

**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2014**

Bill Number: H. 690      Name of Bill: An act relating to the definition of serious functional impairment

Agency/ Dept: AHS      Author of Bill Review: Monica Hutt

Date of Bill Review: 2/28/14      Status of Bill: (check one):

☒ XX Upon Introduction      ☐ As passed by 1<sup>st</sup> body      ☐ As passed by both bodies      ☐ Fiscal

---

Recommended Position:

☒ XX Support      ☐ Oppose      ☐ Remain Neutral      ☐ Support with modifications identified in #8 below

---

**Analysis of Bill**

---

1. Summary of bill and issue it addresses. *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.*

The bill proposes to amend the definition of “serious functional impairment” to specify that the designation only applies to persons residing within a correctional facility and not to offenders once they have re-entered the community.

2. Is there a need for this bill? *Please explain why or why not.*

Yes. Addressing this issue will assuage any additional stigma in community related to what might be potentially an additional label for offenders and removes the clear implication, through use of a Dept. of Corrections exclusive designation, that an individual comes from a correctional setting. Additionally, it assists us in clarifying that SFI is a designation and not a diagnosis and that no “SFI” program or specialized funding exists separate from traditional programs based on diagnostic need.

3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?

None.

4. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?

Other departments such as Public Safety have had ongoing connections with offenders re-entering communities. Clarifying this designation does not impact their relationships with re-entering offenders in any way.

- 5. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?** *(for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)*

None that we are aware of.

**6. Other Stakeholders:**

**6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?**

Offenders themselves would probably be supportive of limiting the number of labels they carry around.

**6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?**

Advocates for offenders might mistakenly believe that the designation used outside of facility guarantees access to some level of service provision and may therefore oppose the proposal.

**7. Rationale for recommendation:** *Justify recommendation stated above.*

This bill provides clarity to the function of the designation and confines it to the Department of Corrections as it was originally intended.

**8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill:** *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*