

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 5721-07  
Bill No.: CCS for HCS for SS for SB 870  
Subject: Ambulances and Ambulance Districts; Education, Higher; Emergencies; Highway Patrol; Health Care; Health Care Professionals; Health and Seniors Services, Department of; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies; Medical Procedures and Personnel; Mental Health; Retirement Systems and Benefits - General; Taxation and Revenue - General  
Type: Original  
Date: May 10, 2018

---

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions of law relating to emergency services.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
General Revenue	\$62,378	\$60,165	\$59,869
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>\$62,378</b>	<b>\$60,165</b>	<b>\$59,869</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Criminal Records	\$30,600	\$30,600	\$30,600
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds</b>	<b>\$30,600</b>	<b>\$30,600</b>	<b>\$30,600</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 16 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>\$0 or Unknown</b>	<b>\$0 or Unknown</b>	<b>\$0 or Unknown</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

**Oversight** was unable to receive some of the agency responses in a timely manner due to the short fiscal note request time. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best current information that we have or on prior year information regarding a similar bill. Upon the receipt of agency responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval of the chairperson of the Joint Committee on Legislative Research to publish a new fiscal note.

#### §44.098

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 2062, officials at the **Joplin Police Department (JPD)** assumed there would be no fiscal impact on the JPD provided the home agency of the responding officer would still bear the responsibility of workers compensation and liability. If this is incorrect, then the workers compensation and liability portion of the proposal in section 44.098.5 would fall on the agency requesting the assistance. In this case, this proposal would have a negative fiscal impact on the JPD if assistance is requested and one of the responding officers from another agency was hurt or sued while assisting the JPD.

**Oversight** inquired the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DOLIR) for their interpretation of section 44.098.5. According to DOLIR, the liability and workers' compensation portion of this section would lie with the home agency. Therefore, Oversight will show no direct fiscal impact for this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 2062, officials at **Legislative Research** and the **Department of Public Safety's Missouri Highway Patrol** assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 2062, officials at the **Jasper County Sheriff's Department** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the counties of Jasper and Newton did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§§99.848, 100.050, 100.059, 135.090, 190.094, 190.100, 190.103, 190.105, 190.131, 190.142, 190.143, 190.147, 190.165, 190.173, 190.196, 190.246, 190.900, 190.903, 190.906, 190.909, 190.912, 190.915, 190.918, 190.921, 190.924, 190.927, 190.930, 190.933, 190.936, 190.939, 191.630

In response to a previous version, officials at the **St. Louis County Police Department (STLPD)** assumed this bill would require the STLPD to complete Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with all local Fire Departments. This feat would cost significant man hours to develop the MOU, have them revised by legal counsel, have them mailed to each Fire Department, and have them returned and signed by Police Department personnel.

The STLPD would also have to modify policy, which again, would require man hours to complete and at least 1 hour of training for all staff, both commissioned and professional staff. The average hourly pay for a St. Louis County Police Department employee is \$46.10. There are currently 1206 employees. The cost for one hour of training would be \$55,596.60. There would be a \$50 an hour cost to develop the training that would take approximately 2 hours of development. The passage of this bill would cost, at minimum, \$55,696.60. This cost does not include the development and approval of all MOUs.

Additionally, this bill is similar to HB 1919, where St. Louis County Police Department expressed concern over the possible increase in cost from taking additional assault reports and searching for homicidal/suicidal subjects who have fled.

**Oversight** assumes that the STLPD is provided with core funding for training employees to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight believes the training referred to above is currently a part of the employees' duties. Oversight also assumes if multiple MOUs are needed for various fire departments with the STLPD, then a basic MOU could be written and adjustments could be made as needed with the various fire departments. Oversight assumes the STLPD could absorb the costs related to this proposal.

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Service (DHSS)** state Section 190.142.1(2) explicitly addresses "initial licensure". However, the subparagraph also states, "Any fees due for a criminal background check shall be paid by the applicant." Therefore, DHSS interprets the language to require applicants for Emergency Medical Services (EMS) licenses to pay for the cost of background checks for both initial licensure and all subsequent license renewals. DHSS would no longer need to pay for criminal background checks for all applicants. Currently, the EMS conducts criminal background checks for all applicants through the Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP). In FY 2017, EMS expended approximately \$72,000 on background screenings. Based on the expenditures from 2017, there would be a positive impact to general revenue in the amount of \$72,000.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Pursuant to Chapter 190.142.1, RSMo, the EMS conducts criminal records checks for all applicants through the MSHP. DHSS assumes there will not be a significant increase in the number of background checks; therefore, current staff will be able to accommodate these.

The proposal expands the EMS investigative authority to include investigations conducted out of state. While the variables of what activity constitutes "reported conduct" and what level of responsibility the investigative authorities in the remote state will have, DHSS assumes there will not be a significant increase in the number of investigations conducted out of state; therefore, these activities will be accomplished with current staff and funding.

