

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0805S.09S
Bill No.: CCS for HCS for SS for SCS for SBs Nos. 81 & 174
Subject: Fireworks; Fire Protection; Counties; Crimes and Punishment
Type: Original
Date: May 5, 2025

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

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
General Revenue	More or Less than (\$423,067)	More or Less than (\$364,313)	More or Less than (\$366,967)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	More or Less than (\$423,067)	More or Less than (\$364,313)	More or Less than (\$366,967)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
Criminal Records System	\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000	\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000	\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000
Fire Education	Up to \$71,278	Up to \$85,534	Up to \$85,534
Cigarette Fire Safety & Firefighter Protection	Up to \$52,712	Up to \$63,255	Up to \$63,255
Chemical Emergency Preparedness	\$834,508	\$1,001,410	\$1,001,410
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	Could exceed \$958,498	Could exceed \$1,150,199	Could exceed \$1,150,199

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
General Revenue	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE

☒ Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.

☒ Estimated Net Effect (savings or increased revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

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

§301.551 – Background checks for certain applicants

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** state §301.551 provides the DOR the option of requiring fingerprint submission with any licensure application for a new motor vehicle franchise dealer, used motor vehicle dealer, powersport dealer, wholesale motor vehicle dealer, motor vehicle dealer, public motor vehicle auction, RV dealer, trailer dealer, boat dealer, manufacturer, or boat manufacture. Applicants will be required to submit fingerprints to the Missouri State Highway Patrol (MSHP) for review of the state criminal record. The MSHP will also forward the prints to the FBI for review of the federal criminal record. Any fees associated with this process will be handled by the MSHP central repository.

NOTE: Although this statute states that the DOR “may” implement this measure, the current opinion of management indicates that this will become a requirement. Additionally, although the language indicates that this be included “... as part of an application seeking licensure...”, the DOR will also make this a requirement for annual dealer license renewals as this falls in line with current procedures.

The DOR will have the following fiscal impact:

Administrative Impact

To implement the proposed changes, the DOR will be required to:

- Update procedures, correspondence letters, forms, and the Department website;
- Update the Dealer and Business operating manual;
- Update Department Systems
- Send communications to registered dealers
- Need additional FTE; and
- Procure equipment for new FTE

The DOR will require 2 additional FTE for reviewing criminal background checks and processing the additional documentation.

Should the legislation be implemented, Motor Vehicle Bureau (MVB) employees will be required to access the MSHP's Missouri Automated Criminal History System (MACHS). Since the new process will give MVB an extensive view of an applicant's criminal history, DOR is expecting the review times for the applications to increase. Additionally, the information contained in MACHS is considered sensitive but unclassified (SBU) federal information. MVB would ideally restrict the number of employees with access to the system to protect the confidentiality of the data. This will create an additional step(s) in the approval process as requested data analysts would be reviewing the MACHS data before MVB grants new dealer licenses.

MVB has roughly 8,000 active dealers within Missouri. Based on data from other states who have implemented the same federal fingerprinting requirement, MVB estimates 10% of new dealers will be denied a license.

After completing the required training, MVB would also participate in MSHP's Rap Back Program. The program will automatically notify MVB every time a registered dealer commits a crime and is fingerprinted for said crime. The Associate Research Data Analyst would be responsible for keeping up with those notifications and beginning procedures to revoke licenses if it is a punishable offense.

DOR anticipates an increase in calls, correspondence, and a delay in processing due to the proposed legislation. The additional FTE would assist in the implementation and continuity of the federal fingerprint-based criminal history background checks.

With the changes, new and renewing dealers may be denied a license to operate and the DOR foresees a need for additional legal resources to pursue such denial actions and defending any appeals which may arise from the denials.

