

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 0532-03  
Bill No.: SB 155  
Subject: Drugs and Controlled Substances; Health Care Professionals; Health and Senior Services Department; Pharmacy; Physicians  
Type: Original  
Date: January 29, 2019

Bill Summary: This proposal establishes the Narcotics Control Act.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
General Revenue	Less than (\$1,028,311 to \$1,452,989)	Less than (\$1,249,183 to \$1,338,990)	Less than (\$1,013,825 to \$1,261,144)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>Less than (\$1,028,311 to \$1,452,989)</b>	<b>Less than (\$1,249,183 to \$1,338,990)</b>	<b>Less than (\$1,013,825 to \$1,261,144)</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.  
This fiscal note contains 16 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>	<b>FY 2022</b>
Federal	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0 to Unknown</b>	<b>\$0 to Unknown</b>	<b>\$0 to Unknown</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>	<b>FY 2022</b>
General Revenue	9 to 14 FTE	9 to 14 FTE	9 to 14 FTE
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>9 to 14 FTE</b>	<b>9 to 14 FTE</b>	<b>9 to 14 FTE</b>

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

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>	<b>FY 2022</b>
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>Less than \$156,118</b>	<b>Less than \$157,522</b>	<b>Less than \$158,000</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

#### §§195.453, 195.456, 195.459, 195.462, and 195.465

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)** state §195.453.1 requires the DHSS to establish and maintain a program for monitoring of prescribing and dispensing of all Schedule II, III, and IV controlled substances by all professionals licensed to prescribe or dispense such substances in this state.

The DHSS assumes the costs associated with a narcotics control program will be funded with General Revenue (GR). Also, since DHSS is not assured of any potential grant funding opportunities at this time, none of the costs are assumed to be funded by grants.

Further, DHSS assumes costs related to a narcotics control program would commence in FY 2020.

**Oversight** notes the U.S. Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Diversion Control Division's website ([www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov](http://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov)) indicates the Harold Rogers Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (HRPDMP, administered by the U.S. Department of Justice) provides three types of grants: planning, implementation, and enhancement. The purpose of the HRPDMP is to enhance the capacity of regulatory and law enforcement agencies as well as public health officials to collect and analyze controlled substance prescription data through a centralized database administered by an authorized state agency. Since inception of the grant program in FY 2002, grants have been awarded to 47 states and 1 U.S. territory. For FY 2011, HRPDMP's funding was approximately \$5.6 million.

The National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Act (NASPER), enacted in 2005, created a U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) grant program for states to implement or enhance prescription drug monitoring programs. NASPER administers a grant program under the authority of HHS. The intent of the law was to foster the establishment or enhancement of PDMPs (prescription drug monitoring programs) that would meet consistent national criteria and have the capacity for the interstate exchange of information. In FY 2009 and FY 2010, NASPER received \$2 million to support NASPER grants in 13 states (most recent information available).

States can participate in both funding programs, but requirements and priorities for each program may vary.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Oversight** was unable to determine the amount of possible grant funds that may be available to the DHSS to help fund the Narcotics Control Act, but assumes if this proposal passes, it would apply for any grants available. Oversight will reflect \$0 to a positive Unknown impact in Federal grant funds for fiscal purposes, but will assume no offsetting effect against General Revenue.

**DHSS** officials state §195.462 requires the DHSS to "promulgate rules setting forth the procedures and methods of implementing §§195.450 to 195.465." To complete this, DHSS, Office of General Counsel will need the following:

One and one half full-time Legal Counsel with a salary of \$64,500 (salary is based on the average department salary with pay plan) would be needed to assist in drafting emergency and proposed regulations and forms; perform legal research and provide day-to-day legal counsel to the program; including review under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and to represent the DHSS in legal actions.

