

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 1178H.08C
Bill No.: HCS for SS for SCS for SB 71
Subject: Higher Education; Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development;
Professional Registration and Licensing; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies
Type: Original
Date: April 22, 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	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
General Revenue*	(\$1,142,655)	More or less than (\$1,736,147)	More or less than (\$2,517,449)	More or less than (\$5,191,562)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	(\$1,142,655)	More or less than (\$1,736,147)	More or less than (\$2,517,449)	More or less than (\$5,191,562)

* **Oversight** notes the Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund is subject to appropriation by the General Assembly and awarded by the DHEWD. If changes to the program are not funded, the impact will be \$0. DHEWD's estimate includes cost for loan services, 1 FTE, and grants to cover the cost of tuition and fees at Missouri public postsecondary institutions for public safety officers and first responders from Section 173.2655. Costs include increases to the Line of Duty Compensation Act from §287.243.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund*	\$0	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
Various State Funds**	Less than \$250,000	Less than \$250,000	Less than \$250,000	Less than \$250,000
Criminal Records System Fund (0671)	\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000	\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000	\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000	\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000
College & Universities	\$0	\$0 or More or less than \$630,202	\$0 or More or less than \$1,323,384	\$0 or More or less than \$3,818,622
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	Could exceed \$426,000	More or less than \$1,056,202	More or less than \$1,749,384	More or less than \$4,244,622

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
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 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
General Revenue				2 to 4 FTE

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
	1 to 3 FTE	1 to 3 FTE	1 to 3 FTE	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	1 to 3 FTE	1 to 3 FTE	1 to 3 FTE	2 to 4 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	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
Local Government	(Unknown, More or Less than \$1,166,667)	(Unknown, More or Less than \$1,500,000)	(Unknown, More or Less than \$1,500,000)	(Unknown, More or Less than \$1,500,000)

*The fine revenue for a Class A Misdemeanor offense goes to local school districts and court costs go to various state and local funds. Section 574.207.2

*Increasing the sheriff deputies' salary to \$50,000 would have significant cost to local subdivisions. Section 57.530

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§§34.069 & 34.074 - Veterans preferences for contracts

In response to similar legislation, HB 714 (2025), officials from the **Office of Administration – Purchasing Division (OA)** assumed the proposed legislation will require OA Purchasing to include bid language and create procedures around evaluation and monitoring of the preference points.

OA-Purchasing believes that the impact of this bill for its implementation in OA-Purchasing is less than \$10,000. However, until the FY26 budget is finalized, specific funding sources cannot be identified.

At this time, it is believed that the additional staff time and resources can be absorbed by OA-Purchasing. However, if there are multiple pieces of legislation passed where OA-Purchasing has responded that the costs can be absorbed, OA-Purchasing would need to reevaluate to see if additional staff and associated expenses would then be required.

In response to similar legislation HB 714 (2025), officials from the **Office of Administration - Facilities Management, Design and Construction (FMDC)** assumed the proposed legislation will require OA FMDC to include bid language and create procedures around evaluation and monitoring of the preference points. OA-FMDC believes that the impact of this bill for its implementation in OA-FMDC is less than \$10,000. However, until the FY26 budget is finalized, specific funding sources cannot be identified. At this time, it is believed that the additional staff time and resources can be absorbed by OA-FMDC. However, if there are multiple pieces of legislation passed where OA-FMDC has responded that the costs can be absorbed, OA-FMDC would need to reevaluate to see if additional staff and associated expenses would then be required.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note as it is noted OA Purchasing and FMDC can absorb the cost of the proposal.

§§43.546, 190.106, 301.551, and 335.022 – 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. =	\$351
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. =	\$2,082
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. =	\$521
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, HCS for HB 1800 (2024), 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, HB 992 (2025), 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, HB 992 (2025), officials from the **University of Missouri** 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, HB 992 (2025), 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 to similar legislation, HCS for HB 1800 (2024), 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.