FY 2026 - Motor Vehicle Bureau additional FTE costs

Associate Research Data Analyst \$46,447

Equipment costs for laptops, accessories and software \$1,085

Additional monitors needed 2 @ \$169 each

Cubicle, chair, calculator \$8,438 each

Phone \$525 each

Headset \$125 each

Total per FTE \$56,958

* 2 FTE

Total \$113,916

FY 2026 – Motor Vehicle Bureau

Associate Research/Data Analyst 20 hrs. @ \$26.03 per hr. =	\$521
Research/Data Analyst 30 hrs. @ \$27.87 per hr. =	\$836
Administrative Manager 10 hrs. @ \$358.10 per hr. =	<u>\$351</u>
Total	\$1,708

FY 2026 – Systems Analysis and Support

Research/Data Analyst 20 hrs. @ \$27.87 per hr. =	\$557
Administrative Manager 10 hrs. @ \$35.10 per hr. =	\$351
Associate Research/Data Analyst 80 hrs. @ \$26.03 per hr. =	<u>\$2,082</u>
Total	\$ 2,990

FY 2026 –Strategy and Communications Office

Research/Data Analyst 30 hrs. @ \$27.87 per hr. =	\$836
Administrative Manager 10 hrs. @ \$35.10 per hr. =	\$351
Associate Research/Data Analyst 20 hrs. @ 26.03 per hr. =	<u>\$521</u>
Total	\$1,708

Total Costs = \$120,322

The fiscal impact estimated above is based on changes in the current DOR's Motor Vehicle system environment. The implementation of this legislation will be coordinated with the integration of the Department's Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing software system approved and passed by the general assembly in 2020 (Senate Bill 176). To avoid duplicative technology development and associated costs to the state, it is recommended a delayed effective date be added to this bill to correlate with the installation of the new system.

Fusion Impact

The costs associated with these legislative changes may be outside of the current contract and identified programming work for DOR's incoming integrated system. As such, the DOR has included the potential costs associated with making the changes to the integrated system by the department's current vendor.

To develop a function within Fusion to add data entry fields to the dealer registration and account maintenance processes:

Implementation Consultant: 200 hrs. @ \$225/ hr = \$45,000

Oversight contacted DOR regarding the potential number of new applicants they receive on a yearly basis. DOR indicated they do not separate applications by new versus renewing dealers but assume the 8,000 applications are mostly renewals. The number stays roughly the same from one year to the next. Therefore, there would be some new dealers filing applications, but there is no way to determine that number.

DOR officials assume the applicant would be required to pay any background fees and the moneys would go to the MHP.

Oversight contacted DOR officials regarding background checks for renewals. DOR officials stated applicants need to have a new background check performed each time they apply for a renewal. The first 2 background checks are only good for a year each (initial licensing year and then the first renewal year). After that, renewals are good for 2 years so the background check would be good for 2 years.

Oversight notes, in response to similar legislation from the prior year (HCS HB 1800), the Department of Public Safety- Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP) stated the proposal provides for a new §301.551 which allows DOR the ability to require a fingerprint criminal record check as part of an application process for said licenses. If DOR chooses to do so as a policy decision, then as a result, revenue would be generated into the Criminal Records System Fund.

Oversight also notes that the provisions of §301.551.1 state “The department of revenue may (emphasis added) require that fingerprint submissions be made a part of an application seeking licensure for a new motor vehicle franchise dealer...” In addition, the provisions of subsection 2 state “If (emphasis added) the department of revenue requires that fingerprint submissions be made as part of such application, the department of revenue shall require applicants submit the fingerprints to the Missouri state highway patrol for the purpose of conducting a state and federal fingerprint-based criminal history background check.” Since the language of the proposal is permissive, Oversight will range DOR’s fiscal impact from \$0 to the amount provided.

In addition, **Oversight** notes the current fingerprint-based background check fee is \$44.75. The State portion of that fee is \$20 + \$2 retained from the federal fee. Based on DOR’s estimate of 8,000 applications annually, the potential income into the Criminal Records System Fund (0671) could be as much as \$176,000 annually attributable to the number of background checks required by DOR alone. However, as stated earlier, the provisions of this proposal are permissive and other state agencies, boards and committees are no longer mandated to require applicants submit fingerprints when seeking various licenses or permits. Therefore, Oversight will range income into the Criminal Records System Fund as \$0 to Could exceed \$176,000 for each FY26, FY27 and FY28.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 992), officials from the **Springfield Police Department (PD)** stated the PD would likely be completing more fingerprint appointments than are currently done. This increase could cause the PD to need to hire another full-time employee.

