

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 4354-03  
Bill No.: Perfected SS for SB 704  
Subject: Cities, Towns and Villages; Compacts; Counties; County Government; Political Subdivisions; Public Officers; City of Kansas City; Utilities; Elections; Taxation & Revenue - Sales & Use; Taxation and Revenue - General; County Officials; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies; Governor & Lieutenant Governor; Education, Elementary & Secondary  
Type: Original  
Date: March 14, 2018

---

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to political subdivisions.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
General Revenue	\$0	\$0 or Up to \$14,375	\$0 or Up to \$19,034
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0 or Up to \$14,375</b>	<b>\$0 or Up to \$19,034</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 17 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2019</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2019</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2019</b>	<b>FY 2020</b>	<b>FY 2021</b>
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>Unknown to (Unknown)</b>	<b>Unknown, less than \$1,428,456</b>	<b>Unknown, less than \$1,882,363</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

#### §§49.020, 67.617, 71.015

In response to a previous version, officials at **Boone County** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

#### §§50.660, 50.783

In response to similar legislation from this year, HB 2416, officials at **Boone County** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

**Oversight** assumes by raising the competitive bidding amount requirements, there could be a savings to counties in advertising for bids. However, Oversight is unclear on the amount of savings. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a positive unknown to county funds for this proposal.

#### §§65.610, 65.620

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 940, officials at **Dade County** assumed at the time the County was a township form of government, the County generated approximately \$500,000 in road tax per tax collecting year. Each township had their own distinct levy which lead to the approximate amount. Now that the County is not a township form of government, the County is allowed by statute to collect the lowest township tax that was in place prior to the abolishment, or \$.22. This generated approximately \$250,000 per year. In the upcoming General Municipal Election, April 3, 2018, the County will be asking for a \$.50. That proposed amount will generate approximately \$588,000 per year.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 940, officials at **Stoddard County** assumed a negative unknown fiscal impact. There are 7 townships in the County.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 940, officials at **Linn County** assumed this legislation would not have a fiscal impact, as long as, the new tax collected is equal to what the township was receiving before abolishment.

**Oversight** assumes that with the removal of subsection 65.620.4 could allow the county to immediately set a rate on the ballot that would allow the county to collect an amount which is equal to the current amount being collected by the townships for road and bridge funding. Under current law the affected county's tax rate is, for a year, the lowest tax rate charged by any of the

ASSUMPTION (continued)

former townships within the county. This removal also allows the question to be answered at the time it is put on the ballot, instead of waiting an extra amount of time, even up to a calendar year, to set the rate. Oversight assumes this could prevent a decrease in road and bridge funding for counties which would abolish townships compared to current statute. Oversight assumes the language in this proposal could avert losses of road and bridge funds by counties which abolish the township form of government. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 (if no abolition of townships or the county does not choose to have an election to set tax rates) or a positive unknown (if there is an abolition of townships and the county government has a successful election to set a countywide property tax rate for roads and bridges) for this proposal.

§84.510

In response to a previous version, officials at the **Office of Administration Budget and Planning Division** assume this increases statutory minimum salaries for a number of KCPD positions. B&P defers to the KCPD for an estimated fiscal impact.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HB 2070, officials at the **Kansas City Police Department (KCPD)** assumed the change to the base annual compensation ranges will not have any current fiscal impact. It provides a cushion for salary growth.