One half full-time Senior Office Support Assistant with a salary of \$31,000 (salary is based on the average division salary with pay plan) would be needed to perform the following:

- Compose correspondence including some interpretation and application of established policies and procedures;
- Attend meetings and takes notes;
- Transcribe written and verbal communication;
- Establish and maintain complex filing systems;
- Prepare and/or oversee the preparation of records for storage and/or archiving;
- Maintain correspondence and report files; enters, updates, and/or retrieves information; and,
- Develop spreadsheets and databases

**Oversight** assumes part-time FTE (0.5 FTE Legal Counsel and 0.5 FTE Senior Office Support Assistant) would not receive the standard fringe benefit package offered to full-time state employees. Therefore, Oversight assumes DHSS would be required to pay 7.65% of these salaries (Social Security benefits only) and has reflected this change for fiscal note purposes. Oversight notes, however, if multiple proposals pass this legislative session which require the DHSS to hire multiple part-time staff in similar positions, the DHSS may consolidate the part-time positions into full-time positions and would therefore, be required to provide the standard fringe benefits package.

**DHSS** officials assume for §§195.450 - 195.465 that the Division of Regulation and Licensure's (DRL) Section for Health Standards and Licensure's (HSL) Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD) will assume the duties set forth in the proposed sections. BNDD will require additional staff to implement the legislation. The following positions will be hired as of September 1, 2019:

ASSUMPTION (continued)

One (1) Health and Senior Services Manager with an annual salary of \$58,000 (salary based on equivalent level managers in the division with pay plan) will be needed to perform the following duties:

- Assist Bureau Chief in drafting a request for proposal to solicit bids for the required database;
- Develop rules, policies, and procedures for reporting by dispensers and access to data by authorized parties;
- Provide technical assistance to program participants on matters relating to the program;
- Supervise subordinate staff involved in program implementation;
- Design and prepare reports of program data and review data collected to determine trends; and
- Review database information.

One (1) Investigator III with an annual salary of \$45,542 (salary is based on the average department salary with pay plan) will be needed to perform the following duties:

- Assign and supervise investigations.
- Assist in the conducting of investigations and complaints.
- This position is expected to travel extensively; it is assumed that the travel cost will be \$10,118 annually for all investigative staff.

One (1) Health Program Representative II with an annual salary of \$35,990 (salary is based on the average starting salary in the division with pay plan) will be needed to perform the following duties:

- Assist the manager in running the program;
- Provide educational meetings on how to report and running reports and queries;
- Assist with requests for information that are allowable by law to be released; and
- Prepare statistics and reports.

Two (2) Administrative Office Support Assistants with the annual salary of \$29,462 (salary is based on the average starting salary in the division with pay plan) will:

- Provide support to the program;
- Respond to inquiries and requests for database reports received;
- Coordinate communication with other agencies and the public, and maintain a memoranda of understanding for data sharing;
- Assist practitioners in obtaining access to the reporting subsystem of the program;
- Generate and e-mail or generate, print, and fax reports as requested by authorized individuals and agencies that cannot access this information via the internet; and
- Respond to telephone inquiries regarding the program.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The following positions will be hired as of January 1, 2020:

Two (2) Investigator II positions with an annual salary of \$38,654 (salary is based on the average starting salary in the division with pay plan) each will be needed to respond to complaints and conduct investigations. These positions are assumed to be telecommuters. These positions are expected to travel extensively; it is assumed that the travel cost will be \$10,118 annually for all investigative staff.

This fiscal note assumes minimal staffing with review and possible referral going to the most serious issues identified in the dispensation information. Additional staff would be required to increase the level of review and investigation.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the costs provided by DHSS, adjusted for fringe benefit costs for part-time FTE, as noted above.

Officials from the **Office of Administration (OA), Facilities Management, Design and Construction (FMDC)** state depending on the additional FTE and/or space needs of DHSS as a result of this legislation, additional capital improvements and/or rental space may be required. Capital improvements costs would depend on the specific needs of the agency. DHSS estimates that space will be required for an additional 8.00 FTE as a result of this legislation. For every one (1) FTE of additional staff in the Cole County area, an additional 230 sq. ft. would be needed at an estimated cost of \$17.50 per sq. ft., or \$4,025 annually per FTE. These costs include building lease cost, fuel and utilities, and janitorial services. DHSS has calculated these costs for the required 8.00 FTE and included such costs in their fiscal note response. As a result, FMDC assumes the funding to support these costs would be transferred from the DHSS budget to HB13.

