

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 1746-01
Bill No.: SB 336
Subject: Taxation and Revenue - Income; Employees - Employers; Revenue Department
Type: Original
Date: February 25, 2015

Bill Summary: This proposal would modify provisions relating to income tax withholdings on employee tips.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0

Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this proposal would not impact Total State Revenues nor the calculation required under Section 18 (e) of the state constitution.

Although they did not respond to our request for information, officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assumed a similar proposal (HB 754 LR 1403-02) would limit the calculation of income tax withholding on tips received by employees to the amount of tips that an employee reports to the employer in a written statement.

Administrative impact

DOR officials noted that in the case of tips that an employee receives from electronic transactions (credit cards), the employer would know the amount of tips the employee received without a written statement.

DOR officials assumed Collections and Tax Assistance (CATA) would have additional customer contacts from employers with questions on employee withholding, and would require one additional Tax Collection Technician (Range 10, Step L) for every additional 15,000 contacts annually on the non-delinquent tax line with CARES equipment.

The DOR response included one additional employee; with benefits, equipment, and expense the DOR estimate of cost to implement this proposal totaled \$41,204 for FY 2016, \$42,044 for FY 2017, and \$42,480 for FY 2018.

Oversight notes this proposal would make Missouri law similar to federal law with respect to calculating withholding on tips, and assumes employers would be able to use the federal reporting data for Missouri withholding calculations. Oversight assumes this proposal would have no impact on the amount of tip income and withholding reported to the state.

Oversight also assumes this proposal would have minimal impact to the Department of Revenue, and that DOR could implement this proposal with existing resources. If unanticipated additional costs are incurred or if multiple proposals are implemented which increase the DOR workload, resources could be requested through the budget process.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal, (HB 754 LR 1403-02) officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** assume many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS 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 the Secretary of State's Office for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, we also recognize that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be greater than our office can sustain with our core budget. Therefore, we reserve 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.

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assume this proposal would not have a fiscal impact to their organization greater than existing resources.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2016 (10 Mo.)	FY 2017	FY 2018
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2016 (10 Mo.)	FY 2017	FY 2018
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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


FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no direct fiscal impact.

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

Office of the Secretary of State
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Office of Administration
 Division of Budget and Planning
Department of Revenue



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
February 25, 2015

Ross Strobe
Assistant Director
February 25, 2015