LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 80TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

April 11, 2007

TO: Honorable Rob Eissler, Chair, House Committee on Public Education

FROM: John S. O'Brien, Director, Legislative Budget Board

IN RE: HB920 by Eissler (Relating to the protection of public safety through the placement of certain offenders who are public school students in alternative education programs and the provision of information relating to certain offenders.), **As Introduced**

No fiscal implication to the State is anticipated.

The bill would disallow students convicted of, adjudicated for, or receiving deferred adjudication or deferred prosecution for certain criminal offenses from enrolling in a public school. School districts would be required to place affected students not exempt from compulsory attendance requirements in either a disciplinary alternative education program (DAEP) or a juvenile justice alternative education program (JJAEP). Since placement in a JJAEP would be at the district's discretion, no fiscal impact to the state is anticipated.

The bill would require the Department of Public Safety (DPS) to maintain an e-mail notification service relating to the residences of persons required to register as sex offenders to which anyone in the state could subscribe. School districts would be required to subscribe to the service.

Local Government Impact

School districts would be required to subscribe to an e-mail notification service regarding the location of residences of registered sex offenders.

To the extent that discretionary JJAEP placements increase under the requirements of the bill, counties operating JJAEPs may incur additional cost. The Juvenile Probation Commission estimates an increase in student attendance days of about 65,300 in FY2008 and about 201,600 in FY2009. At an average cost of \$125 per student attendance day to operate a JJAEP, the total cost of increased placements is estimated at about \$8.2 million in FY2008 and \$25.2 million in FY2009.

To the extent that Foundation School Program funding associated with a student placed in a JJAEP is insufficient to cover the contracted payment by a district to a JJAEP on behalf of that student, school districts could incur additional cost.

Fiscal impact to counties and school districts would be expected to vary widely.

Source Agencies: 405 Department of Public Safety, 665 Juvenile Probation Commission, 701 Central Education Agency

LBB Staff: JOB, JSp, UP, JSc