

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2015

Bill Number: S.36

Name of Bill: An act relating to postadoption contact agreements

Agency/ Dept: AHS/DCF

Author of Bill Review: Leslie Wisdom

Date of Bill Review: February 19, 2015

Related Bills and Key Players: S.9, Senators Flory and Sears

Status of Bill: (check one): Upon Introduction As passed by 1st body As passed by both

Recommended Position:

Support Oppose Remain Neutral Support with modifications identified in #8 below

Analysis of Bill

1. Summary of bill and issue it addresses.

This bill proposes language that is identical to the postadoption contact agreement provisions in S.9 with one difference. S.9 allowed for postadoption contact agreements only for children in DCF custody. This bill omits the requirement that the child is in DCF custody, thus opening up the possibility for these types of agreements in all adoptions.

2. Is there a need for this bill?

Under current law, postadoption contact agreements are not enforceable except for stepparent adoptions.

3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?

None.

4. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?

The judiciary, including Family and Probate Courts, will likely weigh in on this bill. The judiciary was supportive of postadoption contact agreements for children in DCF custody and worked with DCF to draft alternative language for S.9. Opening up these agreements to all adoptions could have resources and staffing implications for the judiciary.

5. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it? (for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)

Parents, parents' attorneys and advocates will support the bill.

6. Other Stakeholders:

6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?

Unknown.

6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?

Unknown.

7. Rationale for recommendation:

DCF is not directly impacted by this bill and so should remain neutral. DCF was involved in drafting postadoption contact agreement language for S.9 and may be also consulted on this language.

8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill:

DCF had input on clarifying the as introduced S.9 language on postadoption contact agreements and would likely recommend the same changes to this language to clarify which courts oversee which proceedings and other details of the agreements.

9. Gubernatorial appointments to board or commission?

Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document: _____ *Date:* _____