Oversight assumes Springfield PD's impact is speculative at this point as there is no guarantee they would see a significant increase in the number of fingerprint appointments scheduled. In addition, of the local law enforcement agencies responding (see below), no other law enforcement agency anticipated a fiscal impact. Therefore, Oversight assumes the potential increase in the number of fingerprint appointments scheduled by the Springfield PD will not be significant enough to require the hiring of additional FTE. Oversight will present no fiscal impact for this agency for the provisions of this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 992), officials from the **University of Missouri (UM)** stated this bill would only create a fiscal cost for the University if UM chooses to pay licensure costs for individuals in the covered licensed professions/occupations (including the fingerprint costs associated with the bill).

Oversight assumes the University would not incur significant costs if it chooses to cover the cost of background checks for potential employees and the cost would be absorbable within the current funding levels of the University. Therefore, Oversight will present no fiscal impact to the University.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 992), officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal could be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation costs.

Oversight notes that in response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 992), officials from the **Missouri Lottery Commission (Lottery or Commission)** stated the proposal appears to remove §43.543 which states Lottery along with other agencies shall submit fingerprints to the MHP to check a person's criminal history. Other agencies are specifically added to the draft legislation but the Lottery is not. However, 313.220 provides the following:

2. The commission shall have the authority to require a fingerprint background check on any person seeking employment or employed by the commission, any person seeking contract with or contracted to the commission and any person seeking license from or licensed by the commission. The background check shall include a check of the Missouri criminal records repository and when the commission deems it necessary to perform a nationwide criminal history check, a check of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's criminal records file. Fingerprints shall be submitted to the Missouri criminal records repository as required. Notwithstanding the provisions of §610.120, the commission shall have access to closed criminal history information when fingerprints are submitted. The commission shall not prohibit a person from participating in the sale of lottery tickets solely on the basis of the person being found guilty of any criminal offense; except that, the person shall not be eligible to be a licensed lottery game retailer under subsection 2 of section 313.260.

Therefore, the Lottery assumes the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present no fiscal impact for this proposal as provided by the Lottery.

In response similar legislation from the prior year (HCS HB 1800), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** stated there may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Oversight notes the following: “The office of state courts administrator may require that fingerprint submissions be made as part of the application of certification as a qualified interpreter...” and “The Missouri supreme court may require that fingerprint submissions be made as part of an application of licensure for admission or reinstatement to the Missouri Bar in order to engage in the practice of law or law business...”.

For purposes of this fiscal note, **Oversight** assumes OSCA will not pay the cost of fingerprint-based criminal history background checks rather the applicant would, if required. Therefore, Oversight will not show a fiscal impact to OSCA.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 992), officials from the **Department of Public Safety (DPS), Divisions of: Capitol Police and Missouri Gaming Commission, the Office of the State Public Defender, the Phelps County Sheriff’s Department, the Branson Police Department, the St. Louis County Police Department, Northwest Missouri State University and the Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** 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 in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§§320.111, 320.116 and 320.147 – Provisions governing fireworks

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety (DPS) – Division of Fire Safety (DFS)** state the DFS took the average of each type of permit over the past three fiscal years and multiplied it by the current and proposed new fees. From the totals, the DFS figured the difference and calculated the proposed 80/20 split between fund 0821 (Firefighter Training) and 0927 (Fire Safe Cigarette). Since the fund split is a new proposal, the ATC then took the low and high revenues over the past three fiscal years to calculate the split and add the fee increase. This would cause an increase in revenues to the Firefighter Training Fund of approximately \$83,520 to \$85,534 annually and an increase to the Fire Safe Cigarette Fund of approximately \$61,241 to \$63,255 annually.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present the fiscal impact of this proposal as provided by DPS-DFS.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HCS HB 806), officials from the **Attorney General's Office (AGO)** assumed any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal could be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation costs.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present no fiscal impact of this proposal as provided by the AGO.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HCS HB 806), officials from the **City of O'Fallon** and the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** 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 in the fiscal note.

In response to a previous version of HB 806, officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

§287.243 – Line of Duty Compensation Act

Oversight notes, based on information requested for a Sunset Review (2024), DOLIR provided the following information related to line of duty compensation claims paid for fiscal years FY 2019 through FY 2024, as shown in the table below:

Fiscal Year	Total Claims	Total Paid
2019	8	\$200,000
2020	6	\$150,000
2021	10	\$250,000
2022*	24	\$600,000
2023	8	\$200,000
2024	6	\$150,000
Total	62	\$1,550,000

*Seventeen of the 24 payments were due to COVID-19.