**Oversight** assumes this proposal changes the following salary ranges for the members of the KCPD per annum.

Lieutenant Colonels - from \$71,969 to \$133,888; to the new salary range of \$71,969 to \$146,124  
Majors - from \$64,671 to \$122,153; to the new salary range of \$64,671 to \$133,320  
Captains - from \$59,539 to \$111,434; to the new salary range of \$59,539 to \$121,608  
Sergeants - from \$48,659 to \$97,086; to the new salary range of \$48,659 to \$106,560  
Master Patrol Officers - from \$56,304 to \$87,701; to the new salary range of \$56,304 to \$94,332  
Master Detectives - from \$56,304 to \$87,701; to the new salary range of \$56,304 to \$94,332  
Detectives, Investigators, and Police Officers - from \$26,643 to \$82,619; to the new salary range of \$26,643 to \$87,636

**Oversight** notes the KCPD requested 1,367 law enforcement positions (non-civilian) for their FY 2018-2019 budget. Oversight is unable to determine how many KCPD members are within each personnel category, how many are at the top of their salary range, and whether or not the City of Kansas City would provide raises to the members of the KCPD in future years.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Oversight** will reflect \$0 to an Unknown cost to the City of Kansas City as a direct result of this proposal.

§94.900

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 885, officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning (B&P)** assumed this proposal allows voters in the City of Centralia to impose a sales tax up to 0.50% for the purpose of funding public safety for the city. Using forecast estimates for statewide average growth in local sales taxes and state taxes (including food), the estimated average growth for FY 2018 and FY 2019 is 2.5% and 1.90%, respectively. Budget and Planning estimates the City of Centralia FY 2019 taxable sales totals \$40 million. The bill indicates that this sales tax would take effect starting April 1, thus only impacting Q4 of FY 2019 sales collections. With estimated Q4 sales collections of \$10.1 million, this proposed sales tax could generate approximately \$51,349 for the city for FY 2019. As a voter approved tax, the collected revenues will not impact General and Total State Revenues; however, DOR will retain 1% to offset collection costs. Therefore, that portion could increase General and Total State Revenues by approximately \$509 in FY 2019.

Using the same methodology to estimate FY 2020 and FY 2021 sales, we estimate taxable sales in the City of Centralia to total \$40.7 million in FY 2019. This proposed sales tax might generate approximately \$201,397 for the city in FY 2020, and annually thereafter. The collected revenues will have no impact on General and Total State Revenues; however, DOR will retain 1% to offset collection costs. Therefore, General and Total State Revenues could increase by approximately \$2,034 in FY 2020 and annually thereafter if the county sales tax is approved.

B&P defers to DOR for estimates of actual collection costs.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 2186, officials at the **City of Centralia** assumed the City would reap almost all of the revenue, except the small percentage retained by the Department of Revenue for collection and disbursement. A ½ cent sales tax is anticipated to raise \$210,000 annually for the City of Centralia. Most of those funds would come from expenditures by Centralia residents.

**Oversight** notes this proposal would give the City of Centralia the option to vote to increase their local sales tax by .50% in order to fund public safety. Oversight notes the effective date of this proposal would be August 28, 2018. Oversight assumes this question would be put before voters at the general municipal election in April 2019 (FY 2019). Therefore, the earliest the sales tax could become effective would be the first day of the second calendar quarter after the Department

ASSUMPTION (continued)

of Revenue is notified of voter approval. In this case, the earliest effective date assuming voter approval at the April 2019 general municipal election would be October 1, 2019 (FY 2020).

Therefore, only nine months of taxes would be collected in FY 2020.

**Oversight** notes that if the proposal is adopted DOR would be allowed to keep 1% of the amount of sales tax collected to cover their expenses. Oversight notes that DOR would retain \$2,034 Oversight will show the fee as \$0 (no sales tax increase is adopted by voters) to up to the amount listed for the City.

For fiscal note purposes, **Oversight** will indicate a range of additional local government revenue from \$0 (the sales tax is not adopted by the City of Centralia and/or voters fail to approve the sales tax) to up to \$201,397 for a full year of tax collections estimated by B&P.

City of Centralia - Taxable Sales Report	
FY 2017	\$19,490,976 (6 month total)
FY 2016	\$38,458,884
FY 2015	\$37,677,040

Source: Department of Revenue website

City of Lebanon

In response to similar legislation from this year, HB 2712, officials at the **Office of Administration Division of Budget and Planning (B&P)** assumed the stated intent of this proposal is to allow voters in the City of Lebanon to impose a sales tax up to 0.50% for the purpose of funding public safety for the city. Using forecast estimates for statewide average growth in local sales taxes and state taxes (including food), the estimated average growth for FY 2018 and FY 2019 is 2.50% and 1.90%, respectively.

