

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 0749H.03C  
Bill No.: HCS for SB 94  
Subject: Health Care; Health Care Professionals; Education, Higher; Health, Public;  
Hospitals; Children and Minors; Medicaid/Mo Healthnet; Drugs and Controlled  
Substances; Insurance - Health; Department of Elementary and Secondary  
Education  
Type: Original  
Date: April 29, 2025

---

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to health care.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2026</b>	<b>FY 2027</b>	<b>FY 2028</b>
General Revenue Fund	(\$1,084,475 to \$1,588,475)	Up to (\$1,017,485 to \$1,521,485)	Up to (\$1,019,391 to \$1,523,391)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>(\$1,084,475 to \$1,588,475)</b>	<b>Up to (\$1,017,485 to \$1,521,485)</b>	<b>Up to (\$1,019,391 to \$1,523,391)</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2026</b>	<b>FY 2027</b>	<b>FY 2028</b>
Dental Board Fund (0677)	\$0 or (\$3,000 - \$6,000)	\$0 or (\$3,000 - \$6,000)	\$0 or (\$3,000 - \$6,000)
Board of Pharmacy (0637)	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
State Road Fund (0320)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
Conservation Commission Fund (0609)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
Other State Funds	(\$195,000 - \$315,000)	(\$195,000 - \$315,000)	(\$195,000 - \$315,000)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>Could exceed (198,000 to \$321,000)</b>	<b>Could exceed (198,000 to \$321,000)</b>	<b>Could exceed (198,000 to \$321,000)</b>

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
Federal Funds	(\$377,832 to \$553,832)	(\$306,589 to \$482,589)	(\$307,927 to \$483,927)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>(\$377,832 to \$553,832)</b>	<b>(\$306,589 to \$482,589)</b>	<b>(\$307,927 to \$483,927)</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

- ☒ Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.
- ☐ Estimated Net Effect (savings or increased revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
<b>Local Government*</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>

\*Potential cost to schools to purchase single-use epinephrine nasal sprays.

## **FISCAL ANALYSIS**

### **ASSUMPTION**

#### **\$135.621 – Diaper Bank Tax Credit**

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 1522), officials from the **Office of Administration – Budget & Planning (B&P)** assumed this proposal would restart this tax credit, keeping the current annual redemption limit of \$500,000. Therefore, B&P estimates that this provision could reduce TSR and GR by \$175,525 to \$500,000 per year starting FY26.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume this proposal modifies the diaper bank tax credit program. The credit sunset December 31, 2024. This proposal would extend the sunset date until six years from August 28, 2025.

**DOR** notes this program was adopted in 2018 and had a cap of \$500,000 annually. No changes have been made to the program since it started. For informational purposes, DOR is showing the issuances and redemptions over the course of the tax credit.

Year	Authorized	Issued
FY 2024	\$173,152.90	\$173,152.90
FY 2023	\$136,018.86	\$136,018.86
FY 2022	\$182,018.00	\$182,018.00
FY 2021	\$189,453.90	\$189,453.90
FY 2020	\$189,628.19	\$189,628.19
FY 2019	\$0.00	\$0.00
FY 2018	\$0.00	\$0.00

This proposal would be restarting the program which would result in a cost of \$500,000 annually. Additionally, it would require DOR to update the Department's computer program at a cost of \$1,832.

**Oversight** notes DOR requests a one-time cost for website updates to comply with the proposed language; however, Oversight notes that DOR receives appropriation for routine website updates and will not show those costs in the fiscal note.

Oversight notes the following for the Diaper Bank Tax Credit:

Year	Authorized	Issued	Redeemed
FY 2024	\$173,153	\$173,153	\$175,525
FY 2023	\$136,019	\$136,016	\$150,010
FY 2022	\$182,018	\$182,018	\$122,611
FY 2021	\$189,454	\$189,454	\$137,331
FY 2020	\$189,628	\$189,628	\$40,082

\*Source: Tax Credit Analysis Forms – January 2025 submission

**Oversight** notes this proposal extends the sunset date for this program. The average, based on the three-year tax credit redemption, was \$149,382 ( $\$175,525 + \$150,010 + \$122,611 / 3$ ), rounded to nearest dollar, for FY 2022 to FY 2024.