DOLIR further stated that while there are no outstanding claims at this time, there are currently five cases on appeal. Additionally, four (4) pending cases for FY 2025 have been received to date.

Oversight notes it is unknown how many individuals may be killed in the line of duty in any particular year; however, the annual average has been 8 $[(8+6+10+6+8) / 5]$ excluding FY 2022, due to the increase in COVID related deaths. Currently, the amount of compensation per claimant is \$25,000. Therefore, on average the compensation line of duty compensation paid was \$200,000 annually.

Oversight notes this act extends the sunset, from its original end date, on June 19, 2025 until December 31, 2031. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the continuous cost of this proposal, beginning of FY 2026, that could more or less the average expenditure of \$200,000 annually in the fiscal note (excluding FY 2022).

Officials from the **Oversight Division** stated the Division is responsible for providing a Sunset Report pursuant to §23.253, RSMo; however, Oversight will be able to absorb the cost with the current budget authority.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety (DPS)- Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** defer to the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations – Division of Workers’ Compensation for a response regarding the potential fiscal impact of this section.

§292.606 – Fees paid to the Missouri Emergency Response Commission

Officials from the **DPS – State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA)** state that currently, authorization for the collection of fees for hazardous chemicals in the workplace, which funds the Missouri Emergency Response Commission (MERC), was not reauthorized under HB 1870 (2024) and was allowed to expire on August 28, 2024. HB 1870 (2024) would have extended the authorization for six years to August 28, 2030.

The mission of the MERC is to protect public health and the environment by assisting communities with chemical incident prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery; and by receiving, processing, and reporting on chemical information under the community right-to-know laws. The program has been in existence since the late 1980s and has provided training and assistance to local communities to be compliant with the federal EPCRA laws.

Current law allowed for the collection of data and fees. In fiscal year 2023, the amount collected was approximately \$1,001,410 with \$598,495 of this fund being redistributed to the locals, \$92,076 distributed to the Missouri Division of Fire Safety for hazardous materials training and the remaining \$230,190 was retained by the MERC to operate the program and to provide a match for federal funds that allow additional hazardous materials planning and training for local first responders. The chemical storage facility owners and gas station owners must pay an annual fee based on the type and amount of chemicals they store at their facility.

This proposal would allow a one-time fee to be calculated based on the normal filing due March 1, 2025 and will be paid by November 1, 2025.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present the fiscal impact of this proposal as revenue coming into the Chemical Emergency Preparedness Fund of \$834,508 in FY 2026 and \$1,001,410 in FY 2027 and subsequent years.

Oversight notes the Chemical Emergency Preparedness Fund (0587) had a fund balance of \$698,599 on December 31, 2024.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HCS HB 70), officials from the **Phelps County Sheriff**, the **Branson Police Department** and the **St. Louis County Police Department** 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 in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§537.046 – Nondisclosure Agreements in Child Sexual Abuse Cases

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 709), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator**, the **Office of the State Public Defender** and the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** 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 in the fiscal note for these agencies.

In response to similar legislation from the current session (HB 709), officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal could be absorbed with existing resources. However, the AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation.

Bill as a whole

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Administrative Hearing Commission**, the **Department of Commerce and Insurance**, the **Department of Economic Development**, the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the **Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development**, the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Mental Health**, the **Department of Natural Resources**, the **Department of Corrections**, the **Department of Public Safety, Divisions of: Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Director's Office, Missouri Highway Patrol and Missouri Veterans Commission**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Office of the Governor**, the **Missouri Department of Conservation**, the **Missouri Department of Transportation**, the **MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System**, the **Office of Administration**, the **Office of the State Treasurer**, the **City of Kansas City**, the **Kansas City Police Department**, the **University of Central Missouri**, the **Missouri Lottery Commission** and the **Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan** each assume the proposal will have no 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.

