FISCAL ESTIMATE FORM	,			1999 Session			
	<i>'</i> .	LRB # LRB-	1376/1				
☑ ORIGINAL	☐ UPDATED	INTRODUCTION	INTRODUCTION # AB 565				
☐ CORRECTED	□ SUPPLEMENTAL	Admin. Rule #					
Subject				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Requires insurance coverage of the diagnosis and treatment of infertility.							
Fiscal Effect							
State: No State Fiscal Effect	divo et e e e e e e e e e e e e e		I III Ingresso Coots May	he neccible to Absorb			
Check columns below only if bill make or affects a sum sufficient appro	☑ Increase Costs - May Within Agency's Budg						
☐ Increase Existing Appropriation	☐ Increase Ex	kisting Revenues					
☐ Decrease Existing Appropriation		xisting Revenues	☐ Decrease Costs				
☐ Create New Appropriation							
Local: ☐ No local government costs	1	1	1				
1. Increase Costs	3. Increase F		1	ernmental Units Affected:			
☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory	☐ Permiss	•					
2. ☐ Decrease Costs ☐ Mandatory	4. ☐ Decrease ☐ Permiss		☐ Counties ☐ Othe ☐ School Districts	□ WTCS Districts			
Fund Sources Affected			h. 20 Appropriations				
⊠ GPR ⊠FED ⊠PRO ⊠P	RS ZISEG ZIS	EG-S					
Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal E	stimate:						
AB 565 requires all health insurance plans offered by the state to its employes to provide coverage for any non-experimental treatment as defined for the diagnosis and treatment of infertility. Coverage would be provided with no deductible or co-payments.							
We estimate that this benefit will add between \$3.7 and \$6.7 million dollars to the total cost of the state health insurance premiums. This is based on a cost of \$2.08 to \$3.75 per member per month for 150,000 members under the active employe coverage in the state plan. The state pays approximately 96% of the total health premium, resulting in a cost to the state of \$3.6 to \$6.5 million per year in 1999 dollars.							
Infertility coverage is not provided under the state plan. Therefore, the estimates are based on information supplied by the Department's consulting actuary, not on actual claims experience under the state plans.							
The estimate assumes that: (1) the In-vitro, GIFT, and ZIFT procedures required by the bill will be between two and three cases per thousand members per year; (2) the average cost per course of treatment is \$10,000; and (3) the average number of procedures per course of treatment per year is one. The estimate also assumes that the plans will most likely experience additional pregnancy and delivery expenses which comprise between approximately \$.7 and \$2.2 million of the above costs. This is because infertility procedures lead to a much higher incidence of multiple births, which can lead to a higher incidence and associated cost of premature infants. We also note that the estimate assumes that language of the current bill provides relatively open access to current technology and makes no estimate of costs associated with future technology that may become non-experimental.							
technology and makes no estimate of costs associated with fatatio technology and may see that supplies							
Long-Range Fiscal Implications:							
Long-Nange Fiscal Implications.							
On-going.							
Prepared By: / Phone # / Agency N		horized Signature / Teleph	none No.	Date			
Pamela Henning 267-2929 Department of Employe Trust Funds) avid Hinrich		11/3/99			

FIS	1999 Session							
	Admin. Rule #							
☐ CORRECTED ☐ UPDATED ☐ SUPPLEMENTAL ☐ SUPPLEMENTAL ☐ INTRODUCTION # AB 5			665					
Subject Requiring insurance coverage of the diagnosis and treatment of infertility.								
I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):								
11.	Annualized Costs:			Annualized Fiscal impact on State funds from:				
A. State Costs by Category			Increased Costs	Decreased Costs				
State Operations - Salaries and Fringes			\$	\$ -				
	(FTE Position Changes)			(FTE)	(- FTE)			
	State Operations - Other Co	osts		\$3.6 - \$6.5 million				
	Local Assistance				-			
	Aids to Individuals or Organ	nizations						
	TOTAL State Costs by			\$ 3.6 – 6.5 million	\$ -			
B.	State Costs by Source of Fun	ds		Increased Costs	Decreased Costs			
	GPR			\$ 1.6 – 2.9 million	\$ -			
	FED				•			
	PRO/PRS	}		\$ 2.0 – 3.6 million	-			
	SEG/SEG-S	J 						
State Revenues Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)				Increased Rev.	Decreased Rev.			
	GPR Taxes			\$	\$ -			
	GPR Earned				-			
	FED				-			
	PRO/PRS							
	SEG/SEG-S				-			
	TOTAL State Revenues			\$	\$ -			
NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT STATE LOCAL								
NE	T CHANGE IN COSTS	\$.	3.6 – 6.5 million	<u> </u>				
NE ⁻	T CHANGE IN REVENUES	\$		\$				
Prepared By: / Phone # / Agency Name Authorized Signature/					Date			
Pamela Henning 267-2929 Department of Employe Trust Funds			with	11/3/99				