

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 1205H.06C
Bill No.: HCS for SS for SB 43
Subject: Attorneys; Children and Minors; Courts; Courts, Juvenile; Domestic Relations;
Family Law; Department of Mental Health; Department of Social Services;
Division of Youth Services; Crimes and Punishment
Type: Original
Date: May 5, 2025

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to child protection.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
General Revenue	Could exceed (\$12,038,516)	Less than \$10,938,506	Less than \$9,845,753	Less than \$9,819,941
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	Could exceed (\$12,038,516)	Less than \$10,938,506	Less than \$9,845,753	Less than \$9,819,941

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
Child and Family Legal Representation Fund*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Crime Victims' Compensation Fund (0681)	\$442,290	\$442,290	\$442,290	\$442,290
Human Trafficking and Sexual Exploitation Fund*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Facility Maintenance And Operation Fund (#0501)	\$0	\$0	Likely to exceed (\$460,241)	Likely to exceed (\$460,241)
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$442,290	\$442,290	Likely to exceed (\$17,951)	Likely to exceed (\$17,951)

*Fund income less disbursements net to zero.
 Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
Federal Funds*	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

*Fund income less disbursements net to zero.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
General Revenue	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE
State Facility Maintenance And Operation Fund (#0501)	0 FTE	0 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
Federal Funds	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	3 FTE	3 FTE	4 FTE	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 2032)
Local Government*	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§135.341 – Champion for Children Tax Credit

Officials from the **Office of Administration – Budget & Planning (B&P)** state Section 135.341.2 would increase the value of the Champion for Children tax credit to 70% of each contribution beginning with tax year 2025. B&P notes that the three-year average redemption amount was \$1,024,066 from FY22-FY24. Had the tax credits been set at 70% of donations, redemptions would have been \$1,433,692; for an increase of \$409,626 in redemptions. This provision will begin impacting GR in FY26 when annual income tax returns are filed.

B&P notes that this proposal would increase the credit value for tax years beginning 2025. However, this proposal would not be effective until August 28, 2025 – after many individuals have already made their donation and received a certificate with a credit value set at 50%. It is unclear if each impacted individual would need to request a new certificate from the agency where the donation was made.

Section 135.341.3 would increase the annual redemption limit from \$1.5 million to \$2.5 million annually beginning with FY26.

B&P notes that this proposal increases the annual redemption limit by more than the estimated impact of increasing the credit value to 70%. Therefore, B&P estimates that in total, this proposal may reduce TSR and GR by \$409,626 to \$1 million annually beginning in FY26.

Section 135.341.7 makes technical changes to the language waiving any addition to tax, interest, and penalties on taxes due because tax credits being apportioned if the resulting tax due is paid within 60 days.

Section 135.341.9 extends the program sunset to 2031.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** state the Champion of Children Tax Credit program began in 2013 and granted a tax credit equal to 50% of a donation made to a qualified agency. It originally had a \$1 million cap and is an apportioned credit. It is administered by DOR.

The tax credit is able to be carried over to any subsequent 5 tax year. The credit is not assignable, refundable, transferrable, or can be sold. None of these things change with this proposal. The original credit contained a sunset clause which is extended per this proposal.

In 2018, the cap on the credit was increased starting July 1, 2019, to \$1.5 million annually. For informational purposes DOR is showing the amount of credits redeemed annually over the last several years.

Fiscal Year	Apportioned Cap	Total Credit Redeemed
FY 2024	\$1,500,000	\$961,385.26
FY 2023	\$1,500,000	\$1,225,848.00
FY 2022	\$1,500,000	\$884,965.00
FY 2021	\$1,500,000	\$1,339,280.00
FY 2020	\$1,500,000	\$827,942.00
FY 2019	\$1,000,000	\$999,995.00
FY 2018	\$1,000,000	\$999,986.00
FY 2017	\$1,000,000	\$999,873.00
FY 2016	\$1,000,000	\$999,987.00

This proposal starting January 1, 2025, would increase the amount of the credit to 70% of the donated amount. Since this credit has a cap, this change in the percentage rate will not have a fiscal impact. It should be noted that these changes will not be effective until after August 28, 2025. This change in the percentage of the cap will be taken on the tax returns starting January 1, 2026 (FY 2026).

This proposal will also increase the cap on the program from \$1.5 million to \$2.5 million starting July 1, 2025. This will result in an additional loss to general revenue of \$1 million starting FY 2026.

Fiscal Year	Loss to General Revenue
FY 2026	(\$1,000,000)
FY 2027	(\$1,000,000)
FY 2028	(\$1,000,000)

It should be noted that due to the backdating of this proposal to January 1, 2025, many of the taxpayers will already have made their donation and received their tax credit certificate at the 50% rate. It is unclear if new certificates will be required to be issued at the 70% rate.

The proposal will require DOR to make changes to the MO-TC form (\$2,200), and to update their website and make changes to the individual income tax computer system (\$1,832). These changes are estimated to cost \$4,032.