**Oversight** notes this section currently allows sunset as of December 31, 2024; however, this proposal extends the sunset to December 31, 2031 (FY 2032). Therefore, Oversight will reflect a cost that could exceed the average redemption total of \$149,382, in continued costs, to general revenue in FY 2026 and thereafter.

**Oversight** is responsible for providing a Sunset Report pursuant to Section 23.253 RSMo; however, this cost can be absorbed within the current budget authority.

Officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance (DCI)** assume this section of the proposal would have a potential unknown decrease of premium tax revenues (up to the tax credit limit established in the bill) in FY2026, FY2027, and FY2028 as a result of the modification to the Contribution to Diaper Banks tax credit. Premium tax revenue is split 50/50 between General Revenue and County Foreign Insurance Fund except for domestic Stock Property and Casualty Companies who pay premium tax to the County Stock Fund. The County Foreign Insurance Fund is later distributed to school districts throughout the state. County Stock Funds are later distributed to the school district and county treasurer of the county in which the principal office of the insurer is located. It is unknown how each of these funds may be impacted by tax credits each year and which insurers will qualify for the tax credit.

**Oversight** assumes the fiscal note does not reflect the possibility that some of the tax credits could be utilized by insurance companies against insurance premium taxes. If this occurs, the loss in tax revenue would be split between the General Revenue Fund and the County Foreign Insurance Fund, which ultimately goes to local school districts.

§§ 167.627, 167.630, 190.246 & 321.621 - Modifies provisions relating to epinephrine products

Officials from the **Department of Social Services (DSS)** assume the cost of Epinephrine nasal spray devices has an average cost of \$100 per device. It is anticipated that the Division of Youth Services would need to purchase 144 Epinephrine devices to meet the needs of this legislation. Therefore, the fiscal impact to DYS would be \$14,400 in FY 2026 and an ongoing cost of \$0 to \$14,400 for the fiscal years following.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the cost estimated by DSS in the fiscal note.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 553), officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed any potential litigation 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 litigation or investigation costs.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the AGO will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the AGO for fiscal note purposes.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 553), officials from the **Audrain County Health Department** assumed the proposal would have a fiscal impact.

**Oversight** notes the proposal authorizes each board of education in this state to grant permission to pupils, as well as each school board in this state to grant permission to school nurses to use this medication (single-use epinephrine nasal sprays). Oversight assumes there could be a potential cost to schools to purchase these devices. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 to Unknown cost to schools in the fiscal note.

#### § 191.600 to § 191.615 - Missouri State Loan Repayment Program (MOSLRP)

Officials from **Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)** state the proposed legislative changes to Sections 191.600 to 191.615 would update the list of eligible profession types to include all professions allowable under the federal Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) state loan repayment program (SLRP) grant, expanding the eligible professions that Missouri can offer loan repayment to under the SLRP grant.

The expansion of the eligible health professions in the proposed legislation would allow the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS), Office of Rural Health and Primary Care (ORHPC) to request additional federal funds for the SLRP program. The maximum award under the federal SLRP grant is \$1,000,000. Because the grant requires a 1:1 state match, ORHPC has historically only been able to apply for a maximum of \$425,000 in SLRP funds under the match requirement, utilizing donated funds to meet the match requirement.

Under the proposed legislation, health professions eligible under the state SLRP statutes would align with HRSA eligible health professions, allowing state funding received for the HPLRP program to be used to meet the HRSA SLRP match requirement. ORPHC could then receive up to an additional \$575,000 in federal funding to award loans to health professionals under the SLRP program, increasing the number of health professionals providing services in underserved areas. The HPLRP eligible professions are chosen by the Director of Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS) in consultation with the Office of Workforce Development in the

Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development and the Department of Mental Health.

In further discussions with DHSS, officials from the **DHSS** state they can absorb the state match requirement for this federal program due to existing funding that can be used as match.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the DHSS will be able to absorb the funding requirements of this proposal with current resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the DHSS for fiscal note purposes.

§ 191.648 – Sexually transmitted infections

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HCS for HB 943), officials from the **Department of Public Safety (DPS), Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** deferred to the Missouri Department of Transportation (MODOT)/MSHP Healthcare Board for an impact statement for the potential fiscal impact of this section.

