

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 4239-01
Bill No.: HB 1146
Subject: Health Care; Guardians
Type: Original
Date: January 30, 2014

Bill Summary: This proposal establishes the Adult Health Care Consent Act that specifies a priority of persons who can make health care decisions for a person who has been certified as unable to consent to his or her own care.

FISCAL SUMMARY

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2015 | FY 2016 | FY 2017 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2015 | FY 2016 | FY 2017 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2015 | FY 2016 | FY 2017 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2015 | FY 2016 | FY 2017 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2015 | FY 2016 | FY 2017 |
| Local Government | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of Secretary of State (SOS)** state many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The Secretary of State's office is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, it is also recognized that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the office can sustain within its core budget. Therefore, the SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

Officials from the **Office of Attorney General** assume any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health (DMH)** state section 191.1312(3) of the proposal specifies that no provision of the proposal would affect "the ability of the Department of Mental Health from executing its authority as specified in Chapters 552, 630, 631, 632, and 633."

Since the DMH is specifically excluded under Section 191.1312(3), there does not appear to be a fiscal or legal issue for the department related to the proposed changes.

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR)** state the legislation is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact to JCAR beyond its current appropriation.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator**, the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration**, the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, and the **Department of Social Services** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **University of Missouri** did not respond to **Oversight's** request for a statement of fiscal impact.

The **Public Administrators** from the counties of: **Boone, Cass, Jackson, Moniteau, and St. Louis** did not respond to **Oversight's** request for a statement of fiscal impact.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the following **hospitals**: Barton County Memorial Hospital, Bates County Memorial Hospital, Cedar County Memorial Hospital, Cooper County Hospital, Excelsior Springs Medical Center, Putnam County Memorial Hospital, and Washington County Memorial Hospital did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u> | FY 2015 (10 Mo.) | FY 2016 | FY 2017 |
|---|---------------------|------------|------------|
| | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> |

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u> | FY 2015 (10 Mo.) | FY 2016 | FY 2017 |
|---|---------------------|------------|------------|
| | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> |

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.


FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no direct fiscal impact.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of Attorney General
Office of State Courts Administrator
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration
Department of Mental Health
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Social Services
Joint Commission on Administrative Rules
Office of Secretary of State



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
January 30, 2014

Ross Strobe
Assistant Director
January 30, 2014