This proposal is adding language that when the credit is apportioned and DOR notifies the taxpayer of the reduced amount of the credit and any additional tax liability owed by the taxpayer from not receiving the full credit, the taxpayer will not owe any interest or penalties on the underpayment as long as they pay within 60 days of the receipt of notice. The current statutes do allow a person to make payment arrangements before instituting any penalties or fees. Therefore, this language would not have a fiscal impact.

Oversight assumes the Department of Revenue (DOR) is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. **Oversight** assumes DOR could absorb the administrative costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, DOR could request funding through the appropriation process.

Oversight notes the last three-year (2022-2024) average redemption totaling \$1,024,066 in tax credits at 50% contribution amounts.

Oversight assumes at the 70% contribution, and three-year average redemption amounts shown above, the taxpayers will be able to receive \$1,433,693 $[(\$1,024,066/0.5) \times 0.70]$. Therefore, the taxpayer could receive up to \$409,627 $(\$1,433,693 - \$1,024,066)$ more at 70% redemption rate. Oversight notes this proposal increases the cap from \$1.5 million to \$2.5 million. This would be an additional cost to general revenue of \$1 million starting in FY 2026. The combined impact would be \$1,409,627 in FY 2026 and FY 2027.

Lastly, Oversight notes the program would sunset as of December 31, 2025 (with redemption occurring in FY 2026) without this proposal. Therefore, Oversight will show an impact up to the full program cap of \$2.5 million in FY 2028 as a continuance of the program beyond the current sunset date.

Officials from the **Oversight Division** state they are responsible for providing a Sunset Report pursuant to Section 23.253 RSMo; however, the Oversight Division can absorb the cost with the current budget authority.

§135.460 – Youth Opportunities Tax Credit

Officials from the **Office of Administration – Budget & Planning (B&P)** note:

This proposal would increase the value of the youth opportunities tax credit to 70% of each contribution. B&P notes that the three-year average redemption amount was \$2,926,896 from FY22 – FY24. B&P further notes that had the tax credits been set at 70% of donations, redemptions would have been \$4,097,655. Therefore, B&P estimates that this provision could reduce GR by \$1,170,759 annually beginning in FY26.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** state the Youth Opportunities tax credit program has a \$6 million cap with the credit based on 50% of the contribution made. For informational purposes we are providing the amount authorized, issued and redeemed for this credit.

Year		Issued	Total Redeemed
FY 2024	\$9,756,101.00	\$4,706,331.00	\$3,468,054.65
FY 2023	\$2,247,858.00	\$4,139,385.00	\$2,987,947.79
FY 2022	\$5,706,067.00	\$3,039,904.00	\$2,324,687.48
FY 2021	\$5,288,870.00	\$1,983,794.00	\$4,084,410.34
FY 2020	\$1,212,623.00	\$4,086,770.50	\$5,217,305.77
FY 2019	\$5,169,666.00	\$5,822,539.00	\$4,040,657.57
FY 2018	\$6,826,426.00	\$5,726,775.00	\$4,818,711.26
FY 2017	\$5,642,936.00	\$6,349,945.00	\$5,451,135.04
FY 2016	\$6,375,728.00	\$5,411,972.00	\$4,706,636.11
FY 2015	\$7,041,012.00	\$5,325,506.00	\$4,247,824.65
FY 2014	\$5,941,601.50	\$5,080,128.00	\$5,239,666.42
FY 2013	\$5,609,784.00	\$5,571,555.00	\$3,906,262.62
FY 2012	\$5,843,692.62	\$4,152,310.83	\$4,979,894.20

This proposal increases the percent of the contribution from 50% to 70% for the amount of the tax credit a person receives. An increase of \$1,170,759. It is unclear if this would encourage more taxpayers to contribute and claim the tax credit. The three-year average of the redemptions of the program has been \$2,926,897. However, since this program has an annual cap, it is not expected to result in any additional impact to the state.

Oversight notes the YOP program expenditures:

	FY 2021 ACTUAL	FY 2022 ACTUAL	FY 2023 ACTUAL
Certificates Issued (#)	974	1,504	1,559
Projects/Participants (#)	36	13	57
Amount Authorized	\$5,706,067	\$2,247,858	\$9,756,101
Amount Issued	\$3,039,904	\$4,139,385	\$4,706,331
Amount Redeemed	\$2,324,687	\$2,987,948	\$3,468,054

DED Form 14

Oversight notes the YOP is a contribution tax credit program, which broadens and strengthens opportunities for positive development and participation in community life for youth and discourages criminal and violent behavior. Individuals, businesses, and corporations having tax liability in Missouri are eligible to receive tax credits for qualified donations to approved YOP projects.

Oversight notes the 3-year average redemption was \$2,926,896 at 50% contribution percentage tax credit.

Oversight notes the 70% contribution tax credit would allow for a total of \$4,097,655 in the same period.

Oversight notes that the difference between 50% and 70% contribution redemption would total to \$1,170,759 (\$4,097,655 - \$2,926,896).