Budget and Planning estimates the City of Lebanon's FY 2019 taxable sales at \$363 million. The bill indicates that this sales tax would take effect starting April 1, thus only impacting Q4 of FY 2019 sales collections. For the City of Lebanon, with estimated Q4 sales collections of \$90.8 million, this proposed sales tax could generate approximately \$454,298 for the city for FY 2019. As a voter approved tax, the collected revenues will not impact General and Total State Revenues; however, DOR will retain 1% to offset collection costs. Therefore, that portion could increase General and Total State Revenues by approximately \$4,543 in FY 2019.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Using the same methodology to estimate FY 2020 and FY 2021 sales, we estimate taxable sales in the City of Lebanon to total \$363 million. This proposed sales tax might generate approximately \$1.8 million for the city in FY 2020, and annually thereafter. The collected revenues will have no impact on General and Total State Revenues; however, DOR will retain 1% to offset collection costs. Therefore, General and Total State Revenues could increase by approximately \$18,172 in FY 2020 and annually thereafter if the county sales tax is approved.

Budget and Planning defers to DOR for more specific estimates of actual collection costs.

Officials at the **City of Lebanon** assume they would generate approximately \$1,700,000 annually in sales tax if adopted.

**Oversight** notes this proposal would give the City of Lebanon the option to vote to increase their local sales tax by .50% in order to fund public safety. Oversight notes the effective date of this proposal would be August 28, 2018. Oversight assumes the question would be put before the voters at the general municipal election in April 2019 (FY 2019). Therefore, the earliest the sales tax could become effective would be the first day of the second calendar quarter after the Department of Revenue is notified of voter approval. In this case, the earliest effective date assuming voter approval at the April 2019 general municipal election would be October 1, 2019 (FY 2020). Therefore, only nine months of taxes would be collected in FY 2020.

**Oversight** notes that if the proposal is adopted DOR would be allowed to keep 1% of the amount of sales tax collected to cover their expenses. Oversight notes that DOR would retain \$17,000. Oversight will show the fee as \$0 (no sales tax increase is adopted by voters) to up to the amount listed for the City.

For fiscal note purposes, **Oversight** will indicate a range of additional local government revenue from \$0 (the sales tax is not adopted by the City of Lebanon and/or voters fail to approve the sales tax) to up to \$1,700,000 for a full year of tax collections estimated by the City of Lebanon.

City of Lebanon - Taxable Sales & Use Report	
FY 2017	\$173,735,023 (6 month total)
FY 2016	\$351,609,337
FY 2015	\$340,006,611

Source: Department of Revenue website

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§115.124

In response to similar legislation from this year, HB 1446, officials from the **Kansas City Election Board**, **St. Louis County Board of Election Commissioners**, **Buchanan County** and **Boone County** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

**Oversight** notes this proposal would allow cities, towns, or villages with less than 2,000 (changed from 1,000) inhabitants to skip local elections if the number of open seats equals the number of candidates running for those seats. We are unable to determine the number of cities, towns, or villages that would not participate in those elections; therefore, Oversight will show the fiscal impact to the Local Election Authorities (LEA) as a savings of \$0 or Unknown.

§162.441

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 990, officials at **Kirksville R-III School District** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

**Oversight** will reflect a potential fiscal impact to community college districts for costs of holding the elections.

§227.601

**Oversight** assumes concession agreements between the commission (the MO Highway and Transportation Commission) and a political subdivision would have no local fiscal impact without action by the governing body of the political subdivision which shall be subject to voter approval if required by law. Oversight will not reflect a fiscal impact to Local Political Subdivisions from this proposal.