§57.530 – Sheriff of the City of St. Louis

In response to similar legislation, SB 192 (2025), officials from the **Sheriff’s Retirement System** assumed the impact is unknown at this time. The sheriff department identified in this legislation is part of the retirement system and benefits are determined based on the salary. This legislation sets the minimum salary for the sheriff not the maximum. Once the salary is known, an impact could be calculated.

Oversight does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect the unknown estimate as provided by the Sheriff’s Retirement System.

In response to similar legislation from 2024, Perfected SB 1363, officials from the **City of St. Louis** assumed this proposal would fix the compensation for Sheriff’s deputies within the City of St. Louis to be no less than \$50,000 annually. Based on the number of deputies and salaries included in the FY24 budget this would increase costs of the Sheriff’s department by an

estimated \$2.0M per year including pay and benefits. The FY24 budget for the Sheriff authorizes 170 total positions. Of this total there are budgeted 151 deputies with an average salary of \$39,333. The differential between this average salary and the \$50,000 is \$10,667. Multiply this amount by the 151 positions and the total increase in salaries would amount to \$1.6M. Adding fringe benefits (social security, life insurance, pension, etc.) would bring total costs to just over \$2M per year.

Oversight does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimates as provided by the City of St. Louis.

§70.630 - LAGERS

In response to similar legislation, SB 514 (2025), officials from the **Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement (JCPER)** assumed the bill has no direct fiscal impact to the Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement. Their review indicates it will not affect retirement plan benefits as defined in Section 105.660(9).

In response to a similar proposal, SB 514 (2025), officials from the **Local Government Employees Retirement System (LAGERS)** assumed that the additional modifications to provisions in RSMo 70.630 were technical clean-up to the system's existing statutes and are assumed to have no fiscal impact on the system.

§§87.140, 87.145, & 87.260 - St. Louis Pension Administration

In response to similar legislation, HB 205 (2025), officials from the **Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement (JCPER)** stated the review of HB 205 indicates that its provisions may constitute a “substantial proposed change” in future plan benefits as defined in section 105.660(10). It is impossible to accurately determine the fiscal impact of this legislation without an actuarial cost statement prepared in accordance with section 105.665. Pursuant to section 105.670, an actuarial cost statement must be filed with the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement as public information for at least five legislative days prior to final passage.

In response to similar legislation, HB 205 (2025), officials from the **City of St. Louis** stated the proposed legislation would allow the trustees of the Firemen's Retirement System (FRS, a plan that was frozen in 2013) to act as trustees of the newer Firefighters' Retirement Plan (FRP) which originated in 2013 as part of a pension plan reform effort to address rising costs partly due to failures under the old FRS board. The reform was successful and has reduced pension costs which had been rising to an increasingly greater proportion of operating costs of the Fire Department. The proposed legislation jeopardizes the progress made through this reform effort.

Oversight notes this proposal allows the Board of the Firemen's Retirement Plan of St. Louis to act on behalf of all other city firefighter retirement plans in St. Louis City including the Firefighter's Retirement Plan of St. Louis.

Oversight assumes any decision by the Board to alter retirement benefits for the Firefighter's Retirement Plan of St. Louis would be an indirect impact. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

Oversight did not receive a response from the Firemen's Retirement Plan of St. Louis or the Firefighter's Retirement Plan of St. Louis 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.

§173.2655 - Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Act

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development (DHEWD)** assumed this legislation creates two new sections, 173.2655 and 173.2660, which establishes the "Public Safety recruitment and Retention Act." This act creates a grant for public safety officers and first responders (dispatchers, EMTs, fire fighters, paramedics, and police officers) to cover the cost of tuition and fees at Missouri public postsecondary institutions after working for 6 years, and for their dependents after working 10 years.

According to data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics Program (BLS – OEWS), there are 29,050 full-time public safety officers and first responders in the state (3,190 dispatchers, 3,670 EMTs, 5,570 fire fighters, 3,550 paramedics, and 13,070 police officers). Although the legislation limits this award to those with at least six years of service, the best available data, from Zippia.com, indicates that just over 44 percent of public safety officers and first responders have been on the job for at least five years, and that 47.5 percent have below a bachelor's degree. Assuming a three percent utilization rate for those meeting the eligibility criteria, the department estimates that **183 individuals** would be eligible ($29,050 * 44.2 \text{ percent with eligible service} * 47.5 \text{ percent below a bachelor's degree} * 3 \text{ percent utilization}$).

