# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

## FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 2521-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 6

Subject: Abortion; Attorney General; Cities, Towns, and Villages; County Government;

General Assembly; Health Care; Health Care Professionals; Insurance - Health;

Religion; Property, Real and Personal

Type: Original

Date: June 13, 2017

Bill Summary: This proposal preempts political subdivision authority regarding abortion

in specified scenarios.

# **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

L.R. No. 2521-01 Bill No. SB 6 Page 2 of 4 June 13, 2017

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	

☐ Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	
<b>Local Government</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	

L.R. No. 2521-01 Bill No. SB 6 Page 3 of 4 June 13, 2017

#### FISCAL ANALYSIS

#### **ASSUMPTION**

**Oversight** was unable to receive some of the agency responses in a timely manner due to the short fiscal note request time. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best current information that we have or on prior year information regarding a similar bill. Upon the receipt of agency responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval of the chairperson of the Joint Committee on Legislative Research to publish a new fiscal note.

In response to similar legislation, HCS HB 174 (LR 0859-03) from the 2017 Regular Session, the following agency responses were received:

Officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assume any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in cases.

Officials from the Department of Health and Senior Services, the Department of Social Services, Divisions of: Finance and Administrative Services, MO HealthNet, Family Support, Legal Services and Children's, the Office of Administration, Commissioner's Office/Alternative-to-Abortion Division, the Office of State Courts Administrator, St. Louis County and the City of Kansas City each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the following **cities**: Ashland, Belton, Bernie, Bonne Terre, Boonville, California, Cape Girardeau, Clayton, Columbia, Dardenne Prairie, Excelsior Springs, Florissant, Frontenac, Fulton, Gladstone, Grandview, Harrisonville, Independence, Jefferson City, Joplin, Kearney, Knob Noster, Ladue, Lake Ozark, Lee Summit, Liberty, Louisiana, Maryland Heights, Maryville, Mexico, Monett, Neosho, O'Fallon, Pacific, Peculiar, Pineville, Popular Bluff, Raytown, Republic, Richmond, Rolla, Sedalia, Springfield, St. Charles, St. Joseph, St. Louis, St. Robert, Sugar Creek, Sullivan, Warrensburg, Warrenton, Webb City, Weldon Spring and West Plains did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

Officials from the following **counties**: Andrew, Atchison, Audrain, Barry, Bollinger, Boone, Buchanan, Callaway, Camden, Cape Girardeau, Carroll, Cass, Christian, Clay, Cole, Cooper, Dekalb, Dent, Franklin, Greene, Holt, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Laclede, Lawrence, Lincoln, Maries, Marion, McDonald, Miller, Moniteau, Monroe, Montgomery, New Madrid, Nodaway, Ozark, Perry, Pettis, Platte, Pulaski, Scott, St. Charles, St. Francois, Taney, Warren, Wayne, Webster and Worth did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

L.R. No. 2521-01 Bill No. SB 6 Page 4 of 4 June 13, 2017

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
	<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.

The proposal has an emergency clause.

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
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Social Services
Office of Administration - Office of the Commissioner
Office of State Courts Administrator
St. Louis County
City of Kansas City

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Mickey Wilen

Director June 13, 2017 Ross Strope Assistant Director June 13, 2017