

Department of Legislative Services  
Maryland General Assembly  
2015 Session

FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE  
Revised

House Bill 971 (Delegate Oaks, *et al.*)  
Health and Government Operations

Finance

---

Public Health - Substance Abuse Treatment Outcomes Partnership Fund

---

This bill expands the scope of the Substance Abuse Treatment Outcomes Partnership (S.T.O.P.) Fund in the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH) to include “eligible functions” that may be funded under S.T.O.P.: transportation to and from treatment services; treatment, prevention, or coordination staff; data sharing services among counties and other appropriate treatment providers; education or outreach programs and materials; in-community emergency behavioral health services or crisis stabilization units; and behavioral health programs in schools. The bill also adds drug offenders under the supervision of the problem solving courts to the “eligible population” who are authorized to receive S.T.O.P. funding.

---

Fiscal Summary

**State Effect:** DHMH can implement the bill’s changes within existing budgeted resources. The bill expands the definition of “eligible populations” to include certain services eligible to receive S.T.O.P. funding without requiring additional expenditures. The Governor’s Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP) can handle the bill’s requirements with existing budgeted resources. Revenues are not affected.

**Local Effect:** Potential meaningful increase in revenues from matching grants from S.T.O.P. funding to the extent that counties have *existing* programs that become eligible for supplemental funding under the bill’s provisions. Otherwise, to receive S.T.O.P. funding, counties must expend additional funds to meet the required match.

**Small Business Effect:** Minimal.

---

## Analysis

**Bill Summary:** The bill makes conforming changes throughout the S.T.O.P. statute to establish that “eligible functions” may receive S.T.O.P. funding. When applying for S.T.O.P. funding for an eligible function, applicants must include in the request any eligible functions that are funded under the proposal. In addition, a request for funding must include a statement of any in-kind contributions that the applicant is committing in the application. The bill establishes that, if a participating county began spending county, or other non-State, funds on eligible functions after October 1, 2010, the participating county may use S.T.O.P. funding to continue or expand funding for eligible functions.

The bill states the intent of the General Assembly that (1) the Governor appropriate funds to the S.T.O.P. Fund in each State budget; (2) any funds appropriated by the S.T.O.P. Fund be in addition to, and not replace, other State budget appropriations for substance abuse treatment; (3) GOCCP, as part of its duties, make it a priority to provide support for substance abuse treatment and prevention programs that help contribute to increased public safety outcomes; and (4) DHMH convene a committee with representatives from the Maryland State Department of Education, local school systems, local departments of social services, substance abuse treatment providers, and county health officers to review the current State Board of Education standards for substance abuse education in public schools; review examples of substance abuse curriculum that are used by local school systems; and develop and provide recommendations regarding treatment, prevention, and education programs for adolescents.

The bill removes references to the Task Force to Study Increasing Availability of Substance Use Programs (IASAP).

**Current Law/Background:** Chapter 778 of 1998 established the Task Force to Study IASAP to develop a comprehensive strategy for increasing the funding and availability of substance abuse services. The Committee on Availability and the Committee on Effectiveness within the Task Force to Study IASAP found that there was insufficient capacity in Maryland and multiple funding streams. The committees concluded that Maryland should establish a statewide treatment system with coordinated care, efficient funding streams, improved access for the uninsured, and systemic accountability.

Accordingly, Chapter 675 of 2000 created the S.T.O.P. Fund within DHMH. The S.T.O.P. Fund is used to issue grants to counties that submit proposals for substance abuse treatment services. The governing body of one or more counties (including Baltimore City) must submit a request for S.T.O.P. funding to DHMH in order to receive grant funding.

The populations that are eligible for funding are defined in statute, and there are guidelines for evaluating a funding proposal. A county receiving a S.T.O.P. grant must provide a 50%

match. However, DHMH is authorized to waive the 50% match requirement after considering (1) the financial hardship of the participating county; (2) prior contributions of funds for substance abuse treatment programs made by the participating county; or (3) other relevant considerations deemed appropriate by DHMH.

The fiscal 2015 budget for the S.T.O.P. Fund is \$6,433,718 with grant funding to 19 of Maryland's 24 counties (including Baltimore City). Funding ranged from \$48,000 in Calvert County to \$663,935 in Dorchester County. The Governor's proposed fiscal 2016 operating budget also provides \$6,433,718 for the S.T.O.P. Fund. This analysis assumes that the proposed budget amount is realized, and that the bill has no impact on funding levels.

**Local Fiscal Effect:** The bill does not require additional spending by local governments. However, S.T.O.P. Fund grants are 50/50 matching grants, meaning counties must expend additional monies in order to receive grant revenue from the State. Under the bill, if a participating county began spending county, or other non-State funds, on eligible functions after October 1, 2010, the participating county may be eligible for S.T.O.P. funding for these newly eligible functions. For these counties, revenues from S.T.O.P. Fund grants may increase significantly without the counties expending any more local or other non-State funds than they have been. Further, counties that choose to expend *additional* county, or other non-State, funds to access S.T.O.P. Fund matching grants for newly eligible functions may realize increased revenues. These counties must increase expenditures to receive the additional grant revenue.

---

### **Additional Information**

**Prior Introductions:** None.

**Cross File:** Although not designated as a cross file, SB 641 (Senator Klausmeier – Finance) is identical.

**Information Source(s):** Baltimore, Charles, Frederick, and Montgomery counties; Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention; Maryland State Department of Education; Department of Health and Mental Hygiene; Judiciary (Administrative Office of the Courts); Maryland Association of Counties; Maryland Association of County Health Officers; Department of Legislative Services

**Fiscal Note History:** First Reader - February 27, 2015  
min/ljm Revised - Clarification - March 10, 2015

---

Analysis by: Kathleen P. Kennedy

Direct Inquiries to:  
(410) 946-5510  
(301) 970-5510