

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 4774H.04C  
 Bill No.: HCS for SB 1019  
 Subject: Health Care; Hospitals; Mental Health; Professional Registration and Licensing;  
 Physicians; Department of Health and Senior Services; Medicaid/MO HealthNet;  
 Drugs and Controlled Substances; Pharmacy; Insurance - Health  
 Type: Original  
 Date: April 24, 2026

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

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
General Revenue*/**	(\$68,115 to Unknown)	(\$136,146 to Unknown)	(\$185,158 to Unknown)	(\$332,325 to Unknown)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>(\$68,115 to Unknown)</b>	<b>(\$136,146 to Unknown)</b>	<b>(\$185,158 to Unknown)</b>	<b>(\$332,325 to Unknown)</b>

\*DOC notes that current capacity will be met by July 2029 (FY 2030) or potentially much sooner. Therefore, Oversight has made the decision to reflect the marginal cost of incarceration up to an unknown cost if DOC needs to add staff and/or rehabilitate, expand or construct additional capacity. Oversight assumes the unknown cost has the potential to exceed \$250,000.

\*\* Costs to DMH are unknown but could exceed \$250,000 annually.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
State Road Fund (1320)	\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)	\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)	\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)	\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)
Merchandising Practices Revolving (1631)*	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other State Funds</u></b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)</b>

\*Potential unknown violation/fines collected by the AGO assumed to be less than \$250,000 annually.

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
Federal Funds*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All Federal Funds</u></b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

\* Revenue gain and costs to DMH are unknown but could exceed \$250,000 annually and net to \$0.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</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.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown)</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown)</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown)</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown)</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

#### §§96.192, 96.196, 206.110 & 206.158 – Provisions Relating to Hospital Investments and Service Areas

In response to a previous version, officials from the **City of Kansas City** and the **Platte County Board of Elections** 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 similar legislation, HB 2146 (2026), officials from the **University of Missouri System** 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, SB 244 (2025), officials from the **Jackson County Election Board** 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.

#### §192.021 - Department Of Health and Senior Services Contracts for Public Health

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)** state section 192.021 of the proposed legislation authorizes the DHSS to contract directly with a Missouri affiliate of The National Network of Public Health Institutes and 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** assumes DHSS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes DHSS could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, DHSS could request funding through the appropriation process. Officials from the DHSS assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

#### §197.708 - Hospital Workplace Violence

Officials from the **DHSS** state section 197.708 of the proposed legislation requires hospitals to prominently display in a prominent place within the waiting rooms of the emergency department and the labor and delivery department a printed sign, in all capital letters, warning that assaulting a health care professional is a serious crime.

The Division of Regulation and Licensure's (DRL) Section for Health Standards and Licensure (HSL) is responsible for the licensure and regulation of hospitals. The proposed legislation would require minor modifications to the hospital inspection protocol to ensure compliance with Section 197.708. In addition, HSL may experience minor additional work in terms of complaint investigations. Any complaints received by HSL as a result of the proposed legislation would be conducted within the normal ebb and flow of work scope.

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** assumes DHSS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes DHSS could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, DHSS could request funding through the appropriation process. Officials from the DHSS assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to similar legislation, HB 1213 (2025), 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 Coverage of Certain Clinical Pathology Services

Officials from the **Department of Social Services-MO Healthnet Division (DSS-MHD)** state the provisions in this section are not currently an allowed billable service amount. In order to establish this payment, the State would need to seek State Plan Approval from CMS. The State actuary would need to evaluate this program change to include in Managed Care rate development. The cost of the actuarial analysis is estimated to be \$25,000.

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

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health (DMH)** stated the anticipated fiscal impact to DMH for Comprehensive Psychiatric Rehab (CPR), Comprehensive Substance Treatment and Rehabilitation (CSTAR), Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinics (CCBHO) and Developmental Disabilities (DD) waiver services are included in the DSS estimate.

**Oversight** notes DMH's deferral to DSS for a statement of fiscal impact; for fiscal note purposes, Oversight assumes no fiscal impact for DMH.