§304.060

**Oversight** assumes this proposal allows school districts to enter into contracts with municipalities to provide transportation to students. Oversight assumes this proposal is permissive and will not show a fiscal impact.

Bill as a Whole

Officials at the **Summersville R-2 School District** assume a negative cost of less than \$100,000 per year.



ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials at the **Office of State Auditor** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal. Any impacts may be absorbed through current appropriations.

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator**, the **Missouri Department of Transportation**, the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the **Department of Economic Development**, the **Office of the Secretary of State** and the **State Tax Commission** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **Department of Revenue**, the **Department of Higher Education** and the **Office of the Governor** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at **St. Louis County**, the **City of Kansas City**, the **Jackson County Board of Election Commission**, the **Platte County Board of Election Commission**, the **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** and the **Missouri Western State University** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at **Missouri State University** and the **State Technical College of Missouri** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

Senate Amendment #1

Officials at the **Missouri Department of Transportation**, the **Platte County Board of Election Commission**, **St. Louis County**, the **State Tax Commission** and the **Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HB 1504, officials at the **Missouri National Guard** and the **State Emergency Management Agency** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HB 1504, officials at **Newton County** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **City of Pineville** and **McDonald County** did not respond to Oversight's request for fiscal impact.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Oversight** assumes this proposal would have no local fiscal impact without the action of the governing body to adopt ordinances regulating incompatible land uses and structures once the counties have participated in the completion of a joint land use study associated with the National Guard training center. Oversight will reflect a \$0 impact for this proposal.

Senate Amendment #2

Officials at the **Missouri Department of Transportation**, the **Platte County Board of Election Commission** and the **State Tax Commission** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

**Oversight** assumes assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Senate Amendment #3

Officials at the **Missouri Department of Transportation**, the **Platte County Board of Election Commission** and the **State Tax Commission** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 892, officials from the **Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement (JCPER)** stated the proposal may constitute a substantial proposed change in future plan benefits as defined in Section 105.660(10), RSMo. It is impossible to accurately determine the fiscal impact of this proposed legislation without an actuarial cost statement prepared in accordance with 105.665 RSMo.

Pursuant to section 105.670, an actuarial cost statement must be filed with the Chief Clerk of the Missouri House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement as public information for at least five legislative days prior to final passage of the bill. An actuarial cost statement for this legislation has not been filed with the JCPER.

PACARS Current System Status: (as of July 1, 2016)

Market Value:	\$37,851,019	Funded Ratio:83.9%
Actuarial Value:	\$37,851,019	Funded Ratio: 83.9%
Liabilities:	\$45,074,928	

Recommended contribution for 2016/2017: \$2,037,365

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Anticipated contribution for 2016/2017:

Expected Monthly County Contribution	\$ 860,030
Expected \$4 Surcharge Contribution	\$1,248,337
Interest Credit	<u>\$ 72,545</u>
Total Anticipated 2016 Contribution	\$2,180,912

Current Monthly County Contribution:

1st Class Counties	\$646
2nd Class Counties	\$271
3rd Class Counties	\$187
4th Class Counties	\$187

Covered Payroll: \$9,910,390

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 892, officials from the **Prosecuting and Circuit Attorney's Retirement System (PACARS)** reviewed the bill and, based on that review, state we are of the view that the bill was intended by the drafters to be at least revenue neutral, and, possibly, to improve the future fiscal health of the system, as compared to the existing statutory provisions.

There are provisions in the bill which correlate the way in which creditable service is accumulated more closely with the way the retirement benefits are calculated, so as to make the contributions to the system more closely relate to the expected retirement payments. Also, the bill requires new full time prosecutors to contribute to their retirement funds, in a manner similar to other retirement systems.