Rule Promulgation

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assume this proposal is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** note 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 its 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.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028
GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
<u>Costs – (\$287.243) – Line of Duty Compensation Sunset Extension to December 31, 2031 p.9-10</u>	More or Less than <u>(\$200,000)</u>	More or Less than <u>(\$200,000)</u>	More or Less than <u>(\$200,000)</u>
<u>Costs – DOR (\$301.551) p.3-6</u>	\$0 to...	\$0 to...	\$0 to...
Personal service	(\$77,412)	(\$94,752)	(\$96,647)
Fringe benefits	(\$57,347)	(\$69,561)	(\$70,320)
Equipment and expense	(\$20,990)	\$0	\$0
Contract programming costs	(\$67,318)	\$0	\$0
Total Costs - DOR	(\$223,067)	(\$164,313)	(\$166,967)
FTE Change - DOR	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>More or Less than (\$423,067)</u>	<u>More or Less than (\$364,313)</u>	<u>More or Less than (\$366,967)</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change on the General Revenue Fund	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028
CRIMINAL RECORDS SYSTEM FUND (0671)			
<u>Income</u> – MHP (§301.551) – fingerprint background check fees p. 6	\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000	\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000	\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE CRIMINAL RECORDS SYSTEM FUND	<u>\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000</u>	<u>\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000</u>	<u>\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000</u>
FIRE EDUCATION FUND (0821)			
<u>Income</u> – DPS-DFS – increase in license and permit fees (§320.111.10) p.8	Up to \$71,278	Up to \$85,534	Up to \$85,534
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE FIRE EDUCATION FUND	<u>Up to \$71,278</u>	<u>Up to \$85,534</u>	<u>Up to \$85,534</u>
CIGARETTE FIRE SAFETY & FIREFIGHTER PROTECTION FUND (0937)			
<u>Income</u> – DPS-DFS – increase in license and permit fees (§320.111.10) p.8	Up to \$52,712	Up to \$63,255	Up to \$63,255
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE CIGARETTE FIRE SAFETY & FIREFIGHTER PROTECTION FUND	<u>Up to \$52,712</u>	<u>Up to \$63,255</u>	<u>Up to \$63,255</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028
CHEMICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND (0587)			
<u>Income</u> – SEMA (§292.606) – renewal of annual fees p. 10	\$834,508	\$1,001,410	\$1,001,410
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE CHEMICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND	<u>\$834,508</u>	<u>\$1,001,410</u>	<u>\$1,001,410</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

This proposal will impact small businesses that are required to have background checks performed before receiving licenses to operate. In addition, should any new or existing small businesses be unable to pass the state or federal criminal record check, they would be unable to do business in Missouri. (§301.551)

This proposal will negatively impact small businesses that sell fireworks as licensure fees are increased. (§320.111)

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal extends the sunset date to December 31, 2031 for the Line of Duty Compensation Act unless reauthorized by the general assembly. (§287.243)

This bill extends the authority of the Missouri Emergency Response Commission to collect fees from August 28, 202, to August 28, 2031. A one-time fee shall be calculated and shall be paid by November 1, 2025. (§292.606)

This bill modifies provisions related to criminal background checks.

The bill provides that the specified entities may require applicants seeking various licenses or permits to submit fingerprints to the Missouri State Highway Patrol for the purpose of undergoing state and federal criminal background checks.

The fingerprints and any required fees will be sent to the MSHP central repository and will be forwarded to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The MSHP will notify the respective agency, board, or other oversight body of their applicants' criminal history or lack thereof. (§301.551)

Currently, all fees collected for permits are deposited to the credit of the Fire Education Fund. This bill requires that the fees be deposited as follows:

- (1) 80% into the Fire Education Fund; and
- (2) 20% into the Cigarette Fire Safety Standard and Firefighter Protection Act (§320.111)

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

Attorney General's Office
Office of Administration - Administrative Hearing Commission
Department of Commerce and Insurance
Department of Economic Development
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Mental Health
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Corrections
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Revenue
Department of Public Safety –
 Alcohol and Tobacco Control
 Capitol Police
 Fire Safety
 Director's Office
 Missouri Gaming Commission
 Missouri Highway Patrol
 Missouri Veterans Commission
 State Emergency Management Agency
Department of Social Services
Office of the Governor
Missouri Department of Conservation

Missouri Department of Transportation
MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System
Office of Administration
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Public Defender
Office of the State Treasurer
University of Missouri
City of Kansas City
City of O'Fallon
Phelps County Sheriff
Branson Police Department
Kansas City Police Department
Springfield Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
Northwest Missouri State University
University of Central Missouri
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Oversight Division
Missouri Lottery Commission
Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Courts Administrator



Julie Morff
Director
May 5, 2025



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
May 5, 2025