# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

#### **FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 0576-03

Bill No.: Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed CCS for SCS for SB 106

Subject: Veterans; Licenses - Professional; Education, Higher

Type: Original

Date: May 30, 2013

Bill Summary: This proposal relates to current and former military personnel.

## **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Total Estimated				
Net Effect on General Revenue				
Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Universities	(Expected to be less	(Expected to be less	(Expected to be less	
	than \$100,000)	than \$100,000)	than \$100,000)	
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	(Expected to be less	(Expected to be less	(Expected to be less	
	than \$100,000)	than \$100,000)	than \$100,000)	

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 8 pages.

Bill No. Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed CCS for SCS for SB 106

Page 2 of 8 May 30, 2013

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	

- □ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).
- ☐ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Local Government	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	

Bill No. Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed CCS for SCS for SB 106

Page 3 of 8 May 30, 2013

#### FISCAL ANALYSIS

#### **ASSUMPTION**

§§ 8.012 and 253.048 - Honor and Remember Flag

Officials at the **Office of Administration - Division of Facilities Management, Design and Construction (OA-FMDC)** state the fiscal impact of this proposal depends on the size of the flag pole, the construction type, and height of each flag pole at each location. These factors will determine whether an additional flag added to current poles would require a replacement for a bigger diameter of flag pole and a higher flag pole.

OA-FMDC states flying more than one flag on a pole increases the stress on the flag pole. The flag industry recommends that the length of a flag be around ¼ the length of the pole and the total square footage of flag load should not exceed the recommendation of the manufacturer. A 20' pole is designed for a 3' x 5' flag. The greater the flag load, the greater the chance that you can break the flag pole. Flying increased flag loads or flying increased flag loads in higher winds than recommended ratings may result in damage to the flag pole.

OA-FMDC states many current flag poles across the state have three flags already flying, the United States flag, State of Missouri flag, and POW-MIA flag. The additional flag at a lower height will increase the flag load and the flag could get caught in and flap against buildings, trees, gutters, rough surfaces causing the flag to tear more easily.

OA-FMDC assumes the fiscal impact of this proposal could exceed \$625,000.

**Oversight** assumes the proposal permits state agencies and state parks to fly the Honor and Remembrance flag on existing flag poles that are currently flying the United States flag, State of Missouri flag, and in some cases the POW-MIA flag.

**Oversight** assumes OA-FMDC and other state agencies are provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of equipment and maintenance activity. **Oversight** assumes any additional expense to purchase and maintain the flags and flag poles could be absorbed by OA-FMDC and other state agencies **if** the agency decides to fly the Honor Remember flag on an existing or an additional flag pole.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources**, **Department of Public Safety - Missouri National Guard** and the **Missouri Veterans Commission** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

LMD:LR:OD

Bill No. Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed CCS for SCS for SB 106

Page 4 of 8 May 30, 2013

## <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

## §§192.360 and 324.007 - Professional licensing

According to officials from the **Department of Insurance**, **Financial Institutions and Professional Registration (DIFP)**, the proposed legislation has an unknown cost to DIFP, contingent on board staff and board members' ability to convert education/training into compliance with licensure/examination requirements. Examination requirements for some boards are set by national testing companies.

**Oversight** assumes DIFP would be able to comply with the provisions of this proposal with existing resources. If additional resources are needed, DIFP can request them through the appropriations process.

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services** assumed no fiscal impact from this section of the proposal.

## §173.1158 - College credit for military courses

Officials from Linn State Technical College assume an unknown fiscal impact on their college.

In response to Perfected Senate Committee Substitute for SB 106, the following colleges and universities provided the following assumptions regarding fiscal impact:

**Northwest Missouri State University** officials assumed there will be a fiscal impact; however, cannot quantify or project the impact without knowing the exact number of military members who will enroll as a result of this legislation.

Officials from **St. Charles Community College** anticipated an unknown cost to evaluate military records.

Officials from Missouri Southern University stated an indeterminate fiscal impact at this time.

**Oversight** assumes, based on the responses from colleges and universities, that the cumulative fiscal impact of this proposal would be less than \$100,000 per year, beginning with the 2014-2015 academic year.

Also in response to Perfected Senate Committee Substitute for SB 106, officials from the **Office of Secretary of State (SOS)** assumed many bills considered by the General Assembly include

L.R. No. 0576-03 Bill No. Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed CCS for SCS for SB 106 Page 5 of 8 May 30, 2013

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS's office is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to Secretary of State's office for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what their office can sustain with their core budget. Therefore, SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

**Oversight** assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal with core funding. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process.

Officials from the Department of Higher Education, Department of Public Safety - Missouri National Guard and the Missouri Veterans Commission, Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, Kansas City Metropolitan Community College, University of Missouri System, University of Central Missouri, Lincoln University, and Missouri State University each assume this section of the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies and institutions.

#### §452.413 - Custody and visitation rights of a deploying military parent

Officials from the **Department of Social Services (DSS)** state this section does not contain any language that would indicate it pertains to custody orders administered by the juvenile or family courts (in accordance with Chapter 210 or 211) in the interest of children placed in the custody of the Children's Division (CD). Therefore, the proposal would not fiscally impact the CD.

In addition, officials from the DSS state since rulings and resolutions regarding child support are determined by judges or parents - not the Family Support Division (FSD), this proposal would not have any impact on child support policy or procedure and, therefore, would not have any fiscal impact on the FSD.

Bill No. Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed CCS for SCS for SB 106

Page 6 of 8 May 30, 2013

# ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the Office of State Courts Administrator and Department of Public Safety - Missouri National Guard and the Missouri Veterans Commission each assume this section of the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)
<u>Cost</u> - Colleges §173.1158 - Course evaluation	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government  LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	FY 2014 (6 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON UNIVERSITIES	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)
<u>Cost</u> - Universities §173.1158 - Course evaluation	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)
UNIVERSITIES	(0 1410.)		
FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2014 (6 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016

# FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

Bill No. Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed CCS for SCS for SB 106

Page 7 of 8 May 30, 2013

#### FISCAL DESCRIPTION

#### §173.1158 - College credit for military courses

This section of the proposal requires higher education institutions to accept credits for courses that the military awarded to personnel as part of their military training if the courses meet certain standards for academic credit.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

#### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Higher Education

Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration

Department of Public Safety

Missouri National Guard

Missouri Veterans Commission

Department of Natural Resources

Office of Administration

Division of Facilities Management, Design and Construction

Joint Committee on Administrative Rules

Office of Secretary of State

Administrative Rules Division

Department of Health and Senior Services

Office of State Courts Administrator

Colleges and Universities

Missouri Southern State University

University of Missouri System

St. Charles Community College

Linn State Technical College

Missouri State University

Kansas City Metropolitan Community College

Northwest Missouri State University

University of Central Missouri

Lincoln University

Con Ada

Bill No. Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed CCS for SCS for SB 106 Page 8 of 8  $\,$ 

May 30, 2013

Ross Strope Acting Director May 30, 2013