Oversight notes this proposal does not change the \$6 million maximum YOP cap, instead it increases the percentage of the contribution from 50% to 70% for the amount of the tax credit. This will allow for those who claim the tax credit receive greater amount of funds, but will not affect the overall maximum cap available under the proposal.

Therefore, for the purpose of this fiscal note, Oversight will reflect only the credit difference of \$1,170,759 to the general revenue in the fiscal note for the YOP tax credit.

Officials from the **DOR** assume the Department will need to update their computer programs (1,832) and forms (\$2,200) for each credit. DOR estimates the total cost of the changes at \$12,096.

Oversight assumes the Department of Revenue (DOR) is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. **Oversight** assumes DOR could absorb the administrative costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, DOR could request funding through the appropriation process.

Officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance (DCI)** state A potential unknown decrease of premium tax revenues (up to the tax credit limit established in the bill) in FY2026, FY2027, and FY2028 as a result of the modification of Youth Opportunities and Violence Prevention Act tax credits. Premium tax revenue is split 50/50 between General Revenue and County Foreign Insurance Fund except for domestic Stock Property and Casualty Companies who pay premium tax to the County Stock Fund. The County Foreign Insurance Fund is later distributed to school districts throughout the state. County Stock Funds are later distributed to the school district and county treasurer of the county in which the principal office of the insurer is located. It is unknown how each of these funds may be impacted by tax credits each year and which insurers will qualify for the modified tax credit.

Section §160.775 – Missouri Childhood Hero Act

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for their agency.

In response to similar legislation, HB 655 (2025), officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. However, the AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation.

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.

In response to similar legislation, HB 655 (2025), officials from **Concordia R-II School District** assumed annual cost (direct and indirect) is \$6,000. Training, implementation, and evaluation of this change to the bullying legislation is another unfunded mandate that places undue hardship on public schools in regards to bullying and anti-bullying programs.

Oversight assumes there could be costs for school districts to implement the proposal as well as court costs, attorney fees, and damages if a parent brings a civil action against a district. Oversight will show a range of impact of \$0 to an unknown cost.

Oversight notes that Section 160.775.9 (2) states that if a school district or charter school, or an employee of such district or charter school, prevails in an action brought against such school district or charter school described in subdivision (1) of this subsection, the court shall award court costs and attorney's fees to such prevailing school district, charter school, or employee. For purposes of the fiscal note, Oversight will reflect a potential revenue gain to school districts in the fiscal note.

§§210.112, 210.119, 210.145, 210.160, 210.560, 210.565, 210.762, 211.032, 211.211, 211.261 & 211.462 - Child Protection

Officials from the **Department of Social Services (DSS)** state the following:

There is an anticipated fiscal impact to the Children's Division to execute 210.119.1 RSMo. as drafted. In Calendar Year 2024 the Division spent \$13,685,535 (\$4,747,512 GR and \$8,938,023) for 70 youth in Out of State Placements for an average of a 60-day placement, due to lack of placement options within the State of Missouri. This is an average of \$3,258.46 daily rate per youth. In CY 2024 the Division spent \$15,066,206 GR for children in hospitals beyond medical necessity. This was for approximately 314 youths for an average of 22 days per youth. The total current cost to house these youth is \$28,751,741. (\$19,813,718 GR and \$8,938,023 FF)

It would take 4 programs to house these youth. A residential program that would follow the DYS model would require an initial start-up cost of \$9,218,844 GR and typically take about six months to get it ready. The Division estimates the on-going cost to operate this program would be \$1,200 per day per youth. Therefore, the on-going cost would be \$17,520,000 (40 beds X \$1,200 X 365 days) (\$6,077,688 GR and \$11,442,312 FF). Below is a chart showing the costs and savings.

			First year		On-going	
			GR	FF	GR	FF
Savings						
Out of state placements	\$13,685,535				\$4,747,512	\$8,938,023
Hospital Stay	\$15,066,206				\$15,066,206	
	<u>\$28,751,741</u>				<u>\$19,813,718</u>	<u>\$8,938,023</u>
Cost						
Start-up	(\$9,218,844)	(\$9,218,844)				
On-going	(\$17,520,000)				(\$6,077,688)	(\$11,442,312)
Net			(\$9,218,844)	\$0	\$13,736,030	(\$2,504,289)

Since the first year would be spent on start-up there would be no savings.

It is difficult to estimate the daily cost of these facilities, so the Department is providing a first-year cost of \$9,218,844 and an on-going net savings to General Revenue up to \$13,736,030 and net federal cost of up to \$2,504,289 for services.

In addition to the services listed above, the Department would need three staff consisting of one legal counsel, one program manager, and one program development specialist. In order to receive federal reimbursement for these services, DSS would need to develop a rate approved by CMS. The staff are needed to coordinate appropriate rate structure research and development and to work with CMS on rate structure approval to maximize federal reimbursement. In addition, staff are needed for developing a structure for on-going service monitoring, oversight of the program, and appropriate licensure for federal reimbursement.

