

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 4211-03
Bill No.: HCS for SB No. 774
Subject: Department of Public Safety; Boats and Watercraft; Consumer Protection; Highway Patrol; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies; Department of Revenue; Transportation
Type: Original
Date: May 4, 2020

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to public safety.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
General Revenue*	Could exceed (\$17,990,868)	Could exceed (\$18,935,332)	Could exceed (\$19,229,497)	Could exceed (\$19,971,881)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	Could exceed (\$17,990,868)	Could exceed (\$18,935,332)	Could exceed (\$19,229,497)	Could exceed (\$19,971,881)

*Oversight notes the largest portion of this fiscal impact (\$0 to approximately \$14 million in costs per year) stems from the repeal of Section 211.438, RSMo, which is currently a contingency effectiveness of the ‘raise the age’ from 17 to 18. Currently, no person under the age of 17 may be detained in an adult jail, unless the person has been certified as an adult. Oversight range the fiscal impact from this change as \$0 to approximately \$14,000,000 in additional cost to the Office of the State Courts Administrator (as well as an unknown amount of costs to counties), depending upon whether or not this change would have been implemented regardless of passage of this bill.

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
 This fiscal note contains 101 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE, OTHER STATE FUNDS AND FEDERAL FUNDS (DOD only)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
Department of Public Safety*	\$0 or \$22,485,373	\$0 or \$44,970,747	\$0 or \$44,970,747
Department of the Defense	\$0 or (\$22,485,373, or could exceed \$22,685,373)	\$0 or (\$44,970,747, or could exceed \$45,170,747)	\$0 or (\$44,970,747, or could exceed \$45,170,747)
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0 or Could exceed (\$200,000)	\$0 or Could exceed (\$200,000)	\$0 or Could exceed (\$200,000)

* The current appropriation for the Office of the Adjutant General is out of several state and federal funds (see page 12 for a breakout).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
Department of Public Safety*	\$1,805,953	\$1,805,953	\$1,805,953	\$1,805,953
Capitol Police Board*	(\$1,805,953)	(\$1,805,953)	(\$1,805,953)	(\$1,805,953)
Criminal Record System Fund (0671)	Unknown to (Could exceed \$86,240)	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)
Various State Funds	Less than \$100,000	Less than \$100,000	Less than \$100,000	Less than \$100,000
Water Patrol Division Fund (0400)	\$0	\$0	Less than \$25,000	Could exceed \$25,000
Colleges and Universities	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
Pretrial Witness Protection Services Fund*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Community Crime Reduction Program*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Inmate Canteen Fund	\$153,609	\$184,331	\$184,331	\$184,331
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	Greater than \$153,609 to (Greater than \$86,240)	Greater than \$184,331 to (Unknown)	Greater than \$184,331 to (Unknown)	Greater than \$184,331 to (Unknown)

* Reallocation of funds and FTE nets to zero.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
General Revenue	Up 44 FTE	Up to 44 FTE	Up to 45 FTE	Up to 48 FTE
Department of Public Safety*	-509.05 FTE	-509.05 FTE	-509.05 FTE	-509.05 FTE
Department of the Defense*	469.05 FTE	469.05 FTE	469.05 FTE	469.05 FTE
Department of the Defense (new)	Could exceed 2 FTE	Could exceed 2 FTE	Could exceed 2 FTE	Could exceed 2 FTE
Capitol Police Board*	40 FTE	40 FTE	40 FTE	40 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	Could exceed 46 FTE	Could exceed 46 FTE	Could exceed 47 FTE	Could exceed 50 FTE

* Reallocation of FTE nets to zero.

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 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
Local Government	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Due to time constraints, **Oversight** was unable to receive some of the agency responses in a timely manner and performed limited analysis. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best current information that we have or on information regarding a similar bill(s). 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.

§§8.010, 8.111, 8.170, 8.172, 8.177, and 8.178

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Capitol Police (CP)** state the transfer from the Department of Public Safety to the "Capitol Police Board" will incur a fiscal impact to the Capitol Police. Costs associated with the reorganization is for the replacement of uniforms, department logos, and department patches. The potential transfer would require Capitol Police to replace all uniform and equipment items that display our current department logo. The words "Department of Public Safety" would be removed from all uniforms and vehicles that display the old department patch/logo/decals. The redesign of CP's department logo would have to reflect the reorganization from under DPS to the "Capitol Police Board."

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Under the proposed legislation, Capitol Police does not see a need to increase its current number of full-time employees (FTE) to complete its mission at this time. If this bill should pass, Capitol Police would request additional funding to cover the initial cost for replacement uniforms, redesign of a department patch, and vehicle decal.

Capitol Police will incur costs associated with outfitting 34 officers with new uniform shirts and winter coats with the new department patch. The purchase of new uniform shirts and winter coats are due to the possible redesign of our department patch to remove the words "Department of Public Safety" inscribed on the upper portion of the CP's patch/logo/decals.

Each uniformed member of Capitol Police receives two (2) long sleeve and two (2) short sleeve shirts, which equates to 136 shirts (34*2*2), each requiring replacement patches. Our winter coats (a total of 34) have an outer shell and an inner liner that also functions as a jacket. Winter coats require six (6) patches in all, two (2) department patches, and one (1) police badge on the outer shell and the same for the inner liner jacket.

To remove and replace all department patches at one-time would be difficult and costly. The redesigned patch may not cover the old stitching leaving small holes in the uniform item and some residual binding adhesive. The uniform may also become damaged during the removal process requiring the purchase of a new uniform item. It would also be difficult for an alterations shop to remove and replace all department patches and provide quality service within a specific time frame. It is more efficient and practical to purchase new shirts, and winter coats with the redesigned patch sewn on by a police uniform vendor. Total uniform replacement cost is estimated at \$21,652.

Capitol Police will need to replace all vehicle decals displayed on five (5) of our six (6) police vehicles as they also display the words "Department of Public Safety" in the upper portion of the decal. CP estimates the cost to replace vehicle decals to be approximately \$7,000.

Uniform and equipment items needed for the proposed reorganization has an initial cost of \$28,652. CP does not foresee any ongoing cost after the first year as uniform items will be replaced as needed within our appropriated budget.

The following equipment items and costs will be considered a one-time expense:

Vehicle/office emblems	\$700 per emblem x 10	=	\$7,000
Long-sleeve police uniform shirts	\$78 per shirt x 68 shirts	=	\$5,304
Short-sleeve police uniform shirt	\$66 per shirt x 68 shirts	=	\$4,488
1,000 replacement uniform patches	\$2 per patch x 1,000	=	\$2,000
Replacement of winter coat	\$290 per coat x 34 coats	=	<u>\$9,860</u>
Total costs			\$28,652

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Capitol Police consulted with the Office of Administration/Information and Technology Systems Division (OA/ITSD) to determine technology-related costs associated with the bill. At this time, it is unknown which ITSD section (House or OA) would provide services to Capitol Police.

Oversight notes the one-time costs as outlined by Capitol Police to replace existing emblems, department patches, uniforms, vehicle and office emblems that would need to be replaced to reflect the name change. Additionally, Oversight notes OA/ITSD is unable to provide an estimate of the cost associated with moving the information and programs from the Department of Public Safety to a new server under the Board. Oversight will reflect CP's impact as (\$28,652 to Unknown) for fiscal note purposes.

Oversight notes this proposal would transfer the Capitol Police from the Department of Public Safety to the Capitol Police Board. The Capitol Police has been the primary law enforcement agency for the 72-acre state office building campus known as the Capitol Complex since 1983. Officers patrol the buildings and grounds in their jurisdiction 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Patrols are made on foot, by vehicle and on a bicycle. Criminal investigations, medical emergencies, traffic accidents, security and fire alarms and security escorts are only a few of the many incidents and calls for service officers provide to over 15,000 state employees and over 200,000 annual visitors to the seat of government. Using the Governor's Executive Budget recommendation for FY 2021, Oversight will show a transfer of \$1,805,953 and 40 FTE from the Department of Public Safety to the Capitol Police Board.

Officials from the **Missouri House of Representatives (MHR)** state one (1) Human Resource Analyst II at an annual salary of \$46,000 would be needed to support the human resources, budget and reporting needs of the Capitol Police Board. The MHR states they have not included costs for operations that are currently located in HB 8 (DPS). It is unclear which budget bill and department the Capitol Police's operating appropriations would fall under. If their budget would fall under the House purview, MHR presumes there would be an increase to the House budget equal to the decrease to DPS's budget to accomplish the reallocation. This is not shown in our fiscal response.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by MHR. Therefore, Oversight will reflect MHR's impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a previous version, officials from the Office of the Secretary of State (SOS) stated 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

ASSUMPTION (continued)

session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$5,000. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the 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 the office can sustain with the core budget. Therefore, the 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. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could require additional resources.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1521), officials from the **Governor's Office (GOV)** stated section 8.111 establishes the "Capitol Police Board" which will consist of five members: the Governor or their designee, the Speaker of the House of Representatives or their designee, the President pro tempore of the Senate or their designee, the Chief Justice of the Missouri Supreme Court or their designee, and the chair of the State Capitol Commission. There should be no added cost to the Governor's Office as a result of this measure.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Facility Management Design and Construction (FMDC)** state FMDC currently pays for security services at multiple facilities statewide. FMDC's three-year average cost (2017 – 2019) for security services was \$920,490. FMDC assumes this cost would be transferred to the Capitol Police Board. Therefore, there would be a potential savings to FMDC as a result of this bill. However, the overall impact to the state would be \$0.

Oversight notes §8.115 was removed from this proposal; therefore, the expense of security services as noted in OA/FMDC's response at a three-year average cost of \$920,490 will remain with OA/FMDC and will not transfer to the Capitol Police Board.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** stated this proposal has no direct impact on B&P, has no direct impact on general and total state revenues and will not impact the calculation pursuant to Art. X, Sec. 18(e).

Oversight notes that the **Missouri Senate** anticipates a negative fiscal impact to reimburse for travel to attend meetings of the Capitol Police Board. As written, the bill does not allow for reimbursement to attend board meetings. However, it's possible the Senator will seek reimbursement to attend meetings. If reimbursement were allowed, the cost to the Senate would be approximately \$110.50 per board meeting.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight notes the proposal does not allow for reimbursement to attend board meetings. Therefore, Oversight will present a zero impact in the fiscal note for the Missouri Senate.

§32.056

Officials at the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume the following regarding this proposal:

Includes a person employed by the Missouri Department of Corrections, any jailer of corrections of the State, or any political subdivision of the State to provisions related to the restricted release by the Department of information contained in the Departments motor vehicle or driver registration records.

Administrative Impact

Missouri Department of Corrections has a total of 10,228 employees that would fall into this proposed legislation which will result in an increase of confidential record transactions processed by the Department by an estimated 20,456 records. DOR notes jailers were considered in their response as well.

The average time it takes to process a new or renewal application is approximately ten minutes. At 21 working days a month (168 working hours per month), one FTE can process 12,096 per year. With the increased phone calls, correspondence, and applications, the Department will require 2 additional FTE to process the increase in confidential record transactions, and 1 FTE to handle the anticipated increase in incoming phone calls.

To implement the proposed legislation, the Motor Vehicle Bureau will be required to:

- Increase FTE by 3
- Update procedures, forms, correspondence letters, and the Department website; and
- Train staff.

FY 2020 - Motor Vehicle Bureau

Revenue Processing Tech II	3 FTE @ \$30,504.00	= \$91,512
Management Analysis Spec I	120 hrs. @ \$18.42 per hr.	= \$ 2,210
Revenue Manager	20 hrs. @ \$20.59 per hr.	= \$ 412
Total		= \$94,134

FY 2020 - Personnel Services Bureau

Administrative Analyst III	30 hrs. @ \$19.43 per hr.	= \$ 583
Management Analysis Spec I	15 hrs. @ \$18.42 per hr.	= \$ 276
Total		= \$ 859

Total Cost = **\$94,993**

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight inquired of DOR in regards to the 20,456 transaction records. DOR stated these transactions are in addition to any transactions that are currently being completed for renewing motor vehicle and license records for the individuals noted in this proposal. In addition, DOR also stated 20,456 is the estimated maximum number of new transactions that would occur due to this proposal. Oversight notes this proposal also includes jailers of “any political subdivision of the state.” Therefore, **Oversight** will range the fiscal impact of this proposal as up to \$152,511 in FY 2021, \$158,826 in FY 2022 and \$160,085 in FY 2023 (up to 3 FTE required).

DOR notes the 3 FTE would be required on a continuous basis due to not all applications being processed in the first year and renewals in subsequent years.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1418), officials from the **Department of Corrections** and the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight notes that the agencies mentioned above have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for these agencies.

§§40.003, 41.005, 45.010, 45.020, 45.030, 650.005

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri National Guard (MNG)** believed there is a potential fiscal impact of \$150,000 - \$200,000 to our personal services. This potential impact would cause reorganizing into a department structure which would create Division Directors, a Deputy Director and Department Director. The unknown at this time is our ability to pay a percentage of certain employees with federal money depending on their funding source and involvement with military missions.

Oversight notes the concerns of the MNG and realizes with a restructure new duties and pay ranges may be established or affected. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a cost of \$0 or Could exceed (\$200,000) to the DOD’s budget for additional salaries (including fringe benefits) as well as other department-specific personnel that may be required (budget, general counsel, etc.) by creating another department.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** stated this proposal has no direct impact on B&P, has no direct impact on general and total state revenues and will not impact the calculation pursuant to Art. X, Sec. 18(e).

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 2209), officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** stated 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 years legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$5,000. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the 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 the office can sustain with the core budget. Therefore, the 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. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could require additional resources.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 2209), officials from the **Office of Administration - General Services (OA/GS)** stated if the creation of a Department of Defense and the other changes are interpreted to increase the number of people covered by state workers' compensation benefits and the Legal Expense Fund, then there could be an increase in costs to the state for workers' compensation benefits and costs to the LEF, if claims are successfully brought.

The number of potential claims, the severity of those claims, and the ultimate costs associated with any settlement or judgment resulting from those claims cannot be forecasted with any degree of assurance to their accuracy.

The state self-assumes its own liability for workers' compensation benefits and under the state Legal Expense Fund, Section 105.711, RSMo. The LEF is a self-funding mechanism whereby funds are made available for the payment of any claim or judgment rendered against the state in regard to the waivers of sovereign immunity or against employees and specified and individuals. Investigation, defense, negotiation or settlement of such claims is provided by the Office of the Attorney General. Payment is made by the Commissioner of Administration with the approval of the Attorney General.

Oversight assumes the new personnel caused by creating a new department would not materially change the number of people covered by state workers' compensation benefits would have no fiscal impact upon the OA/GS and will reflect a zero impact for fiscal note purposes.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 2209), officials from the **Governor’s Office** stated this proposal creates the “Department of Defense” and grants authority to the Governor to appoint a director, by and with advice and consent of the senate. There should be no added cost to the Governor’s Office as a result of this measure.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for this agency.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 2209), officials from the **Office of Administration - Divisions of Accounting, Personnel, ITSD, and Purchasing** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight notes the **Department of Public Safety** and the **Missouri Senate** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Oversight will range the fiscal impact of the transfer from \$0 (joint resolution is rejected by the voters) or to the annual appropriation for the Department of Public Safety - Office of the Adjutant General.

According to HB 8 (2019), the total amount appropriated to the Office of the Adjutant General for FY 2020, by fund is:

General Revenue	\$7,904,523
Missouri National Guard Trust Fund	\$5,275,256
Federal Drug Seizure Fund	\$240,000
Veterans’ Commission Capital Improvement Trust Fund	\$635,628
Federal Funds	\$30,388,904
Adjutant General Revolving Fund	\$25,000
Missouri Military Family Relief Fund	\$150,000
National Guard Training Site Fund	\$351,436
Total	\$44,970,747

Since the transfer would be effective January 1, 2021, Oversight will reflect six months of impact in FY 2021.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§44.080

This section states that no state of emergency declared by a county executive shall be imposed or continue for more than fifteen days without a 60 percent majority vote of the county governing body approving and setting the number of days beyond the 15 days.

Oversight assumes this change will have no fiscal impact on state or local governments.

This section of the proposal has an emergency clause.

§67.142

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB Nos. 2241 & 2244), officials at the **City of Springfield** assumed a negative impact from this proposal. Currently, the City has heightened ownership requirements for pit bulls, including registration, muzzling while not on owners' property, and posting a sign on the property. The City would lose approximately \$25,000 in registration fees annually, and there may be additional unquantifiable costs related to animal control issues.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB Nos. 2241 & 2244), officials at the **Department of Agriculture** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB Nos. 2241 & 2244), officials at the **City of Columbia** assumed no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

In response to a previous version (HB 2241), officials at the **City of Brentwood** assumed no fiscal impact to their entity from this proposal.