The number of subpoenas issued under this section is unknown. DHSS assumes there will not be a significant number of subpoenas for attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of evidence; therefore, these activities will be accomplished with current staff and funding.

DHSS assumes the commission will receive sufficient revenue through other sources so an annual assessment will not be imposed on the state of Missouri.

**Oversight** notes that DHSS' response to this bill is quite different from previous years' (i.e. HB 100 in 2017). DHSS noted that there is more data on the compact now and other states have indicated that only some minimal travel costs should be anticipated and that there has been no influx of new applicants in the other states.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Department of Public Safety (DPS), Missouri State Highway Patrol (MHP)** provided the following assumptions:

Part of Section 190.142.1 (2) states "The department may share the results of such a criminal background check with any emergency services licensing agency in any member state, as that term is defined under section 190.900, of the recognition of EMS personnel licensure interstate compact."

It should be noted that federal law requires the dissemination of criminal history information to be audited. Based on the ability for the department to share the results of a criminal record check with an emergency services licensing agency in any member state as stated in Section 192.140.1(2) the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Missouri State Highway Patrol would, therefore, be required to audit the member states. Due to the audit requirement, the CJIS Division would incur an unknown fiscal impact to audit the licensing agencies in the member states or dissemination would have to be prohibited.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

During 2017, the Department of Health and Senior Services conducted approximately 3,400 name-based criminal record checks for Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) licensing. This number accurately reflects the number of emergency medical personnel that would be required to obtain a state and federal fingerprint-based criminal record check with the passage of this legislation. This requirement would take effect no later than five (5) years after approval of the Emergency Medical Services Compact. For purposes of this fiscal note, the MHP assumes this legislation will take effect August 28, 2018.

The cost for a fingerprint-based background check to include state and federal open and closed records is as follows:

State fee: \$20  
FBI fee: \$12 (\$2 of the federal fee is retained by the Central Repository as a pass-through fee)  
Total: \$32

3,400 applicants annually X \$32 = \$108,800	
State fee portion deposited in the Criminal Records Fund = 3,400 X \$20 = \$68,000	
Federal pass through fee retained by Central Repository = 3,400 X \$2 =	\$6,800
Total	\$74,800

The funds currently generated as a result of the name-based checks is 3,400 X \$13 = \$44,200. Therefore, the total increase in revenue deposited in the Criminal Record System Fund (new fingerprint background check cost + federal pass through fee - existing cost of name-based check is \$30,600 (\$74,800 - \$44,200).

**Oversight** notes that the Recognition of EMS Personnel Licensure Interstate Compact (REPLICA) has been passed by 12 states and is now active.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the Governor** assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their agency.

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

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

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§§100.050, 100.059, 353.110

In response to a previous version, officials at **St. Louis County** and **Boone County** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

**Oversight** assumes this proposal would modify provisions relating to tax increment financing. Should a redevelopment plan, area or project or urban redevelopment corporation which receives tax abatement or exemption on property be amended, an ambulance or fire district will have the right to recalculate the reimbursement rate that they would receive for tax revenues. This could generate an increase of tax revenues to the ambulance and/or fire district from this proposal. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 or unknown increase in tax revenues for this proposal.

§105.666

Officials at the **Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement** assume section 105.666 will not affect retirement plan benefits as defined in Section 105.660.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HB 2505, officials at the **Prosecuting and Circuit Attorney's Retirement System**, the **Missouri Local Government Employees Retirement System**, the **County Employees' Retirement Fund**, the **Police Retirement System of Kansas City** and the **Sheriffs' Retirement System** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

§173.260

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education** assume section 173.260 adds air ambulance staff (pilot, nurse, respiratory therapist, etc) and employees of the state fire marshal's office and emergency medical technicians to the list of eligible classes this grant will serve. It is almost impossible to estimate the impact of this change since it is based upon catastrophic events. However, DHE estimates at least two additional scholarships may be required each year. The average scholarship for this program is currently \$5,773 per eligible recipient per year. The total amount needed to pay two additional recipients would be \$9,622.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Division of Fire Safety** assume section 173.260 includes the uniformed staff under the definition of "Public Safety Officer". This then allows their survivors to be eligible for the educational grant program. The Division currently employs 56 uniformed employees. The Division of Fire Safety is not fiscally impacted by this proposed legislation; however the uniformed staff of the Division are impacted. Section 173.260

ASSUMPTION (continued)

includes the uniformed staff under the definition of "Public Safety Officer". This then allows their survivors to be eligible for the educational grant program.

