

# FISCAL NOTE

**Bill #:** SB0040

**Title:** Interstate compact for adult offender supervision

**Primary**

**Sponsor:** Chris Christiaens

**Status:** As Introduced

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sponsor signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chuck Swysgood, Budget Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Fiscal Summary

	<b><u>FY2002</u></b> <b><u>Difference</u></b>	<b><u>FY2003</u></b> <b><u>Difference</u></b>
<b>Expenditures:</b>	0	0
<b>Revenue:</b>	0	0
<b>Net Impact on General Fund Balance:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

<b><u>Yes</u></b>	<b><u>No</u></b>		<b><u>Yes</u></b>	<b><u>No</u></b>	
	X	Significant Local Gov. Impact		X	Technical Concerns
X		Included in the Executive Budget	X		Significant Long-Term Impacts
	X	Dedicated Revenue Form Attached	X		Family Impact Form Attached

## Fiscal Analysis

### ASSUMPTIONS:

#### **Department of Corrections**

1. The Department of Corrections will absorb any and all costs associated with this bill in its operating budget.

#### **Judiciary**

2. Since a judge is an appointed member of the state council, the Judiciary will have to cover travel costs for the judge to attend states council meetings. As long as travel remains within the state, the Judiciary will absorb the cost in its current budget.

3. If LC 89 is authorized by the legislature and the state takes over the funding of District Courts, passage of SB 40 could result in a significant increase in Judiciary costs. Currently, the majority of these travel costs are borne by the county or the state Department of Corrections and they are in a position to determine the specific cost. If the Judiciary takes over the funding of District Courts the Judiciary will also be liable for council costs incurred by the District Courts.

FISCAL IMPACT:

	FY2002	FY2003
	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Difference</u>
None		

EFFECT ON COUNTY OR OTHER LOCAL REVENUES OR EXPENDITURES:

Only at the county level would staff know what the current costs are and what the potential increases or decreases would be from passage of SB 40 and/or LC 89.