

The Big Sky Country

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SPONSOR'S REBUTTAL TO FISCAL NOTE

$\Omega \circ \Omega$
House Bill Number: 323 Date Prepared: 2/5/23
Short Title: Rouse laws related to Child Protective towns
Sponsor: C. Hiwale
Generally, why do you disagree with the fiscal note?
See attaches
Specifically, what in the fiscal note do you feel is flawed? (Describe specific assumptions, calculations, technical issues, etc.)
See attached
What is your estimate of the fiscal impact?
See attaches
Sponsor Signature: Ang In

Technical notes rebuttal:

- 1. No citizen who would serve on these teams would have any sort of nefarious intent to harm these children. These are volunteers who are selected to serve as a neutral third party in these hearings.
- 2. Law enforcement, first responders, others public servants all have training to identify potential child abuse. These are the folks who usually make up these teams. Community members know their communities better than anyone, honestly a member of the community should be able to identify potential child abuse before some random CPS worker.
- 3. Law enforcement are generally the ones who make the call for these emergency situations.
- 4. In all the examples cited in this paragraph law enforcement would already be involved. These are examples of emergencies, and 80% of all CPS cases are non-emergency and do not involve these examples. Nice red herring CPS.