Oversight notes there are several cities with ordinances in place regarding registration, proper confinement and the posting of signs for certain breeds of dogs. Such cities include Springfield, Liberty, Independence, Florissant, Ferguson and Carthage Missouri. Oversight is unclear on how much the cities charge for registration and how many dogs are registered in those cities.

Oversight assumes that should this proposal be enacted, registration fees in those cities and possibly others not listed could be eliminated from the cities revenue. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 or unknown, greater than \$25,000 negative impact to local political subdivision for this proposal.

§§71.201 and 84.344

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1604), officials at the **Missouri Highway Patrol** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **City of Columbia** state section 71.201 requires police officers to live within a 30 mile radius of the community, thereby requiring a more stringent standard than the bill proposes. While it is not possible to accurately estimate the fiscal impact of extending that radius, considerations include the cost of a longer time to respond to violent, critical and other emergency situations.

Oversight notes section 71.201 pertains to police departments in St. Louis and Kansas City per the statutes listed (84.020 and 84.350). Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for this agency.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1604), officials at the **City of Brentwood**, the **City of O'Fallon**, the **Springfield Police Department** and the **St. Louis County Police Department** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

In response to a previous version (HB 1604), officials at **St. Louis City** stated the Fiscal Manager of the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department assumes no measurable fiscal impact from the passage of this legislation.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes no direct fiscal impact to local political subdivisions from this proposal.

§84.400

Oversight notes the **City of Kansas City** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for this agency.

§§94.900 and 94.902

In response to a previous version, officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning (B&P)** assumed this proposal allows the cities of Clinton in Henry County, and Cole Camp and Lincoln in Benton County to impose a public safety sales tax of 0.25%, 0.5%, 0.75% or 1%. The impact of this will depend upon the sales tax rate the cities select. The charts below show the DOR collections fees and sales tax collections each city may generate based upon each tax rate:

ASSUMPTION (continued)

0.25%	DOR Collections			Sales Tax Collections Data		
City	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
Clinton	1,135	4,539	4,539	112,339	449,356	449,356
Cole Camp	93	373	373	9,222	36,888	36,888
Lincoln	58	230	230	5,699	22,796	22,796
	1,286	5,142	5,142	127,260	509,040	509,040
0.50%	DOR Collections			Sales Tax Collections Data		
City	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
Clinton	2,269	9,078	9,078	224,678	898,712	898,712
Cole Camp	186	745	745	18,444	73,776	73,776
Lincoln	115	461	461	11,398	45,591	45,591
	2,570	10,284	10,284	254,520	1,018,079	1,018,079
0.75%	DOR Collections			Sales Tax Collections Data		
City	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
Clinton	3,404	13,617	13,617	337,017	1,348,068	1,348,068
Cole Camp	279	1,118	1,118	27,666	110,664	110,664
Lincoln	173	691	691	17,097	68,387	68,387
	3,856	15,426	15,426	381,780	1,527,119	1,527,119
1.00%	DOR Collections			Sales Tax Collections Data		
City	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
Clinton	4,539	18,156	18,156	449,356	1,797,424	1,797,424
Cole Camp	373	1,490	1,490	36,888	147,552	147,552
Lincoln	230	921	921	22,796	91,183	92,183
	5,142	20,567	20,567	509,040	2,036,159	2,037,159

Since the bill indicates that this sales tax would take effect starting April 1, only Q4 of FY21 sales collections would be impacted with the full year collection amounts generated in FY22 and FY23.

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, this portion could increase general and total state revenues by the DOR fee amounts shown in the charts above.

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

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials at the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume the following:

City of Branson West Public Safety Sales Tax

The Department assumes this proposal would allow the City of Branson West to authorize and impose up to one-half of one percent, and shall be imposed solely for the purpose of improving the public safety. Using taxable sales report data for the City of Branson West, DOR estimates the impact as follows:

City of Branson West Sales by Calendar Year

CY	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Total
2015					
2016	18,901,040	25,156,599	26,716,172	23,132,889	93,906,700
2017	18,850,783	25,742,289	26,723,871	22,779,379	94,096,322
2018	19,229,746	26,277,102	27,300,134	24,081,341	96,888,323
2019	19,962,599	27,108,143			

Conversion of Taxable Sales by Calendar Year to Fiscal Year

FY16	-	-	18,901,040	25,156,599	44,057,639
FY17	26,716,172	23,132,889	18,850,783	25,742,289	94,442,133
FY18	26,723,871	22,779,379	19,229,746	26,277,102	95,010,098
FY19	-	-			96,910,300

Once converted to Fiscal Years, DOR took the taxable sales times the proposed tax rate of one-half of one percent to determine the total amount of the sales tax collected. DOR notes that this proposal allows DOR to retain 1% that is deposited into General Revenue for expenses for collection of this tax.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

FY	% Growth	check	Collections	DOR Fee	Final Collection
FY16					
FY17					
FY18			475,050	4,751	470,300
FY19	2.00%	-5.34%	484,551	4,846	479,706
FY20	2.00%	3.40%	494,243	4,942	489,300
FY21	2.00%		504,127	5,041	499,086
FY22	2.00%		514,210	5,142	509,068
FY 23	2.00%		524,494	5,245	519,249

DOR notes that this proposal would become effective on August 28, 2020 and the first election would be the April 6, 2021 election. Therefore this will not have a fiscal impact in FY 2021. This sales tax would begin October 1, 2021 (FY 2022) if adopted by the voters. Therefore the impact in FY 2022 would be for 9 months.

Fiscal Year	DOR Collection Fee	Branson West Sales Tax Amount
2021	\$0	\$0
2022	\$3,857	\$381,801
2023	\$5,245	\$519,249

City of Kearney Public Safety Sales Tax

The Department assumes this proposal would allow the City of Kearney to authorize and impose up to one-half of one percent, and shall be imposed solely for the purpose of improving the public safety. Using taxable sales report data for the City of Kearney, DOR estimates the impact as follows:

ASSUMPTION (continued)

City of Kearney Taxable Sales by Calendar Year

CY	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Total
2015	27,519,194	30,433,910	30,585,656	30,499,212	119,037,972
2016	29,649,506	32,472,290	32,177,705	31,615,729	125,915,230
2017	30,965,917	33,837,063	33,228,851	31,556,051	129,587,881
2018	31,091,023	34,389,327	33,602,628	32,563,846	131,646,825
2019	30,832,259	34,565,728			

Conversion of Taxable Sales by Calendar Year to Fiscal Year

FY	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Total
FY16	30,585,656	30,499,212	29,649,506	32,472,290	123,206,664
FY17	32,177,705	31,615,729	30,965,917	33,837,063	128,596,414
FY18	33,228,851	31,556,051	31,091,023	34,389,327	130,265,252
FY19	-	-			132,870,557
FY20					135,527,968
FY21					138,238,528
FY22					141,003,298
FY 23					143,823,364

Once converted to Fiscal Years, DOR took the taxable sales times the proposed tax rate of one-half of one percent to determine the total amount of the sales tax collected. DOR notes that this proposal allows DOR to retain 1% that is deposited into General Revenue for expenses for collection of this tax.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

FY	Total		% Growth	check	Collections	DOR Fee	Final Collection
FY16	123,206,664						
FY17	128,596,414						
FY18	130,265,252				651,326	6,513	644,813
FY19	132,870,557		2.00%	-5.34%	664,353	6,644	657,709
FY20	135,527,968		2.00%	3.40%	677,640	6,776	670,863
FY21	138,238,528		2.00%		691,193	6,912	684,281
FY22	141,003,298		2.00%		705,016	7,050	697,966
FY 23	143,823,364		2.00%		719,117	7,191	711,926

DOR notes that this proposal would become effective on August 28, 2020 and the first election would be the April 6, 2021 election. Therefore this will not have a fiscal impact in FY 2021. This sales tax would begin October 1, 2021 (FY 2022) if adopted by the voters. Therefore the impact in FY 2022 would be for 9 months.

Fiscal Year	DOR Collection Fee	Kearney Sales Tax Amount
2021	\$0	\$0
2022	\$5,288	\$523,475
2023	\$7,191	\$711,926

City of Smithville Public Safety Sales Tax

The Department assumes this proposal would allow the City of Smithville to authorize and impose up to one-half of one percent, and shall be imposed solely for the purpose of improving the public safety. Using taxable sales report data for the City of Smithville, DOR estimates the impact as follows:

City of Smithville Taxable Sales by Calendar Year

CY	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Total
2015	18,324,168	21,003,657	20,543,911	18,606,705	78,478,441
2016	18,563,002	21,339,111	21,767,674	19,455,853	81,125,639
2017	18,671,654	22,070,560	21,628,460	19,691,818	82,062,492
2018	19,056,529	22,849,004	22,213,205	20,463,774	84,582,512
2019	18,956,527	22,859,235			

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Conversion of Taxable Sales by Calendar Year to Fiscal Year

FY	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Total
FY16	20,543,911	18,606,705	18,563,002	21,339,111	79,052,729
FY17	21,767,674	19,455,853	18,671,654	22,070,560	81,965,741
FY18	21,628,460	19,691,818	19,056,529	22,849,004	83,225,811
FY19	-	-			84,890,327
FY20					86,588,134
FY21					88,319,896
FY22					90,086,294
FY 23					91,888,020

Once converted to Fiscal Years, DOR took the taxable sales times the proposed tax rate of one-half of one percent to determine the total amount of the sales tax collected. DOR notes that this proposal allows DOR to retain 1% that is deposited into General Revenue for expenses for collection of this tax.

FY	Total	% Growth	check	Collections	DOR Fee	Final Collection
FY16	79,052,729					
FY17	81,965,741					
FY18	83,225,811			416,129	4,161	411,968
FY19	84,890,327	2.00%	-5.34%	424,452	4,245	420,207
FY20	86,588,134	2.00%	3.40%	432,941	4,329	428,611
FY21	88,319,896	2.00%		441,599	4,416	437,183
FY22	90,086,294	2.00%		450,431	4,504	445,927
FY 23	91,888,020	2.00%		459,440	4,594	454,846

DOR notes that this proposal would become effective on August 28, 2020 and the first election would be the April 6, 2021 election. Therefore this will not have a fiscal impact in FY 2021. This sales tax would begin October 1, 2021 (FY 2022) if adopted by the voters. Therefore the impact in FY 2022 would be for 9 months.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Fiscal Year	DOR Collection	Smithville Collection Amount
2021	\$0	\$0
2022	\$3,378	\$334,445
2023	\$4,594	\$454,846

City of Hallsville Public Safety Sales Tax

The Department assumes this proposal would allow the City of Hallsville to authorize and impose up to one-half of one percent, and shall be imposed solely for the purpose of improving the public safety. Using taxable sales report data for the City of Hallsville, DOR estimates the impact as follows:

City of Hallsville Taxable Sales by Calendar Year

CY	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Total
2015	2,120,442	2,206,788	2,374,865	2,281,633	8,983,728
2016	2,209,520	2,277,424	2,389,793	2,287,573	9,164,310
2017	2,283,198	2,479,424	2,423,003	2,283,876	9,469,500
2018	2,305,757	2,424,249	2,156,592	2,249,081	9,135,679
2019	2,272,117	2,266,564			

Conversion of Taxable Sales by Calendar Year to Fiscal Year

FY	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Total
16	2,374,865	2,281,633	2,209,520	2,277,424	9,143,442
17	2,389,793	2,287,573	2,305,757	2,479,424	9,439,988
18	2,423,003	2,283,876	2,305,757	2,424,249	9,436,885
19					9,625,623
20					9,818,135
21					10,014,498
22					10,214,788
23					10,419,084

Once converted to Fiscal Years, DOR took the taxable sales times the proposed tax rate of one-half of one percent to determine the total amount of the sales tax collected. DOR notes that this proposal allows DOR to retain 1% that is deposited into General Revenue for expenses for collection of this tax.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

FY	Total		% Growth	check	Collections	DOR Fee	Final Collection
FY16	9,143,442						
FY17	9,439,988						
FY18	9,436,885				47,184	472	46,713
FY19	9,625,623		2.00%	-5.34%	48,128	481	47,647
FY20	9,818,135		2.00%	3.40%	49,091	491	48,600
FY21	10,014,498		2.00%		50,072	501	49,572
FY22	10,214,788		2.00%		51,074	511	50,563
FY 23	10,419,084		2.00%		52,095	521	51,574

DOR notes that this proposal would become effective on August 28, 2020 and the first election would be the April 6, 2021 election. Therefore this will not have a fiscal impact in FY 2021. This sales tax would begin October 1, 2021 (FY 2022) if adopted by the voters. Therefore the impact in FY 2022 would be for 9 months

Fiscal Year	DOR Fee	Hallsville Collection
2021	\$0	\$0
2022	\$383	\$37,922
2023	\$521	\$51,574

City of Clinton, City of Lincoln, City of Cole Camp Public Safety Sales Tax

This proposal would allow any city of the third classification with more than nine thousand but fewer than ten thousand inhabitants and located in any county of the third classification with a township form of government and with more than twenty thousand but fewer than twenty-three thousand inhabitants to implement a sales tax for public safety. DOR believes the only City to qualify under this description is the City of Clinton.

Additionally, this proposal would allow any city of the fourth classification with more than one thousand fifty but fewer than one thousand two hundred inhabitants and located in any county of the third classification without a township form of government and with more than eighteen thousand but fewer than twenty thousand inhabitants and with a city of the fourth classification with more than two thousand one hundred but fewer than two thousand four hundred inhabitants as the county seat to also implement a sales tax for public safety. DOR believes this would apply to the City of Lincoln and the City of Cole Camp.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The sales tax may be imposed in an amount of up to one-fourth, one-half, three-fourths, or one percent. The tax shall be imposed solely for the purpose of improving the public safety.

DOR shows that the **City of Clinton** has taxable sales of:

CY	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Total
2015	40,147,895	44,618,974	44,443,717	44,037,435	173,248,021
2016	41,389,150	45,465,065	45,533,177	44,893,260	177,280,651
2017	40,038,915	47,066,194	45,477,582	43,884,475	176,467,167
2018	40,961,939	47,940,212	46,462,280	46,505,858	181,870,288
2019	41,173,575	47,416,316			
Source:	http://dor.mo.gov/publicreports/				
Sales Tax only (no use tax)					
DOR reports are generated by calendar year not fiscal year					
City of Clinton Taxable Sales Report Data					

Using the taxable sales and a 2% inflation rate in the future, DOR calculated the amount DOR would collect and the City of Clinton would collect as:

Fiscal Year	DOR 1% Fee	Clinton City Collection
2021	\$0	\$0
2022	\$7,236	\$716,360
2023	\$9,841	\$974,250

DOR notes that this proposal would become effective on August 28, 2020 and the first election would be the April 6, 2021 election. Therefore this will not have a fiscal impact in FY 2021. This sales tax would begin October 1, 2021 (FY 2022) if adopted by the voters. Therefore the impact in FY 2022 would be for 9 months.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DOR shows that the **City of Lincoln** has taxable sales of:

CY	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	July-Sept	Oct-Dec	Total
2015	2,124,060	2,412,496	2,368,178	2,014,074	8,918,808
2016	2,138,130	2,369,529	2,437,892	2,142,464	9,088,015
2017	2,177,513	2,602,875	2,547,296	2,120,049	9,447,733
2018	2,444,106	2,542,249	2,617,362	2,318,717	9,922,434
2019	2,030,154	2,244,162			

Source: <http://dor.mo.gov/publicreports/>
 Sales Tax only (no use tax)
 DOR reports are generated by calendar year not fiscal year
 City of Lincoln Taxable Sales Report Data

Using the taxable sales and a 2% inflation rate in the future, DOR calculated the amount DOR would collect and the City of Lincoln would collect as:

Fiscal Year	DOR 1% Fee	Lincoln City Collection
2021	\$0	\$0
2022	392	38,794
2023	533	52,759

DOR notes that this proposal would become effective on August 28, 2020 and the first election would be the April 6, 2021 election. Therefore this will not have a fiscal impact in FY 2021. This sales tax would begin October 1, 2021 (FY 2022) if adopted by the voters. Therefore the impact in FY 2022 would be for 9 months.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DOR shows that the **City of Cole Camp** has taxable sales of:

CY	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Total
2015	3,229,113	3,002,081	3,402,238	3,196,016	12,829,447
2016	3,095,340	3,003,988	3,225,042	3,279,187	12,603,558
2017	3,081,084	2,956,959	3,249,944	3,360,607	12,623,994
2018	3,278,248	3,220,758	3,474,064	4,684,461	14,657,531
2019	3,243,595	3,502,112			
Source: http://dor.mo.gov/publicreports/					
Sales Tax only (no use tax)					
DOR reports are generated by calendar year not fiscal year					
City of Cole Camp Taxable Sales Report Data					

Using the taxable sales and a 2% inflation rate in the future, DOR calculated the amount DOR would collect and the City of Cole Camp would collect as:

Fiscal Year	DOR 1% Fee	Cole Camp City Collection
2021	\$0	\$0
2022	\$532	\$52,681
2023	\$724	\$71,646

DOR notes that this proposal would become effective on August 28, 2020 and the first election would be the April 6, 2021 election. Therefore this will not have a fiscal impact in FY 2021. This sales tax would begin October 1, 2021 (FY 2022) if adopted by the voters. Therefore the impact in FY 2022 would be for 9 months.