§376.417 - 340B Drugs

Officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance (DCI)** state the proposal includes a provision that would prohibit health carriers and pharmacy benefit managers from engaging in activity, outlined in the statute, which would constitute discrimination against a covered entity under the 340B drug program. It would give the Department the authority to impose a civil penalty on health carriers, pharmacy benefit managers, or their affiliates for violations of the statute, and requires the Department to promulgate rules. This provision does have an impact on the Insurance Divisions.

The department believes the costs of this bill can be absorbed within their current appropriations. However, should the cost exceed the anticipated amount, the department would request an increase to their FTE and/or appropriations as appropriate through the budget process.

**Oversight** assumes DCI is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes DCI could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, DCI could request funding through the appropriation process. Officials from the DCI assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** assume this section allows the director of DCI to impose a civil penalty on health carrier, pharmacy benefits manager, or agent or affiliate that violates requirements of this section. Such penalty shall not exceed \$5,000 per violation per day. Article IX, Section 7 of the Missouri Constitution requires that penalties, forfeitures and fines collected for violations of state law be distributed to the schools. To the extent any additional such revenues are deposited into the state treasury, TSR may increase.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Missouri Highway Patrol** deferred to the **Missouri Department of Transportation/MSHP Health Care Board** for the potential fiscal impact of this proposal.

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

Since it is unknown if this proposal will result in a cost to the medical plan that could pass on to members, **Oversight** will range the fiscal impact as \$0 to Unknown, greater than \$250,000 to the State Road Fund (1320). Oversight assumes this proposal could have a fiscal impact on local political subdivisions.

**Oversight** notes provisions of §376.417.3 imposes a civil penalty on any health carrier, pharmacy benefits manager, or agent or affiliate of such health carrier or pharmacy benefits

manager that violates provisions of this subsection. The penalty may not exceed \$5,000 per day. Oversight notes that violations resulting in fines could vary widely from year to year. Civil penalties collected per Article IX, Section 7 of the Missouri Constitution requires fines to be distributed to the school district where the violation occurred; therefore, Oversight will reflect a positive fiscal impact of \$0 to Unknown to local school districts on the fiscal note.

§§376.1000, 376.1012 & 376.1017 – Multiple Employer Self-Insured Health Plans

**Oversight** assumes these provisions are codifying language in statute regarding Multiple Employer Self-Insured Health Plans and will have no fiscal impact on this proposal.

§376.1280 - Insurance Coverage of Alternatives to Opioid Drugs

Officials from the **DCI** state the proposal specifies that in situations where a health care provider prescribes a nonopioid medication for the treatment of acute pain, a health benefit plan may not deny coverage of the nonopioid drug in favor of an opioid drug; may not require the enrollee to try an opioid before covering the nonopioid drug, or require higher cost-sharing for the nonopioid drug than for the opioid drug. This section of the proposal is not a new health benefit mandate.

The department believes the costs of this bill can be absorbed within their current appropriations. However, should the cost exceed the anticipated amount, the department would request an increase to their FTE and/or appropriations as appropriate through the budget process.

**Oversight** assumes DCI is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes DCI could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, DCI could request funding through the appropriation process. Officials from the DCI assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

§407.3007 - Provisions Relating to Artificial Intelligence in Mental Health

In response to similar legislation, Perfected HCS for HB 2372 (2026), 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.

Oversight notes the provisions of §407.3007.4 provide that if the AGO finds a violation of the provisions of this proposal have occurred, the AGO shall commence a civil action with civil penalties of \$10,000 for the first violation and \$20,000 for any subsequent violation. Oversight

notes civil penalties for merchandising practices violations (Chapter 407) are deposited in the Merchandising Practices Revolving Fund (1631). Oversight will reflect a \$0 or Unknown positive fiscal impact to the Merchandising Practices Revolving Fund. It is assumed additional collections resulting from these changes will be less than \$250,000 annually.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** state §407.3007 prohibits persons or entities deploying AI from advertising or representing the AI as a mental health professional. There is a \$10,000 penalty for the first violation and \$20,000 for every subsequent violation. Article IX, Section 7 of the Missouri Constitution requires that penalties, forfeitures and fines collected for violations of state law be distributed to the schools. To the extent any additional such revenues are deposited into the state treasury, TSR may increase.