The bill also addresses certain issues presented by the current language of Sections 56.800 et seq. For example, the current language now allows members who qualified for a retirement benefit as a part-time prosecutor, and returned to serve as a full time prosecutor, to obtain a retirement benefit equal to 50% of the Final Average Compensation as a full time prosecutor. Provisions in SB 892 would make the benefits and the payments into the System correspond. In this way the bill addresses a "loophole" which currently allows certain members to qualify for a retirement benefit which costs the System more than the payments into the system would have "paid for". According to the System's actuaries, each such individual currently reduces the System's funded ratio by 1%. The bill also addresses transfers of creditable service between the System, and other retirement systems of the State, as well as the effect of returning to work as a prosecutor after leaving the position (having already fully vested) for a significant period of time.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Oversight** assumes, based on the response from PACARS, that the proposal will have no fiscal impact on PACARS. Oversight also assumes this proposal is **not** making changes to section 56.807 that would change the monthly contributions from counties or from the City of St. Louis into PACARS; therefore, Oversight will not show a fiscal impact to local governments.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 892, officials from the **Missouri Local Government Employees Retirement System** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 892, officials from **Boone County** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS/SB 639) from 2016, officials from the **City of Columbia** and the **City of Kansas City** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Senate Amendment #4

Officials at the **Missouri Department of Transportation**, the **Platte County Board of Election Commission**, **St. Louis County** and the **State Tax Commission** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HB 1366, officials at the **Department of Public Safety's Missouri Highway Patrol** and the **Kirkville R-III School District** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

**Oversight** notes that school bus drivers are required to undergo a criminal background check before being allowed to operate a school bus. Some school districts may contract with municipalities or other entities to provide school buses. This proposal clarifies that any person who drives a school bus, whether the bus is operated by the school district, a transportation company, a municipality or any other entity must undergo that criminal background check.

**Oversight** is unable to determine if any school districts currently contract school bus drivers that have not undergone the criminal background check. Oversight notes the criminal background check is performed by the Missouri Highway Patrol and they charge a fee for the background check. Oversight assumes the Missouri Highway Patrol may have to complete additional background checks but the expenses of the background check will be offset by the fee charged for the performance of the background check. Oversight will not show an fiscal impact

ASSUMPTION (continued)

for this proposal.

**Oversight** assumes this proposal allows school districts to enter into contracts with municipalities to provide transportation to students. Oversight assumes this proposal requires a school-approved adult supervisor on municipal vehicles transporting students and requires seating to be designated for school children. Oversight assumes this proposal is permissive and will not show a fiscal impact.

Senate Amendment #5

Officials at the **Platte County Board of Election Commission** and the **State Tax Commission** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation this year, SB 1042, officials at the **Department of Economic Development** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 1042, officials at **St. Louis County**, the **Platte County Board of Elections** and the **City of Kansas City** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

**Oversight** assumes concession agreements between the commission (the MO Highway and Transportation Commission) and a political subdivision would have no local fiscal impact without action by the governing body of the political subdivision which shall be subject to voter approval if required by law. Oversight will reflect a \$0 fiscal impact to Local Political Subdivisions.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<u>Additional Revenue</u> - DOR - 1% Collection charges Centralia (\$94,900)	\$0	\$0 or Up to \$1,625	\$0 or Up to \$2,034
<u>Additional Revenue</u> - DOR - 1% Collection charges Lebanon (\$94,900)	\$0	\$0 or Up to <u>\$12,750</u>	\$0 or Up to <u>\$17,000</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or Up to \$14,375</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or Up to \$19,034</u></b>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
<b>LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>			
<u>Savings</u> - County Funds - raises the amount when advertising for bids (§§50.660, 50.783)	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Savings</u> - County Funds - on road and bridge funding in counties with townships who abolish their government (§§65.610, 65.620)	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Additional Revenues</u> - City of Centralia - additional half cent sales taxes for Public Safety (§94.900)	\$0	\$0 to Up to \$167,831	\$0 to Up to \$201,397
<u>Additional Revenues</u> - City of Lebanon - additional half cent sales taxes for Public Safety (§94.900)	\$0	\$0 to Up to \$1,275,000	\$0 to Up to \$1,700,000
<u>Savings</u> - Local Election Authorities - skip certain elections based on the number of open seats and number of candidates running (§115.124)	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost</u> - City of Kansas City - Potential increased KCPD salaries (§84.510)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Loss</u> - Collection Fee kept by DOR (§94.900) Centralia	\$0	\$0 or (Up to \$1,625)	\$0 or (Up to \$2,034)
<u>Loss</u> - Collection Fee kept by DOR (§94.900) Lebanon	\$0	\$0 or (Up to \$12,750)	\$0 or (Up to \$17,000)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
<p><u>Cost - Community College Districts - election costs regarding plan of attachment of the school district and the community college district (§162.441)</u></p>	<p>\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u></p>	<p>\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u></p>	<p>\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u></p>
<p><b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b></p>	<p><b>Unknown to <u>(Unknown)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Unknown, less <u>than \$1,428,456</u></b></p>	<p><b>Unknown, less <u>than \$1,882,363</u></b></p>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