The fund(s) and appropriation(s) numbers are to be determined based upon agency funding sources. BOBCs 180, 420, and 680 would be utilized in HB13 following transfer to HB13.

Officials from the **OA, Information Technology Services Division (ITSD)/DHSS** state this proposal will require a new system to establish and maintain an application to monitor the dispensing of Schedule II, III, and IV controlled substances by all professionals licensed to dispense such substances in this state. Each dispenser will submit to DHSS, in electronic format, the required information in accordance with transmission standards established by the American Society for Automation in Pharmacy, or any successor organization, and shall report data within twenty-four hours. A paper form alternative must be available for those provided a waiver for electronic submission by DHSS.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

For purposes of this estimate, a custom application has been assumed understanding that Custom Off the Shelf (COTS) solutions do exist and DHSS has had discussions regarding systems utilized by surrounding states. Infrastructure costs were calculated using the FY 2019 State Data Center (SDC) Cost Allocation Plan (CAP) document. ITSD assumes use of an application build for the State of Missouri and hosted by the SDC. Three servers to include development, test and production with 100 gb of disk storage space for each is assumed. Funding has been identified as “General Revenue” based on language in the bill that directs the department (DHSS) to establish and maintain this program “subject to appropriations”. It is assumed that every new IT project/system will be bid out because all ITSD resources are at full capacity. Contracted IT consultant hours are estimated at a rate of \$75 per hour. A total of 14,605.92 contract IT hours are estimated to develop the system, test and implement the program (\$1,095,444) plus equipment and expenses; on-going support (of approximately \$156,000 per year) is needed in FYs 2021 and 2022.

ITSD assumes General Revenue (GR) costs of \$760,926 for FY 2020; \$496,764 for FY 2021; and \$163,134 for FY 2022.

**Oversight** notes ITSD assumes that every new IT project/system will be bid out because all their resources are at full capacity. For this proposal, ITSD assumes a new system will needed to establish and maintain an application to monitor the dispensing of Schedule II, III, and IV controlled substances by all professionals licensed to dispense such substances in this state. ITSD estimates the project would take 14,605.92 hours at a contract rate of \$75 per hour for a total cost to the state of \$1,095,444 in GR funds. Oversight notes that an average salary for a current IT Specialist within ITSD is \$51,618, which totals roughly \$80,000 per year when fringe benefits are added. Assuming all ITSD resources are at full capacity, Oversight assumes ITSD may (instead of contracting out the programming) hire additional IT Specialists to perform the work required by this proposal. Therefore, Oversight will range the fiscal impact from the cost of contracting out the work (\$757,836 in FY 2020, \$492,964 in FY 2021, and \$159,240 in FY 2022) to hiring 5 ( $\$757,836 / \$75 / 2,080 \text{ hours} = 4.86$  rounded up) additional FTE IT Specialists (each at roughly \$80,000 each, per year) to complete the development and implementation of the system in approximately the same time as contract IT consultants. Hiring the number of IT Specialists to build the required system, rather than contracting out the work, results in lower costs in FYs ‘20 & ‘21, but higher costs in subsequent years.

**Oversight** notes the fiscal note response from OA, ITSD/DHSS was received at 4:55 p.m. Friday, January 25, 2019. The fiscal note request was sent out to all agencies December 4, 2018.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this bill proposes a class E felony for individuals, authorized or unauthorized, who unlawfully access prescribing or dispensing information or discloses said information. In order to provide information on the impact of this legislation on the Department of Corrections (DOC), standard impact for a new nonviolent class E felony is analyzed. In FY 2017, the average class E nonviolent sentence was 3.4 years. Incarcerated offenders serve 2.1 years in prison and 1.3 years on parole. The average term for probation is 3.0 years. An estimate, for each year, is one offender sentenced to prison while two offenders are given probation.

The initial impact, with the passage of the Narcotic Control Act, begins in FY 2020 with the addition of one more person to prison and two more persons to probation. The full impact to DOC occurs in FY22 with an additional two offenders incarcerated and seven persons on field supervision.

If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it is because the DOC has changed the way probation and parole daily costs are calculated to more accurately reflect the way the Division of Probation and Parole is staffed across the entire state.

