

OFFICE OF FISCAL ANALYSIS

Legislative Office Building, Room 5200
Hartford, CT 06106 ◊ (860) 240-0200
<http://www.cga.ct.gov/ofa>

sHB-5562

AN ACT CONCERNING VARIOUS REVISIONS TO HUMAN SERVICES STATUTES.

AMENDMENT

LCO No.: 5252

File Copy No.: 446

House Calendar No.: 329

OFA Fiscal Note

See Fiscal Note Details

The amendment strikes the language in the underlying bill and the associated fiscal impact.

Section 5 of the amendment requires the Long-Term Planning Committee within the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) to (1) study state models of financing long-term care and projected federal support for long-term care, and (2) submit a report by January 1, 2028, on the impact of Public Law 119-21 and other federal regulatory changes related to long-term care. This results in a one-time cost to OPM of up to \$500,000 for a consultant to meet the requirements of the study and submit a report by the deadline.

Section 6 requires the Long-Term Care Advisory Council to advise and make recommendations to the Long-Term Care Planning Committee regarding the study required under section 5 and allows the council to accept charitable donations to support the state's work.

Section 11 increases the annual per person cap for the Deaf Blind grant program administered by the Department of Aging and Disability Services (ADS) from \$10,000 to \$14,000 per person. This results in a potential cost to ADS to the extent that any individuals receive a grant

between \$10,000 and \$14,000. ADS spent \$3,125 per person in FY 25.¹

Section 12 removes the requirement that people serving a probation sentence be doing so “satisfactorily” to be eligible for TFA and SNAP benefits. To the extent this enables an individual to receive benefits sooner than they otherwise would have, DSS will incur TFA costs. For context the average TFA benefit per person is approximately \$250. It is assumed any additional SNAP benefit costs would be covered by federal funds.

Section 15 results in a cost of \$56,000 in FY 27 and \$58,000 in FY 28 associated with eliminating a reduced monthly benefit for transitional individuals under the State Administered General Assistance (SAGA) program.

Section 16 results in a potential cost to DSS and the Office of Early Childhood (OEC) associated with allowing the agencies to design and evaluate a benefits cliff pilot program in accordance with the recommendations of the benefits cliff study report required by Special Act 24-8.

The benefits cliff pilot cost analysis provides a framework through which different design parameters can be analyzed. The study presents three pilot models to assist 200 families, resulting in costs from between \$3 million and \$7 million over a three or four-year period. The study suggests the stable benefit pilot design as the best fit to maximize family supports. If implemented, this is anticipated to result in annual costs of approximately \$1.4 million in FY 27, \$1.7 million in FY 28, \$1.9 million in FY 29, and \$1.7 million if continued in year four. Approximately 62% of annual costs reflect benefit payments with the remaining funds used to support operation costs. Actual costs depend on the final pilot design, related funding, and timeframe in which it is operational.

This section may also result in a cost to the Department of Housing (DOH) of approximately \$2.9 million in FY 27 and FY 28 due to

¹ Grant spending was \$165,660 in FY 25, disbursed to 53 recipients.

including housing assistance as part of the public assistance considered under the pilot (housing assistance was not included in the benefits cliff pilot cost analysis). The average rental assistance program (RAP) certificate costs the state approximately \$14,400/annually.² If the program resulted in continuing a certificate at the same level for two years for 200 households, this would result in a cost of about \$2.9 million in each year.

Additionally, the amendment makes various technical, conforming, procedural, and other changes that have no fiscal impact to the state.

The preceding Fiscal Impact statement is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for the purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose. In general, fiscal impacts are based upon a variety of informational sources, including the analyst's professional knowledge. Whenever applicable, agency data is consulted as part of the analysis, however final products do not necessarily reflect an assessment from any specific department.

² DOH does not remove households from the RAP program unless the household is no longer eligible. However, changes in eligibility and associated changes to the average RAP certificate cost may impact how many certificates can be issued in the future.