Claycomo

The Department assumes this proposal would allow the Village of Claycomo to authorize and impose up to one-half of one percent, and shall be imposed solely for the purpose of improving the public safety. Using taxable sales report data for the Village of Claycomo, DOR estimates the impact as follows:

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Village of Claycomo Taxable Sales by Calendar Year

CY	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Total
2015	5,987,942	5,945,109	5,798,774	6,032,010	\$23,763,736
2016	6,312,917	6,245,000	6,027,650	5,480,769	\$24,066,236
2017	5,349,230	5,570,093	5,149,850	4,944,736	\$21,013,909
2018	5,150,294	5,761,090	5,959,771	6,450,921	\$23,322,075
2019	6,300,774	6,332,614	0	0	\$12,633,388

Conversion of Taxable Sales by Calendar Year to Fiscal Year

FY	Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun	Total
FY16	5,798,774	6,032,010	6,312,917	6,245,000	\$ 24,388,701
FY17	6,027,650	5,480,769	5,349,230	5,570,093	\$22,427,742
FY18	5,149,850	4,944,736	5,150,294	5,761,090	\$21,005,970
FY19					\$21,426,089
FY20					\$21,854,611
FY21					\$22,291,703
FY22					\$22,737,537
FY23					\$23,192,288

Once converted to Fiscal Years, DOR took the taxable sales times the proposed tax rate of one-half of one percent to determine the total amount of the sales tax collected. DOR notes that this proposal allows DOR to retain 1% that is deposited into General Revenue for expenses for collection of this tax.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

FY	Total	% Growth	Collections	DOR Fee	Final Collection
FY16	24,388,701				
FY17	22,427,742				
FY18	21,005,970		105,030	1,050	103,980
FY19	21,426,089	2.00%	107,130	1,071	106,059
FY20	21,854,611	2.00%	109,273	1,093	108,180
FY21	22,291,703	2.00%	111,459	1,115	110,344
FY22	22,737,537	2.00%	113,688	1,137	112,551
FY 23	23,192,288	2.00%	115,961	1,160	114,802

DOR notes that this proposal would become effective on August 28, 2020 and the first election would be the April 6, 2021 election. Therefore this will not have a fiscal impact in FY 2021. This sales tax would begin October 1, 2021 (FY 2022) if adopted by the voters. Therefore the impact in FY 2022 would be for 9 months.

Fiscal Year	DOR Fee	Claycomo Collection
2021	\$0	\$0
2022	\$284	\$84,413
2023	\$1,160	\$114,802

Summary

	FY 2022		FY 2023	
	DOR 1%	City Collection	DOR 1%	City Collection
Branson West	\$3,857	\$381,801	\$5,245	\$519,249
Kearney	\$7,050	\$697,966	\$7,191	\$711,926
Smithville	\$4,504	\$445,927	\$4,594	\$454,846
Hallsville	\$511	\$50,563	\$521	\$51,574
Clinton	\$9,648	\$955,147	\$9,841	\$974,250
Lincoln	\$522	\$51,725	\$533	\$52,759
Cole Camp	\$710	\$70,242	\$724	\$71,646
Claycomo	\$1,137	\$112,551	\$1,160	\$114,802

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In summary, DOR's totals are as follows:

- FY 2022 DOR 1% = \$27,939
- FY 2022 City Collection = \$2,765,922
- FY 2023 DOR 1% = \$29,809
- FY 2023 City Collection = \$2,951,052

DOR notes that this proposal would become effective on August 28, 2020, and the first election would be the April 6, 2021, election. Therefore this will not have a fiscal impact in FY 2021. This sales tax would begin October 1, 2021 (FY 2022) if adopted by the voters. Therefore the impact in FY 2022 would be for 9 months.

In response to similar legislation from HCS for HB 1701, officials at the **City of Clinton** assumed, based on financial data from FY 18-19, the City would expect to generate annual revenues of \$950,000 based on a one-half percent sales tax.

In response to similar legislation from HCS for HB 1701, officials at the **City of Branson West** assumed if the Board of Alderman of the City decide to approve the tax at half a percent and it is passed, the approximate revenue that will be brought in is \$500,000 annually.

Oversight has calculated those cities within this proposal as follows:

Taxable Sales by City

	CY 19 Taxable Sales Tax Jan- Mar	CY 19 Taxable Sales Tax Apr- Jun	CY 18 Taxable Sales Tax Jul- Sept	CY 18 Taxable Sales Tax Oct- Dec	Total FY 19 Taxable Sales Tax
Branson West	19,962,599	27,108,143	27,300,134	24,081,341	98,452,217
Claycomo	6,300,774	6,332,614	5,959,771	6,450,921	25,044,080
Clinton	41,173,575	47,416,316	46,462,280	46,505,858	181,558,029
Cole Camp	3,243,595	3,502,112	3,474,064	4,684,461	14,904,232
Hallsville	2,272,117	2,266,564	2,156,592	2,249,081	8,944,353
Kearney	30,832,259	34,565,728	33,602,628	32,563,846	131,564,461
Lincoln	2,030,154	2,244,162	2,617,362	2,318,717	9,210,395
Smithville	18,956,527	22,859,235	22,213,205	20,463,774	84,492,740
	124,771,599	146,294,873	143,786,036	139,317,998	554,170,507

ASSUMPTION (continued)

2% Growth each year based on FY 19 Taxable Sales Tax

	2% Growth for FY 20 Taxable Sales	2% Growth for FY 21 Taxable Sales	2% Growth for FY 22 Taxable Sales	2% Growth for FY 23 Taxable Sales
Branson West	100,421,261	102,429,686	104,478,280	106,567,846
Claycomo	25,544,962	26,055,861	26,576,978	27,108,518
Clinton	185,189,190	188,892,974	192,670,833	196,524,250
Cole Camp	15,202,317	15,506,363	15,816,490	16,132,820
Hallsville	9,123,240	9,305,705	9,491,819	9,681,656
Kearney	134,195,750	136,879,665	139,617,258	142,409,603
Lincoln	9,394,603	9,582,495	9,774,145	9,969,627
Smithville	86,182,595	87,906,247	89,664,372	91,457,659
	565,253,917	576,558,995	588,090,175	599,851,979

Oversight notes that this version of the proposal is based on a half-percent sales tax for the cities. Therefore, Oversight has generated those totals below based on the 2% growth in sales tax per year above.

Half-Percent Revenue Generated for each City

	.5% Revenue for FY 21	.5% Revenue for FY 22 (12 mo)	.5% Revenue for FY 22 (8 mo)	.5% Revenue for FY 23
Branson West	-	522,391	348,261	532,839
Claycomo	-	132,885	88,590	135,543
Clinton	-	963,354	642,236	982,621
Cole Camp	-	79,082	52,722	80,664
Hallsville	-	47,459	31,639	48,408
Kearney	-	698,086	465,391	712,048
Lincoln	-	48,871	32,580	49,848
Smithville	-	448,322	298,881	457,288
	-	2,940,451	1,960,301	2,999,260

Oversight inquired DOR regarding their methodology when calculating the sales tax. DOR stated they based their calculation on calendar year amounts vs. state fiscal year amounts. Oversight used state fiscal year amounts in their calculation of taxable sales by cities.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight notes while the cities within this proposal could start to generate sale tax revenue beginning October 1, 2021, the reporting will not occur until 1 month later. Therefore, Oversight will range the fiscal impact from \$0 (not approved by voters) the estimates calculated by Oversight for 8 months in FY 22. FY 23 will reflect a full year of sales tax revenue for this proposal.

§160.665

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1961), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol** assumed this proposal will have no direct fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assume this proposal will likely have an impact on local school districts. We defer to them regarding the extent of any impact.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1961), officials from **Gasconade County R-I School District** assumed the cost associated with each person being trained to be a school protection officers would be \$10,000 or more. A district would want to have at least one person trained per building so if you have 3 buildings you would have \$30,000 or more in cost for training.

We would want to give a stipend officer in some way since there will be time used outside of regular contracts. Would look at around \$1,000 per individual?

Officials from **Wellsville Middletown R-I School District** state our board has shown no inclination to allow for school protection officers or a person of any other designation that would allow any person who is not a law enforcement officer to carry firearms in our school. I don't believe this bill will currently have any fiscal impact on our school.

Oversight assumes that because this bill permits, but does not require additional school resource officers, that it will have no direct fiscal impact on state agencies and that fiscal impacts on school districts will be at the discretion of the school districts.

§168.133

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) officials assume this proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol (MHP) officials state the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education anticipates that this legislation would impact a relatively low number of individuals totaling approximately 100 applicants per year equaling \$2,200 deposited in the Criminal Record System Fund annually.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

100 applicants x \$22.00 = \$2,200 deposited in the Criminal Record System Fund annually.

The cost for a state and federal fingerprint based criminal record check is \$33.25, per request. The state portion of the record check fee is \$20.00 and the federal portion is \$13.25. If the submitting agency chooses to utilize the state fingerprint services vendor, then an additional \$8.50 is charged by the vendor for this service. Thus, the fee breakdown per request is as follows:

State Fee: \$20.00

Federal Fee: \$13.25

Total (State and Federal Fee) \$33.25

Total (State, Federal and vendor fee): \$41.75

The total amount retained in the Criminal Record System Fund after paying the FBI is \$22.00 per request. This equals \$20.00 for the state fee, pursuant to Section 43.530, and \$2.00 of the federal fee, pursuant to 28 CFR 20.31(e) (2) and the current fee schedule as posted in the Federal Register.

The amendment would require technical system changes to be completed by the MSHP's Criminal History vendor at an estimated cost of \$165,000, based on previous projects with a similar scope of work and utilizing one of our vendors. The required changes would be based on the functionality of the system and the registration process. Allowing multiple registrations changes the functionality as well as how the coding and the system work. The changes are approximated to be effective January 1, 2022.

There are 560 public school districts, and the initial registration is already law. The Patrol assumes each additional registration costs \$5.00. Based on the estimation of 5 substitutes per district utilizing the additional registration option, this would equate to 2,800 substitutes. The following is the estimated fiscal impact based on the above 2,800 substitutes utilizing the extra registrations:

1 extra registration at \$5.00 x 2,800 = \$14,000
2 extra registrations at \$10.00 x 2,800 = \$28,000
3 extra registrations at \$15.00 x 2,800 = \$42,000
4 extra registrations at \$20.00 x 2,800 = \$56,000

Oversight assumes this proposal could reduce the number of initial background checks if some substitutes utilize the additional registration option rather than getting another background check. This would potentially be a net loss of \$15 per additional registration (\$20 state fee - \$5 additional registration fee).

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Alternatively, **Oversight** assumes this proposal could induce substitute teachers to use the additional registration option who otherwise would have not had substituted for more than one school district. This would potentially be a gain of revenue for each additional registration.

Oversight cannot estimate the number of background checks that would no longer be needed or the number of substitutes who utilize the additional registration option. Therefore, Oversight will show a Could exceed \$165,000 loss to an unknown gain in revenue for the Criminal Records Systems Fund and a corresponding savings or costs to school districts in the implementation year, and unknown loss to unknown gain in the following years.

Oversight received a no responses from school districts related to the fiscal impact of this proposal. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best current information available.

Upon the receipt of additional responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval to publish a new fiscal note.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, school districts were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. A general listing of political subdivisions included in our database is available upon request.

Oversight notes if school districts must perform background checks on adult students not counted for purposes of average daily attendance, the Criminal Record System Fund (0671) income would increase \$2,200 (using the estimate given by the MHP) and school districts cost would increase \$4,175 (100 x \$41.75).

§§173.2700, 173.2703, 173.2706, 173.2709, 173.2712

Officials from the **Department of Revenue -Motor Vehicle (DOR)** assume the proposed legislation establishes the "Private College Campus Protection Act" which allows any private college or university to appoint and employ college or university police officers. These officers will have the authority to enforce regulations established by the governing board of such college or university to control traffic on any thoroughfare owned or maintained by the college or university.

Administrative Impact:

The proposed legislation allowing a private college or university to appoint officers to enforce regulations established to control traffic on any thoroughfare owned or maintained by the college or university will result in an increase in the number of traffic convictions received and processed by the Department.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The Department is unable to find data that would help us determine how significant that increase will be, but assumes it will be minimal enough to not require additional FTE and cause no impact.

Oversight notes DOR processed 561,645 total traffic convictions in FY 2018. DOR indicated a Revenue Processing Tech I can process an estimated 340 convictions a day at a salary of \$11.71 per hour for approximately \$0.30 per conviction processed.

Oversight notes, the issuance of a traffic violation ticket would result in a fine, of which \$20.50 goes to fine revenue and the remaining amount goes to various state and local funds for court costs. However, all fines may not have been paid (for example, the court could have dismissed the ticket or set the fine at a different amount).

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1282), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Office of the Director** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight does not know how many tickets may be issued as a result of this proposed legislation. However, it would take over 1,000 tickets to be issued to reach \$100,000 in fine and court cost revenue. Oversight will reflect a potential amount of revenue to the state and local political subdivisions of "Less than \$100,000" per year from this charge.

Additional fine revenue received by local school districts may count as a deduction in the following year in determining their state aid apportionment, if the district is not a 'hold harmless' district. For simplicity, Oversight will only reflect the increase in fine revenue as a positive impact to local political subdivisions.

Below are examples of some of the state and local funds which court costs are distributed to.

Fee/Fund Name	Fee Amount
Basic Civil Legal Services Fund	\$8.00
Clerk Fee	\$15.00 (\$12 State/\$3 County)
County Fee	\$25.00
State Court Automation Fund	\$7.00
Crime Victims' Compensation Fund	\$7.50
DNA Profiling Analysis Fund	\$15.00

Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Fund	\$1.00
Sheriff's Retirement Fund	\$3.00
Motorcycle Safety Trust Fund	\$1.00
Brain Injury Fund	\$2.00
Independent Living Center Fund	\$1.00
Sheriff's Fee	\$10.00 (County)
Prosecuting Attorney and Circuit Attorney Training Fund	\$4.00
Prosecuting Attorney Training Fund	\$1.00 (\$0.50 State/\$0.50 County)
Spinal Cord Injury Fund	\$2.00

According to information on the Department of Higher Education website, in Missouri, there are approximately 11 specialized/technical colleges, 24 independent four-year colleges and universities, and 17 theological institutions. **Oversight** assumes College of the Ozarks currently meets the criteria set forth in the bill, but is uncertain if other institutions may meet the criteria. Additionally, Oversight is uncertain regarding the legal framework of how this would be implemented.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue - Motor Vehicle** and the **Department of Public Safety - Office of the Director** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact for their respective organizations.

§190.092

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1460), officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department (St. Louis County PD)** stated they have approximately 38 automated external defibrillators (AEDs) that would need to be tested on the 90-day schedule. Each test/inspection would take approximately 15 minutes. The total testing time would be 9.5 hours (38 AEDs * 15 minutes/60 minutes per hour = 9.5 hours). Additionally, the testing would have to be done every quarter (12 months/4 = every 3 months or approximately 90 days) to stay within the time-line of the proposal. This increases the testing time to 38 hours (9.5 hours * 4 quarters = 38 hours).

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Because the locations of the AED vary across St. Louis County boundaries, drive time would be a significant addition to the cost of the tests. Drive time to each AED device is difficult to estimate due to varying time-lines.

The St. Louis County PD would have to devote a minimum of 40 hours a year, or 120 hours every three years, to test the AEDs. Basing the salary on a Professional Staff 110, the average hourly wage with fringe benefits is \$31.82 per hours. The estimated total cost per year is \$1,273 per year (\$3,818 for the three years of the fiscal note) to the St. Louis County PD.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1460), officials from the **Cooper County Public Health Center** stated this proposal would cost their county health center \$1,500 annually.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1460), officials from the **City of Riverside** assumed no/minimal fiscal impact as a result of this legislation.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary for local government costs for this proposal. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight will reflect the costs for all local governments as (Unknown).

