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission estimated the cost of notifications from courts to eligible victims under the adult court system. At that time, they estimated the cost of one notification to be \$2.50, which included staff and postage costs. LBO adjusted this figure to reflect inflation using a GDF deflator, and determined that the cost of one notification in 1999 dollars would be \$4.62. LBO would like to emphasize that the \$4.62 estimate used in this analysis is a rough estimate, and that the actual cost of providing notification will vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. This estimate also assumes that one notification letter will be sent per offender independently of all others. In practice, courts may consolidate these notices in weekly reports, or may accomplish these notifications in other, less costly manners.

If we assume that 46,000 cases would fall under the notification provisions of the bill, then we might estimate a statewide notification cost of around \$212,520 (46,000 x \$4.62 = \$212,520).

However, as stated above, existing law allows for notification to superintendents of school districts of certain crimes. If we assume that 14 percent of these cases already require notification of superintendents, then we arrive at an estimate of around \$183,000 ($46,000 \times 0.14 = 6,440$ and $46,000 - 6,440 = 39,560$, so $39,560 \times \$4.62 = \$182,767$).

The bill requires notification of district superintendents *and* principals of the school in which the offender is enrolled (for the purpose of this analysis, we assume that all offenders are enrolled in school). Therefore, two notifications are required. First, we assume an additional notification to principals for cases in which superintendents are currently notified, at a cost of around \$30,000 ($6,440$ current notifications \times $\$4.62 = \$29,752$). Then, we must assume two notifications for the principals and superintendents of juveniles who are currently not subject to notification requirements, at a cost of around \$366,000 ($\$182,767$ for the cost of one notice per offender $\times 2 = \$365,534$). If we add these two figures together, the maximum statewide cost for these notifications would be around \$396,000.

LBO would like to emphasize that the estimate of up to \$396,000 in expenditures is a maximum potential expenditure for courts, based on the following assumptions:

- We assume that all offenders charged will be convicted;
- We assume that all offenders are enrolled in school;
- We assume that each notice will be processed and sent separately to principals and superintendents by U.S. mail.

LBO believes that costs associated with this provision may be partially mitigated by mass mailings, by mailing weekly lists to affected school districts, and by the possibility of using existing personnel.

LAW ENFORCEMENT INSPECTION OF RECORDS

Existing Law. Current law specifies that, two years after the termination of any order made by a juvenile court or two years after the unconditional discharge of a person from the Department of Youth Services (DYS) or another institution, the court that issued the order must do one of the following: (1) if the person was adjudicated an unruly child, order their record to be sealed, or (2) if the person was adjudicated a delinquent child or a juvenile traffic offender, either order the record of the person sealed or send the person notice of their right to have the record sealed. To “seal a record” means to remove a record from the main file of similar records and to secure it in a separate file that contains only sealed records and that is accessible only to the juvenile court.

The inspection of sealed records, under existing law, is only permitted by the court upon the application by the person who is the subject of the sealed record.

Provisions of the Bill. Under the bill, in addition to inspection by the persons named in the record, if the records in question pertain to an act that would be a felony offense of violence if committed by an adult, any law enforcement officer or any prosecutor may inspect the records that have been ordered sealed for any valid law enforcement or prosecutorial purpose.

Currently, the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation (BCII) and local courts have either electronic or copied access to juvenile sealed records. LBO assumes the bill will result in additional minimal expenditures for BCII and local courts due to the administrative burdens of law enforcement inspection of specific sealed records.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Community Corrections Facility Advisory Boards. The bill provides that, if the board of a community corrections facility establishes an advisory board, the board must reimburse the board members for expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. The bill also states that these board members must serve without compensation. According to the Department of Youth Services, community corrections facilities are not currently providing reimbursements. LBO assumes that counties may be required to change the way in which their RECLAIM Ohio dollars are spent, and this provision may result in negligible increases in expenditures to counties.

DYS Facilities. The bill repeals provisions that require DYS to gain General Assembly consent before changing the purposes for which the Maumee and Mohican Youth Camps may be operated or significantly reduce their level of operations. LBO assumes that this provision serves to facilitate changes in DYS facility operations, and has no substantive fiscal effect.

SUMMARY OF STATE & LOCAL FISCAL EFFECTS

Below, we have summarized our estimate of the fiscal effects of the major provisions of the bill on units of state and local government.

Summary of State Fiscal Effects

- The State Public Defender will likely incur increases in expenditures, potentially in the tens of thousands of dollars, associated with public defense of additional delinquency cases involving truant juveniles.
- BCII may incur some additional minimal administrative expenditures associated with making sealed records available to law enforcement.
- There will be, at most, a negligible annual gain in locally collected state court costs that are generated for the GRF and the Crime Victim Reparations Fund through the parental responsibility and truancy provisions of the bill.

Summary of Local Fiscal Effects

- Statewide costs to juvenile courts to provide notice to schools of certain offenses are expected to be up to \$400,000 annually.
- The truancy and parental responsibility provisions of the bill will likely result in increases in expenditures, potentially in the thousands or tens of thousands of dollars per county. Under the bill, more truant juveniles would be charged delinquent than is currently the case, increasing prosecution, indigent defense, adjudication, and sanctioning costs. Parents or guardians may be

found in contempt of court on an infrequent basis, increasing expenditures for prosecution, indigent defense, adjudication, and sanctioning in these cases.

- Counties may experience minimal annual gains in fine revenue stemming from the truancy and parental responsibility provisions of the bill.
- Counties may incur minimal increases in expenditures for providing reimbursements to advisory board members for expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

*LSC fiscal staff: Laura Potts, Budget Analyst
Amy Frankart, Budget/Policy Analyst
Laura Bickle, Budget/Policy Analyst*

\\Budget_office\isis_voll.lbo\FN123\SB0181EN.doc