§§ 191.708, 208.152 208.662, 208.1400, 208.1405, 208.1410, 208.1415, 208.1420, 208.1425 - MO HealthNet hearing aids

§ 208.152

Officials from the **Department of Social Services (DSS), MO HealthNet Division (MHD)** state currently, MO HealthNet does not include childbirth education classes as a covered service, except for doulas who can bill childbirth classes, which started on 10/1/2024. However, some of the Managed Care health plans offer this as an additional benefit at no cost to the patient. If this were a required service, it is possible a state plan amendment and amendment to the 1915(b) Waiver would be needed.

The cost of a study on the impact of childbirth classes on infant and maternal mortality among pregnant women of color would be a one-time cost of approximately \$45,000 and would be contracted to a vendor.

The cost of adding this service would result in an impact to the Managed Care capitation rates of \$30,000. For FY27 and FY28, a 6.5% medical inflation rate was used. The cost of the actuarial study to evaluate this program change would be \$50,000 in the first year.

FY26 Total: \$125,000 (GR: \$58,168; Federal: \$66,832)

FY27 Total: \$31,950 (GR: \$11,361; Federal: \$20,589)

FY28 Total: \$34,027 (GR: \$12,100; Federal: \$21,927)

**Oversight** does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimates as provided by the DSS.

§ 191.1145 – Telehealth services

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 825), officials from the **City of O'Fallon** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this agency.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 825), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** deferred to the Missouri Department of Transportation for the potential fiscal impact of this proposal.

§ 192.021 - Public health services

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)** stated § 192.021.1 authorizes the Department to contract with the Missouri affiliate of the National Network of Public Health Institutes.

192.021.2 requires an annual report of any grants made. It is assumed that the Department can absorb the costs of this bill with current resources. However, if the workload significantly increased or other legislation was enacted, additional resources would be requested through the appropriation process.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the DHSS will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the DHSS for fiscal note purposes.

§ 192.2521 - Specialty hospitals

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)** state § 192.2521 of the proposed legislation exempts a specialty hospital from the provisions of sections 192.2520 and 197.135 if such hospital has a policy for transfer of a victim of a sexual assault to an appropriate hospital with an emergency department. As used in this section, "specialty hospital" means a hospital that has been designated by the department of health and senior services as something other than a general acute care hospital.

As a result of the proposed legislation, the Division of Regulation and Licensure (DRL), Section for Health Standards and Licensure may experience minor additional work in terms of receiving and processing complaints related to the statute.

It is assumed that DRL can absorb the costs associated with Section 192.2521 with current resources. However, if the workload significantly increased or other legislation was enacted, additional resources would be requested through the appropriation process.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the DHSS will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the DHSS for fiscal note purposes.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 845), officials from the **University of Missouri System** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

§§ 196.990 & 210.225 - Allergy prevention and responses in childcare facilities

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 97), officials from the **Audrain County Health Department** assumed the proposal will have a fiscal impact.

**Oversight** assumes Audrain County Health Department could absorb the costs related to this proposal.

§197.708 – Assaults on health care professionals

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 1213), officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance**, the **Department of Corrections**, the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol**, the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services**, the **Office of the State Courts Administrator**, and the **Office of the State Public Defender** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 1213), officials from the **Cass Regional Medical Center** stated with ten locations and depending on the number of signs per location at \$50 per sign, the estimated cost is \$2,000 for Cass Regional Medical Center. If posted at all treatment locations within the facilities, the cost could increase to \$10,000.

**Oversight** notes the cost for the Cass Regional Medical Center and is unable to project a statewide cost; therefore, the impact to local governments-political subdivisions will be presented as (Unknown). Oversight assumes the fiscal impact will be less than \$250,000.

§ 208.149 - MO HealthNet reimbursement for the professional component of clinical pathology services

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 1500), officials from the **Department of Social Services (DSS)**, **MO HealthNet Division (MHD)** stated Medicare does not have a separate rate for pathology services. MHD is implementing a Diagnosis Related Group (DRG) payment methodology similar to Medicare for inpatient services starting in SFY26. This new payment structure is a bundled rate inclusive of pathology services. Therefore, the fiscal impact



of this is unknown. DSS doesn't have any further information as to the extent of the cost or whether there would be a cost.