Additionally, this allows the dependents of public safety officers and first responders, who have at least 10 years of service (19 percent), to receive this grant, which would include spouses and children. According to Pew Research, about 53 percent of individuals are married, and Census data indicates that 68 percent of adults have below a bachelor's degree. Applying national enrollment trends by age on the population, they estimate that around three percent of Missourians between the ages of 25 and 64 attend college, which would result in **60 eligible spouses** ($29,050 * 19 \text{ percent with 10 years of service} * 53 \text{ percent that are married} * 68 \text{ percent below a bachelor's degree} * \text{three percent utilization}$). Further, Pew Research estimates that 19 percent of families have children, and the average family size is 1.9 children. Of those, roughly 9.5 percent are 18-24, of which 80 percent will stay in state and 60 percent will attend a public postsecondary institution, resulting in **91 eligible children** ($29,050 * 19 \text{ percent with 10 years of service} * 19 \text{ percent with children} * 1.9 \text{ children} * 9.5 \text{ percent of college going age} * 80 \text{ percent staying in-state} * 60 \text{ percent attending a public college or university}$).

This results in **334 individuals eligible for the award**. If they assume that roughly 32 percent attend community colleges (where tuition and fees average \$5,140 a year for full-time students) and 68 percent attend a public four-year institution (where tuition and fees average \$11,418.73 a year for full-time students), they get a total of \$3.13 million. Because these individuals have been working in their positions at least six years, the department does not believe they would be Pell or Fast Track eligible, and only a negligible amount would be eligible to receive a small Access Missouri award.

Upon further inquiry, DHE provided ITSD estimate. **OA-ITSD** states the project would take 1,587.60 hours at a contract rate of \$105 for a total cost of **\$166,698** in FY 2026 with on-going support costs of **\$34,173** in FY 2027 and **\$35,027** in FY 2028.

Oversight notes DHEWD is assuming a three percent utilization rate for those meeting the eligibility criteria. Oversight has calculated the below based on DHEWD's methodology to show a range of utilization rates. However, Oversight is unable to determine how many individuals will be eligible or utilize the grant. Oversight further assumes transfers-in and grants provided will net to \$0.

Percentage utilization/ individuals eligible	Cost
1% / 111	\$1,043,333
2% / 222	\$2,086,667
3% / 334	\$3,138,180
6% / 518	\$6,260,000
9% / 640	\$9,390,000
12% / 883	\$12,520,000

Oversight notes DHEWD is assuming a three percent utilization rate for those utilizing these programs. Oversight assumes there will be a gradual rise in participation as students receive the award over several years and new students are added to the participant group; therefore, Oversight will reflect a step up in participation. In response to similar legislation HCS for HB Nos. 1514, 1525, and 1527, DHE provided the average award amounts for students receiving the award, which included a 5% inflation rate for award amounts. Therefore, using their estimates and Oversight calculations for stepped up participation, Oversight will reflect the cost below:

R&R	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY29	FY30	FY31
student	0	67	134	200	267	334
avg. award	\$0	\$9,406	\$9,876	\$10,370	\$10,889	\$11,433
award sub.	\$0	\$630,202	\$1,323,384	\$2,074,000	\$2,907,363	\$3,818,622

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 71 (2025), officials from the **University of Missouri System** assumed that 120 credit hours tuition cost \$54,600 in academic year 2025. This fiscal impact would be this amount multiplied by the number of students who were eligible to receive this waiver, which they cannot estimate at this time.

