

## REGULATORY ANALYSIS

For

Rules Pertaining to the Standards for Hospitals and Health Facilities

6 CCR 1011-1

Chapter II, General Licensure Standards with conforming amendments to

Chapter VII, Assisted Living Residences and Chapter XXVI, Home Care Agencies

Adopted by the Board of Health on August 17, 2011

1. **A description of the classes of persons who will be affected by the rule, including classes that will bear the costs of the proposed rule and classes that will benefit from the rule.**

The classes of persons who will be affected by the proposed rule are the owner/operators of licensed health entities and patients, residents and health-care consumers. There is no anticipated cost to this rule. Facilities will benefit from this rule as it reduces the license fee for processing a change of name or change of address. Both facilities and the public will benefit from the modified criteria regarding health care entity names. The deletion of the requirement that a health care entity name also clearly identify the services for which it will be licensed, should help to remove any public stigma that may have been associated with visiting certain types of facilities.

2. **To the extent practicable, a description of the probable quantitative and qualitative impact of the proposed rule, economic or otherwise, upon affected class of persons.**

The impact of this proposed rule will be positive in that the license fees for processing a change of name or address are being reduced from \$360 to \$75, thus allowing health care entities to save money on license fees. Additionally, the public will benefit from the modified criteria regarding health care entity names because it should help to remove any public stigma that may have been associated with visiting certain types of facilities.

3. **The probable costs to the agency and to any other agency of the implementation and enforcement of the proposed rule and any anticipated effect on state revenues.**

The Department does not anticipate any significant additional cost with implementing and enforcing the proposed rule. Costs to other state agencies will remain unchanged.

4. **A comparison of the probable costs and benefits of the proposed rule to the probable costs and benefits of inaction.**

Since there is negligible cost associated with the proposed rule, the cost is the same as inaction. The facility and consumer benefits associated with the proposed rule, however, are far greater than if no action is taken.

5. **A determination of whether there are less costly methods or less intrusive methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule.**

The Department has determined that there is no other less costly or less intrusive method for achieving the purpose of the rule.

6. **A description of any alternative methods for achieving the purpose of the proposed rule that were seriously considered by the agency and the reasons why they were rejected in favor of the proposed rule.**

The Department considered several different versions of the proposed language. The current version was adopted because it was acceptable to both stakeholders and the Department.

7. **To the extent practicable, a quantification of the data used in the analysis; the analysis must take into account both short-term and long-term consequences.**

The short and long-term consequences of these proposed changes are to allow health care entities greater latitude with regard to their licensed names and to reduce the financial burdens associated with processing a request for change of name or address.