In December 2017, the DOC reevaluated the calculation used for computing the Probation and Parole average daily cost of supervision and revised the cost calculation to be used for 2019 fiscal notes. The new calculation estimates the increase/decrease in caseloads at each Probation and Parole district due to the proposed legislative change. For the purposes of fiscal note calculations, the DOC averaged district caseloads across the state and came up with an average caseload of 51 offender cases per officer. The new calculation assumes that an increase/decrease of 51 cases in a district would result in a change in costs/cost avoidance equal to the cost of one FTE staff person in the district. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offenders are assumed to be absorbable.

In instances where the proposed legislation would only affect a specific caseload, such as sex offenders, the DOC will use the average caseload figure for that specific type of offender to calculate cost increases/decreases.

The DOC cost of incarceration is \$17,224 per day or an annual cost of \$6,287 per offender. The DOC cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that would be needed to cover the new caseload.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

	# to pris on	Cost per year	Total Costs for <b>prison</b>	# to probation & parole	Cost per year	Total cost for <b>probation and parole</b>	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes and 2% inflation)
Year 1	1.0	(\$6,287)	(\$5,239)	2	absorbed	\$0	(\$5,239)
Year 2	2.0	(\$6,287)	(\$12,825)	4	absorbed	\$0	(\$12,825)
Year 3	2.0	(\$6,287)	(\$13,082)	7	absorbed	\$0	(\$13,082)
Year 4	2.0	(\$6,287)	(\$13,344)	7	absorbed	\$0	(\$13,344)
Year 5	2.0	(\$6,287)	(\$13,611)	7	absorbed	\$0	(\$13,611)
Year 6	2.0	(\$6,287)	(\$13,883)	7	absorbed	\$0	(\$13,883)
Year 7	2.0	(\$6,287)	(\$14,160)	7	absorbed	\$0	(\$14,160)
Year 8	2.0	(\$6,287)	(\$14,444)	7	absorbed	\$0	(\$14,444)
Year 9	2.0	(\$6,287)	(\$14,732)	7	absorbed	\$0	(\$14,732)
Year 10	2.0	(\$6,287)	(\$15,027)	7	absorbed	\$0	(\$15,027)

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the costs provided by DOC for fiscal note purposes.

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** state they cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with any of the proposed new crimes relating to dispensation of pharmaceutical monitoring. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

**Oversight** notes over the last three fiscal years, the SPD has lapsed a total of \$152 of General Revenue appropriations (\$0 out of \$36.4 million in FY 2016; \$2 out of \$28.0 million in FY 2017; and \$150 out of \$42.5 million in FY 2018). Therefore, **Oversight** assumes the SPD is at maximum capacity and the increase in workload resulting from this bill cannot be absorbed within SPD's current resources.

Adding one additional Assistant Public Defender 1 (APD) with a starting salary of \$47,000, will cost approximately \$74,500 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. One additional APD II (\$52,000 per year; eligible for consideration after 1 year of successful performance at

ASSUMPTION (continued)

APD I) will cost the state approximately \$81,000 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. When expense and equipment costs such as travel, training, furniture, equipment and supplies are included, **Oversight** assumes the cost for a new APD could approach \$100,000 per year.

**Oversight** assumes the SPD cannot absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal within their existing resources and, therefore, will reflect a potential additional cost of (Less than \$100,000) per year to the General Revenue Fund.

Officials from the **OA, Division of Budget & Planning (B&P)** state the proposed legislation should not result in additional costs or savings to the B&P.

§195.465.1 contains an administrative penalty of \$1,000 per violation for dispensers that knowingly fail to submit or submit incorrect information. §195.465.2 states that any person who unlawfully and knowingly accesses or discloses, or any person authorized to have prescription and dispensation information who knowingly discloses or misuses such information, shall be guilty of a Class E felony. Fines or penalties collected must be directed to the benefit of public schools and may increase TSR. This would increase TSR by an unknown amount.

The proposal has no direct impact on the calculation in Article X, Section 18(e).