Oversight notes the University of Missouri's response indicates an average cost per credit hour of \$455 (\$54,600/ 120 hours) for academic year 2025.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 71 (2025), officials from **Northwest Missouri State University** assumed potential material fiscal impact; volume is unknown and state funding is not guaranteed; also costly to manage because their system will not automatically manage the criteria for eligibility and continuation; the five-year residency in MO will be difficult to track and they will not be able to utilize the debt offset in MO so there will ultimately be no payback of the funds.

Oversight assumes this award could act as an incentive for students to attend college and community colleges. However, it is unclear how many students would have already been college bound and what percentage would attend only due to this new incentive. Therefore, Oversight assumes there could be an increase in student enrollment which would result in an increase in revenue to the colleges and community colleges for \$0 to Unknown.

Officials from **DHEWD** estimate that the fiscal impact for FY 2026 is between zero and \$241,673, to stand up the program. The department estimates this program will go into effect in FY 2027 and estimates the fiscal impact to be between zero and \$3.25 million. Assuming an annual inflationary increase of five percent per year, the costs for FY 2028 would range from zero to \$3.41 million.

In response to similar legislation, HB 1525 (2025), officials from the **Office of Budget and Planning** assumed this proposal creates the "Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund" to support public safety tuition awards. This fund does not have a dedicated source; transfers from General Revenue would be subject to appropriation. There are no limits on awards and is subject to appropriation. There is no direct impact on Total State Revenues.

The DPS provided the current number of commissioned peace officers (law enforcement officer) count in the table below.

Full-time Peace Officers	14,307
Reserve Peace Officers	1,568
Officers Not Working and Not Expired	7,833
Active Agencies	597
Firefighters	22,000

Section 173.2660 - provisions for "Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Act"

Officials from **DHEWD** assume section 173.2660 requires the recipients of this award to remain in the state for five years and provide tax documentation to the department. For those who fail to remain in Missouri or file taxes over this five-year period, the grant would convert to a loan, which would require repayment. The department would need to contract with a loan servicer to

handle this repayment and estimates that initial costs include at least \$20,000 in set up fees, and that ongoing costs would include \$25 per loan for onboarding and \$3.50 per loan per month servicing fee. Beyond the initial set up fees, these costs will not be immediate and will only be incurred later in the life of the program.

Oversight notes the servicer of the loans shall be the **Higher Education Loan Authority of the State of Missouri (MOHELA)**. However, without a response from MOHELA, Oversight will reflect the estimated impact by DHEWD in the fiscal note of \$20,000 in FY 2027 for loan servicing set up fee and a zero (no repayments) or unknown cost starting in FY 2028.

Oversight notes, if a recipient of the award does not remain a Missouri resident for five years after accepting the award and does not garnish tax returns the recipient agreed that the award would be treated as a loan. Therefore, Oversight assumes repayment of the award through this loan process will result in an income to the Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund as \$0 to Unknown as it is unclear how many award recipients would be in violation.

§287.243 – Line of duty compensation awards

In response to similar legislation HB 365 (2025), officials from the **Office of Administration (OA)** stated section 287.243.3 increases the workers' compensation benefit for the death of a public safety officer killed in the line of duty from \$25,000 to \$100,000 beginning August 28, 2025, and increasing with the consumer price index beginning calendar year 2025. This would increase expenses to the state in workers' compensation cases where such benefits are due. Potential costs to the state are unknown as it would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case.

Officials from the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DOLIR)** state no direct fiscal impact to the Division of Workers' Compensation; however, an increased amount of General Revenue transfer authority will likely be necessary to cover the increased compensation amount and estimated increase in claims filed. The expected increase is between \$200,000 and \$400,000 including the cost-of-living increase based on the consumer price index.

Officials from the **DOC** defer to the **DOLIR** for the potential fiscal impact of this provision.

Oversight notes the DOLIR, upon request for purpose of the Sunset Review of this statute (2024), provided 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. This proposal increases the payout to \$100,000. Oversight estimates the increased cost at \$600,000 (8 claimants times \$75,000) per year beginning in FY 2026.

Oversight notes the compensation shall be adjusted annually by the percent increase in the Consumer Price Index. Assuming 2% inflation per year, Oversight estimates the following impact for FY 2027 and FY 2028 respectively \$612,000 and \$624,240.