There would appear to be no fiscal impact on CD in the underlying CAN cases in juvenile court, as the county/juvenile office usually pays for these contracted attorneys.

However, CD pays for the services of parents' attorneys and the GAL in all TPR cases. Although it is not likely in many courts that an attorney for the child and a GAL would be appointed, there would be a fiscal impact on CD for the cost of paying for both counsel for a child and a GAL for a child, when typically at present only a GAL represents the child.

So essentially in TPR cases, the fiscal impact for CD would be the fees of one additional attorney on the case in those cases where a court appointed both counsel for a child and a GAL. If the judge chooses to appoint a GAL in addition to an attorney for the child in the TPR, the result would be additional attorney fees of approximately \$7000 in each child's case, and this would include DLS and JO filed cases. There were 6,725 children who exited Family Centered Out-of-Home (alternative/foster) Care according to 2023 Children's Division Annual Report. Out of that number, there were **404** terminations of parental rights proceedings. The worst-case scenario would be an anticipated fiscal impact of **\$2,828,000** (404 TPRs X \$7000). However, it is unknown how many judges would appoint both an attorney and a GAL.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of Administration (OA), Information Technology Services Division (ITSD)/DSS** stated updates to the DYS and FACES applications would be required.

OA, ITSD/DSS assumes every new IT project/system will be bid out because all ITSD resources are at full capacity. IT contract rates for the DYS & FACES applications are estimated at \$105/hour. It is assumed the applications modifications will require 1,135.08 hours for a cost of \$119,183 (1135.08 * \$105) for FY26 and on-going costs of \$23,712 for FY27 and \$24,305 for FY28.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the costs provided by DSS and by ITSD/DSS for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a similar proposal from the current session (SB 311), officials from the **Office of Administration (OA), Facilities Management, Design and Construction (FMDC)** stated the new program created for youth with severe behavioral challenges or severe developmental disabilities will cause FMDC Operations to experience additional costs based on the location that DSS is proposing. It will take 1.00 FTE, Specialized Trades Worker, and associated expenditures. The costs for fuel and utilities that would be expended at the location cannot be determined at this time since FMDC does not know the number of square feet the program would utilize. Therefore, FMDC's estimate for this location would be \$245,358 (FTE, fuel and utilities) to unknown starting in FY29 or FY30. FMDC anticipates the timeframe to complete the project would be 4 plus years based on completing a location study, waiting for appropriation funding, project design, and construction.

Given the project timeframes provided by DSS, Oversight assumes the additional costs for OA, FMDC could begin as early as FY 2028. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimates for FTE, fuel and utilities provided by the OA, FMDC as beginning in FY 2028.

§211.436 – Prohibits use of restraints on a child in juvenile court

In response to a similar proposal from 2025 (SB 718), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol**, the **Office of the State Courts Administrator**, the **Office**

of the State Public Defender, the Department of Social Services, the Phelps County Sheriff, the Kansas City Police Department, the Springfield Police Department, the St. Louis County Police Department 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.

Oversight only reflects the responses received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other local law enforcement agencies 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.

§§477.700, 477.705, 477.710 & 477.715 – Child and Family Legal Representation

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** assume §477.710 creates the Child and Family Legal Representation Fund. This fund may hold gifts, contributions, grants, bequests, or other aid received from federal, private, or other sources. To the extent that gifts, contributions, grants, bequests, or other aid received from federal, private, or other sources are deposited into this fund, Total State Revenue may increase by an unknown amount.

Officials from **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** state the “Child and Family Legal Representation Coordinating Board” shall be composed of nine members. The members shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed out of funds appropriated for this purpose for actual and reasonable expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated it is unclear who will pay the attorney fees associated with representing the children. OSCA presumes that the counties would be responsible for paying the child's attorney fees in the same manner that the counties currently pay for guardians' ad litem. There may be additional impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Oversight notes §477.700 creates the “Child and Family Legal Representation Coordinating Board” within the Missouri Supreme Court. The Board, consisting of nine members appointed by the Supreme Court as specified in the act, shall have the responsibility to collaborate with the various judicial circuits, judges, attorneys and other state departments or agencies to ensure uniform, high-quality legal representation to children. The “Child and Family Legal Representation Fund” is also created in the State Treasury to fund the work of this office.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the State Treasurer (STO)** assumed 1 FTE (Treasury Coordinator) is needed to handle the potential activity from this proposal.

Oversight assumes STO is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes STO could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, STO could request funding through the appropriation process.

Responses regarding these sections as a whole

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed 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 **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Mental Health, Department of Health and Senior Services, Missouri Senate, Missouri House of Representatives, Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** and the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** 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.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender** 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.

§§491.075 & 492.304 – Depositions and Examination of Witnesses

Based on agency responses from similar legislation in 2025 (HCS HB 224), **Oversight** assumes this section will have no fiscal impact on state or local governments.