Without additional information from DSS, **Oversight** cannot estimate a fiscal impact for this proposal. For purposes of this fiscal note, Oversight will assume DSS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes DSS could absorb any costs related to this proposal. If this assumption is incorrect, this would alter the fiscal impact as presented in this fiscal note. If additional information is received, Oversight will review it to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

#### § 210.030 - Prenatal tests for certain diseases

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)** state § 210.030.1 of the proposed legislation would increase the number of patient samples that the Missouri State Public Health Laboratory (MSPHL) would receive for HIV, syphilis, Hepatitis C, and Hepatitis B testing.

Approximately 4.5 percent of women are pregnant at any one time, so this percentage was used on the total number of female samples received for HIV and syphilis testing in 2024. An additional 500 to 800 samples a year would be tested for all conditions if this legislation passed.

The estimated number of pregnant females was used in the calculations for HIV, syphilis, Hepatitis C, and Hepatitis B expenses for both screening and confirmatory costs. Confirmatory numbers were based on current trends that are seen for each test.

The cost estimates are based upon the expected number of samples and cost per test with an applied algorithm for testing and confirmation.

- HIV (765 samples times \$6.20 per test plus \$327.60 confirmation testing = \$5,071)
- Syphilis (675 samples times \$3.25 per test plus \$1,420.25 confirmation testing = \$3,614)
- Hepatitis B (500 samples times \$14.93 per test = \$7,465)
- Hepatitis C (500 samples times \$7.63 per test plus \$3,815 confirmation testing = \$6,080)

The projected total per year would be \$22,230 in additional reagents and kit costs. The cost of reagents will go up each year with an inflation cost of 5 percent per year. MSPHL cannot absorb this cost. The workload for performing the additional testing can be absorbed by current staff.

**Oversight** does not have information to the contrary. Oversight notes this proposal does not have an emergency clause. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the FY 2026 estimates as provided by the DHSS as \$18,525  $(\$22,230/12)*10$ .

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

However, in response to similar legislation from the current session (HCS for HB 943), officials from the **DOC** stated there is no apparent fiscal impact on the **Division of Offender Rehabilitative Services (DORS)**, however additional obstetric labs and treatment may impact contracted healthcare provider.

**Oversight** assumes because the potential increased costs due to additional obstetric labs and treatment is speculative, that the DOC, DORS will not incur significant costs related to this proposal. If a fiscal impact were to result, the DOC, DORS may request additional funding through the appropriations process.

§§ 332.211, 332.281, 332.700 to 332.760 – Dental and Dental Hygienist Compact

Officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance (DCI)** state that there are now 11 states that have passed the compact language. They are estimating that it will take another 12 to 18 months for the compact to be enacted. Costs are still unknown at this time.

**Oversight** notes in response to similar legislation from 2023 (SB 70) (the Counseling Interstate Compact), DCI estimated a cost of \$3,000 - \$6,000 in annual fees to participate in the compact if the compact were to be enacted.

Therefore, **Oversight** will reflect the estimated fiscal impact as a range of \$0 (the compact is not enacted) to \$3,000 - \$6,000 (the compact is enacted) to the Dental Board Fund (0677).

§ 338.333 - Licensure of entities involved in the distribution of drugs

Officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance (DCI)** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

**Oversight** notes currently, no person or outlet can act as a wholesale drug distributor, pharmacy distributor, drug outsourcer, or third-party logistics provider without obtaining a license from the Missouri Board of Pharmacy. Oversight assumes this legislation permits the Board of Pharmacy to license out-of-state entities if those entities possess a valid license from another state with comparable standards.

**DCI** noted the current fees for instate licensees are:

\$360 for Original Pharmacy Distributor/Wholesale Drug, Distributor, Drug Outsourcer, or Third-Party, Logistics Provider License Fee (includes both temporary and permanent license)

\$540 for Pharmacy Distributor/Wholesale Drug Distributor/Drug Outsourcer or Third-Party Logistics Provider License Renewal Fee

Although the current “in-state” fee is known, the number of out-of-state licenses that could be issued and the fee that will be charged to the new licensees is unknown. **Oversight** will reflect a \$0 (no new licenses are issued) to Unknown revenue to the Board of Pharmacy Fund (0637). Oversight assumes the revenue generated (if any) will be less than \$250,000.

§ 376.1240 - Self-administered hormonal contraceptives

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 398), officials from the **Department of Public Safety (DPS), Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** deferred to the Missouri Department of Transportation (MODOT)/MSHP Healthcare Board for an impact statement for the potential fiscal impact of this proposal.

