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BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The total DMH budget recommended by the Governor for FY92 was

$455,000,000

of that amount $140,000,000 was earmarked for community programs
as follows:

- $35,000,000 ADA 25%
- $47,600,000 CPS 34%
- $57,400,000 MR/DD 41%

The current state population is 5,137,804.

The need for services to eligible Missourians is currently documented at
over ______________ people who would benefit from the programs
offered by each of the DMH divisions.

A 1' sales tax will raise $425 million and will progressively rise. A com-
bination of "other" taxes (such as liquor, cigarettes, etc.) could also be
used as an alternative to sales tax to generate "earmarked" revenues.
THE PLAN

WIN — WIN — WIN

A. NOT OPTIONAL

1. Promote and pass a 1¢ sales tax or "other" tax referendum for mental health services which will generate $425 million.
2. If the $425 million initiative passes:
   a. DMH would release back to GR that portion of the $140 million currently appropriated to DMH that is not Federal $. The Legislature would then be responsible to fund state operated services and staff from existing GR.
   b. Of the new $425 million raised, $140 million would be distributed to the existing service provider system based on historical allocation/spending information to replace the $140 million returned to the GR.
   c. The remaining $285 million would be distributed on a per capita basis to each county, based on the total percentage currently expended by each DMH Division.

That is:

$71.25 million - ADA 25%
96.90 million - CPS 34%
116.85 million - MR/DD 41%

For example: Funds would be distributed to each Missouri county at the following rates for each person residing in the county. 13.87 ADA, 18.86 CPS, 22.74 MR/DD. The county would then be responsible to develop and fund appropriate community placement and other (POS) services.

B. OPTIONAL

1. Any clients living and receiving services through state operated programs (ie. Day Program) may be absorbed into the community services/county budget at a negotiated rate between the county and the DMH.

C. OPTIONAL

1. Case management services may be absorbed into the community services/county budget from DMH divisions at a negotiated rate between the county and DMH.

D. OPTIONAL

1. Any other state agency dollars for Mental Health Services may be absorbed into the community services/county budgets as negotiated by the counties with those agencies.
EXPECTED BENEFITS

1. By structuring the distribution of funds as outlined above:

   A. The legislature gets money back into GR, not specifically "earmarked" for any state service.
   B. The incentive to pass the legislation is enhanced because each county tax payer will receive a guaranteed amount of money back to the local county/city.
   
   C. For small counties, cooperatives (similar to special ed co-ops) may be formed.
   D. The county will not "lapse" money if not spent in the state fiscal year.
   
   E. Waiting lists for services could be totally eliminated and rate equity achieved.
   F. DMH division personnel could focus more directly on client eligibility, provider training, quality assurance, and program evaluation.