In response to similar legislation, Perfected HCS for HB 2372 (2026), officials from the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Department of Public Safety, (Capitol Police, Missouri Veterans Commission), Missouri Ethics Commission, Missouri Department of Transportation, Office of Administration, Office of the State Public Defender, City of Kansas City, Platte County Election Board, St. Louis County Election Board, St. Louis City Assessor, Eastern Clay Ambulance District, Wayne County Public Water Supply District #2, Northwest Missouri State University** and the **Office of the Lieutenant Governor** each assumed the proposal would 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 similar legislation, Perfected HCS for HB 2372 (2026), officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services, Office of the Secretary of State, City of O'Fallon, Jackson County Election Board** and the **Metro St. Louis District Employees Pension Plan** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organizations. **Oversight** has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

#### §632.305 – Detention for Evaluation and Treatment

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health (DMH)** 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 this agency.

#### Responses regarding the proposed legislation as a whole for §§191.1146, 192.021, 197.708, 208.149, 324.009, 334.108, 345.050, 376.417 & 376.1280

In response to similar legislation, Perfected HCS for HB 2372 (2026), officials from the **City of Kansas City** stated the proposed legislation may have a negative fiscal impact of an indeterminate amount.

**Oversight** notes that several provisions included in this legislation increase medical insurance obligations which may have an unknown direct or indirect fiscal impact on local political subdivisions. Therefore, for fiscal note purposes, Oversight will reflect the overall impact on local political subdivisions as \$0 or unknown.

In response to similar legislation, Perfected HCS for HB 2372 (2026), 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, Perfected HCS for HB 2372 (2026), officials from the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Department of Mental Health, Department of Public Safety (Capitol Police, Missouri Veterans Commission), Office of Administration (OA), Office of the State Public Defender, Platte County Board of Elections, Eastern Clay Ambulance District and Northwest Missouri State University** each assumed the proposal would 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 similar legislation, Perfected HCS for HB 2372 (2026), officials from the **City of O'Fallon** 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 for this agency.

In response to similar legislation, Perfected HCS for HB 2372 (2026), officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** stated, as misdemeanors fall outside the purview of the Department of Corrections, this legislation will have no impact on the department.

§§632.489, 632.492, 632.495, 632.504, and 632.520 – Sexual Offenses

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state the following:

Section 632.495 modifies a provision regarding the Department of Mental Health (DMH) entering into an interagency agreement with DOC for the housing of sexually violent predators or those that may meet the definition of such as determined by the courts. It adds that the department would have to have necessary space and services available, and the director would have to agree to provide such confinement. It also allows DOC to enter into other contractual agreements to provide necessary services. Currently, no plans to enter into an interagency agreement have been made, however, this legislation permits future joint collaboration should this legislation pass. Should arrangements be made and the department enters into an agreement

with the Department of Mental Health, the DOC could request any necessary funding from the General Assembly through the budget process. However, at this time, the department assumes no impact to this section.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the DOC 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 DOC for fiscal note purposes. However, if multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties, the DOC may request funding through the appropriation process.

Officials from the **DMH** state Sections 632.489, 632.492, 632.495, 632.504, and 632.520 are added regarding the ability of DMH to enter into an interagency agreement with DOC for the confinement of persons meeting the definition of a sexually violent predator. There is no anticipated fiscal impact.

In response to similar legislation, HS for HCS for HB Nos. 3068 & 3049 (2026), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** stated they provide training and continuing legal education to Missouri's elected prosecuting attorneys and assistant prosecuting attorneys. Each year, MOPS reviews criminal justice-related legislation enacted by the General Assembly and incorporates those statutory changes into training materials and legislative update presentations provided at statewide conferences and other continuing legal education programs.

To implement the provisions of this legislation, MOPS staff will be required to review the enacted statutory language, analyze the changes for purposes of criminal enforcement and charging decisions, update training materials and presentations, and then deliver the new information to law enforcement officers and prosecutors across the state.

MOPS anticipates that implementation of this legislation would require a modest amount of staff time to review and incorporate the statutory changes into existing training materials. The cost associated with this activity is unknown but expected to be minimal.