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1460), officials from the **Office of Administration (OA), Facilities Management, Design and Construction (FMDC)** stated this bill modifies the requirements associated with an automated external defibrillator (AED). This bill states that any person or entity who acquires an AED shall comply with all regulations governing the placement of an AED; notify an agent of the local emergency medical services agency of the existence, location, and type of AED acquired; ensure that the AED is maintained and tested according to the operation and maintenance guidelines set forth by the manufacturer; ensure that the AED is tested at least biannually and after each use; and ensure that an inspection is made of all AEDs on the premises at least every ninety days for potential issues related to operability of the device. The bill also states that any person who in good faith renders emergency care by use of or provision of an AED shall not be held liable for any civil damages or subject to any criminal penalty as a result of such care or treatment, unless the person acts in a willful and wanton or reckless manner in providing the care, advice, or assistance. The person or entity who provides training to the person using an AED, the person or entity responsible for the site where the AED is located, and the person or entity that owns the AED shall likewise not be held liable for civil damages or subject to any criminal penalty resulting from the use of an AED.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

If FMDC were to acquire AEDs for State facilities, this bill would impose a substantial burden on FMDC, as it would require routine inspection, testing and maintenance of AEDs. However, FMDC rarely acquires AEDs. FMDC also assumes that if another state agency acquires an AED for placement in a state facility that the acquiring agency will be responsible for complying with the requirements of this bill. Based on those assumptions, FMDC estimates that the fiscal impact will be less than \$10,000. FMDC anticipates being able to absorb these costs. However, until the FY21 budget is final, FMDC cannot identify specific funding sources.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes costs will be absorbed within current funding sources and will reflect no fiscal impact for OA for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1460), officials from the **University of Missouri Health Care (UMHC)** stated they had reviewed the proposed legislation and determined that, as written, it should not create expenses in excess of \$100,000 annually.

Oversight contacted UMHC officials and determined that expenses expected to be less than \$100,000 annually are “absorbable” within current funding levels. The organization can and has to absorb the costs to be compliant with the regulation, but it may be at the expense of other priorities.

Based on the responses **Oversight** received from the UMHC and other Colleges and Universities, Oversight assumes a range of \$0 or (Unknown) for Colleges and Universities.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1460), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Natural Resources**, the **Department of Public Safety**, the **City of Kansas City**, the **Columbia/Boone County Department of Public Health and Human Services**, the **St. Louis County Health Department** and the **Springfield Police Department** have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1460), officials from the **Missouri Department of Conservation**, the **City of Hazelwood**, the **City of Springfield**, the **Adair County Health Department**, the **Boone County Sheriff’s Department**, the **Joplin Police Department**, the **St. Louis County Department of Justice Services**, the **Brentwood Fire Department**, **State Technical College of Missouri**, the **St. Charles Community College** and the **University of Central Missouri** stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these organizations.

§§190.094, 190.100, 190.105, 190.143, and 190.196

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 2125), officials at the **Department of Health and Senior Services** assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to a previous version (HB 2125), officials at the **University of Missouri Health Care** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Oversight notes this proposal permits physician assistants and assistant physicians to serve as staff on ambulances and exempts them from any mileage requirements and requirements to hold an emergency medical technician's license. The proposal also adds physician assistants and assistant physicians to those who may supervise someone with a temporary emergency medical technician license. The Department of Health and Senior Services, the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations and the University of Missouri Health Care have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note.

§190.142

Oversight notes this section of the proposal pertains to emergency medical technician licenses. Currently, all levels of emergency medical technicians may perform only that patient care which is ordered by a physician. This bill proposes to include patient care which is ordered by a physician assistant.

Oversight assumes this change will have no fiscal impact on state or local governments.

§190.243

Oversight notes this section of the bill pertains to transportation to trauma, STEMI, or stroke center or hospitals. This bill proposes to allow an ambulance service to create and implement a protocol to triage emergency calls during a pandemic, provided that the protocol has been approved by the ambulance service medical director and administrator.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS SS SB 600), officials from the **Florissant Fire Department** stated this change will have a detrimental consequence for our fire district and the ability to provide timely and effective 911 services.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes section 190.243 could extend transport and return times. Oversight will show a range of impact \$0 (no additional staff or resources are required to meet extended transport times) to an unknown cost if extended transport times require additional staff and resources to meet service requests.

§191.255

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this legislation creates a class E felony offense for sharing information of persons who have applied for or obtained a medical marijuana card to federal agencies and third parties.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the department estimates one person will be sentenced to prison and two to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class E felony offense is 3.4 years of which, 2.1 years will be served in prison with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the Department is estimated to be two additional offenders in prison and seven on field supervision by FY2023.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probations	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Parole			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probation	2	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Impact										
Prison Population	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Field Population	2	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Population Change	3	6	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's impact for fiscal note purposes.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1896), **Oversight** notes, the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** stated the proposal would not have a measurable fiscal impact on their organization. However, the creation of a new crime creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors which may in turn result in additional costs which are difficult to determine. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this organization.

Oversight notes the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** contacted SPD officials and determined the SPD assumes state agencies and employees will not be indigent and, therefore, will not require services from the SPD. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this organization.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1896), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Health and Senior Services** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these organizations.

§195.815

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety (DPS), Missouri State Highway Patrol (MHP)** state the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS) notes there are 348 medical marijuana “facilities” and assumes each facility will request background checks on 10 employees. DHSS has the ability to conduct the state fingerprint portion of the employee background check requirement pursuant to the Missouri Constitution Article XIV. This legislation, if enacted and approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Criminal Justice Information Law Unit (CJILU), would authorize the federal fingerprint portion of the employee background check requirement. With the estimation of 348 facilities conducting background checks on 10 employees, it is assumed that \$6,960 will be deposited into the Criminal Record System Fund which includes a \$2.00 FBI fee (CJISD retains \$2.00 of the FBI fee).

The state fee for a fingerprint based criminal record check is \$20.00 per request. The federal fee for a fingerprint based criminal record check is \$13.25 per request, of which, the CJIS Division retains \$2.00. This equates to \$22 of the total state and federal fingerprint background check fee that is retained in the Criminal Record System Fund per request.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

State and Federal Fingerprint Fee Schedule

State Fee = \$20.00

Federal Fee = \$13.25

Total State and Federal fee = \$33.25

Vendor Fee (if applicable) = \$8.50

Total State and Federal with Vendor fee = \$41.75

Total Retained in the Criminal Record System (CRS) Fund = \$22.00

Oversight obtained additional information from the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS) regarding the number of background checks that could be required as a result of this legislation. DHSS notes there are 348 medical marijuana “facilities” and assumes each facility will request background checks on 10 employees. Therefore, Oversight assumes \$76,560 (348 facilities x 10 employees x \$22/background check) will be deposited into the Criminal Record System Fund for FY 21.

Based on DHSS’ analysis, it is expected the DHSS will receive 38 to 75 background check requests per week once the industry is up and running. Therefore, for fiscal note purposes, **Oversight** will present an impact to the Criminal Records System Fund of \$43,472 (38 checks/week x 52 weeks x \$22 fee retained in CRS Fund) to \$85,800 (75 checks/week x 52 weeks x \$22 fee retained in CRS Fund) for FY 22 and FY 23.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS No.2 HB 1896), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Health and Senior Services** stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this organization.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS No. 2 HB 1896), officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS), Rules Division** stated 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 SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$5,000. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the 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 the office can sustain with the core budget. Therefore, the 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.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

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 require additional resources.

§§211.071, 556.061, and 570.027 - Vehicle Hijacking

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated no impact to the underlying bill (HB 1873/4321-02P). However, in response to this bill, OSCA states this bill will have the same impact as SB 793 from the 2018 legislative session. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a fiscal impact of \$0 to (Unknown) for purposes of this fiscal note.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state these sections create the offense of vehicle hijacking and makes it an offense punishable as a class B felony, or as a class A felony given certain conditions.

The DOC has no prior data relating to these charges; therefore, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class B felony.

For each new class B felony, the DOC estimates three people will be sentenced to prison and four to probation. The average sentence for a class B felony offense is 8.7 years, of which 5.1 years will be served in prison with 3.4 years to first release. The remaining 3.6 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 15 additional offenders in prison and 12 on field supervision by FY 2025.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Probations	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	3	6	9	12	15	15	15	15	15	15
Parole						3	6	9	11	11
Probation	4	8	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Impact										
Prison Population	3	6	9	12	15	15	15	15	15	15
Field Population	4	8	12	12	12	15	18	21	23	23
Population Change	7	14	21	24	27	30	33	36	38	38

Section 211.071.1 requires a court having jurisdiction over a juvenile offender alleged to have committed the offense, hold a certification hearing in order to determine whether the juvenile should be tried as an adult. Presumably, more juvenile certification hearings will result in more juvenile offenders tried and sentenced as adults. The actual impact of section 211.071.1 is difficult to determine as it is unknown how many juveniles will be found guilty and sentenced to a term of adult incarceration for this offense. DOC reflected a cost each year of the additional prisoners in plus an unknown amount.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC’s impact for fiscal note purposes.

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** state they cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with the proposed new crime of vehicle-hijacking, a new class B felony, if armed or if a child or special victim is a victim, the charge is escalated to a class A felony. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

As this is a newly defined crime, SPD does not have any statistics relating to the number of possible cases.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight notes over the last three fiscal years, the SPD has lapsed a total of \$153 of General Revenue appropriations (\$2 out of \$28.0 million in FY 2017; \$150 out of \$42.5 million in FY 2018; and \$1 out of \$46.0 million in FY 2019). Therefore, Oversight assumes the SPD is at maximum capacity, and the increase in workload resulting from this bill cannot be absorbed with SPD's current resources.

Adding one additional Assistant Public Defender 1 (APD) with a starting salary of \$47,000, will cost approximately \$74,500 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. One additional APD II (\$52,000 per year; eligible for consideration after 1 year of successful performance at APD I) will cost the state approximately \$81,000 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. When expense and equipment costs such as travel, training, furniture, equipment and supplies are included, Oversight assumes the cost for a new APD could approach \$100,000 per year.

Oversight assumes the SPD cannot absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal within their existing resources and, therefore, will reflect a potential additional cost of (Less than \$100,000) per year to the General Revenue Fund. Oversight also notes since this is a new crime, the SPD may need additional staff to provide representation for indigent persons charged with this proposed new crime and assumes if additional FTE are required in the future, the SPD will request additional funding through the appropriations process.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1873), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assumed the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS and no measurable fiscal impact to prosecutors (since the proposed crimes have similar elements to the existing crimes of robbery in the first degree and robbery in the second degree).

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1873), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol**, the **St. Louis County Police Department**, and the **Springfield Police Department** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§211.439 and repeal of §211.438

In response to similar legislation (HCS SCS SB 662), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** assumed this proposal would have the same fiscal impact as SB 793 (2018). The total cost to state general revenue to implement the proposed legislation would be at least \$14,037,937.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections** assume no material impact from these changes.

Oversight notes the repeal of §211.438 removes the requirement to appropriate funds for the new service to become effective. This proposal, for §211.439, changes the effective date to January 1, 2022, suggesting the costs would not be incurred until January 1, 2022. OSCA noted that they submitted a new decision item (1100040) for FY 2022 to expand the service of raising the age from 17 to 18. The NDI was for \$13,239,678 General Revenue and included \$1.5 million in personal service (34 FTE Juvenile Officers) \$192,184 of training and \$1,352,050 in program reimbursements (\$350 x 3,863) for multi-county circuits, plus \$10,187,476 of reimbursements for single-county circuits. Oversight will range the fiscal impact from \$0 (new service would have occurred without this bill), to OSCA's estimate.

§217.145

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this legislation establishes a pilot program to allow increased visitation of children with incarcerated mothers.

Missouri's Department of Correction's (DOC) currently has two female prisons, one in Chillicothe (Chillicothe Correctional Center - CCC) and one in Vandalia (Women's Eastern Reception and Diagnostic Correctional Center -- WERDCC.) DOC currently has several parenting programs in place for incarcerated mothers that focus on providing them access to their children as well as enhancing their parenting skills, i.e., Parents as Teachers, Parents and Their Children (PATCH), 4H-LIFE, Story Link, Girl Scouts Beyond Bars, etc.

The department has a limited number of institutional staff and does not currently have the resources or vehicles to provide transportation for visits between children and incarcerated mothers and is unsure if additional general revenue funds exist for further appropriations that would be necessary to cover this expenditure if this bill were passed into law. It would be necessary to hire one additional caseworker, at a minimum, at each facility to manage this project and possibly clerical support as well. Fringe benefits and associated one-time and ongoing expense and equipment would also be required in addition to the ongoing personal service funds to cover the salary of the FTE.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Transportation of children and their parent/guardian via DOC creates a liability issue for the state as the majority of these are private citizens. This liability issue could be avoided by paying a public transportation provider to transport the children and their parent/guardian, however, the funding dilemma is the same. This project is to mainly focus on children who live fifty or more miles from the facility, likely making the cost to transport them an unknown but substantial amount per each fiscal year. There is no means by which to project the number of persons impacted, the resulting transportation expenditures nor potential costs for the project due to unknown program implementation via collaboration with DFS/DSS.

Passage of this legislation will likely cause a substantial fiscal impact, however, the department is unable to predict that amount. Therefore the impact is unknown.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's unknown impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 2700), Oversight notes the **Department of Social Services** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. The Children's Division (CD) assumes this section is intended to create access for children in the care and custody of the CD to visit incarcerated mothers within the Department of Corrections. However, if the intent is for all children, there could be substantial impact.

Oversight assumes the intent of this pilot program is only for children in the care and custody of the CD. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for this agency.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** state 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 SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$5,000. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the 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 the office can sustain with the core budget. Therefore, the 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.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§217.195

In response to a similar proposal (SB 864), officials from the **State Treasurer's Office (STO)** stated §217.195.3(3) requires interest and moneys earned on such investments currently credited to the General Revenue Fund to be credited to the Inmate Canteen Fund.

Listed below are the average daily balances for the months of July through December 2019:

July	\$9,558,427
August	\$9,144,796
September	\$8,877,106
October	\$8,845,742
November	\$8,261,994
December	<u>\$7,977,842</u>
Total	\$52,665,907

Estimated average daily balance \$8,777,651 (\$52,665,907 / 6)

The estimated yield on state funds is 2.10 percent. Therefore, the estimated loss of interest to General Revenue is approximately \$153,609 for FY2021 (10 months) and \$184,331 (\$8,777,651 *.021, rounded up) for FY2022 and FY2023.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** did not expect a fiscal impact from this legislation since the Inmate Canteen Fund is currently operating within the proposed statutory guidelines. The addition of reentry services as an allowable expenditure will be subject to appropriation from the legislature.

Oversight notes any unexpended balance in the pre-August 28, 2020, inmate canteen fund shall be transferred to the post-August 28, 2020, inmate canteen fund established under subsection 3 of §217.195. The balance in this fund at December 31, 2019 was \$7,977,842. This will allow for the DOC to include some additional allowable expenditures to this fund. For purposes of this fiscal note, Oversight will show a one-time transfer in and out of this fund of \$8 million in FY 2021.

§217.697

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this section proposes the early parole of certain offenders over the age of sixty-five.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

To project the potential impact on the department over the next ten years, all offenders 56 years of age and older who meet the following conditions were considered:

- No conviction for a dangerous felony;
- Not a convicted sex offender;
- Offender will be 65 years or older by the time they have served at least 30 years in prison; and
- Serving a sentence of life without parole for a minimum of 50 years or more and was sentenced under §565.008.

The total potential impact on the department could be up to an additional 57 offenders eligible for release over the next ten fiscal years.

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
Possible Release	21	5	4	4	4	4	7	4	2	2
Total	21	26	30	34	38	42	49	53	55	57

The proposed legislation does not involve new admissions to prison or probation cases; therefore, the total cumulative impact on the offender population is reflected in the transfer of incarcerated offenders to the field population.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Probations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	-21	-26	-30	-34	-38	-42	-49	-53	-55	-57
Parole	21	26	30	34	38	42	49	53	55	57
Probation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Impact										
Prison Population	-21	-26	-30	-34	-38	-42	-49	-53	-55	-57
Field Population	21	26	30	34	38	42	49	53	55	57

ASSUMPTION (continued)

As this statute only states these offenders would become eligible to receive a parole hearing once the listed criteria is met, release would still be a decision for the Parole Board to make. Therefore, the impact could be none, should they choose not to release any additional offenders, all the way up to the above stated impact.

§217.735

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state under the interstate compact authorized in sections 589.500 to 589.569 and chapter 559, this bill permits out-of-state offenders, under lifetime supervision, to remain in the receiving state, and the board shall defer to the standards of supervision of the receiving state, including electronic monitoring. However, if at any time the offender returns to Missouri for more than thirty consecutive days, the offender shall be subject to lifetime supervision required by this section.

Currently, there are three out-of-state offenders under lifetime supervision of the board. After the changes in this bill, those offenders are permitted to remain in the receiving state and the board may defer those offenders to the standards of supervisions and electronic monitoring of the receiving states. However, when any of these offenders return to Missouri for more than 30 consecutive days, board will retain the lifetime supervision. It is not possible to deduce how many of these out of state offenders, currently under lifetime supervision of board, will return to Missouri for thirty or more consecutive days or for how many out of state offenders Missouri will be a receiving state under the interstate compact, thus the total impact cannot be reliably ascertained except that these three offenders may remain in their respective states.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's negative unknown impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1289), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assume the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1289), officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, and the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol** each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§§217.850, 577.800, and 632.460

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** state they cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with the proposed new crimes relating to

ASSUMPTION (continued)

the unlawful use of an unmanned aircraft near a correctional center. These new crimes range from a new class A misdemeanor to a class B felony. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight notes over the last three fiscal years, the SPD has lapsed a total of \$153 of General Revenue appropriations (\$2 out of \$28.0 million in FY 2017; \$150 out of \$42.5 million in FY 2018; and \$1 out of \$46.0 million in FY 2019). Therefore, Oversight assumes the SPD is at maximum capacity, and the increase in workload resulting from this bill cannot be absorbed with SPD's current resources.