Based on the information from the Department of Higher Education's budget request, **Oversight** notes the following for the Public Service Officer Survivor Grant Program:

Table II: Appropriations and Expenditures

	<u>FY 2015</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>
Appropriations	\$140,000	\$140,000	\$140,000
Expenditures	\$73,003	\$77,807	\$121,226

Table III: Average Award per Student

	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>FY 2018</u>	<u>FY 2019</u>
Average Award	\$5,774 (actual)	\$5,800 (projected)	\$5,900 (projected)

Table IV: Number of Students Accepting a Grant

	<u>FY 2015</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>FY 2018</u>	<u>FY 2019</u>
Number of Students	14 (actual)	14 (actual)	21 (actual)	20 (proj.)	20 (proj.)

Officials at the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations** cannot predict the number of additional claims it would be required to review each year for Line of Duty Benefits and could likely absorb the increase in claim reviews with existing resources. However, if the number of additional claims is significant enough that the Division of Workers' Compensation could not absorb the additional work, additional resources would be requested through the appropriations process.

In response to a similar proposal, HB 2360 (LR 6251-01) **Department of Public Safety - Office of the Director** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on the organization.

§190.101

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for SB 796, officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** assumed many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act.



ASSUMPTION (continued)

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 in excess of what 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.

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

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for SB 796, officials from the **Attorney General's Office (AGO)** assumed any potential cost arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in cases.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for SB 796, officials from the **Office of the State Treasurer**, the **Missouri Senate** and the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for SB 796, officials from the **Office of the Governor**, **University of Central Missouri**, **Missouri State University**, **State Technical College of Missouri** and **Missouri Western State University** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

§§217.151

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1627, LR 5302-01), officials from the **City of Kansas City** assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their agency.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HB 1437, officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department** and the **Boone County Sheriff's Department** each assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HB 1437, officials from the **Jefferson County**

ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Sheriff's Department** stated as a medical provider, they have all these requirements in place already. The only thing we need to make sure of is that custody does not use restraints on anyone that is in their 3rd trimester. We can review all the policies related to this.

287.243

**Oversight** notes this section appears to broaden the class of individuals entitled to line of duty compensation to include: a uniformed employee of the Office of the State Fire Marshall, parole officer, probation officer, correctional officer, water safety officer, park ranger and conservation officer. Oversight notes the Line of Duty Compensation program was established to provide a \$25,000 benefit payment to the survivors of emergency personnel killed in the line of duty, subject to appropriation. Oversight notes the following appropriations and expenditures for the Line of Duty Compensation program:

Table IV: Line of Duty Compensation

	<u>FY 2018*</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2015</u>	<u>FY 2014</u>
Appropriations	\$450,000	\$450,000	\$450,000	\$450,000	\$450,000
Expenditures	\$50,000	\$150,000	\$125,000	\$50,000	\$250,000
Unexpended	-	\$300,000	\$325,000	\$400,000	\$200,000
Number of Claims	2	6	5	2	10

Source: DOLIR FY 2019 budget submission.

\*There are four additional claims currently pending.

Officials from the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration, Department of Public Safety** and **Department of Health and Senior Services** assume the proposal as amended will have no fiscal impact on their organizations.

**Oversight** notes if line of duty compensation claims increased by 4 because of this proposal, the cost is estimated at \$100,000 (4 \* \$25,000). Oversight assumes, based on the unexpended funds in previous years, an small increase in the number of line of duty compensation claims could be absorbed with the current appropriation authority. Therefore, Oversight will not reflect an additional cost to the state. Should additional funds be required, DOLIR could request additional funding through the appropriation process.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§320.086

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 1488, officials at the **Office of the Attorney General (AGO)** assumed that any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if there is a significant increase in litigation.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 1488, officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Accounting** and the **Division of Personnel** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

§577.029

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 2413, officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** each assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 2413, officials from the **Springfield Police Department** assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

§590.1040

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 1411, officials from the **Department of Public Safety Missouri Highway Patrol** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 1411, officials from the **Attorney General's Office (AGO)** assume that any potential costs arising from this proposal could be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO stated they may seek additional appropriations if there is a significant increase in litigation.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 1411, officials from the **Springfield Police Department** and the **Boone County Sheriff's Department** each assume no fiscal impact from the proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB 1411, officials from the **Greene County Sheriff's Department** state the proposal could possibly cost tens of thousands of dollars if we can not receive information from counselors that would prevent further problems related to their work by information not being passed to the employers.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Oversight** assumes the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact to the state or local law enforcement agencies.