§§566.151 & 567.030 – Criminal Offenses Involving a Child and Prostitution

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state Section 566.151 changes the age of the victim from any person who is less than fifteen to seventeen years of age. From FY 2022 to FY 2024, the department totaled 59 new prison admissions and 3 new probation cases for sentences of enticement of a child. The increase in the minimum age under which a person can be considered to be enticed as a child could create additional instances in which a person could be charged with a crime under this section. However, there is no available data to determine the number of 16- and 17-year-olds to whom this could have potentially applied. Therefore, the impact for this section is an unknown cost.

Section 567.030 alters the offense of patronizing prostitution by changing the age of the victim from less than eighteen years of age but older than fourteen to older than fifteen years of age. The bill changes the existing class D felony to a class E felony if the individual the person patronizes is eighteen years of age or older, changes the existing class E felony to a class D felony if the individual the person patronizes is older than fifteen but younger than eighteen years of age, and changes the class D felony to a class B felony if the individual who the person patronizes is fifteen years of age or younger.

There were three new court commitments to prison and one new probation case under section 567.030 from FY 2021 through FY 2024 that were class D felonies.

Given there have been years in which there were no new court commitments and/or probation cases under this section, we will use the averages of one new court commitment and one new probation cases annually over this three-year period to estimate the impact. The average sentence length for a class D felony sex and child abuse offense is 6.6 years, with 5.3 years spent in prison. Changing this to a class B felony would extend the sentence length to 9.0 years, with 7.3 years spent in prison.

Change in prison admissions and probation openings with legislation

	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030	FY2031	FY2032	FY2033	FY2034	FY2035
New Admissions										
Current Law	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Change (After Legislation - Current Law)										
Admissions										
Probations										
Cumulative Populations										
Prison						1	2	2	2	2
Parole						-1	-1	-1		
Probation										
Impact										
Prison Population						1	2	2	2	2
Field Population						-1	-1	-1		
Population Change								1	2	2

Oversight notes, from information provided by the State Courts Administrator, the following number of felony convictions under §566.151 and §567.030:

	<u>FY 2020</u>	<u>FY 2021</u>	<u>FY 2022</u>	<u>FY 2023</u>	<u>FY 2024</u>
§566.151 felonies	19	25	22	24	24
§567.030 felonies	0	2	1	2	0

Oversight will reflect DOC's impact as an unknown impact to the General Revenue Fund. Oversight notes it would take roughly 24 additional prisoners to reach the \$250,000 cost threshold. Oversight will assume a fiscal impact of less than \$250,000.

In response to similar legislation from 2025 (Perfected HCS HB 1464), **SPD** stated per the National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charge contemplated by this change to Section 566.211 creating a class A felony which could result in life imprisonment, would take approximately ninety-nine 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 four to five 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.

§568.045 – Endangering the Welfare of a Child

Officials from the **DOC** state the increase in the minimum age under which a person can be considered to be endangered as a child in the first degree could create additional instances in which a person could be charged with a crime under this section. However, there is no available data to determine the number of 17 year olds to whom this could have potentially applied. Therefore, the impact is an unknown cost.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for prison	Change in probation & parole officers	Total cost for probation and parole	# to probation & parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes 2% inflation)
Year 1	0	(\$10,485)	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Year 2	0	(\$10,485)	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Year 3	0	(\$10,485)	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Year 4	0	(\$10,485)	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Year 5	0	(\$10,485)	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
Year 6	1	(\$10,485)	(\$11,576)	0	\$0	(1)	(\$11,576)
Year 7	2	(\$10,485)	(\$23,616)	0	\$0	0	(\$23,616)
Year 8	2	(\$10,485)	(\$24,088)	0	\$0	1	(\$24,088)
Year 9	2	(\$10,485)	(\$24,570)	0	\$0	3	(\$24,570)
Year 10	2	(\$10,485)	(\$25,061)	0	\$0	3	(\$25,061)

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.

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.

In response to a similar proposal from 2025 (HCS for SS for SCS for SB 60), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** stated per the National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charge contemplated by this change to Section 568.045, creating a class A felony which could result in life imprisonment, would take approximately ninety-nine 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 four to five 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 a similar proposal from 2025 (HCS for SS for SCS for SB 60), officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed 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.

In response to a similar proposal from 2025 (HCS for SS for SCS for SB 60), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** 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

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Mental Health**, the **Department of Corrections** and the **Department of Social Services** 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.

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

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.

§§451.040, 451.080 & 451.090 – Age of Marriage

In response to similar legislation from 2024, SCS for SB Nos. 767 & 1342, officials from the **Mississippi County Recorder of Deeds Office** assumed a slight impact, but the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the little loss that the office may incur.

Oversight assumes the Mississippi County Recorder of Deeds Office’s impact would be minimal for this proposal and will reflect no fiscal impact.

Officials from the **Department of Social Services** and the **Department of Health and Senior Services** 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.

Oversight only reflects the responses received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other counties, St. Louis City and other county recorders of deeds 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.

