LEGISLATIVE FISCAL OFFICE
Fiscal Note

Fiscal Note On: **SB 71** SLS 13RS 311
Bill Text Version: **REENGROSSED**
Opp. Chamb. Action:
Proposed Amd.:
Sub. Bill For.:

Date: April 26, 2013 9:02 AM
Author: BROOME
Dept./Agy.: Judiciary
Subject: Mental Health Treatment Act - Mental Health Courts
Analyst: Travis McIlwain

MENTAL HEALTH RE SEE FISC NOTE GF EX See Note

Authorizes and provides for mental health courts. (8/1/13)

Proposed bill provides that the chief judge of each judicial district may establish a mental health court. Proposed bill provides that the judicial district is authorized to provide funding for any expenses related to the administration and operation of such a mental health court treatment program. A mental health court, which is defined in the bill as a structured judicial intervention process for mental health treatment of eligible criminal defendants that includes mental health court professionals, local social programs and intensive judicial monitoring in support of defendants. Proposed bill provides that the mental health court program may collaborate with a network of mental health treatment programs.

EXPENDITURES	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2017-18**	**5 -YEAR TOTAL**
State Gen. Fd.	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	
Agy. Self-Gen.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Ded./Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Federal Funds	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Local Funds	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	
Annual Total						

REVENUES	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2017-18**	**5 -YEAR TOTAL**
State Gen. Fd.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Agy. Self-Gen.	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Ded./Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Federal Funds	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Local Funds	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Annual Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

EXPENDITURE EXPLANATION

This bill may result in an indeterminable increase in state and/or local expenditures. The bill provides that the chief judge of each judicial district may establish a mental health court treatment program. The exact fiscal impact is indeterminable since it is not known how many judicial districts will actually create these specialized courts. The specific expenditures associated with the establishment of the mental health court are dependent upon the size and scope of the newly created mental health court. To the extent the newly created mental health court involves court hearings above the normal current court activity, the district courts will likely experience an increase in expenditures.

In addition, to the extent the mental health clients in the court receive mental health treatment at a state facility, there could be an indeterminable increase in any state and/or federal costs associated with such treatment. This bill provides that the mental health court program may collaborate with a network of mental health treatment programs, which could result in an indeterminable increase in any state funded mental health treatment programs that may collaborate with the mental health court.

A mental health court is a specialized court docket (like drug courts) that focuses on individuals who have been charged with a crime and also have a mental health illness. For **illustrative purposes**, the 22nd Judicial District Court currently has a mental health court that currently has 30 clients. The current cost of this court is approximately $50,000 for 1 client administrator and funded entirely with local funds. According to the 22nd Judicial District, the mental health services these clients receive are provided by private providers (through private insurance) or state clinics (state expenditures).

For purposes of simplicity, the potential impact of this legislation is reflected above as SGF and local funds but may ultimately impact all means-of-finance.

For context, the state has 48 drug courts that currently cost approximately $16 million of which $10 million is state general fund. The state's drug courts see approximately 2,800 clients per month.

REVENUE EXPLANATION

There is no anticipated direct material effect on governmental revenues as a result of this measure.

Senate Dual Referral Rules House

☐ 13.5.1 >= $100,000 Annual Fiscal Cost {S&H} ☐ 6.8(F) >= $500,000 Annual Fiscal Cost {S}

☐ 13.5.2 >= $500,000 Annual Tax or Fee Change {S&H} ☐ 6.8(G) >= $500,000 Tax or Fee Increase or a Net Fee Decrease {S}

Evan Brasseaux

Evan Brasseaux
Staff Director