§ 376.1245 – Anesthesia Services Insurance Coverage

Officials from the **Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT)** assume this bill may increase costs for plan administrators, which will likely pass on costs to the MoDOT-MSHP medical plan. This would have an unknown negative impact to the State Road Fund.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 932), officials from **Kansas City** stated the proposed legislation has a potential negative fiscal impact of an indeterminate amount.

**Oversight** assumes prohibiting policy or practices of limiting timeframes for payment of anesthesia services and restricting or excluding anesthesia time could increase health insurance costs for insurance plans. Oversight assumes the cost will be less than \$250,000 based on MoDOT’s response to similar legislation from this year (HB 1071). Oversight will reflect a \$0 to Unknown, less than \$250,000 cost to the State Road Fund, Conservation Commission Fund (although MDC has stated no impact) and Local Political Subdivisions.

§§ 376.2100 - 376.2108 - Prior Authorization Exemption

Officials from the **Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan (MCHCP)** assume this legislation creates a prior authorization exemption, which would allow providers to skip prior authorization requirements if they qualify by meeting a 90% approval threshold in the 6 months prior. Once this exemption is applied, payment can only be withheld for limited reasons that does not include the service being later found not medically necessary in whole or in part.

It is unknown how many providers serving MCHCP members would qualify for this exemption. For this calculation, it is assumed that 15% of providers would qualify. It is also unknown how many cases would be authorized under the exemption that would otherwise be deemed not medically necessary in whole or in part. It is assumed a 5% utilization increase once Prior Authorization controls are off. HB 618 would have an estimated impact of \$1,300,000 to \$2,100,000 for MCHCP.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the cost estimated provided by MCHCP, broken out as follows:

General Revenue Fund -	\$819,000 - \$1,323,000 (63%)
Federal Fund -	\$286,000 - \$ 462,000 (22%)
Other Fund -	\$195,000 - \$ 315,000 (15%)
<b>Total -</b>	<b>\$1,300,000 - \$2,100,000 (100%)</b>

Officials from the **Missouri Department of Transportation (MODOT)** state this bill may increase costs for plan administrators, which will likely pass on costs to the MoDOT-MSHP medical plan. This would have an unknown negative impact to the State Road Fund.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the cost estimate as “Unknown” to the State Road Fund. Oversight assumes this cost could be greater than \$250,000.

Officials from the **Department of Social Services (DSS)** assumed this legislation applies to Chapter 376 and states that a Medicaid managed care organization, as defined in section 208.431, shall be considered a health carrier for purposes of sections 376.2100 to 376.2108. Subsequently, this legislation would apply to MO HealthNet Managed Care and there could be a fiscal impact.

The Managed Care Health Plans (HP) have prior authorization processes in place, and this legislation would result in providers not needing to obtain prior authorization for services unless the HP determines that it has approved or would have approved less than 90% of prior authorization requests submitted by that provider for health care services in the most recent evaluation period. MHD estimates that there could be an impact on the administrative component of the rate for the additional reporting, reviewing, and monitoring of the prior authorizations. However, MHD does not have enough information at this time to ascertain whether there would be an impact on the service portion of the capitated rate. This will require an actuarial analysis estimated to cost \$25,000 for this program change.

FY26 Total: \$25,000 (GR: \$12,500; Federal: \$12,500)

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the fiscal impact as estimated by DSS.

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 618), officials from the **Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC)** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 618), officials from **Kansas City** assumed this legislation will have a negative fiscal impact of an indeterminate amount

**Oversight** notes that although the MDC state this legislation would have no fiscal impact on their organization, Oversight assumes this legislation could affect other insurance plans such as the Missouri Department of Conservation and local political subdivisions. Oversight will reflect a \$0 to Unknown cost to the Conservation Commission Fund (0609) and local political subdivisions.

Officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance (DCI)** believes the costs of this section of the bill can be absorbed within our current appropriations. However, should the cost be more than anticipated, the department would request an increase to our FTE and/or appropriations as appropriate through the budget process.

**Oversight** will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this agency.

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 618), from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** deferred to the Missouri Department of Transportation for the potential fiscal impact of this proposal.