MOPS notes, however, that each legislative session produces numerous changes to criminal statutes that must be reviewed and incorporated into statewide training materials. While the fiscal impact of any individual bill is minimal, the cumulative effect of multiple statutory changes is not insignificant.

Responses regarding the proposed legislation as a whole for §§632.489, 632.492, 632.495, 632.504 & 632.520

In response to similar legislation, HS for HCS for HB Nos. 3068 & 3049 (2026), 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, HS for HCS for HB Nos. 3068 & 3049 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety (Capitol Police), Missouri Ethics Commission, Missouri Department of Transportation, University of Missouri System, City of Kansas City, Kansas City Election Board, Platte County Board of Elections, Metro St. Louis District Employees Pension Plan, Wayne County Public Water Supply District #2 and Northwest Missouri State University** 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 similar legislation, HS for HCS for HB Nos. 3068 & 3049 (2026), officials from the **Eastern Clay Ambulance District** indicated this proposal would have a fiscal impact on their organization. However, they provided no information explaining the potential fiscal impact this proposal would have on their organization. Therefore, for fiscal note purposes, **Oversight** assumes any fiscal impact incurred would be minimal and absorbable within current funding levels.

§§632.580, 632.585, 632.590, 632.593, 632.595, 632.600, 632.605 and 632.610 - Court-Ordered Involuntary Outpatient Treatment for Persons with Mental Disorders

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this proposal modifies provisions relating to health care.

Section 632.585 allows for petitions for assisted outpatient treatment to be filed without notarization or for any affidavits, declarations, or other documents supporting a petition. The petition and any affidavits, declarations, or other documents supporting the petition shall be subject to the provisions of section 492.060 allowing for declaration under penalty of perjury. Section 575.040 outlines the penalties for perjury.

It adds a Class E nonviolent felony if the perjury is committed in any proceeding not involving felony charges.

It adds a Class D nonviolent felony if the perjury is committed in any proceeding involving felony charges.

It adds a Class B felony if the perjury is committed during a criminal trial for the purpose of securing the conviction of an accused for any felony except murder.

It adds a Class A felony if the perjury is committed during a criminal trial for the purpose of securing the conviction of an accused for murder.

As these are new crimes, there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, and as such, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class E, D, B, and A felony.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the department estimates one person could be sentenced to prison and two to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class E felony offense is 3.4 years, of which 2.1 years could be served in prison with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years could be on parole. Probation sentences could be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 2 additional offenders in prison and 7 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

For each new nonviolent class D felony, the department estimates three people could be sentenced to prison and five to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class D felony offense is 5 years, of which 2.8 years could be served in prison with 1.7 years to first release. The remaining 2.2 years could be on parole. Probation sentences could be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 8 additional offenders in prison and 16 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

Given the seriousness of class B felony offenses and that the introduction of a completely new class B felony offense is a rare event, the department assumes the admission of one person per year to prison following the passage of the legislative proposal.

Offenders committed to prison with a class B felony as their most serious sentence, have an average sentence length of 9.0 years and serve on average, 3.4 years in prison prior to first release. The department assumes one third of the remaining sentence length could be served in prison as a parole return, and the rest of the sentence could be served on supervision in the community.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 5 additional offenders in prison and 0 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2031.

Given the seriousness of class A felony offenses and that the introduction of a completely new class A felony offense is a rare event, the department assumes the admission of one person per year to prison following the passage of the legislative proposal.

Offenders committed to prison with a class A felony have an average sentence length of 17.1 years and serve, on average, 12.3 years in prison prior to first release. The department assumes one third of the remaining sentence length could be served in prison as a parole return, and the rest of the sentence could be served on supervision in the community.

The sentence lengths associated with these offenses pushes the estimate of total cumulative impact on the department beyond the 10-year time frame of this fiscal note. However, the estimated impact by FY 2036 is 10 additional offenders in prison.