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Administrative penalties against a dispenser that knowingly fails to submit dispensation information is in the amount of \$1,000 per violation. One hundred violations would have to be made by dispensers that “knowingly fail” to submit dispensation information for the amount to be \$100,000. Oversight assumes penalty income to school districts would be less than \$100,000 annually.

Officials from **St. Louis County (County)** state the adoption of SB 155 with or without the contract opportunities outlined in §195.459 would decrease County expenditures related to the contract for the prescription drug monitoring program (PDMP) platform by \$56,118 in 2020; \$57,522 in 2021; and \$58,000 in 2022.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the savings provided by St. Louis County for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assume any additional litigation costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing personnel and resources. However, the AGO may seek additional appropriations if there is a significant increase in litigation.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Oversight assumes the AGO will be able to litigate any additional cases with existing staff.

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.

**Oversight** assumes JCAR will be able to administer any rules resulting from this proposal with existing resources.

Officials from the **OA, Administrative Hearing Commission (AHC)** anticipate this legislation will not significantly alter its caseload. However, if similar bills pass resulting in more cases, there could be a fiscal impact.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the OA, AHC can absorb any increase in their caseload resulting from this proposal with existing personnel.

Officials from the **Office of the 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 SOS 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 \$5,000. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the SOS also recognizes 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 with the 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.

**Oversight** assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could require additional resources.

**Oversight** notes that the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration, the Department of Public Safety, Missouri State Highway Patrol, the Department of Social Services, the Missouri House of Representatives, the Missouri Office of Prosecution Services, the Office of State Courts Administrator, the Missouri Senate, the St. Louis County Police Department and the St. Louis County Department of Justice Services** have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these organizations.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 188), officials from the **Boone County Sheriff’s Department**, the **Jackson County Sheriff’s Office** and the **Joplin Police Department** stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these organizations.

**Oversight** only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, Boone County and other local law enforcement agencies were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. For a general listing of political subdivisions included in our database, please refer to [www.legislativeoversight.mo.gov](http://www.legislativeoversight.mo.gov).

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<u>Costs - DHSS (§§195.453-195.465)</u>			
Personal service	(\$297,756)	(\$391,894)	(\$395,812)
Fringe benefits	(\$144,144)	(\$209,300)	(\$210,384)
Equipment and expense	<u>(\$144,924)</u>	<u>(\$128,207)</u>	<u>(\$131,413)</u>
Total <u>Costs</u> - DHSS	<u>(\$586,824)</u>	<u>(\$729,401)</u>	<u>(\$737,609)</u>
FTE Change - DHSS	9 FTE	9 FTE	9 FTE
 <u>Costs - OA, ITSD (§§195.453-195.465)</u>			
System creation and on-going support (ranged from contracting out the programming to hiring additional 5 FTE IT Specialists)*	(\$333,158 to \$757,836)	(\$403,157 to \$492,964)	(\$159,240 to \$406,559)
Equipment and expense	<u>(\$3,090)</u>	<u>(\$3,800)</u>	<u>(\$3,894)</u>
Total <u>Costs</u> - OA, ITSD	<u>(\$336,248 to \$760,926)</u>	<u>(\$406,957 to \$496,764)</u>	<u>(\$163,134 to \$410,453)</u>
FTE Change - OA, ITSD	0 to 5 FTE	0 to 5 FTE	0 to 5 FTE

\* Costs to hire additional FTE would be the lower number in the range in FYs ‘20 and ‘21 and the higher number in the range in subsequent years