Oversight notes the number of marriages from the Provisional Vital Statistics Report on the Department of Health and Senior Services website over the last 5 years:

Calendar Years	Number of Marriages	Both Under the Age of 18
2024 ending April	7,508	N/A
2023	33,684	N/A
2022	36,103	51
2021	37,254	87
2020	34,425	68
2019	36,636	71

Oversight assumes there would be a minimal loss to County Recorder of Deeds offices; therefore, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact.

§578.365 – Danny’s Law

In response to a similar proposal from 2025 (HCS for HB 234), officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. However, 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 **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this Section enhances the offense of hazing to include “solicits another person to participate in or plan a willful act”, a class A misdemeanor unless substantial risk of life, then class D felony; also adds former member to the list of persons the hazing is against; specifies a person is not guilty of hazing if they were trying to help. There was only one guilty plea made under this section with a Misdemeanor A penalty in 2024. DOC therefore expects no impact to the department with this change in this section of legislation.

Oversight notes on December 24, 2024, President Joe Biden signed into law the Stop Campus Hazing Act. (Source: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/5646>)

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development** and the **Kansas City Police Department** 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.

In response to a similar proposal from 2025 (HCS for HB 234), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol**, the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services**, the **Office of the State Courts Administrator**, the **Office of the State Public Defender**, the **University of Missouri**, the **Phelps County Sheriff’s Department**, the **Branson Police Department**, the **St. Louis County Police Department**, **Northwest Missouri State University**, and the **University of Central Missouri** 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.

Oversight only reflects the responses received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other colleges and universities and local law enforcement 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.

§589.700 – Human Trafficking Offenses

Oversight notes the provisions of this section state in addition to any fine imposed for a violation of section 566.203, 566.206, 566.209, 566.210, 566.211, 566.215 or 567.030, the court shall enter a judgment of restitution payable to the Human Trafficking and Sexual Exploitation Fund established under section 589.700, upon a plea of guilty or a finding of guilt for a violation of these sections, excluding restitution ordered under section 566.218, in the following amounts:

- \$10,000 for each identified victim of the offense(s) under section 566.203, 566.206, 566.209, 566.210, or 566.211;
- \$2,500 for each identified victim of the offense(s) under section 567.030; and
- \$2,500 for each county in which such offense(s) occurred.

Upon receipt of the moneys from the fund, a county shall allocate the disbursement as follows:

- \$10,000 for each identified victim of the offense(s) for any violation under section 566.203, 566.206, 566.209, 566.210, or 566.211, that occurred in the county toward local rehabilitation services such as mental health and substance abuse counseling; parenting skills, housing relief, vocational training, and employment counseling;
- \$2,500 for any violation under section 567.030, that occurred in the county toward local rehabilitation services such as mental health and substance abuse counseling; parenting skills, housing relief, vocational training, and employment counseling; and
- \$2,500 toward local efforts to prevent human trafficking such as education programs and increasing the number of local law enforcement members charged with enforcing human trafficking laws.

Oversight notes OSCA reported the following number of guilty convictions in 2020 – 2024:

	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024</u>
§566.203	0	0	0	0	0
§566.206	0	0	0	0	0
§566.209	0	0	0	1	2
§566.210	0	0	1	0	0
§566.211	1	1	2	3	9
§566.215	0	0	0	0	0
§567.030	0	3	3	9	2

Oversight has no way to determine the number of victims associated with each guilty conviction listed above; therefore, Oversight will assume an (unknown) impact to the new Human Trafficking and Sexual Exploitation Fund. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight assumes services provided by the counties will equal income and net to zero.

DOC states Section 589.700 establishes a judgment of restitution payable to the human trafficking and sexual exploitation fund for violations of section 566.203, 566.206, 566.209, 566.210, 566.211, 566.215, or 567.030. This fine is manually entered into the Offender Finance System. The additional staff time which will be required to enter the fines is unknown, as there is no way to know how many people found guilty of these offenses would be sentenced and incarcerated to the department. Therefore, the impact to this legislation is an unknown cost.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** state Section 589.700 establishes human trafficking restitution payable to the Human Trafficking and Sexual Exploitation Fund, potentially impacting TSR.

§595.045 – Crime Victims’ Compensation Fund

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Office of the Director (DPS)** state in CY 2022, there were 10,822 class E felony convictions. This data was pulled using charge level felony E with a charge disposition of Guilty Plea, Guilty Plea Written, Tried by Court- Guilty, Jury Verdict - Guilty, Alford Plea and a Charge Disposition Date within CY2022. It does not include juvenile cases.

DPS assumes this will bring in an estimated \$500,000 ($\$46 \times 10,822 = \$497,812$) into the Crime Victims’ Compensation Fund.

Officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** state Section 595.045 includes Class E felonies to the collection of monetary fees to the Crime Victims’ Compensation Fund. Based on recent case data the inclusion of Class E felonies will result in additional judgments of approximately \$279,000 per year, with an estimated collection of 35% to 60% over three years.