In response to similar legislation HB 365 (2025), officials from the **Department of Corrections**, the **Department of Public Safety (Office of the Director, Capitol Police, Alcohol & Tobacco Control, Fire Safety, Gaming Commission, State Emergency Management Agency and Veterans Commission)** and the **Missouri Department of Transportation** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations for this proposal.

In response to similar legislation HB 365 (2025), officials from the **Department of Public Safety – Highway Patrol** deferred to the Missouri Department of Transportation for the potential fiscal impact of this proposal.

In response to similar legislation HB 365 (2025), officials from the **University of Central Missouri** and the **Missouri University System** both assumed the proposal will have no 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 colleges and universities.

In response to similar legislation HB 365 (2025), officials from the **City of Kansas City**, the **Phelps County Sheriff Department**, the **Kansas City Police Department**, and the **St. Louis**

County Police Department each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation from 2024 (HB 1732), officials from the **Eureka Fire Protection District – St. Louis** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

§§569.170 and 569.175 – Offenses Involving Motor Vehicles

Officials from the Department of Corrections (DOC) state this proposal modifies provisions relating to public safety.

569.170

The bill creates a new class D felony when a person unlawfully enters into a motor vehicle with the intent to commit any felony or theft, and a class C felony when the burglary is committed with the possession of a firearm.

For each new nonviolent class D felony, the department estimates three people could be sentenced to prison and five to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class D felony offense is 5 years, of which 2.8 years could be served in prison with 1.7 years to first release. The remaining 2.2 years could be on parole. Probation sentences could be 3 years.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation-Class D Felony (nonviolent)

	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030	FY2031	FY2032	FY2033	FY2034	FY2035
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

For each new class C felony, the department estimates four people could be sentenced to prison and six to probation. The average sentence for a class C felony offense is 6.9 years, of which 3.7 years could be served in prison with 2.1 years to first release. The remaining 3.2 years could be on parole. Probation sentences could be 3 years.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation-Class C Felony

	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030	FY2031	FY2032	FY2033	FY2034	FY2035
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	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Probations	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	4	8	12	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
Parole				1	5	9	13	13	13	13
Probation	6	12	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
Impact										
Prison Population	4	8	12	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
Field Population	6	12	18	19	23	27	31	31	31	31
Population Change	10	20	30	34	38	42	46	46	46	46

569.175

The bill creates a new Non-violent class E felony when unlawfully gaining entry into a motor vehicle.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the department estimates one person could 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 could be served in prison with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years could be on parole. Probation sentences could be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 2 additional offenders in prison and 7 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2028.

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

Combined Cumulative Estimated Impact

The impact of a new class D felony, a new C felony and a new class E violent felony on the department is estimated to be 29 additional offenders in prison and 59 on field supervision by FY 2032.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030	FY2031	FY2032	FY2033	FY2034	FY2035
New Admissions										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Probation										
Current Law	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
After Legislation	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Probations	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	9	18	26	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
Parole	0	0	1	7	14	18	22	22	22	22
Probation	12	24	36	37	37	37	37	37	37	37
Impact										
Prison Population	9	18	26	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
Field Population	12	24	37	44	51	55	59	59	59	59
Population Change	21	42	63	73	80	84	88	88	88	88

* If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it could be due to an increase/decrease in the number of offenders, a change in the cost per day for institutional offenders, and/or an increase in staff salaries.

If the projected impact of legislation is less than 1,500 offenders added to or subtracted from the department's institutional caseload, the marginal cost of incarceration will be utilized. This cost of incarceration is \$28.73 per day or an annual cost of \$10,485 per offender and includes such costs as medical, food, and operational E&E. However, if the projected impact of legislation is 1,500 or more offenders added or removed to the department's institutional caseload, the full cost of incarceration will be used, which includes fixed costs. This cost is \$100.25 per day or an annual cost of \$36,591 per offender and includes personal services, all institutional E&E, medical and mental health, fringe, and miscellaneous expenses. None of these costs include construction to increase institutional capacity.