There could be a direct fiscal impact to small businesses as a result of this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

§§50.660, 50.783

Currently, counties must advertise a request for bids for contracts and purchases of more than \$4,500 with any one person or corporation during a 90-day period. This bill provides that the bidding requirement applies to contracts or purchases involving expenditures of more than \$6,000.

Currently, a county commission is required to seek competitive bids or proposals on single feasible source purchases of \$3,000 or more, and advertise for bids on such purchases of \$5,000 or more. The bill requires the commission to seek bids and advertise on single feasible source purchases of more than \$6,000.

§§65.610, 65.620

This act specifies that ballot questions to abolish the township form of government in a county shall also provide for a countywide tax for road and bridge purposes.

§84.510

This bill increases the maximum base annual compensation of Kansas City police officers of various ranks, as specified in the bill.

§94.900

This act adds the City of Centralia to the list of cities authorized to propose a sales tax for the purposes of improving public safety. Such sales tax, if approved by the voters, would be at a rate of up to 0.5%.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

§115.124

This bill expands the existing exception for small cities, towns, and villages under Section 115.124, RSMo, which allows candidates for election to assume office without holding an election if a particular election is uncontested and the number of candidates available equal the number of open positions, from cities, towns, or villages with 1,000 or less persons to those with 2,000 or less persons.

§162.441

Under current law, in order for a school district to become attached to a community college district, a petition must be submitted to the school board of the school district signed either by voters of the district equal in number to ten percent of those voting in the last school election at which school board members were elected or by a majority of the voters of the district, at which point an election must be called. This act provides that a community college district may, by a majority vote of its board of trustees, propose a plan to the voters of the school district to attach the school district to the community college district and call an election upon the question of such plan. The community college district shall be responsible for the costs associated with the election.

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 State Auditor  
Office of the State Courts Administrator  
Office of Administration  
    Division of Budget and Planning  
Department of Revenue  
Missouri Department of Transportation  
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Department of Higher Education  
Department of Economic Development  
Office of the Governor  
Office of the Secretary of State  
State Tax Commission  
Missouri National Guard  
State Emergency Management Agency



SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

Joint Committee on Public Retirement  
Missouri Local Government Employees Retirement System  
Prosecuting and Circuit Attorney's Retirement System  
Department of Public Safety  
    Missouri Highway Patrol  
State Tax Commission  
Kirksville R-III School District  
City of Columbia  
St. Louis County  
Boone County  
City of Kansas City  
Jackson County Board of Election Commission  
Platte County Board of Election Commission  
Summersville R-2 School District  
Missouri Western State University  
Missouri State University  
State Technical College of Missouri  
Dade County  
Stoddard County  
Linn County  
Kansas City Police Department  
City of Centralia  
Kansas City Election Board  
St. Louis County Board of Election Commissioners  
Buchanan County  
Kirksville R-III School District  
Wellsville-Middletown R-1 School District  
Newton County

Ross Strope



Acting Director  
March 14, 2018