Oversight notes the provisions of this section state the court shall enter a judgment payable to the Crime Victims’ Compensation Fund of \$46 for a class E felony. Oversight also notes, from information provided by the Office of the State Courts Administrator, the following number of E felony convictions from FY 2020 through FY 2024:

<u>FY 2020</u>	<u>FY 2021</u>	<u>FY 2022</u>	<u>FY 2023</u>	<u>FY 2024</u>
7,545	8,407	10,575	10,838	10,708

The average number of E felonies over this five-year period is 9,615 ($7,545 + 8,407 + 10,575, 10,838 + 10,708$). Therefore, for purposes of this fiscal note, Oversight will reflect an impact to the Crime Victims’ Compensation Fund of \$442,290 ($\$46 \times 9,615$).

Oversight notes the ending balance in the Crime Victims’ Compensation Fund as of December 31, 2024, is \$2,040,252.

In response to a similar proposal from 2025 (HCS for HB 615), **DOC** stated Section 595.045 expands the offenses for which Crime Victims Compensation can be collected for from class C or D felonies, to include class E felonies as well.

This fine is manually entered into the Offender Finance System. The additional staff time which will be required to enter the fines is unknown, as there is no way to know how many people found guilty of an E felony would be sentenced and incarcerated to the department. Therefore, the impact to this legislation is an unknown cost.

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

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume the following regarding Section 595.045:

Currently a \$7.50 surcharge is assessed on all criminal court proceedings. Additionally, based on the plea of the defendant additional fees are assessed. A fee of \$68 dollars is owed upon a plea of guilty for class A & B felonies, a \$46 fee is due upon a plea of guilty for class C & D felonies and a \$10 fee for a plea of guilty is due for misdemeanors. This proposal expands the \$46 fee to also include pleas of guilty for class E felonies.

The Department of Public Safety noted there were 10,822 class E felony convictions in calendar year 2022. This could increase the fees paid by \$497,812 ($10,822 * \46) annually.

The courts collect the surcharges in all these cases and forwards the money to DOR for deposit. This \$46 fee is received from the court clerks and deposited entirely into the crime victims' compensation fund.

This proposal will not fiscally impact DOR.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** state Section 595.045.8 expands the application of a current court cost surcharge that generates revenues for the state's Crime Victim Compensation Fund, potentially impacting TSR.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
<u>Savings</u> – DSS – Housing Youth in Out of State Placements and Hospitals (§210.119.1) p. 9-11	\$0	\$19,813,718	\$19,813,718	\$19,813,718
<u>Transfer Out</u> - OSCA (§ 477.710) Appropriation to the Child and Family Legal Representation Fund p. 12	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> – DSS – to house youth under 4 programs (§210.119.1) p. 9-11	(\$9,218,844)	(\$6,077,688)	(\$6,077,688)	(\$6,077,688)
<u>Costs</u> – DSS - (§210.119.1) p. 9-11				
Personnel Service	(\$98,503)	(\$119,386)	(\$120,580)	(\$121,786)
Fringe Benefits	(\$56,953)	(\$68,802)	(\$69,265)	(\$69,958)
One Time E&E	(\$10,342)	\$0	\$0	\$0
On-going Expense & Equipment	(\$13,897)	(\$17,094)	(\$17,521)	(\$17,696)
ITSD Costs	(\$59,591)	(\$11,856)	(\$12,152)	(\$12,274)
<u>Total Costs</u> - DSS	(\$239,286)	(\$217,138)	(\$219,518)	(\$221,714)
FTE Change	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE
<u>Cost</u> – DSS – additional costs if judge appoints both a GAL and attorney (§210.119) p. 9-11	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> – DOC – potential increase in incarcerations with a change in age from 17 to 18 for (§568.045) p. 15	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
<u>Revenue Reduction –Youth Opportunity Program YOP</u> (change in credit from 50% to 70%) (§135.460) p. 6	Could exceed (\$1,170,759)	Could exceed (\$1,170,759)	Could exceed (\$1,170,759)	Could exceed (\$1,170,759)
<u>Cost</u> – §135.341 – CASA Tax Credits - the difference between 50% to 70% contributions (based on a 3-year historical average of redemptions) and expending the cap to \$2.5M from previously set \$1.5M. p. 4-6	Could Exceed (\$1,409,627)	Could Exceed (\$1,409,627)	Up to (\$2,500,000)	Up to (\$2,500,000)
<u>Cost</u> – DOC - Increased incarceration costs (§§566.151, 567.030, 568.045) p. 13-15	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$23,616)
<u>Cost</u> – DOC Manual entry of fines into Offender Finance System (§§589.700 and 595.045) p. 21	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND	Could exceed <u>(\$12,038,516)</u>	Less than <u>\$10,938,506</u>	Less than <u>\$9,845,753</u>	Less than <u>\$9,819,941</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change to the General Revenue Fund	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE
CHILD AND FAMILY LEGAL REPRESENTATION FUND				

