

Date:

Anthony Kremer

## **Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement**

**Bill**: S.B. 141 of the 131st G.A.

October 1, 2015

Status: As Passed by the Senate

Sponsor: Sens. Burke and Manning

Local Impact Statement Procedure Required: No

Contents: Pharmacist consult agreements

## **State Fiscal Highlights**

• No direct fiscal effect on the state.

## Local Fiscal Highlights

• No direct fiscal effect on political subdivisions.

## **Detailed Fiscal Analysis**

The bill authorizes a pharmacist practicing under a consult agreement with a physician to administer or prescribe drugs and order blood tests. The bill also amends current law which outlines these pharmacist-physician consult agreements by creating a single process for establishing such agreements. The State Board of Pharmacy and the State Medical Board may adopt rules, unchanged from current law, regarding the standards and procedures for entering into consult agreements.

Enactment of the bill is not expected to create any discernible ongoing licensing and regulatory costs for the State Board of Pharmacy. Potential violators of the bill's prohibitions could be subject to the State Board of Pharmacy's disciplinary procedures.<sup>1</sup>

SB0141SP.docx/jc

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The disciplinary sanctions the Board may take include revoking, suspending, or limiting the pharmacist's or intern's identification card; placing the pharmacist's or intern's identification card on probation; refusing to grant or renew the pharmacist's or intern's identification card; or imposing a monetary penalty or forfeiture not to exceed \$500. Any forfeiture collected would be deposited to the credit of Fund 4K90, the Occupational Licensing and Regulatory Fund.