If the incarcerated population impact of any one piece of legislation, or combined impact of multiple pieces of legislation, results in a prison population that exceeds the current physical capacity of 26,835, the state would need to construct additional capacity. Based on current construction projects in other Midwest states, the department estimates the cost of constructing a new 1,500-bed maximum security prison at approximately \$825 million to \$900 million.

DOC's cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that are needed to cover its caseload. The DOC average district caseload across the state is 51 offender cases per officer. An increase/decrease of 51 cases would result in a cost/cost avoidance equal to the salary, fringe, and equipment and expenses of one P&P Officer II. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offender cases 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.

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

Oversight notes that with the combined impact the DOC would require an FTE in FY 2030 to handle the additional case load. Oversight notes due to the structure of the note the cost for the FTE will be shown in FY 2031. However, Oversight notes there would be a cost of \$426,602 in FY 2030 for the FTE for DOC.

In response to similar legislation, HB 117 (2025), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** stated per the National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charge contemplated by the changes to Sections 569.170 and 569.175 would take approximately thirty-five hours of SPD work for reasonably effective representation. If one hundred cases were filed under this section in a fiscal year, representation would result in a need for an additional one to two attorneys. Because the number of cases that will be filed under this statute is unknown, the exact additional number of attorneys necessary is unknown. Each case would also result in unknown increased costs in the need for core staff, travel, and litigation expenses.

Oversight assumes this proposal will not create the number of new cases required to request additional FTE for the SPD and that the SPD can absorb the additional caseload required by this proposal with current staff and resources. Therefore, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact to the SPD for fiscal note purposes. However, if multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties, the SPD may request funding through the appropriation process.

In response to similar legislation, HB 117 (2025), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assumed the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS. The enactment of new crimes [569.170 and 569.175] create additional responsibilities for county prosecutors and the circuit attorney which may, in turn, result in additional costs, which are difficult to determine.

In response to similar legislation, HB 117 (2025), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§574.207 – Offense of Interference with a First Responder

In response to similar legislation, SB 669 (2025), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assumed the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS. The enactment of a new crime creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors

and the circuit attorney which may, in turn, result in additional costs, which are difficult to determine.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present no fiscal impact for MOPS.

In response to similar legislation, SB 669 (2025), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender**, the **Phelps County Sheriff**, and the **St. Louis County Police Department** and the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** each assumed 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.

Oversight notes the provisions of §574.207.2 provide that a person who interferes with a first responder is guilty of a class A misdemeanor. Class A misdemeanors carry a penalty of \$2,000 for each offense in addition to any individual county/municipal fees and court costs. The fine revenue for the offense goes to local school funds and court costs go to various state and local funds. Oversight assumes there will be some (less than \$250,000) amount of fine revenue from violations of the statute. Therefore, the impact to various state funds and local governments will be presented as less than \$250,000. For simplicity, Oversight will not reflect the possibility that fine revenue paid to school districts may act as a subtraction in the foundation formula.

Below are examples of some of the state and local funds 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
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

§590.100 – Peace Officer License Requirements

In response to similar legislation, HB 981 (2025), officials from the **Springfield Police Department** indicated the proposal would have an impact on their organization. However, no other information was provided. Therefore, **Oversight** assumes any impact that may occur would be minimal and absorbable within current funding levels and will present no impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to similar legislation, HB 981 (2025), officials from the **Phelps County Sheriff** and the **St. Louis County Police Department** each assumed 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.

Bill as Whole

Officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assume any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal can 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 does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the AGO will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the AGO for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Administrative Hearing Commission, Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Mental Health, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Public Safety (Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Fire Safety, Director's Office, Gaming Commission, Highway Patrol, State Emergency Management Agency, Veterans Commission), Department of Social Services, Missouri Department of Agriculture, Missouri Department of Conservation, Missouri Ethics Commission, Missouri Department of Transportation, National Guard, MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System, Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund, University of Missouri, Kansas City, Jackson County Election Board, Kansas City Election Board, Branson Police Department, Kansas City Police Department, Department of Economic Development, Office of the State Auditor, St. Louis County Police Department, Missouri House of Representatives, Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement, Legislative Research, Missouri Senate, Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan, Missouri Office of Prosecution Services, Missouri State Employee's Retirement System, State Tax Commission and the Missouri Lottery** each assume the proposal will have no 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.