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
<u>Income</u> – Gifts, grants, bequests, or contributions (§477.705) p. 12	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Transfer In</u> – Appropriation from General Revenue (§477.710) p. 12	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Cost</u> – admin costs and distributions from the Child and Family Legal Representation Coordinating Board to various judicial circuits (§477.710) p. 12	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE CHILD AND FAMILY REPRESENTATION FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
CRIME VICTIMS’ COMPENSATION FUND (0681)				
<u>Revenue</u> – DPS (§595.045) Class E felony fee (\$46 per) p. 21	<u>\$442,290</u>	<u>\$442,290</u>	<u>\$442,290</u>	<u>\$442,290</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE CRIME VICTIMS’ COMPENSATION FUND	<u>\$442,290</u>	<u>\$442,290</u>	<u>\$442,290</u>	<u>\$442,290</u>
HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND SEXUAL EXPLOITATION FUND				

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
<u>Revenue</u> - Restitution for each county in which the offense(s) occurred (§589.700) p. 19-20	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>
<u>Transfer Out – To Counties</u> (§589.700) p. 19-20	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND SEXUAL EXPLOITATION FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
STATE FACILITY MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION FUND (0501)				
<u>Cost – OA, FMDC</u> (§ 210.119) p. 11				Could exceed
Personal service	\$0	\$0	(\$87,169)	(\$87,169)
Fringe benefits	\$0	\$0	(\$50,729)	(\$50,729)
Equipment and expense – One time	\$0	\$0	(\$76,985)	(\$76,985)
Location study & building costs	\$0	\$0	Likely to exceed (\$245,358)	Likely to exceed (\$245,358)
Fuel & utilities at the location	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
Total <u>Costs</u> - OA, FMDC	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>Likely to exceed (\$460,241)</u>	<u>Likely to exceed (\$460,241)</u>
FTE Changes	0	0	1 FTE	1 FTE
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FACILITY MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>Likely to exceed (\$460,241)</u>	<u>Likely to exceed (\$460,241)</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change on the State Facility Maintenance and Operation Fund	0	0	1 FTE	
FEDERAL FUNDS				
Program Reimbursement	Unknown, more or less than \$239,290	Unknown, more or less than \$2,721,429	Unknown, more or less than \$2,723,810	Unknown, more or less than \$2,723,810
<u>Savings</u> – DSS – Housing Youth in Out of State Placements and Hospitals (§210.119.1) p. 9-11	\$0	\$8,938,023	\$8,938,023	\$8,938,023
Cost – DSS – to house youth under 4 programs (§210.119.1) p. 9-11	\$0	(\$11,442,312)	(\$11,442,312)	(\$11,442,312)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
<u>Costs – DSS - (\$210.119.1) p. 9-11</u>				
Personnel Service	(\$98,504)	(\$119,387)	(\$120,580)	(\$120,580)
Fringe Benefits	(\$56,954)	(\$68,803)	(\$69,266)	(\$69,266)
One Time E&E	(\$10,342)	\$0	\$0	\$0
On-going Expense & Equipment	(\$13,898)	(\$17,094)	(\$17,522)	(\$17,522)
ITSD Costs	(\$59,592)	(\$11,856)	(\$12,153)	(\$12,153)
<u>Total Costs - DSS</u>	(\$239,290)	(\$217,140)	(\$219,521)	(\$219,521)
FTE Change	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE
<u>Cost – DSS – additional costs if judge appoints both a GAL and attorney (\$210.119) p. 9-11</u>	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change on Federal Funds	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE	1.5 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS				
<u>Revenue (Schools) – potential collection of court fees and attorney’s fees if the school district prevails (\$160.775.9) p. 9</u>	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Transfer In – To Counties from Human Trafficking and Sexual</u>	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028	Fully Implemented (FY 2032)
Exploitation Fund (§589.700) p. 19-20				
<u>Costs</u> (Schools) – for implementation costs, court costs, attorney fees and damages (§160.775) p. 9	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Costs</u> (Counties) – potential child attorney or GAL costs (§210.119) p. 9-11	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> - Human trafficking prevention (§589.700) p. 19-20	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

Small businesses that qualify for the credit may be positively impacted as a result of this proposal. (§135.460)

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal modifies provisions relating to child protection.

This legislation is not federally mandated and would not duplicate any other program. It would require additional capital improvements and rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of Administration - Budget and Planning
 Office of the State Courts Administrator
 Department of Social Services
 Office of the State Treasurer
 Department of Commerce and Insurance
 Attorney General's Office
 Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Department of Mental Health
Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development
Office of the State Public Defender
Missouri House of Representatives
Missouri Senate
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Corrections
Missouri Highway Patrol
Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office
Department of Revenue
Office of the Secretary of State
Mississippi County Recorder of Deeds Office
Concordia R-II School District
Phelps County Sheriff
Kansas City Police Department
Springfield Police Department
University of Missouri
Branson Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
Northwest Missouri State University
University of Central Missouri



Julie Morff
Director
May 5, 2025



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
May 5, 2025