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
(continued)			
<u>Costs - DOC (\$195.465)</u>			
Increase in incarceration costs	(\$5,239)	(\$12,825)	(\$13,082)
<u>Costs - SPD (\$195.465)</u>			
Increase in representation costs	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b><u>Less than (\$1,028,311 to \$1,452,989)</u></b>	<b><u>Less than (\$1,249,183 to \$1,338,990)</u></b>	<b><u>Less than (\$1,013,825 to \$1,261,144)</u></b>
Estimated Net FTE Change on the General Revenue Fund	9 to 14 FTE	9 to 14 FTE	9 to 14 FTE
<b>FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<u>Income - DHSS</u>			
Grant income	<u>\$0 to Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 to Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 to Unknown</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>	<b><u>\$0 to Unknown</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to Unknown</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to Unknown</u></b>
<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENTS - SCHOOLS</b>			
<u>Income - Schools (\$195.465)</u>			
Administrative penalties	<u>Less than \$100,000</u>	<u>Less than \$100,000</u>	<u>Less than \$100,000</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS - SCHOOLS</b>	<b><u>Less than \$100,000</u></b>	<b><u>Less than \$100,000</u></b>	<b><u>Less than \$100,000</u></b>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT - ST. LOUIS COUNTY</b>			
<u>Savings - St. Louis County</u>			
Reduction in PDMP platform expenditures	<u>\$56,118</u>	<u>\$57,522</u>	<u>\$58,000</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS - ST. LOUIS COUNTY</b>	<b><u>\$56,118</u></b>	<b><u>\$57,522</u></b>	<b><u>\$58,000</u></b>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

Licensed pharmacies and individual practitioners dispensing Schedule II, III, and IV controlled substances may incur an indeterminate fiscal impact obtaining the computer hardware and software and for additional work hours related to entering and transmitting dispensation data. This dispensing information is already maintained and documented by law; however, the proposed legislation would require the dispensation log information to be submitted within 24 hours of dispensing to the patient. Any costs incurred may be partially offset by being able to immediately access controlled substance dispensing data from the database. An additional economic impact could occur if the dispenser is assessed a fine for not reporting as required by the proposed legislation.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This act establishes the Narcotics Control Act. The Department of Health and Senior Services shall be required to establish and maintain a program to monitor the prescribing and dispensing of all Schedule II, III, and IV controlled substances by all licensed professionals who prescribe or dispense these substances in Missouri. The provisions of this act shall be subject to appropriations and may also be funded with federal or private moneys.

A dispenser shall electronically submit to the Department specified information for each controlled substance dispensed. The Department may issue a waiver to a dispenser who is unable to submit the required information electronically. If a waiver is obtained, a dispenser may submit the required information in paper format or by other approved means. Beginning January 1, 2021, the Department shall begin phasing in a requirement that dispensers report data in real time with all reported data to be submitted in real time by January 1, 2022.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

All dispensation information shall be kept confidential with specified exceptions. This act authorizes the release of non-personal, general information for statistical, educational, and research purposes. The Department shall review the dispensation information and, if there is reasonable cause to believe a violation of law or breach of professional standards may have occurred, the Department shall notify the appropriate law enforcement or professional regulatory entity and provide the dispensation information required for an investigation. No dispensation information submitted to the Department shall be used by any local, state, or federal authority to prevent an individual from owning or obtaining a firearm, or used as the sole basis for probable cause to obtain an arrest or search warrant in a criminal investigation.

Beginning August 28, 2021, the Department shall maintain an individual's prescription and dispensation information obtained under this act for a maximum of 3 years, after which the information shall be deleted from the program.

If a political subdivision of this state is operating a prescription monitoring program for controlled substances, the political subdivision's program shall be permitted to continue operating until such time as the Department's program is available for statewide utilization.

Dispensers who knowingly fail to submit the required information or who knowingly submit incorrect dispensation information shall be subject to a penalty of \$1,000 per violation. Any persons who are authorized to have prescription or dispensation information and who knowingly disclose such information or who knowingly use it in a manner and for a purpose in violation of this act shall be guilty of a Class E felony.

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

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of Attorney General  
Department of Health and Senior Services  
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration  
Department of Corrections  
Department of Public Safety -  
    Missouri State Highway Patrol  
Department of Social Services  
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules  
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services  
Office of Administration -  
    Administrative Hearing Commission  
    Division of Budget & Planning  
    Facilities Management, Design and Construction

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

Office of State Courts Administrator  
Missouri Senate  
Office of Secretary of State  
Office of State Public Defender  
St. Louis County  
Boone County Sheriff's Department  
Jackson County Sheriff's Office  
Joplin Police Department  
St. Louis County Police Department  
St. Louis County Department of Justice Services



Kyle Rieman  
Director  
January 29, 2019

Ross Strobe  
Assistant Director  
January 29, 2019