§ 407.324 – Air Ambulance Insurance Provisions

Officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance**, the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Missouri Department of Conservation**, the **Missouri Department of Transportation**, the **Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan** and the **City of Kansas City** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 991), officials from the **Attorney General's Office** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Bill as a whole:

Officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator**, **State Tax Commission**, **Office of the Governor**, **Missouri Department of Conservation**, **Missouri National Guard**, **Office of the State Treasurer**, **Department of Mental Health**, **Department of Natural Resources**, **Department of Corrections**, **Department of Economic Development**, **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, **Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development**, **Department of Public Safety (Capitol Police, Fire Safety, Directors Office, State Emergency Management Agency, Missouri Highway Patrol)**, the **Newton County Health Department**, the **Platte County Board of Elections**, the **Phelps County Sherriff Department**, **Branson Police Department**, **Kansas City Police Department**, **St. Louis Police Department**, **University of Central Missouri**, **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services**, and the **State Tax Commission** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their

respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

#### Rule Promulgation

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assume this proposal is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** note 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 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.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028
<b>GENERAL REVENUE</b>			
<u>Costs -Diaper Bank Tax Credit</u> (§135.621) p.3	Could Exceed (\$149,382)	Could Exceed (\$149,382)	Could Exceed (\$149,382)
<u>Costs – DSS (§§ 167.627, 167.630 &amp; 190.246) – Purchase of epinephrine nasal spray devices p.4-5</u>	(\$14,400)	\$0 to (\$14,400)	\$0 to (\$14,400)
<u>Costs – DSS/MHD (§ 208.152) p. 6</u>			
Actuarial study	(\$12,500)	\$0	\$0
Childbirth Education Classes	(\$58,168)	(\$11,361)	(\$12,100)
<u>Total Costs - DSS/MHD</u>	(\$70,668)	(\$11,361)	(\$12,100)
<u>Costs – DHSS/MSPHL (§ 210.030)</u> Additional testing supplies p. 9-10	(\$18,525)	(\$23,342)	(\$24,509)
<u>Cost – MCHCP (§§376.2100 - 376.2108) p.12-13</u> Prior Authorization Exemptions	(\$819,000 - \$1,323,000)	(\$819,000 - \$1,323,000)	(\$819,000 - \$1,323,000)
<u>Cost – DSS – (§§376.2100 - 376.2108)</u> Actuarial Analysis p.11-13	(\$12,500)	\$0	\$0
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b><u>(\$1,084,475 to \$1,588,475)</u></b>	<b><u>Up to (\$1,017,485 to \$1,521,485)</u></b>	<b><u>Up to (\$1,019,391 to \$1,523,391)</u></b>
<b>DENTAL BOARD FUND (0677)</b>			
<u>Costs – DCI (§ 332.700) Dental and Dental Hygienist Compact Fees p. 10</u>	<u>\$0 or (\$3,000- \$6,000)</u>	<u>\$0 or (\$3,000- \$6,000)</u>	<u>\$0 or (\$3,000- \$6,000)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE DENTAL BOARD FUND (0677)</b>	<b><u>\$0 or (\$3,000- \$6,000)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or (\$3,000- \$6,000)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or (\$3,000- \$6,000)</u></b>

<b>FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<u>Costs</u> – DSS/MHD (§ 208.152) p. 6		Up to...	Up to...
Actuarial study	(\$12,500)	\$0	\$0
Childbirth Education Class	(\$66,832)	(\$20,589)	(\$21,927))
<u>Total Costs</u> - DSS/MHD	(\$79,332)	(\$20,589)	(\$21,927))
<u>Cost</u> – MCHCP (§§376.2100 - 376.2108) p.11-13 Prior Authorization Exemptions	(\$286,000 - \$462,000)	(\$286,000 - \$462,000)	(\$286,000 - \$462,000)
<u>Cost</u> – DSS – (§§376.2100 - 376.2108) Actuarial Analysis p.11-13	(\$12,500)	\$0	\$0
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>	<b><u>(\$377,832 to \$553,832)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$306,589 to \$482,589)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$307,927 to \$483,927)</u></b>
<b>*BOARD OF PHARMACY FUND (0637)</b>			
<u>Revenue</u> – DCI (§338.333) License Fee p. 10-11	\$0 to <u>Unknown</u>	\$0 to <u>Unknown</u>	\$0 to <u>Unknown</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE BOARD OF PHARMACY FUND</b>	<b><u>\$0 to Unknown</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to Unknown</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to Unknown</u></b>
<b>STATE ROAD FUND (0320)**</b>			
<u>Cost</u> – MoDOT (§376.1245) Anesthesia Cost p. 11	\$0 to (Unknown, less than \$250,000)	\$0 to (Unknown, less than \$250,000)	\$0 to (Unknown, less than \$250,000)
<u>Cost</u> – MoDOT §§376.2100 - 376.2108 Prior Authorization Exemptions p.11-13	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)