Adding one additional Assistant Public Defender 1 (APD) with a starting salary of \$47,000, will cost approximately \$74,500 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. One additional APD II (\$52,000 per year; eligible for consideration after 1 year of successful performance at APD I) will cost the state approximately \$81,000 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. When expense and equipment costs such as travel, training, furniture, equipment and supplies are included, Oversight assumes the cost for a new APD could approach \$100,000 per year.

Oversight assumes the SPD cannot absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal within their existing resources and, therefore, will reflect a potential additional cost of (Less than \$100,000) per year to the General Revenue Fund.

Officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assume the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS. The creation of a new crime creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors which may, in turn, result in additional costs, which are difficult to determine.

Oversight notes the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** has state the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. DOC notes the legislation includes the requirement that the department post a warning sign, no smaller than 11" x 14". The cost of the sign from Missouri Vocational Enterprise (MVE) is approximately \$28 each. Therefore, the cost to place one sign at all prisons would be \$588 (\$28 x 21).

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight notes §577.800.5 requires a 11" x 14" warning sign at each high capacity venue. Oversight assumes the cost for these signs will be minimal and, therefore, can be absorbed.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's no impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1898), **Oversight** notes the **Missouri State Highway Patrol**, the **Springfield Police Department**, and the **St. Louis County Police Department** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§221.111

Oversight notes the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. The DOC states there are very few violations of two-way telecommunication devices and their component parts by visitors, and it is already on the list of illegal contraband in correctional centers and jails.

DOC stated a six-year average was approximately 30 violations annually. Currently, the violation is a minor violation-confiscation, and the offender spends up to 20 days in disciplinary segregation and loss of privileges. With the passage of this bill, courts would make the determination as to any extra time imposed on the offender's sentence. If the court decides the sentence will run concurrently with the sentence the offender is already serving, the offender's time in prison or on parole would not be extended. However, if the offender now must serve additional time at the end of his or her scheduled sentence, this would (at some point depending on when the prisoner would have been released if not for this new charge) increase the prison population and result in additional costs for DOC.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's no impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1296), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assumed the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS.

Oversight notes the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol**, and the **State Public Defender's Office** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§270.400

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1292), officials from the **Department of Agriculture (MDA)** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes that MDA has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for MDA.

Officials from the **Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC)** assume this proposal will have a negative unknown fiscal impact caused by conflicting language between this statutory language and the Wildlife Code of Missouri that could lead to enforcement actions.

Oversight assumes MDC would not have a direct fiscal impact from this proposal.

§§301.560 and 301.564

In response to a previous version, **Oversight** notes the **Department of Revenue** and the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§306.127

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1935), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. MHP notes the Water Patrol Division currently has a system in place regarding the temporary boater identification cards.

Oversight inquired of MHP as to how many temporary boater safety identification cards have been issued. **MHP** stated the following:

CY 2019: 3,561 cards purchased at a cost of \$7.75 each for a total of \$27,597.75 (net)

CY 2018: 2,798 cards purchased at a cost of \$7.75 each for a total of \$21,684.50 (net)

CY 2017: 2,696 cards purchased at a cost of \$7.75 each for a total of \$20,894.00 (net)

MHP notes the temporary boater safety identification cards are sold for \$9; however, Jet Pay (payment processing vendor) collects \$1.25 of the \$9.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

CY 2019: 3,561 payments processed at \$1.25 each (to Jet Pay) for a total of \$4,451.25
CY 2018: 2,798 payments processed at \$1.25 each (to Jet Pay) for a total of \$3,497.50
CY 2017: 2,696 payments processed at \$1.25 each (to Jet Pay) for a total of \$3,370.00

Oversight notes the fund balance in the Water Patrol Division Fund (0400) as of December 31, 2019 was \$1,912,364.

Oversight notes that the authority to issue temporary boater safety identification cards and collect the associated fees in Section 306.127, RSMo expires on December 31, 2022. This proposal extends that expiration date to December 31, 2032. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a revenue extension (continuance) of "Less than \$30,000" beginning January 1, 2023 for this proposal. In addition, Oversight will reflect a continuing cost of "Less than \$5,000" beginning January 1, 2023 for a net fiscal impact of "Less than \$25,000."

§307.179

In response to a similar proposal (HB 2199), officials from the **Department of Revenue** and the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight notes that the agencies mentioned above have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for these agencies.

Oversight notes there were 1,020 infractions (\$83 fine) in 2019 for failure to secure a child less than eight years old in a child restraint or booster seat.

Oversight notes, of the \$83 fine, \$20.50 goes to fine revenue and the remaining \$62.50 goes to various state and local funds for court costs. However, all fines may not have been paid (for example, the court could have dismissed the ticket or set the fine at a different amount).

Oversight notes it would take approximately 1,200 tickets to be issued to reach \$100,000 in fine and court cost revenue. Oversight will reflect a potential amount of revenue to the state and local political subdivisions of "Less than \$100,000" per year from this charge.

Additional fine revenue received by local school districts may count as a deduction in the following year in determining their state aid apportionment, if the district is not a 'hold harmless' district. For simplicity, Oversight will only reflect the increase in fine revenue as a positive impact to local political subdivisions.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Below are examples of some of the state and local funds to which court costs are distributed.

Fee/Fund Name	Fee Amount
Basic Civil Legal Services Fund	\$8.00
Clerk Fee	\$15.00 (\$12 State/\$3 County)
County Fee	\$25.00
State Court Automation Fund	\$7.00
Crime Victims' Compensation Fund	\$7.50
DNA Profiling Analysis Fund	\$15.00
Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Fund	\$1.00
Sheriff's Retirement Fund	\$3.00
Motorcycle Safety Trust Fund	\$1.00
Brain Injury Fund	\$2.00
Independent Living Center Fund	\$1.00
Sheriff's Fee	\$10.00 (County)
Prosecuting Attorney and Circuit Attorney Training Fund	\$4.00
Prosecuting Attorney Training Fund	\$1.00 (\$0.50 State/\$0.50 County)
Spinal Cord Injury Fund	\$2.00

§§311.060, 311.660, and 313.220

Oversight notes the **Department of Public Safety - Alcohol and Tobacco Control** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1468), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Revenue** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§311.199

Oversight notes the **Department of Public Safety - Alcohol and Tobacco Control** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for this agency.

§311.293

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1699), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Revenue** stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this agency.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1699), officials from the **City of Brentwood** responded to the legislation but did not provide a fiscal impact.

Officials from the **City of Springfield** state there is a potential positive fiscal impact to the City of Springfield. However, the impact is unquantifiable without knowing how the proposed legislation will affect the City's general fund.

Oversight assumes any potential impact on cities and counties would be indirect. Therefore, for purposes of this fiscal note, Oversight will present a zero impact to local governments.

§311.332

Oversight notes the **Department of Public Safety - Alcohol and Tobacco Control** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note.

§320.091

In response to a similar proposal (HB 2097), officials at the **Missouri Highway Patrol** assumed no fiscal impact to their agency from this proposal.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 2097), officials at the **City of Springfield** assumed no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to similar legislation from 2019, HCS for HB 369, officials at the **City of Columbia** and the **Kearney Fire & Rescue Protection District** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note.

§441.231

Officials from **Department of Corrections** assume this section makes it a class E felony for a landlord to expel a tenant on grounds protected by statute, county, or municipal ordinance.

There is no data for offenses based on section 441.231, making it difficult to judge the impact should a tenant be unlawfully evicted. Therefore, the department will use the standard response for a non-violent E felony. For each new non-violent class E felony, the department estimates one person will be sentenced to prison and two to probation. The average sentence for a non-violent class E felony offense is 3.4 years, of which 2.1 years will be served in prison with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probations	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Parole			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probation	2	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Impact										
Prison Population	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Field Population	2	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Population Change	3	6	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1377), officials from **Office of the State Courts Administrator**, the **St. Louis County Police Department**, the **St. Louis County Department of Justice Services**, the **Boone County Sheriff's Department** and the **Springfield Police Department** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organizations.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§491.641

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety (DPS)** state this proposal creates a new fund in the state treasury to be used solely by the DPS for the purposes of witness protection services. It does not establish a specific source from which monies will be collected by the fund. It also does not specify if fund monies can be spent on administration of the fund.

The DPS believes it will require one (1) Public Safety Program Specialist to administer the fund.

In the proposed Governor's Budget, DPS is receiving additional FTE to work on grant programs. It is our anticipation that those FTE would cover administering this program. However, if those FTE are cut from the budget, DPS would require an additional one (1) FTE to administer this program.

This version removes the sunset provision.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DPS. Therefore, Oversight will range DPS' response from \$0 (DPS will receive additional FTE in the FY 2021 budget) to DPS' impact for fiscal note purposes.

Oversight notes this proposed legislation creates the Pretrial Witness Protection Services Fund. The legislation authorizes the Department of Public Safety to disperse to reimburse expenditures by law enforcement agencies to provide for the security, health, safety and welfare of witnesses, potential witnesses, victims, and members of their families and households, if they are in danger of bodily injury or their life is in jeopardy as a result of giving testimony or being willing to testify in criminal proceedings instituted or investigations pending against a person alleged to have engaged in a violation of state law. This includes authority for local law enforcement agencies to purchase, rent or modify protected housing facilities and to contract with federal or state government agencies to obtain or provide the facilities or services necessary for such housing. In the FY 2021 budget, the Governor's Recommendation approved the funding for this program at \$1,000,000.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated this proposal may have some impact, but there is no way to quantify that impact at the present time. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 2207), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Natural Resources**, the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Department of Conservation**, and the **State Treasurer's Office** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a previous version, Oversight notes the **St. Louis County Police Department** stated this proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§§556.061 and 570.027

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state §556.061 modifies the definition of a dangerous felony to include armed criminal action, conspiracy when the offense is a dangerous felony, and vehicle hijacking when punished as a class A felony which will not impact the department.

Additionally, §570.027 creates the offense of vehicle hijacking and makes it an offense punishable as a class B felony, or as a class A felony given certain conditions.

The DOC has no prior data relating to these charges; therefore, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class B felony.

For each new class B felony, the DOC estimates three people will be sentenced to prison and four to probation. The average sentence for a class B felony offense is 8.7 years, of which 5.1 years will be served in prison with 3.4 years to first release. The remaining 3.6 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 15 additional offenders in prison and 12 on field supervision by FY 2025.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Probations	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	3	6	9	12	15	15	15	15	15	15
Parole						3	6	9	11	11
Probation	4	8	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Impact										
Prison Population	3	6	9	12	15	15	15	15	15	15
Field Population	4	8	12	12	12	15	18	21	23	23
Population Change	7	14	21	24	27	30	33	36	38	38

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1873), **Oversight** noted the **St. Louis County Police Department** and the **Springfield Police Department** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other police and sheriff's departments were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. A general listing of political subdivisions included in our database is available upon request.

§565.002

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** state they cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with the enhanced penalties for crimes against sporting officials and employees of a public or charter school while in the performance of their job duties - now defined as "special victims," which enhances the penalties. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight notes over the last three fiscal years, the SPD has lapsed a total of \$153 of General Revenue appropriations (\$2 out of \$28.0 million in FY 2017; \$150 out of \$42.5 million in FY 2018; and \$1 out of \$46.0 million in FY 2019). Therefore, Oversight assumes the SPD is at maximum capacity, and the increase in workload resulting from this bill cannot be absorbed with SPD's current resources.

Adding one additional Assistant Public Defender 1 (APD) with a starting salary of \$47,000, will cost approximately \$74,500 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. One additional APD II (\$52,000 per year; eligible for consideration after 1 year of successful performance at APD I) will cost the state approximately \$81,000 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. When expense and equipment costs such as travel, training, furniture, equipment and supplies are included, Oversight assumes the cost for a new APD could approach \$100,000 per year.

Oversight assumes the SPD cannot absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal within their existing resources and, therefore, will reflect a potential additional cost of (Less than \$100,000) per year to the General Revenue Fund.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** stated this involves a small population and specialized circumstances and is expected to have no significant impact on the DOC.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact for fiscal note purposes for the DOC.

Officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assume the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB Nos. 1809 & 1570), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§575.150

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** state they cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with the enhanced penalties for the offense of resisting or interfering with an arrest - a new class E felony. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

In Fiscal Year 2019, SPD's Trial Division opened 1,454 cases under charge code 575.150 of the 62,002 total cases opened.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight notes over the last three fiscal years, the SPD has lapsed a total of \$153 of General Revenue appropriations (\$2 out of \$28.0 million in FY 2017; \$150 out of \$42.5 million in FY 2018; and \$1 out of \$46.0 million in FY 2019). Therefore, Oversight assumes the SPD is at maximum capacity, and the increase in workload resulting from this bill cannot be absorbed with SPD's current resources.

Adding one additional Assistant Public Defender 1 (APD) with a starting salary of \$47,000, will cost approximately \$74,500 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. One additional APD II (\$52,000 per year; eligible for consideration after 1 year of successful performance at APD I) will cost the state approximately \$81,000 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. When expense and equipment costs such as travel, training, furniture, equipment and supplies are included, Oversight assumes the cost for a new APD could approach \$100,000 per year.

According to "The Missouri Project" (RubinBrown, June 2014), the number of hours that should be spent on a misdemeanor case is 13.3. This number takes into account time for travel and in-court appearances. In contrast, the number of hours that should be spent on a C/D/E felony case is 28.5. This equates to a difference of 15.2 additional hours spent on a felony case versus a misdemeanor case ($28.5 - 13.3 = 15.2$). **SPD** notes of the 1,454 cases, 510 individuals were misdemeanor cases. If just ten percent of the previously charged with a misdemeanor will now be charged with a felony, this equates to an additional 775 hours ($15.2 \text{ hours} \times 51 \text{ cases}$) annually. With 2,080 work hours in a year, the SPD would need one attorney to meet the requirements of this legislation ($775 / 2,080$).

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes the SPD cannot absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal within their existing resources and, therefore, will reflect a potential additional cost of (Less than \$100,000) per year to the General Revenue Fund.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this section modifies the offense of resisting or interfering with arrest. Section 575.150 creates a class E felony for resisting arrest by fleeing in a motor vehicle from law enforcement and increases to a D felony for subsequent convictions. It also increases the penalty for resisting arrest by fleeing in a motor vehicle from law enforcement in which the person demonstrates disregard for the safety of any person or property and it results in serious bodily injury or death to another person from a class E felony to a class D felony. This penalty increases to a C felony for subsequent offenses.

The potential impact of this bill is difficult to determine because department records do not differentiate between resisting arrest offenses that involve motor vehicles and those that do not. Therefore, DOC assumes that offenses under section 577.150 that were sentenced as class E felonies will continue to be sentenced as class E felonies unless the offender has a prior sentence under this section, in which case the sentence would be reclassified as a class D felony.

The combined operational impact of this bill takes into account the increase in penalties for offenders with repeated resisting arrest sentences and the creation of a new class D felony offense for aggravated resisting arrest.

In FY 2019, there were 272 offenders sentenced to prison related to 575.150. Of those, 26 had prior sentences that were related to 575.150. Offenders serving these sentences served, on average, 2.2 years to first release. This is approximately 55% of their sentence, which is the average used in our standard response for a new violent class E felony.

The differences between the department's standard responses for a violent class E felony and violent class D felony are summarized in the table below.

	Class E	Class D	Diff
First release	2.2	3.0	0.8
Total prison	2.8	3.9	1.1
Total Parole	1.2	1.8	0.6
Total Sentence	4.0	5.7	1.7

ASSUMPTION (continued)

As shown in the table, the reclassification will establish a sentence that is 1.7 years longer. On average, an offender serving a prison term for a violent class D felony serves 3 years to first release, or 0.8 years more than offenders with a violent class E felony. Given our assumption of 33% of the remaining sentence due to returns from parole for violations, offenders with a violent class D felony will serve, on average, an additional 0.9 years in prison, or 0.3 years more than for a violent class E felony. This equates to a total of 1.1 more years in prison for a violent class D felony than a violent class E felony. Offenders with a violent class D felony are estimated to serve 1.8 years of their sentence under parole supervision, which is 0.6 years longer than for a violent class E felony.