**Combined Cumulative Estimated Impact**

The total impact of adding an A, B, Non-violent D and Non-Violent E felony on the department is estimated to be 25 additional offenders in prison and 33 on field supervision by FY 2036.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for prison	Change in & parole officers	Total cost for probation <b>and</b> parole	# to probation & parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes 2% inflation)
Year 1	6	(\$11,123)	(\$55,615)	0	\$0	7	(\$55,615)
Year 2	12	(\$11,123)	(\$136,146)	0	\$0	14	(\$136,146)
Year 3	16	(\$11,123)	(\$185,158)	0	\$0	23	(\$185,158)
Year 4	18	(\$11,123)	(\$212,469)	0	\$0	26	(\$212,469)
Year 5	20	(\$11,123)	(\$240,798)	0	\$0	29	(\$240,798)
Year 6	21	(\$11,123)	(\$257,895)	0	\$0	30	(\$257,895)
Year 7	22	(\$11,123)	(\$275,579)	0	\$0	31	(\$275,579)
Year 8	23	(\$11,123)	(\$293,867)	0	\$0	32	(\$293,867)
Year 9	24	(\$11,123)	(\$312,777)	0	\$0	33	(\$312,777)
Year 10	25	(\$11,123)	(\$332,325)	0	\$0	33	(\$332,325)

The department will assume a marginal cost (multiplied by number of offenders) for any projected increase or decrease in the incarcerated population. Marginal cost is \$30.47 per day or an annual cost of \$11,123 per offender which includes costs such as medical, food, wages and operational E&E. The unknown amount is a result of the uncertainty in the growth of the underlying offender population. The impact of any new legislation combined with the growth of the underlying population could result in the tiered approach below in order to meet the population demands.

1. Fully staffing DOC's current capacity (27,368) which is habitable, but DOC does not have the staffing resources for all bed space.
2. Rehabilitating current space that is not currently habitable and obtaining staffing resources for that space (requires capital improvements).
3. Expanding new capacity by adding housing units or wings to existing prisons and obtaining staffing resources for that space (requires capital improvements).
4. Constructing a new prison and obtaining staffing resources. Based on current construction projects in other Midwest states, the department estimates the cost of constructing a new 1,500-bed maximum security prison at approximately \$825 million to

\$900 million plus annual operating costs of approximately \$50 million (requires capital improvements).

The department's population projections indicate current physical capacity will be met by July 2029; however recent trends indicate that capacity could be met much sooner. Should new construction be the result of the increasing offender population, the full cost per day per offender would be used, which is \$106.96 or an annual cost of \$39,040. This includes all items in the marginal cost calculation plus fringe, personal service, utilities, etc.

DOC's cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that are needed to cover its caseload. The DOC average district caseload across the state is 51 offender cases per officer. An increase/decrease of 51 cases would result in a cost/cost avoidance equal to the salary, fringe, and equipment and expenses of one P&P Officer II. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offender cases 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.

\* If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it could be due to an increase/decrease in the number of offenders, a change in the cost per day for institutional offenders, and/or an increase in staff salaries.

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

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health (DMH)** state this proposal creates provisions relating to court ordered involuntary outpatient treatment for persons with mental disorders.

Section 632.580 defines "assisted outpatient treatment" as court ordered involuntary outpatient mental health care services that are provided by a mental health program under a treatment plan developed and monitored by a master's level mental health professional. The services can include case management, medication management, therapy, substance use treatment, crisis intervention services, and assistance with housing, employment, or other county resources necessary to an individual's stability.

Section 632.585 states a petition for an order authorizing involuntary outpatient treatment may be filed by the director, administrator or treating physician of a mental health program of where the individual is hospitalized or an emergency center where the individual is receiving services or the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS), the Department of Mental Health (DMH) or any local public health agency located within the judicial district in which the petition is filed. Subsection 3 states the petition shall allege under oath, without a notarization requirement, that the petitioner has reason to believe that the respondent meets the criteria for

assisted outpatient treatment in section 632.590 and the petition shall specify factual information on which such belief is based and shall contain the names and addresses of all persons known to the petitioner who have knowledge of such facts through personal observation. Subsection 4 states no notarization shall be required for a petition or for any affidavits, declarations or other documents supporting a petition and shall be subject to the provisions of section 492.050 allowing for declaration under penalty of perjury.