The **Oversight Division** is responsible for providing a Sunset Report pursuant to Section 23.253 RSMo; however, they can absorb the cost with the current budget authority

Officials from the **University of Central Missouri** assume the proposal will have an indeterminate fiscal impact. Possible increase in revenue under the section that provides tuition assistance for law enforcement and their dependents.

Officials from **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assume in reference to Fiscal Note Number 1178-08, House Committee Substitute for Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 71 there may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

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.

Oversight only reflects the responses received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other colleges and universities were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. A listing of political subdivisions included in the Missouri Legislative Information System (MOLIS) database is available upon request.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
GENERAL REVENUE				
<u>Costs – DHEWD– Loan servicing - §173.2660 p.14</u>	\$0	(\$20,000)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Costs – DOC (§§569.170 and 569.175) p.18-19</u>				
Personal Service	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$49,224)
Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$36,327)
Exp. & Equip.	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$3,926)
Increased incarceration costs	(\$78,637)	(\$192,504)	(\$283,623)	(\$335,712)
<u>Total Cost - DOC</u>	<u>(\$78,637)</u>	<u>(\$192,504)</u>	<u>(\$283,623)</u>	<u>(\$425,189)</u>
FTE Change - DOC	0 FTE	0 FTE	0 FTE	1 FTE
<u>Costs – DHEWD/ITSD – FAMOUS changes/updates - §173.2655 p.12</u>	(\$166,698)	(\$34,173)	(\$35,027)	(\$37,720)
<u>Costs – DHEWD (§173.2655) p.12</u>				
Personnel Service	(\$36,550)	(\$44,737)	(\$45,632)	(\$48,426)
Fringe Benefits	(\$27,809)	(\$33,723)	(\$34,081)	(\$35,201)
Expense & Equipment	(\$5,399)	\$0	\$0	\$0
ITSD ongoing costs	(\$4,495)	(\$4,495)	(\$4,495)	(\$4,495)
<u>Total Costs – DHEWD (§173.2655) p.12</u>	<u>(\$74,253)</u>	<u>(\$82,955)</u>	<u>(\$84,208)</u>	<u>(\$88,122)</u>
FTE Change	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
<u>Costs – DOR (§301.551) p.5-6</u>	\$0 to...	\$0 to...	\$0 to...	\$0 to...
Personal service	(\$77,412)	(\$94,752)	(\$96,647)	(\$102,563)
Fringe benefits	(\$57,347)	(\$69,561)	(\$70,320)	(\$56,899)
Equipment and expense	(\$20,990)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contract programming costs	(\$67,318)	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Total Costs - DOR</u>	<u>(\$223,067)</u>	<u>(\$164,313)</u>	<u>(\$166,967)</u>	<u>(\$159,462)</u>
FTE Change - DOR	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE	0 to 2 FTE
<u>Transfer out – DHEWD - Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund (§173.2655) p.13</u>	<u>\$0</u>	\$0 or More or less than (\$630,202)	\$0 or More or less than (\$1,323,384)	\$0 or More or less than (\$3,818,622)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
<u>Costs - DOLIR p.15 (\$287.243)</u> Increase claims amount for Line of Duty Comp	<u>(\$600,000)</u>	<u>(\$612,000)</u>	<u>(\$624,240)</u>	Up to <u>(\$662,447)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	<u>(\$1,142,655)</u>	<u>More or less than (\$1,736,147)</u>	<u>More or less than (\$2,517,449)</u>	<u>More or less than (\$5,191,562)</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change on General Revenue	1 to 3 FTE	1 to 3 FTE	1 to 3 FTE	2 to 4 FTE
VARIOUS STATE FUNDS				
<u>Revenue – (\$574.207) Court costs p.20</u>	<u>Less than \$250,000</u>	<u>Less than \$250,000</u>	<u>Less than \$250,000</u>	<u>Less than \$250,000</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON VARIOUS STATE FUNDS	<u>Less than \$250,000</u>	<u>Less than \$250,000</u>	<u>Less than \$250,000</u>	<u>Less than \$250,000</u>
CRIMINAL RECORDS SYSTEM FUND (0671)				
<u>Income – MHP (\$301.551) – fingerprint background check fees p. 8</u>	<u>\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000</u>	<u>\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000</u>	<u>\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000</u>	<u>\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000</u>
