

Judicial Impact Fiscal Note

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Bill Number: 2541 S HB | Title: Involuntary treatment orders | Agency: 055-Admin Office of the Courts |
|-------------------------------|--|---|

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

| Account | FY 2016 | FY 2017 | 2015-17 | 2017-19 | 2019-21 |
|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Counties | | | | | |
| Cities | | | | | |
| Total \$ | | | | | |

Estimated Expenditures from:

Non-zero but indeterminate cost. Please see discussion.

The revenue and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Responsibility for expenditures may be subject to the provisions of RCW 43.135.060.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Contact | Phone: | Date: 03/07/2016 |
| Agency Preparation: Sam Knutson | Phone: 3607045528 | Date: 03/07/2016 |
| Agency Approval: Ramsey Radwan | Phone: 360-357-2406 | Date: 03/07/2016 |
| OFM Review: | Phone: | Date: |

Request # 2541 SHB-1

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact on the Courts

Please see attached Judicial Impact Note (JIN)

II. B - Cash Receipts Impact

II. C - Expenditures

Part III: Expenditure Detail

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

Part II: Narrative Explanation

This bill would amend RCW 71.05.240 and RCW 71.05.320 to require the courts to name the provider responsible for planning and administering services for a person who is involuntarily committed for mental health treatment, and include a requirement that the person comply with the services planned by the provider.

Part II.A – Brief Description of what the Measure does that has fiscal impact on the Courts

Section 2(3)(c) would amend RCW 71.05.240 and Section 4(3) would amend RCW 71.05.320 to require a court to name the mental health service provider responsible for identifying the services the person will receive and must include a requirement that the person cooperate with the services planned by the mental health service provider. The statutes currently state that an order for less restrictive alternative treatment must identify the services the person will receive. Based on input from the courts, the proposed legislation would require a second hearing for all of the cases involving the request for less restrictive alternatives.

II.B - Cash Receipt Impact

No cash receipt impact.

II.C – Expenditures

Indeterminate.

Based on data received from DSHS, there are an average of 5,000 hearings statewide that could be affected by this legislation. For the purposes of this judicial impact note, if only 10% (a conservative number) of those hearings were affected, that would be an additional cost of \$94,243 (\$18,031 State; \$76,213 County).