<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE STATE ROAD FUND (0320)**</b>	<b><u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u></b>
<b>CONSERVATION COMMISSION FUND (0609)**</b>			
<u>Cost – MDC (§376.1245)</u> <u>Anesthesia Cost p. 11</u>	<u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown, less</u> <u>than \$250,000)</u>	<u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown, less</u> <u>than \$250,000)</u>	<u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown, less</u> <u>than \$250,000)</u>
<u>Cost – MDC §§376.2100 - 376.2108</u> <u>Prior Authorization Exemptions</u> <u>p.11-13</u>	<u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO CONSERVATION COMMISSION FUND (0609)**</b>	<b><u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u></b>
<b>OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
<u>Cost – MCHCP (§§376.2100 -</u> <u>376.2108) p.12-13</u> <u>Prior Authorization Exemptions</u>	<u>(\$195,000 -</u> <u>\$315,000)</u>	<u>(\$195,000 -</u> <u>\$315,000)</u>	<u>(\$195,000 -</u> <u>\$315,000)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>	<b><u>(\$195,000 -</u> <u>\$315,000)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$195,000 -</u> <u>\$315,000)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$195,000 -</u> <u>\$315,000)</u></b>

\*The fee to be charged and the number of applicants is unknown. Oversight assumes the revenue generated will be less than \$250,000.

\*\* Health benefit plans unknown cost to provide coverage for possible increase in anesthesia services could increase health insurance costs.

§§376.2100 - 376.2108 - **Oversight** assumes increase costs for plan administrators will likely pass on costs to the MoDOT-MSHP, the Missouri Department of Conservation and locals' medical plans.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028
<b>LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>			
<u>Costs</u> – School Districts (§§ 167.627, 167.630 & 190.246) - Purchase of epinephrine nasal spray devices p. 4-5	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<u>*Cost</u> – Local Political Subdivisions (§§376.2100 - 376.2108) Prior Authorization Exemptions p.12-13	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>	<b>\$0 to (Unknown)</b>

**\*Oversight** assumes increase costs for plan administrators will likely pass on costs to the MoDOT-MSHP, the Missouri Department of Conservation and locals’ medical plans.

#### FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

Licensed Dentist and Dental Hygienist could have a direct fiscal impact as a result of this proposal. (§ 332.700)

#### FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal modifies provisions relating to health care.

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

Attorney General’s Office  
 Department of Commerce and Insurance  
 Department of Corrections  
 Department of Economic Development  
 Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
 Department of Health and Senior Services  
 Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development

Department of Mental Health  
Department of Natural Resources  
Department of Public Safety  
    Capitol Police  
    Director's Office  
    Division of Fire Safety  
    Missouri Highway Patrol  
    Missouri Veterans Commission  
    State Emergency Management Agency  
Department of Revenue  
Department of Social Services  
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules  
Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan  
Missouri Department of Conservation  
Missouri Department of Transportation  
Missouri National Guard  
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services  
Office of the Governor  
Office of the Secretary of State  
Office of the State Courts Administrator  
Office of the State Public Defender  
Office of the State Treasurer  
Oversight Division  
State Tax Commission  
City of Kansas City  
City of O'Fallon  
City of Osceola  
Jackson County Election Board  
Platte County Board of Elections  
St. Louis City Board of Elections  
St. Louis County Board of Elections  
Audrain County Health Department  
Newton County Health Department  
Phelps County Sheriff  
Branson Police Department

L.R. No. 0749H.03C  
Bill No. HCS for SB 94  
Page **20** of **20**  
April 29, 2025

Kansas City Police Department  
St. Louis County Police Department  
Northwest Missouri State University  
University of Central Missouri  
University of Missouri System



Julie Morff  
Director  
April 29, 2025



Jessica Harris  
Assistant Director  
April 29, 2025