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>	<u>\$0 to Could exceed \$176,000</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
PUBLIC SAFETY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION FUND				
<u>Transfer in</u> – from General Revenue to Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund (§173.2655) p.13	\$0	\$0 or More or less than \$630,202	\$0 or More or less than \$1,323,384	\$0 or More or less than \$3,818,622
<u>Income</u> – Award repayment for violation of conditions - (§173.2655) p.13	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Income</u> – gifts, donations, Bequests (§173.2655) p.13	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Transfer out</u> – Distributions of tuition awards from Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund (§173.2655) p.13	\$0	\$0 or More or less than (\$630,202)	\$0 or More or less than (\$1,323,384)	\$0 or More or less than (\$3,818,622)
ESTIMATEDE NET EFFECT ON PUBLIC SAFETY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITIES				
<u>Income</u> – Tuitions awards from Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund (§173.2655) p.13	\$0	\$0 or More or less than \$630,202	\$0 or More or less than \$1,323,384	\$0 or More or less than \$3,818,622
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITIES	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0 or More or less than \$630,202</u>	<u>\$0 or More or less than \$1,323,384</u>	<u>\$0 or More or less than \$3,818,622</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2030)
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS				
<u>Revenue</u> – (§574.207) Court costs p.20	Less than \$250,000	Less than \$250,000	Less than \$250,000	Less than \$250,000
<u>Revenue</u> – Schools (§574.207) Fine revenue p.20	Less than \$250,000	Less than \$250,000	Less than \$250,000	Less than \$250,000
<u>Costs</u> - §57.530 – to increase deputy salaries to \$50k per year p.10	More or Less than (\$1,666,667)	More or Less than (\$2,000,000)	More or Less than (\$2,000,000)	More or Less than (\$2,000,000)
<u>Costs</u> – Sheriff’s Retirement System - proportional increase in fringe benefit costs with an increase in salary for St. Louis City Sheriff Deputies §57.530 p.10	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	<u>(Unknown, More or Less than \$1,166,667)</u>	<u>(Unknown, More or Less than \$1,500,000)</u>	<u>(Unknown, More or Less than \$1,500,000)</u>	<u>(Unknown, More or Less than \$1,500,000)</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. (§301.155)

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal modifies provisions relating to public safety.

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

Department of Commerce and Insurance
Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Corrections
Department of Public Safety- Directors Office
Department of Public Safety- Highway Patrol
Secretary of State
University of Missouri System
Office of the State Treasurer
Southeast Missouri State University
Northwest Missouri State University
Office of Administration - Budget and Planning
Phelps County Sheriff Department
Kansas City Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
University of Central Missouri
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Branson Police Department
Office of Administration
Department of Natural Resources
Missouri Department of Conservation
Missouri Department of Transportation
Missouri National Guard
City of Kansas City
Office of the Secretary of State
Sheriff's Retirement System
City of St. Louis
Attorney General's Office
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of the State Public Defender
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Public Defender
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement
Missouri Local Government Employees Retirement System
Department of Social Services
Springfield Police Department
Kansas City Election Board
Jackson County Board of Elections
Department of Economic Development

L.R. No. 1178H.08C
Bill No. HCS for SS for SCS for SB 71
Page **28** of **28**
April 22, 2025

St. Louis County Police Department
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Office of the State Courts Administrator



Julie Morff
Director
April 22, 2025



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
April 22, 2025