Section 632.590 states a court may issue an order requiring a respondent to participate in assisted outpatient treatment if they are eighteen years of age or older, is suffering from a mental disorder, will not obtain treatment voluntarily and is unable to make an informed decision to seek or to comply with the voluntary treatment. The court shall assign a case manager from a Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinic (CCBHC) to individuals ordered to assisted outpatient treatment, and the case manager shall monitor compliance of the court order. The case worker and respondent shall report to court at least every 90 days unless the court request more frequent appearances. Respondents that do not comply with the order may be court ordered to an evaluation or hospitalization as outlined.

DMH does not directly provide outpatient services. The Department of Mental Health (DMH) contracts with Community Mental Health Centers (CMHC) and CCBHC providers who provide Assisted Outpatient Treatment (AOT). Because of the case management and treatment requirements included in the proposal, DMH community providers will likely see increased costs. The average CCBHC PPS rate for FY26 is \$318.52 per visit. The fiscal impact at this time is unknown as it is not known how many new individuals would be court-ordered to AOT.

**Oversight** does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimates as provided by the DMH. Oversight assumes the unknown negative impact to DMH could exceed \$250,000 annually each to GR and Federal Funds.

In response to similar legislation, Perfected SS for SCS for SB 1015 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender** 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.

#### Responses regarding the proposed legislation as a whole

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** state there may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

**Oversight** notes OSCA assumes this proposal may have some impact on their organization although it can't be quantified at this time. As OSCA is unable to provide additional information regarding the potential impact, Oversight assumes the proposed legislation will have a \$0 or (Unknown) cost to the General Revenue Fund. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight also assumes the impact will be under \$250,000 annually. 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.

Officials from the **Office of Administration** defer to the **Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan** for the potential fiscal impact of this proposal.

Except for information provided in §208.149, officials from the **Department of Social Services (DSS)** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact as this legislation does not require programmatic or system changes. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this agency.

Officials from the **Department of Economic Development, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Revenue, Department of Public Safety (Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Office of the Director, Missouri Gaming Commission, Missouri Veterans Commission, State Emergency Management Agency), Missouri Department of Agriculture, Missouri Department of Conservation, Missouri National Guard, MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System, Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund, Office of the State Treasurer, St. Louis City Board of Elections, St. Louis County Board of Elections, Newton County Health Department, Phelps County Sheriff's Office, Branson Police Department, Kansas City Police Department, St. Louis County Police Department, County Employees Retirement Fund, Public Education Employees' Retirement System, Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, South River Drainage District, University of Central Missouri, Office of the State Auditor, Legislative Research, Oversight Division, Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement, Missouri Senate, Missouri Lottery Commission, Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan, Missouri State Employee's Retirement System 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.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of Administration - Administrative Hearing Commission, Department of Public Safety (Fire Safety), Christian County Auditor's Office, Kansas City Civilian Police Employees' Retirement, Kansas City Police Retirement System, Sheriff's Retirement System** and the **Missouri House of Representatives** 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.

**Oversight** only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other cities, local election authorities, counties, county health departments, county recorders, nursing homes, county assessors, county auditors, county circuit clerks, county collectors, county prosecutors, county treasurers, county public administrators,

local law enforcement agencies, fire protection districts, ambulance districts, retirement agencies, school districts, utility districts, hospitals, colleges and universities, electric companies and coops and public libraries were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. Upon the receipt of additional responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval to publish a new fiscal note. A general listing of political subdivisions included in our database is available upon request.

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.

In response to similar legislation, officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** noted 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 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
<b>GENERAL REVENUE</b>				
<u>Cost – OSCA (Various Sections)</u> Potential increase in court costs p. 15-16	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Cost – DSS/MHD (§208.149)</u> Actuarial analysis of MHN coverage of certain clinical pathology services p.5	(\$12,500)	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Cost – DOC (§632.585)</u> Increased incarceration costs p.13	(\$55,615 to Unknown)	(\$136,146 to Unknown)	(\$185,158 to Unknown)	(\$332,325 to Unknown)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
<u>Cost – DMH (\$632.590)</u> Outpatient services p.15*	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE</b>	<b><u>(\$68,115 to Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$136,146 to Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$185,158 to Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$332,325 to Unknown)</u></b>
<b>STATE ROAD FUND (1320)</b>				
<u>Cost – MoDOT (\$376.417)</u> Enrollee’s cost sharing p.6	\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)	\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)	\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)	\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE STATE ROAD FUND (1320)</b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 to (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000)</u></b>
<b>MERCHANDISING PRACTICES REVOLVING FUND (1631)</b>				
<u>Revenue Gain – AGO</u> (\$407.3007) Potential increase in collections for violations p.7-8	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE MERCHANDISING PRACTICES REVOLVING FUND</b>	<b><u>\$0 or Unknown</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or Unknown</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or Unknown</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or Unknown</u></b>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
<b>FEDERAL FUNDS</b>				
<u>Revenue Gain</u> - DSS/MHD (\$208.149) Program reimbursement for actuarial analysis p.5	\$12,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Cost</u> - DSS/MHD (\$208.149) Actuarial analysis p.5	(\$12,500)	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Revenue Gain</u> – DMH (\$632.590) Outpatient services p.15**	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Cost</u> – DMH (\$632.590) Outpatient services p.15**	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