From FY 2021 to FY 2024, the total population number stays the same, but offenders who would have been released to parole will remain in prison longer, lowering the parole population temporarily. In FY 2025, the total population is expected to increase. By FY 2026, there will be an additional 29 offenders in prison and 16 offenders under field supervision.

Impact of reclassifying class E felony sentences to class D felony offenses for repeat offenders

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
After Legislation	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Probations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cumulative Populations										
Prison			5	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
Parole			-5	-29	-3	16	16	16	16	16
Probation										
Impact										
Prison Population			5	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
Field Population			-5	-29	-3	16	16	16	16	16
Population Change					26	44	44	44	44	44

Although the bill also introduces the potential for a class C felony for repeated aggravated resisting arrest, the impact of creating the aggravated resisting arrest offense as a first offense is what is taken into account in this response. This is done by using the department's standard response to the creation of a new violent class D felony offense.

For each new violent class D felony, the department estimates four people will be sentenced to prison and four to probation. The average sentence for a violent class D felony offense is 5.7 years, of which 4 years will be served in prison with 3 years to first release. The remaining 1.7 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 4 years.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Probations	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	4	8	12	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
Parole				0	4	7	7	7	7	7
Probation	4	8	12	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
Impact										
Prison Population	4	8	12	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
Field Population	4	8	12	16	20	23	23	23	23	23
Population Change	8	16	24	32	36	39	39	39	39	39

The estimated combined cumulative impact of this bill is an additional 44 offenders in prison and (12) offenders under field supervision by FY 2024.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
After Legislation	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Probation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Probations	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	4	8	17	44	44	44	44	44	44	44
Parole	0	0	-5	-28	2	23	23	23	23	23
Probation	4	8	12	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
Impact										
Prison Population	4	8	17	44	44	44	44	44	44	44
Field Population	4	8	7	-12	18	39	39	39	39	39
Population Change	8	16	24	32	62	83	83	83	83	83

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1620), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assumed the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1620), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Revenue** and the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§575.180

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1342), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Revenue**, the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol**, the **Joplin Police Department**, the **Springfield Police Department**, and the **St. Louis County Police Department** have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this section introduces a new class E felony that has the potential impact on the corrections department.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the Department estimates one person will be sentenced to prison and two to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class E felony offense is 3.4 years of which, 2.1 years will be served in prison with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the Department is estimated to be two additional offenders in prison and seven on field supervision by FY2023.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probations	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Parole			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probation	2	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Impact										
Prison Population	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Field Population	2	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Population Change	3	6	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

Oversight notes, it appears DOC is responding to existing law as the new legislation provides an affirmative defense to prosecution if the law enforcement officer acted under exigent circumstances in failing to execute an arrest warrant although the provisions of the subsection do not apply in specified circumstances. Therefore, Oversight assumes no fiscal impact to the DOC for this section of the proposal.

§575.205

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** state they cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with the enhanced definitions for tampering with electronic monitoring equipment. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

In Fiscal Year 2019, SPD's Trial Division opened 22 cases under charge code 575.205 of the 62,002 total cases opened.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight notes over the last three fiscal years, the SPD has lapsed a total of \$153 of General Revenue appropriations (\$2 out of \$28.0 million in FY 2017; \$150 out of \$42.5 million in FY

ASSUMPTION (continued)

2018; and \$1 out of \$46.0 million in FY 2019). Therefore, Oversight assumes the SPD is at maximum capacity, and the increase in workload resulting from this bill cannot be absorbed with SPD's current resources.

Adding one additional Assistant Public Defender 1 (APD) with a starting salary of \$47,000, will cost approximately \$74,500 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. One additional APD II (\$52,000 per year; eligible for consideration after 1 year of successful performance at APD I) will cost the state approximately \$81,000 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. When expense and equipment costs such as travel, training, furniture, equipment and supplies are included, Oversight assumes the cost for a new APD could approach \$100,000 per year.

Oversight assumes the SPD cannot absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal within their existing resources and, therefore, will reflect a potential additional cost of (Less than \$100,000) per year to the General Revenue Fund.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this bill modifies the offense of tampering with electronic monitoring equipment. Section 575.205 is modified to include failing to charge or otherwise attempting to disable an electronic monitoring device in the list of actions considered as an offense of tampering with electronic monitoring equipment. This legislation, as it is written, adds a class D and E felony. However, the department is assuming that anyone charged under this legislation will receive a D felony.

Since this is a new offense, the department will use a standard class D felony response. For each new class D felony, it is estimated that three people will be sentenced to prison and 5 to probation. The average sentence for a non-violent class D felony offense is 5 years, of which 2.8 years will be served in prison with 1.7 years to first release. The remaining 2.2 years will be on Parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be eight additional offenders in prison and 16 on field supervision by FY 2023.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Probations	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	3	6	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Parole			1	4	7	7	7	7	7	7
Probation	5	10	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
Impact										
Prison Population	3	6	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Field Population	5	10	16	19	22	22	22	22	22	22
Population Change	8	16	24	27	30	30	30	30	30	30

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact for fiscal note purposes for the DOC.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1332), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assumed the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1332), officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department (SLCPD)** estimated if the department received 100 cases annually, it would require two hours of booking, two hours of report writing and warrant application, and one hour of warrant application review for each case. Therefore, at five hours per case, with an average hourly pay of \$46.72, each case would total \$233.60 (5 x \$46.72). This equates to approximately \$23,360 annually.

Oversight notes the estimated cost for the St. Louis County Police Department; however, Oversight is unable to project a statewide cost for police and sheriff's departments; therefore, the impact to local governments will be presented as \$0 to (Unknown).

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1332), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol**, the **Office of State Courts Administrator**, the **Springfield Police Department**, and the **St. Louis County Department of Justice Services** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1332), officials from the **Joplin Police Department** stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§577.011

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1488), officials at the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** and the **Department of Revenue** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note.

§§578.018 and 578.030

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 2111), officials from the **Department of Agriculture**, the **Department of Corrections**, and the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services** assume the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact. The creation of a new crime creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors, which may in turn result in additional costs which are difficult to determine.

Oversight notes that the agencies mentioned above have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for these agencies.

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** state they cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons charged with the proposed new crime of intentionally euthanizing or sterilizing an animal without proper authority would be charged with a new Class B misdemeanor - subsequent offenses would be a new Class A misdemeanor. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

SPD notes in FY 2019, the Trial Division did not open any cases under charge code 578.018.

Oversight assumes there will be minimal (if any) new cases as a result of this proposal, based on the SPD not opening any cases under charge code 578.018 in FY 2019. Therefore, Oversight will not reflect a fiscal impact on the SPD on this fiscal note.

Officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department** assume this proposal would require the department have a police officer apply for all animal confiscation warrants rather than animal control officers.

While the police department currently assists the health department with these cases, the animal control officers would no longer be able to function without police involvement.

The proposal also removes the ability to post search warrant materials on the property. The proposal would require that a resident of the property be served with the appropriate materials. In some cases this may make executing the search warrant impossible.

The proposal would change the usual disposition hearing following an animal confiscation from thirty days to ten days. There are serious implications of moving the hearing to ten days rather than thirty. For example, many tests completed by the veterinarian and lab will not be completed within ten days. If the tests are completed in the rushed time frame, the case may be found in favor of the pet owner and the police would have wasted time and manpower.

The increase in man hours, paperwork and overtime are difficult to estimate. The police officer's process, if involved in animal confiscation case would be as follows:

The officer would have to compile evidence and apply for a warrant. After approval, the officer would then have to respond to the location where the animal is being maintained with the health department and animal control to serve the warrant. If the owner of the animal is not on-scene, the officer must locate a resident of the property and serve them in person, which may be impossible. After completing all necessary reports and having them approved, the officer would have to respond to a disposition hearing within ten days. During this process, the officer involved would no longer be able to respond to other calls and additional officers would have to complete the work the missing officer would generally complete, generating overtime costs.

According to an officer assigned to the Problem Properties Unit, the current process to confiscate animals takes an average of 24 to 40 hours to complete from start to finish. If the process were changed, there could be an increase of hours worked.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes local law enforcement agencies could incur increased costs related to this proposal; therefore, Oversight will reflect an “Unknown” cost to law enforcement agencies on the fiscal note.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 2111), officials from the **Springfield Police Department** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes that the agencies mentioned above have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for these agencies.

Oversight assumes any confiscated animal care costs, should the animal owner be acquitted, has an inability to pay before the initial disposition hearing, or upon conviction, would be incurred by veterinarians, local government dog pounds, animal shelters, animal rescue facilities, or another third party with existing animal care facilities approved by the court.

§§579.040 and 579.076

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)** stated the proposed legislation would require any entity that possesses, distributes, or delivers hypodermic needles or syringes for the purpose of operating a syringe exchange program or mitigating health risks that are associated with unsterile drug use to register with the DHSS. The proposed legislation would also not allow a registered entity to be within five hundred feet of any school building, unless it was in operation prior to the school building. DHSS would be responsible for registering entities, and it is assumed that DHSS would also be responsible for ensuring that the entity was not within five hundred feet of a school as part of the registration process. The duties associated with the registration of entities would require an additional 25 hours per year by a Health Program Representative, which would be a total cost of \$512.75 annually. (HPR average salary \$42,665 and average hourly salary of \$20.51 x 25 hours = \$512.75).

The department anticipates being able to absorb these costs. However, until the FY21 budget is final, the department cannot identify specific funding sources.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Oversight assumes the DHSS has sufficient staff and resources to perform the additional work required by this proposal and will reflect no fiscal impact for the DHSS for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state bill adds that unlawful delivery of drug paraphernalia is a class A misdemeanor and as a class E felony if done for commercial purposes. This creates one new class A misdemeanor offense and one new class E felony offense.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The misdemeanor offense does not fall under the purview of DOC. However, for a new nonviolent class E felony, the DOC estimates one person will be sentenced to prison and two to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class E felony offense is 3.4 years of which, 2.1 years will be served in prison with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the Department is estimated to be two additional offenders in prison and seven on field supervision by FY2023.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probations	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Parole			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Probation	2	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Impact										
Prison Population	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Field Population	2	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Population Change	3	6	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact for fiscal note purposes for the DOC.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1486), **Oversight** notes the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** has stated the proposal would not have a measurable fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this organization.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1486), officials from the **Cooper County Public Health Center** assumed unknown revenues and savings, as well as unknown costs and potential losses, related to this proposal.

Oversight notes the Cooper County Public Health Center did not elaborate on the unknown fiscal impact of this proposal and did not provide any additional follow-up information.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Therefore, Oversight assumes the Cooper County Public Health Center's unknown revenues/savings and unknown costs/losses will be minimal and absorbable within current funding levels and no fiscal impact will be assumed for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal (SB 668), officials from the **Columbia/Boone County Department of Public Health and Human Services** stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this organization.

§§579.065 and 579.068

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol (MHP)** state from January 1 to December 9, 2019, the Crime Laboratory Division qualitatively tested 937 items containing a weighable amount (>0.01 gram) of powder, liquid, or solid containing fentanyl/fentanyl derivatives. The proposed legislation would necessitate an additional, quantitative, test be performed.

Due to the nature of fentanyl/fentanyl derivatives as an abused drug, it would be expected that the concentration of the drug in any given sample would be less than 10%. Four hundred and twelve of the 937 items tested, had a weight of less than 0.10 gram. To meet the lowest threshold of 10 milligrams in the proposed bill, at the concentrations anticipated in the samples, it is likely that multiple items from these cases will need both additional qualitative testing and quantitative testing. The MHP estimates this number to be approximately 400 items. The additional qualitative testing would take approximately 400 personnel hours per year.

The laboratory does not currently have a method in place to perform quantitative testing on fentanyl/fentanyl derivatives. It is anticipated, developing and testing a method would take a full-time employee approximately three months or 520 personnel hours.

If the method developed was similar to our current quantitative method(s), the cost for standards to generate a curve would be approximately \$855. Approximately 32 samples would be able to be run on each curve. The total estimated cost for running the method would be (\$26.71/sample x 1337 samples) \$35,711 per year.

The 937 items already qualitatively tested plus the additional estimated 400 items that would be qualitatively tested, result in an estimated 1,337 items that would require quantitative testing on the new method. Based on quantitative methods in place currently, the MHP estimates a full-time employee would be able to quantitative analyze 40-50 items per month. The quantitative testing would take approximately 5,150 personnel hours per year (3 FTE).

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by MHP. Therefore, Oversight will reflect MHP's impact for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state §579.065 (1) removes the upper weight limits of various drugs, and adds one gram or more of flunitrazepam for the first offense, Any amount of gamma-hydroxybutyric acid for the first offense, and more than ten milligrams of fentanyl in the 1st degree drug trafficking offense. The trafficking of all these drugs as a 1st degree offense is a class B felony.

However, trafficking these drugs in larger quantities, as per weights specified by this bill, is a class A felony. Similarly, trafficking one gram or more of flunitrazepam for a second or subsequent offense, any amount of gamma-hydroxybutyric acid for a second or subsequent offense, or twenty milligrams or more of fentanyl is also a class A felony.

Section 579.068 establishes the drug trafficking offenses in 2nd degree. This section also removes the upper weight limits of various drugs, and adds more than ten milligrams of fentanyl in the 2nd degree drug trafficking offense. The trafficking of all these drugs as a 2nd degree offense is a class C felony, and is a class B felony for larger quantities. Trafficking of less than one gram of flunitrazepam, in the 2nd degree, is a class C felony. It is a class B felony for a repeated offense.

Flunitrazepam is not approved by the FDA and is illegal. The effects of overdosing is known and may be increased with the use of opioids. Gamma-Hydroxybutyric is an approved Schedule 1 drug that is used to treat narcolepsy. Both drugs have illegal street uses but the impact of changing the felony class is considered to have little impact upon on the DOC. Very few offenders receive prison sentences for possession unless the offenders have multiple convictions.

Offenders sentenced to probation will serve the same time on probation (three years after earning compliance credits).

The bill adds felony classes A and B for these drugs (flunitrazepam, fentanyl and gamma-hydroxybutyric acid) if they are charged under trafficking 1st degree, depending upon quantity of drugs involved and first or subsequent offense. Similarly, it adds them to felony B and C, if the offense is charged under trafficking 2nd degree.

We are expecting that the average sentence length and average first releases from the prison as well as parole and probation sentences will remain the same for these new offenders, however their number may increase because of the addition of new drugs under this legislation.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In FY2019, there were seven new admissions under charges of 1st degree drug trafficking class A felony, with 12.5 years of average sentence, and 7.2 years average time for first release, 4 new probations with average term of 5 years. For 1st degree class B felony, there were six new admissions with average sentence of 8.7 years and four new probations with average term of 5 years.

For 2nd degree drug trafficking felony class A, there were five new admissions with an average sentence of 10.7 years, 6.7 years to first release and 5 new probations with 4.2 years average probation term. For class B felony, there were 30 new admissions, 9.7 years average sentence, 2.8 years to first release and 6 new probations with 4.7 years average term.

For 2nd degree drug trafficking class C felony, there were 11 new admissions with 7.2 years average sentence length, 1.3 years to first release, and 14 new probations with 3.8 years average term length.

Estimating that the changes in the bill result in an increase of at least 30% new admissions and probations, based on the addition of three new drugs to the list, and assuming the same sentence lengths, the likely impact will be approximately 96 new prison admissions and 109 additional field population by FY2030.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
Drug Trafficking 1st Degree Class A										
Prison Population	2	4	6	8	11	13	15	17	19	19
Field Population	1	2	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	8
Drug Trafficking 1st Degree Class B										
Prison Population	2	4	5	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Field Population	1	2	4	5	8	10	11	13	14	14
Drug Trafficking 2nd Degree Class A										
Prison Population	2	3	5	6	8	9	11	12	12	12
Field Population	2	3	5	6	6	6	6	6	8	9
Drug Trafficking 2nd Degree Class B										
Prison Population	9	18	27	36	45	47	47	47	47	47
Field Population	2	4	5	7	8	16	25	34	43	49
Drug Trafficking 2nd Degree Class C										
Prison Population	3	7	10	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Field Population	4	8	13	18	21	25	28	29	29	29
Cumulative Impact										
Prison Population	18	35	54	69	82	87	91	94	96	96
Field Population	10	20	30	41	50	62	76	87	100	109
Population Change	28	55	84	110	132	149	167	181	196	205

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact for fiscal note purposes for the DOC.

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** state they cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with the proposed new crime of trafficking fentanyl, or gamma-hydroxybutyric acid, or flunitrazepam. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

In Fiscal Year 2019, SPD's Trial Division opened 193 drug cases of the 62,002 total cases opened.

Statute	Description	Number of Cases
579.065	Trafficking Drugs 1 st Degree	55
579.068	Trafficking Drugs 2 nd Degree	138
	Total Cases	193

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight notes over the last three fiscal years, the SPD has lapsed a total of \$153 of General Revenue appropriations (\$2 out of \$28.0 million in FY 2017; \$150 out of \$42.5 million in FY 2018; and \$1 out of \$46.0 million in FY 2019). Therefore, Oversight assumes the SPD is at maximum capacity, and the increase in workload resulting from this bill cannot be absorbed with SPD's current resources.