Bill as a Whole

Officials at **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assume there may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Officials at the **Missouri Department of Transportation** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **Department of Corrections**, the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules**, the **Department of Revenue**, the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration**, the **Office of Administration's Division of General Services** and the **Administrative Hearing Commission**, the **Department of Mental Health**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System**, the **Missouri State Employees' Retirement System** and the **State Tax Commission** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at the **Sheriff's Retirement System** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2019 (10 Mo.)	FY 2020	FY 2021
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<u>Savings</u> - DHSS (§190.142.1(2))			
Reduction in background check fees paid REPLICA p. 4	\$72,000	\$72,000	\$72,000
<u>Cost</u> - DHE - expanding the Public Safety Officer Grant Programs - (§173.260) p. 7-8			
	<u>(\$9,622)</u>	<u>(\$11,835)</u>	<u>(\$12,131)</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b><u>\$62,378</u></b>	<b><u>\$60,165</u></b>	<b><u>\$59,869</u></b>
<b>CRIMINAL RECORDS FUND</b>			
<u>Income</u> - DPS - increase in background check fees REPLICA (§190.142.1)			
	<u>\$30,600</u>	<u>\$30,600</u>	<u>\$30,600</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE CRIMINAL RECORDS FUND</b>	<b><u>\$30,600</u></b>	<b><u>\$30,600</u></b>	<b><u>\$30,600</u></b>
 <u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>			
	FY 2019 (10 Mo.)	FY 2020	FY 2021
<b>AMBULANCE AND FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT FUNDS</b>			
<u>Revenues</u> - potential increase in tax revenues from recalculating rates set for reimbursement on tax increments (§§100.050, 100.059, 353.110) p. 5-6			
	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON AMBULANCE AND FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT FUNDS</b>	<b><u>\$0 or Unknown</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or Unknown</u></b>	<b><u>\$0 or Unknown</u></b>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

§§99.848, 100.050, 100.059, 190.100, 190.103, 190.131, 190.142, 190.143, 190.147, 190.165, 190.173, 190.196, 190.900, 190.903, 190.906, 190.909, 190.912, 190.915, 190.918, 190.921, 190.924, 190.927, 190.930, 190.933, 190.936, 190.939

This bill authorizes Missouri to become a member state of the Recognition of EMS Personnel Licensure Interstate Compact and to adopt the provisions of authorization as specified in the bill. The purpose of the compact is to facilitate the exchange of information between members states regarding EMS personnel licensure, adverse actions, and significant investigatory information.

Current law provides that ambulance and fire protection districts are entitled to a reimbursement of between 50% and 100% of the amount of the district's tax increment deposited into the Special Allocation Fund of a tax increment financing district. This act provides that ambulance and fire protection districts shall annually set such reimbursement rate prior to the time the assessment is paid into the Fund. If the redevelopment plan, area, or project is amended, the ambulance or fire protection district shall have the right to recalculate the reimbursement rate.

This act also modifies the Urban Redevelopment Corporations Law by allowing ambulance and fire protection districts to receive a reimbursement of between 50% and 100% of the amount of ad valorem property tax revenues the district would have received in the absence of the property tax abatement or exemption provided for under current law. Ambulance and fire protection districts shall annually set such reimbursement rate prior to the time the assessment is determined by the county assessor. If the redevelopment plan, area, or project is amended, the ambulance or fire protection district shall have the right to recalculate the reimbursement rate.

§173.260 & 287.243

This bill adds several professions, including air ambulance pilots, air ambulance registered professional nurses, air ambulance registered respiratory therapists, uniformed employees of the Office of the State Fire Marshal, and their children and spouses, and specified emergency medical technicians and their children and spouses to the list of those eligible to receive a public safety officer or employee survivor grant from the Coordinating Board for Higher Education within the Department of Higher Education.

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

St. Louis County Police Department  
Office of Administration  
    Division of Accounting  
    Division of Personnel  
    Division of General Services  
    Administrative Hearing Commission  
Department of Health and Senior Services  
Office of Attorney General  
Department of Public Safety  
    Office of the Director  
    Division of Fire Safety  
    Missouri State Highway Patrol  
Office of the Governor  
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules  
Department of Revenue  
Office of State Courts Administrator  
Office of Secretary of State  
Missouri Department of Transportation  
Department of Corrections  
Department of Social Services  
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration  
Boone County Sheriff's Department  
Springfield Police Department  
Joplin Police Department  
St. Louis County  
State Tax Commission  
Legislative Research  
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement  
Prosecuting and Circuit Attorney's Retirement System  
Missouri Local Government Employees Retirement System  
County Employees Retirement Fund  
Police Retirement System of Kansas City  
Sheriffs' Retirement System  
Department of Higher Education  
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations  
Office of the State Treasurer  
Jasper County Sheriff's Department  
Missouri State Employees' Retirement System  
Missouri Senate  
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

University of Central Missouri  
Missouri State University  
State Technical College of Missouri  
Missouri Western State University  
St. Louis County Police Department  
Greene County Sheriff's Department  
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules  
Department of Mental Health  
MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System  
Jefferson County Sheriff's Department  
Boone County  
City of Kansas City

Ross Strope



Acting Director  
May 10, 2018