\* Costs to DMH are unknown but could exceed \$250,000 annually.

\*\* Revenue gain and costs to DMH are unknown but could exceed \$250,000 annually and net to \$0.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
<b>LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>				
<u>Cost</u> - Health Facilities - (\$197.708) Printed signs at various health care facilities p.5	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Revenue gain</u> – School Districts (\$376.417.3) Fines from violations p.6-8	\$0 to Unknown*	\$0 to Unknown*	\$0 to Unknown*	\$0 to Unknown*
<u>Cost</u> – Medical Plans (\$376.417) Enrollee’s cost sharing p.6	\$0 to (Unknown)*	\$0 to (Unknown)*	\$0 to (Unknown)*	\$0 to (Unknown)*

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
<u>Cost - Local Political Subdivisions - Increased medical insurance obligations p.7</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown)</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown)</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown)</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown)</b>

\***Oversight** assumes this proposal could result in a cost to the MoDOT-MSHP and local medical plans that could potentially be passed on to members. Oversight also assumes a potential revenue from civil fine penalties.

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

Community providers may see an increase in business from court-ordered treatment.

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

- Department of Health and Senior Services
- Department of Commerce and Insurance
- Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development
- Department of Revenue
- Office of the State Treasurer
- Office of the State Courts Administrator
- University of Missouri System
- State Tax Commission
- City of Kansas City
- Jackson County Election Board
- Platte County Board of Elections
- St. Louis City Board of Elections
- St. Louis County Board of Elections
- Newton County Health Department

MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System  
Christian County Auditor's Office  
Phelps County Sheriff's Office  
Kansas City Police Department  
County Employees Retirement Fund  
Public Education Employees' Retirement System  
Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District  
South River Drainage District  
Oversight Division  
Missouri Senate  
Cass Regional Medical Center  
Department of Social Services  
Department of Mental Health  
Missouri Department of Transportation  
Attorney General's Office  
Office of Administration  
    Office of the Commissioner  
    Administrative Hearing Commission  
    Budget and Planning  
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations  
Department of Public Safety  
    Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control  
    Capitol Police  
    Fire Safety  
    Missouri Gaming Commission  
    Missouri Veterans Commission  
    State Emergency Management Agency  
    Office of the Director  
    Missouri Highway Patrol  
Missouri Department of Agriculture  
Missouri Department of Conservation  
Missouri Ethics Commission  
Office of the State Public Defender  
Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund  
St. Louis City Assessor's Office  
Eastern Clay Ambulance District  
Sheriff's Retirement System  
Wayne County Public Water Supply District #2  
Northwest Missouri State University  
University of Central Missouri  
Office of the Lieutenant Governor  
Office of the State Auditor  
Missouri House of Representatives  
Legislative Research

Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan  
Missouri State Employee's Retirement System  
Missouri National Guard  
City of O'Fallon  
Kansas City Civilian Police Employees' Retirement  
Kansas City Police Retirement System  
Metro St. Louis District Employees Pension Plan  
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement  
Department of Corrections  
Department of Economic Development  
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Department of Natural Resources  
Branson Police Department  
St. Louis County Police Department  
Missouri Lottery Commission  
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services  
Kansas City Election Board  
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules  
Office of the Secretary of State



Julie Morff  
Director  
April 24, 2026



Jessica Harris  
Assistant Director  
April 24, 2026