Adding one additional Assistant Public Defender 1 (APD) with a starting salary of \$47,000, will cost approximately \$74,500 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. One additional APD II (\$52,000 per year; eligible for consideration after 1 year of successful performance at APD I) will cost the state approximately \$81,000 per year in personal service and fringe benefit costs. When expense and equipment costs such as travel, training, furniture, equipment and supplies are included, Oversight assumes the cost for a new APD could approach \$100,000 per year.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes the SPD cannot absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal within their existing resources and, therefore, will reflect a potential additional cost of (Less than \$100,000) per year to the General Revenue Fund.

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1450), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assumed the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for this agency.

§§589.400, 589.401, 589.404, and 589.414

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state the DOC is responsible for supervising those who are charged with failure to register. Failure to register as a sex offender is in violation of §589.425, RSMo, with penalties of class D, E, or unclassified felonies. While this bill proposes no new penalties, the expanded registry population increases the potential of a violation of §589.425, RSMo. In FY 2019, there were 267 new court commitments to the department under §589.425, RSMo. Of those, 187 were probation cases, 29 were new commitments for 120 days, and 51 were prison sentences. As of January 13, 2020, the Missouri sex offender registry had 16,469 offenders in the registry (Missouri State Highway Patrol 2020). Based on the results of an audit by the Office of State Auditor (Galloway 2018), we can expect approximately 8 percent of those offenders (1,318) are noncompliant with registration at any given time.

Given the proposed legislation increases the monitoring requirements for offenders who are already supervised by the department, it increases the likelihood that an offender will fail to register. However, given that the cases affected by this proposal are already monitored and the estimate that 20 percent of noncompliant cases result in a new court commitment for failure to register under §589.425, RSMo, the department does not expect a significant impact on operations. Therefore, passage of this legislation is expected to have no impact on the department.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's no impact for fiscal note purposes.

The cumulative impact of changes proposed within the ten-year reporting timeframe is shown below:

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Cumulative Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
Cumulative Impact										
Prison Population	13	41	70	111	123	124	121	120	120	118
Field Population	56	86	128	133	179	222	246	264	281	292
Population Change	69	127	198	244	302	346	367	384	401	410

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for prison	Change in probation & parole officers	Total cost for probation and parole	# to Probation and Parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes a 2% inflation)
Year 1	13	(\$6,386)	(\$69,182)	1	(\$63,563)	56	(\$132,745)
Year 2	41	(\$6,386)	(\$267,063)	1	(\$75,542)	86	(\$342,604)
Year 3	70	(\$6,386)	(\$465,080)	2	(\$153,030)	128	(\$618,109)
Year 4	111	(\$6,386)	(\$752,233)	2	(\$155,006)	133	(\$907,239)
Year 5	123	(\$6,386)	(\$850,227)	3	(\$235,521)	179	(\$1,085,748)
Year 6	124	(\$6,386)	(\$874,282)	4	(\$318,112)	222	(\$1,192,394)
Year 7	121	(\$6,386)	(\$870,192)	4	(\$322,269)	246	(\$1,192,461)
Year 8	120	(\$6,386)	(\$880,261)	5	(\$408,112)	264	(\$1,288,373)
Year 9	120	(\$6,386)	(\$897,866)	5	(\$413,112)	281	(\$1,311,349)
Year 10	118	(\$6,386)	(\$900,560)	5	(\$418,937)	292	(\$1,319,496)

If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it is because the DOC has changed the way probation and parole daily costs are calculated to more accurately reflect the way the Division of Probation and Parole is staffed across the entire state.

In December 2019, the DOC reevaluated the calculation used for computing the Probation and Parole average daily cost of supervision and revised the cost calculation to be used for 2020 fiscal notes. For the purposes of fiscal note calculations, the DOC averaged district caseloads across the state and came up with an average caseload of 51 offender cases per officer. The new calculation assumes that an increase/decrease of 51 cases would result in a change in costs/cost avoidance equal to the cost of one FTE staff person. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offenders are assumed to be absorbable.

In instances where the proposed legislation would only affect a specific caseload, such as sex offenders, the DOC will use the average caseload figure for that specific type of offender to calculate cost increases/decreases. For instances where the proposed legislation affects a less specific caseload, DOC projects the impact based on prior year(s) actual data for DOC's 44 probation and parole districts.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The DOC cost of incarceration is \$17,496 per day or an annual cost of \$6,386 per offender. The DOC cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that would be needed to cover the new caseload.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1289), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assumed the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1289), **Oversight** notes the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol**, the **State Public Defender's Office**, and the **Springfield Police Department** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a previous version (HB 1289), officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department** stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§589.805

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety (DPS)** state §589.805 requires the DPS to establish a pilot program known as the "Community Crime Reduction Grant Program" to qualifying municipal police departments as provided under subsection 2.

DPS is also required to administer the grants issued and promulgate all necessary rules and regulations for the administration of this section.

Due to the effort required to establish the grant program and to then administer the grants, DPS will require one (1) FTE Program Specialist (at \$46,171). This would be a new grant program to the department. Costs relative to this new grant program would be as follows:

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Program Specialist	\$46,171
Fringe Benefits	\$26,853
Chair	\$574
File Cabinet	\$599
Calculator	\$40
ITSD One-Time Costs (PC/Monitor/Software)	\$1,425
On-Going Office Supplies	\$372
On-Going ITSD Expenses	<u>\$478</u>
Total	\$76,512

The grant program covered by this legislation is subject to appropriation by the general assembly. There is also a dedicated fund created to support this section. DPS will need administrative support funding to adequately achieve the intent of this legislation.

The appropriation/gifts will set the size or level of the grant program overseen by DPS. Depending on how this grant program is established and managed, there could be an increase in maintenance costs to our grant management system that cannot be calculated at this point.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DPS. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DPS's estimated impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal (SB 572), officials from the **Columbia Police Department (CPD)** stated the City of Columbia would qualify for funding. Since it is not possible to estimate how much would actually be available to the City of Columbia, we assume a positive fiscal impact since new funds would be available on a matching basis for officers and for the full cost of training specified in the bill.

Oversight contacted the CPD to determine the number of sworn and civilian employees, starting salary for an officer, fringe benefit rate, and an estimate of the City of Columbia's population. According to CPD, the City's approved budget document estimates a 2020 population of 124,537 and states the CPD has 184 sworn and 41 civilian employees. Therefore, using a future estimated population of 125,000, meeting the "two officers per one thousand people" threshold as stated in the bill would require 250 police officers. Oversight assumes this refers to sworn officers and does not include civilian employees. Therefore, CPD would need to add approximately 66 (250-184) police officers to meet the threshold.

CPD states the starting salary for a police officer is \$46,354 and fringe benefits are calculated at a rate of 67.36 percent. Therefore, an additional 66 police officers would equate to \$5,120,152 (66

ASSUMPTION (continued)

x (\$46,354 x 1.6736)) in costs. Under §589.805.3(1), the state would provide fifty percent (\$2,560,076) of this funding. Additional costs may be incurred under subdivision (2), where the state pays for the new officers to attend at least one seminar relating to fair and impartial policing and one seminar related to racial sensitivity.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by CPD. Therefore, Oversight will reflect CPD's impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal (SB 572), officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** stated 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 SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$5,000. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the 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 the office can sustain with the core budget. Therefore, the 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. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could require additional resources.

In response to a similar proposal (SB 572), **Oversight** notes the **State Treasurer's Office** and the **St. Joseph Police Department** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Oversight assumes, for fiscal note purposes, that appropriations to the Community Crime Reduction Program Fund will be distributed as grants in the same fiscal year for which moneys are appropriated.

§590.207

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1961), officials from the **Missouri Highway Patrol** assumed this proposal will have no direct fiscal impact on their agency.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assume this proposal will likely have an impact on local school districts. We defer to them regarding the extent of any impact.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1961), officials from **Gasconade County R-I School District** assumed the cost associated with each person being trained to be a school protection officers would be \$10,000 or more. A district would want to have at least one person trained per building so if you have 3 buildings would have \$30,000 or more in cost for training.

We would want to stipend them in some way to be this officer since there will be time used outside of regular contracts. Would look at around \$1,000 per individual.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 1961), officials from **Wellsville Middletown R-I School District** say in that our board has shown no inclination to allow for school protection officers or a person of any other designation that would allow any person who is not a law enforcement officer to carry firearms in our school, I don't believe this bill will currently have any fiscal impact on our school.

Oversight assumes that because this bill permits, but does not require additional school resource officers, that it will have no direct fiscal impact on state agencies and that fiscal impacts on school districts will be at the discretion of the school districts.

§640.042

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight inquired of DNR as to if they have an existing interactive map of hazardous waste sites. DNR stated they do have a map of hazardous waste sites (<https://dnr.mo.gov/ESTART/>). In addition, they have a handful of high priority, high visibility sites that have their own web pages and those pages allow individuals to sign up for updates. The vast majority of the sites in the ESTART mapper do not have their own separate web page dedicated to the site.

Oversight notes that DNR has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for DNR.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§§640.142, 640.144 and 640.145

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 2120), officials from the **Department of Economic Development** and **Department of Corrections** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight notes that the agencies mentioned above have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for these agencies.

In response to a similar proposal (HCS HB 2120), officials from the **City of St. Louis Water Division** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes that the agencies mentioned above have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for these agencies.

Oversight notes that cities with a population of less than 30,000 could incur costs to upgrade their water systems and perform the required inspections listed in this proposal; therefore, Oversight will reflect an “unknown” cost to local political subdivisions.

§610.021

In response to a similar proposal (HB 1366), **Oversight** notes the **Secretary of State, State Treasurer, Office of Administration, Department of Revenue, Department of Public Safety, House Appropriations, Department of Conservation, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Agriculture, Department of Health and Senior Services, Missouri State Highway Patrol, Missouri Office of Prosecution Services, Administrative Hearing Commission, Missouri National Guard, Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement, State Technical College of Missouri, Capitol Police, Jackson County Election Board, Kansas City Public School Retirement System, City of Riverside, Springfield Police, St. Louis County Police Department, Employees’ Retirement System of the City of St. Louis, and the St. Louis County Directors of Elections** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Because of the consistent and broad response, **Oversight** concludes this proposal will likely have no direct fiscal impact to state agencies or local political subdivisions.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Bill as a Whole

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR)** state the legislation is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact to JCAR beyond its current appropriation.

Oversight assumes JCAR will be able to administer any rules resulting from this proposal with existing resources.

Oversight notes the **Department of Commerce and Insurance**, the **Missouri State Employees' Retirement System**, the **Attorney General's Office**, the **Lottery Commission**, the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**, the **Department of Transportation**, the **Department of Public Safety - Divisions of Fire Safety, Gaming Commission, State Emergency Management Agency** and the **Missouri Veterans Commission**), the **Administrative Hearing Commission**, the **Missouri Ethics Commission**, the **Department of Higher Education & Workforce Development**, the **Department of Higher Education & Workforce Development, Legislative Research**, the **State Tax Commission**, the **Department of Natural Resources**, the **Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan**, the **State Auditor's Office**, the **MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement**, the **Department of Mental Health**, the **St. Louis County Board of Elections**, the **Jackson County Election Board**, the **City of Kansas City**, the **St. Louis Metropolitan Sewer District**, the **St. Louis County Department of Justice Services**, the **University of Central Missouri** and the **Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations.

In response to a previous version, **Oversight** notes the **Department of Social Services**, the **Platte County Board of Elections**, and the **City of O'Fallon** have each stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, **Oversight** will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other sheriff's and police departments, cities, counties, utilities, hospitals, colleges and universities, public schools, circuit courts, fire departments, LEAs, LPHAs, municipal courts and the St. Louis Regional Convention and Sports Center were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. A general listing of political subdivisions included in our database is available upon request.

FISCAL IMPACT -
State Government

	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
<u>Revenue - DOR -</u> §§94.900 & 94.902 - 1% DOR Collection fee p. 14-30				
	\$0	\$0 to \$19,603	\$0 to \$29,993	\$0 to \$29,993
<u>Costs - CP (§8.177)</u> One-time costs to replace emblems, uniforms, patches p. 5-7				
	(\$28,652)	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Costs - OA/ITSD</u> (§8.177) Moving CP information and programs from DPS to Capitol Police Board p. 7				
	(Unknown)	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Costs - MHR</u> (§8.177) p. 7				
Personal Services	(\$38,333)	(\$46,460)	(\$46,925)	(\$46,925)
Fringe Benefits	(\$22,330)	(\$26,949)	(\$27,104)	(\$27,104)
Equipment and Expense	<u>(\$3,333)</u>	<u>(\$4,100)</u>	<u>(\$4,203)</u>	<u>(\$4,203)</u>
<u>Total Costs - MHR</u>	<u>(\$63,996)</u>	<u>(\$77,509)</u>	<u>(\$78,232)</u>	<u>(\$78,232)</u>
FTE Change - MHR	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
<u>Costs - DOR</u> (§32.056) p. 9-10				
Personal services	Up to... (\$76,260)	Up to... (\$92,427)	Up to... (\$93,351)	Up to... (\$93,351)
Fringe benefits	(\$59,886)	(\$65,255)	(\$65,562)	(\$65,562)
Expense and equipment	<u>(\$16,365)</u>	<u>(\$1,144)</u>	<u>(\$1,172)</u>	<u>(\$1,172)</u>
<u>Total Costs - DOR</u>	<u>(\$152,511)</u>	<u>(\$158,826)</u>	<u>(\$160,085)</u>	<u>(\$160,085)</u>
FTE Change - DOR	Up to 3 FTE	Up to 3 FTE	Up to 3 FTE	Up to 3 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> <u>State Government</u>	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
GENERAL REVENUE FUND (continued)				
<u>Costs - DOC Change in P&P Officers</u>				
Personal Services	(\$32,294)	(\$39,140)	(\$79,064)	(\$211,915)
Fringe Benefits	(\$20,350)	(\$24,664)	(\$49,822)	(\$133,538)
Equipment and Expense	<u>(\$10,919)</u>	<u>(\$11,738)</u>	<u>(\$24,144)</u>	<u>(\$73,484)</u>
<u>Total Costs - DOC</u>	<u>(\$63,563)</u>	<u>(\$75,542)</u>	<u>(\$153,030)</u>	<u>(\$418,937)</u>
FTE Change - DOC	1 FTE	1 FTE	2 FTE	5 FTE
 <u>Costs - DOC Increased incarceration costs</u>				
	(\$69,182)	(\$267,063)	(\$465,080)	(\$900,560)
 <u>Costs - SPD Salaries, fringe benefits, and equipment and expense</u>				
	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
 <u>Costs - MHP (§§579.065 and 579.068) p. 72-73</u>				
Personal Service	(\$147,240)	(\$178,455)	(\$180,239)	(\$193,241)
Fringe Benefits	(\$131,456)	(\$159,325)	(\$160,917)	(\$172,526)
Expense and Equipment	<u>(\$86,785)</u>	<u>(\$84,728)</u>	<u>(\$86,846)</u>	<u>(\$103,232)</u>
<u>Total Costs - MHP</u>	<u>(\$365,481)</u>	<u>(\$422,508)</u>	<u>(\$428,002)</u>	<u>(\$468,999)</u>
FTE Change - MHP	3 FTE	3 FTE	3 FTE	3 FTE

FISCAL IMPACT -
State Government

	FY 2021			Fully
	(10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Implemented
				(FY 2030)

GENERAL
REVENUE FUND
 (continued)

Costs - DPS p. 56-57
 (§491.641)

Administer Pretrial
 Witness Protection

Services Fund	\$0 or...	\$0 or...	\$0 or...	\$0 or...
Personal Services	(\$38,476)	(\$46,633)	(\$47,099)	(\$47,099)
Fringe Benefits	(\$22,378)	(\$27,007)	(\$27,162)	(\$27,162)
Equipment and Expense	(\$3,346)	(\$871)	(\$893)	(\$893)
<u>Total Cost - DPS</u>	<u>\$0 or (\$64,200)</u>	<u>\$0 or (\$74,511)</u>	<u>\$0 or (\$75,154)</u>	<u>\$0 or (\$75,154)</u>
FTE Change - DPS	0 or 1 FTE	0 or 1 FTE	0 or 1 FTE	0 or 1 FTE

Costs - DPS p. 78-80
 (§589.805) to

establish and
 administer the grant
 program

Personal service (1 FTE)	(\$38,476)	(\$46,633)	(\$47,099)	(\$47,099)
Fringe benefit	(\$22,378)	(\$27,007)	(\$27,162)	(\$27,162)
Expense and Equipment	(\$3,346)	(\$871)	(\$893)	(\$893)
<u>Total Costs - DPS</u>	<u>(\$64,200)</u>	<u>(\$74,511)</u>	<u>(\$75,154)</u>	<u>(\$75,154)</u>
FTE Change - DPS	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE

Costs - DPS
 p. 78-80 (§589.805)

Appropriation to
 Community Crime
 Reduction Program

Fund (Subject to appropriation)	(Could exceed \$2,133,397)	(Could exceed \$2,560,076)	(Could exceed \$2,560,076)	(Could exceed \$2,560,076)
------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> <u>State Government</u>	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
<u>Costs - OSCA p. 41</u> (\$211.071) Raises the age for a juvenile	\$0 to...	\$0 to..	\$0 to...	\$0 to..
Personal Service (34 FTE)	(\$1,256,640)	(\$1,523,048)	(\$1,538,278)	(\$1,538,278)
Fringe Benefits	(\$743,730)	(\$897,484)	(\$902,542)	(\$902,542)
Training	(\$192,181)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Reimb. multi- county circuits	(\$1,352,050)	(\$1,352,050)	(\$1,352,050)	(\$1,352,050)
Reimb. single county circuits	<u>(\$10,187,476)</u>	<u>(\$10,187,476)</u>	<u>(\$10,187,476)</u>	<u>(\$10,187,476)</u>
Total Costs - OSCA	\$0 to (\$13,732,077)	\$0 to (\$13,960,058)	\$0 to (\$13,980,346)	\$0 to (\$13,980,346)
FTE Change - DOC	0 to 34 FTE	0 to 34 FTE	0 to 34 FTE	0 to 34 FTE
<u>Transfer Out - p. 56</u> (\$491.641) To Pretrial Witness Protection Services Fund	(\$1,000,000)	(\$1,000,000)	(\$1,000,000)	(\$1,000,000)
<u>Loss - STO p. 46</u> (\$217.195) Reduction in interest revenue (retained by the new Inmate Canteen Fund)	<u>(\$153,609)</u>	<u>(\$184,331)</u>	<u>(\$184,331)</u>	<u>(\$184,331)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND	(Could exceed <u>\$17,990,868</u>)	(Could exceed <u>\$18,935,332</u>)	(Could exceed <u>\$19,229,497</u>)	Could exceed <u>\$19,971,881</u>)
Estimated Net FTE Change for General Revenue	Up to 44 FTE	Up to 44 FTE	Up to 45 FTE	Up to 48 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> State Government	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY (Across all funds)				
<u>Reallocation -</u> Adjutant General funding and 469.05 FTE from DPS to the Department of Defense				
	<u>\$0 or</u> \$22,485,373	<u>\$0 or</u> \$44,970,747	<u>\$0 or</u> \$44,970,747	<u>\$0 or</u> \$44,970,747
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY (Across all funds)				
	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>\$22,485,373</u>	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>\$44,970,747</u>	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>\$44,970,747</u>	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>\$44,970,747</u>
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (Across all funds)				
<u>Reallocation -</u> Adjutant General funding and 469.05 FTE into the Department of Defense				
	\$0 or (\$22,485,373)	\$0 or (\$44,970,747)	\$0 or (\$44,970,747)	\$0 or (\$44,970,747)
<u>Costs - MNG-DOD</u> Additional Personal Services expenses (could exceed 2 FTE)				
	<u>\$0 or (Could</u> <u>exceed</u> <u>\$200,000)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Could</u> <u>exceed</u> <u>\$200,000)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Could</u> <u>exceed</u> <u>\$200,000)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Could</u> <u>exceed</u> <u>\$200,000)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (Across all funds)				
	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>(\$22,485,373, or</u> <u>could exceed</u> <u>\$22,685,373)</u>	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>(\$44,970,747, or</u> <u>could exceed</u> <u>\$45,170,747)</u>	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>(\$44,970,747, or</u> <u>could exceed</u> <u>\$45,170,747)</u>	<u>\$0 or</u> <u>(\$44,970,747, or</u> <u>could exceed</u> <u>\$45,170,747)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> <u>State Government</u>	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY				
<u>Reallocation</u> - CP funding and 40 FTE from DPS to Capitol Police Board p. 5-7	<u>\$1,805,953</u>	<u>\$1,805,953</u>	<u>\$1,805,953</u>	<u>\$1,805,953</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY	<u>\$1,805,953</u>	<u>\$1,805,953</u>	<u>\$1,805,953</u>	<u>\$1,805,953</u>
MISSOURI STATE CAPITOL POLICE BOARD				
<u>Reallocation</u> - CP funding and 40 FTE into the Commission	<u>(\$1,805,953)</u>	<u>(\$1,805,953)</u>	<u>(\$1,805,953)</u>	<u>(\$1,805,953)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE CAPITOL POLICE BOARD	<u>(\$1,805,953)</u>	<u>(\$1,805,953)</u>	<u>(\$1,805,953)</u>	<u>(\$1,805,953)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> <u>State Government</u>	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
CRIMINAL RECORD SYSTEM FUND (0671)				
<u>Income - DPS, MHP</u> (\$195.815) Increase in background check fees p. 39-40	\$76,560	\$43,472 to \$85,800	\$43,472 to \$85,800	\$43,472 to \$85,800
<u>Revenue Gain or</u> <u>(Loss) - from</u> backgrounds checks no longer needed for different districts (\$168.133) p. 30-32	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)
<u>Revenue Gain - from</u> background checks on adult students not counted towards average daily attendance (\$168.133) p. 30-32	<u>\$2,200</u>	<u>\$2,200</u>	<u>\$2,200</u>	<u>\$2,200</u>
<u>Costs - Criminal</u> history system changes (\$168.133) p. 30-32	<u>(\$165,000)</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON CRIMINAL RECORD SYSTEM FUND	<u>Unknown to</u> <u>(Could exceed</u> <u>\$86,240)</u>	<u>Unknown to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>Unknown to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>Unknown to</u> <u>(Unknown)</u>

FISCAL IMPACT -
State Government

VARIOUS STATE FUNDS

Revenue - Court costs for tickets for traffic violations (§§173.2700 to 173.2712 and 307.179) p. 32-34, 52-53

FY 2021
(10 Mo.)

FY 2022

FY 2023

Fully
Implemented
(FY 2030)

Less than
\$100,000

Less than
\$100,000

Less than
\$100,000

Less than
\$100,000

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON VARIOUS STATE FUNDS

Less than
\$100,000

Less than
\$100,000

Less than
\$100,000

Less than
\$100,000

WATER PATROL DIVISION FUND (0400)

Revenue Extension - MHP - Extension of Fee (§306.127) from 12/31/2022 to 12/31/2032 - \$9 fee on average of over 3,000 cards issued annually p. 51-52

\$0

\$0

Less than
\$30,000

Could exceed
\$30,000

Cost - MHP - \$1.25 payment processing fee to Jet Pay p. 51-52

\$0

\$0

Less than
(\$5,000)

Could exceed
(\$5,000)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE WATER PATROL DIVISION FUND

\$0

\$0

Less than
\$25,000

Could exceed
\$25,000

FISCAL IMPACT -
State Government

FY 2021
 (10 Mo.)

FY 2022

FY 2023

Fully
 Implemented
 (FY 2030)

**COLLEGES AND
 UNIVERSITIES**

Costs - Colleges and
 Universities
 (§190.092) - AED
 maintenance and
 upkeep p. 34-37

\$0 or
(Unknown)

\$0 or
(Unknown)

\$0 or
(Unknown)

\$0 or
(Unknown)

**ESTIMATED NET
 EFFECT ON
 COLLEGES AND
 UNIVERSITIES**

\$0 or
(Unknown)

\$0 or
(Unknown)

\$0 or
(Unknown)

\$0 or
(Unknown)

**PRETRIAL
 WITNESS
 PROTECTION
 SERVICES FUND**

Transfer In - From
 General Revenue
 Fund p. 56-57

\$1,000,000

\$1,000,000

\$1,000,000

\$1,000,000

Transfer Out - Local
 Political
 Subdivisions (Police
 and Sheriff's
 Departments)
 p. 56-57

(\$1,000,000)

(\$1,000,000)

(\$1,000,000)

(\$1,000,000)

**ESTIMATED NET
 EFFECT ON THE
 PRETRIAL
 WITNESS
 PROTECTION
 SERVICES FUND**

\$0

\$0

\$0

\$0

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> <u>State Government</u>	<u>FY 2021</u> <u>(10 Mo.)</u>	<u>FY 2022</u>	<u>FY 2023</u>	<u>Fully</u> <u>Implemented</u> <u>(FY 2030)</u>
COMMUNITY CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAM FUND				
<u>Transfer-in - from</u> General Revenue Fund p. 78-80	Could exceed \$2,133,397	Could exceed \$2,560,076	Could exceed \$2,560,076	Could exceed \$2,560,076
<u>Costs - DPS p. 78-80</u> (\$589.805) Grants (Subject to appropriation)	<u>(Could exceed</u> <u>\$2,133,397)</u>	<u>(Could exceed</u> <u>\$2,560,076)</u>	<u>(Could exceed</u> <u>\$2,560,076)</u>	<u>(Could exceed</u> <u>\$2,560,076)</u>
ESTIMATED NET FISCAL IMPACT TO THE COMMUNITY CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAM FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> <u>State Government</u>	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
INMATE CANTEEN FUND				
<u>Income - STO</u>				
(\$217.195) Interest Earned to fund instead of General Revenue p. 46				
	\$153,609	\$184,331	\$184,331	\$184,331
<u>Transfer-In - DOC</u>				
(\$217.195) Transfer- in from Canteen Fund post-August 28, 2020 p. 46				
	\$8,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Transfer-Out - DOC</u>				
(\$217.195) Transfer- out from Canteen Fund pre-August 28, 2020 p. 46				
	<u>(\$8,000,000)</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE INMATE CANTEEN FUND				
	<u>\$153,609</u>	<u>\$184,331</u>	<u>\$184,331</u>	<u>\$184,331</u>

FISCAL IMPACT -
Local Government

POLITICAL
SUBDIVISIONS

Revenue - p. 14-30
 Additional sales tax
 for Public Safety
 (§§94.900 & 94.902)

FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
---------------------	---------	---------	-----------------------------------

	\$0	\$0 to \$1,960,301	\$0 to \$2,999,260	\$0 to \$2,999,260
--	-----	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Revenue - Fine
 revenue and court
 costs to various local
 political
 subdivisions for
 tickets written

	Less than \$100,000	Less than \$100,000	Less than \$100,000	Less than \$100,000
--	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Revenue - Animal
 Rescue Facilities -
 Bond or security for
 animal care costs
 from the animal
 owner (§§578.018
 and 578.030)
 p. 68-70

	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
--	---------	---------	---------	---------

Income - Columbia
 Police Department
 (§589.805) -
 Community Crime
 Reduction grants
 from DPS p. 78-80

	Could exceed \$2,133,397	Could exceed \$2,560,076	Could exceed \$2,560,076	Could exceed \$2,560,076
--	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

Transfer In - From
 Witness Protection
 Services Fund
 (§491.641) p. 56-57

	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
--	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

FISCAL IMPACT -
Local Government

POLITICAL
SUBDIVISIONS
 (continued)

Transfer in -
 Juvenile Justice
 Preservation Fund
 Sweep - \$211.438
 repealed p. 44

Savings or Costs - to
 school districts for
 substitutes utilizing
 the additional
 registration option
 (§168.133) p. 30-32

Costs - Columbia
 Police Department
 (§589.805) - Adding
 additional officers to
 meet 2 per 1,000
 population threshold
 p. 80

Costs - for
 background checks
 on adult students not
 counted towards
 average daily
 attendance
 (§168.133) p. 30-32

Costs - Potential cost
 for extended
 transport time for
 fire districts
 (§190.243) p. 37-38

	FY 2021 (10 Mo.)	FY 2022	FY 2023	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)
	(Could exceed \$4,266,794)	(Could exceed \$5,120,152)	(Could exceed \$5,120,152)	(Could exceed \$5,120,152)
	(\$4,175)	(\$4,175)	(\$4,175)	(\$4,175)
	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)

FISCAL IMPACT -
Local Government

FY 2021
 (10 Mo.)

FY 2022

FY 2023

Fully
 Implemented
 (FY 2030)

POLITICAL
SUBDIVISIONS
 (continued)

Costs - Animal
 Rescue Facilities -
 Care of animals held
 until final
 disposition of
 charges and acquittal
 or inability to pay
 (§§578.018 and
 578.030) p. 68-70

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

Costs - Law
 Enforcement
 Agencies - Increased
 duties in the animal
 confiscation process
 (§§578.018 and
 578.030) p. 68-70

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

Costs - All Local
 Governments
 (§190.092) - AED
 maintenance and
 upkeep p. 34-37

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

Costs - Update water
 systems and perform
 inspections
 (§§640.142,
 640.144, and
 640.145) p. 82

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

(Unknown)

FISCAL IMPACT -
Local Government

FY 2021
 (10 Mo.)

FY 2022

FY 2023

Fully
 Implemented
 (FY 2030)

POLITICAL
SUBDIVISIONS
 (continued)

Cost - Police and
 Sheriff's
 Departments
 (\$575.205) Increased
 labor hours to
 process cases
 p. 65-68

\$0 to (Unknown) \$0 to (Unknown) \$0 to (Unknown) \$0 to (Unknown)

Loss - Potential loss
 of fees generated
 from registering
 breed-specific dogs
 (\$67.142) p. 13

\$0 or (Unknown,
 greater than
 \$25,000) \$0 or (Unknown,
 greater than
 \$25,000) \$0 or (Unknown,
 greater than
 \$25,000) \$0 or (Unknown,
 greater than
 \$25,000)

Costs - counties and
 City of St. Louis -
 raise the age
 implementation
 (§211.438 repeal)

Loss - 1% collection
 fee kept by DOR
 (§§94.900 & 94.902)
 p. 14-30

\$0 \$0 to (\$19,603) \$0 to (\$29,993) \$0 to (\$29,993)

ESTIMATED NET
EFFECT TO ALL
POLITICAL
SUBDIVISIONS

Unknown to
(Unknown)

Unknown to
(Unknown)

Unknown to
(Unknown)

Unknown to
(Unknown)

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

This proposal would allow for a sales tax increase in the cities listed above that would impact small businesses depending on if a half percent sales tax rate is approved by the voters. (§§94.900 and 94.902)

This proposal may have a fiscal impact on small business deciding to have an AED on the premises. (§190.092)

This proposal will negatively impact small businesses in the medical marijuana industry if they pay the background check fees for potential employees. (§195.815)

Certain small businesses that sell intoxicating liquor could be impacted by this proposal. (§311.293 and 311.332)

Small business animal shelters and veterinary facilities might incur additional costs as a result of this proposal. (§§578.018 and 578.030)

There may be a direct fiscal impact to those public water systems that meet the definition of a small business as a result of this proposal. This may include not only those systems that will be regulated, but also any small business that may have to adjust water rates to allow the water system to comply with this bill. (§§640.142, 640.144, and 640.145)

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal modifies numerous provisions relating to public safety.

This legislation is not federally mandated but may be duplicative of parts of the American Water and Infrastructure Act (AWIA). It would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

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

Administrative Hearing Commission
Attorney General's Office
Department of Agriculture
Department of Commerce and Insurance
Department of Conservation
Department of Corrections

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)


Department of Economic Development
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Higher Education & Workforce Development
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Mental Health
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Public Safety
Department of Revenue
Department of Social Services
Department of Transportation
Governor's Office
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement
Legislative Research
Lottery Commission
Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan
Missouri Ethics Commission
Missouri House of Representatives
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Missouri Senate
Missouri State Employees' Retirement System
MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System
Office of Administration
Office of Administration - Budget and Planning
Office of Administration - Facilities Management, Design and Construction
Office of State Courts Administrator
Office of Secretary of State
State Auditor's Office
State Public Defender's Office
State Tax Commission
State Treasurer's Office
City of Springfield
City of Columbia
City of Kansas City
City of O'Fallon
City of Brentwood
City of Clinton
City of Branson West
City of Hazelwood

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

City of Riverside
City of Springfield
Adair County Health Department
Columbia/Boone County Department of Public Health and Human Services
Cooper County Public Health Center
St. Louis County Department of Health
Boone County Sheriff's Department
Joplin Police Department
St. Louis County Department of Justice Services
St. Louis County Police Department
Springfield Police Department
Brentwood Fire Department
State Technical College of Missouri
St. Charles Community College
University of Central Missouri
University of Missouri Health Care System
Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District
Kansas City Elections Board
Jackson County Election Board
St. Louis County Board of Elections
City of St. Louis Water Division
St. Louis City
St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department
Kearney Fire & Rescue Protection District
Gasconade County R-I School District
Wellsville Middletown R-I School District
Kansas City Public School Retirement System
Platte County Board of Elections
St. Louis Metropolitan Sewer District



Julie Morff
Director
May 4, 2020



Ross Strope
Assistant Director
May 4, 2020