

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 3359-01
Bill No.: HB 862
Subject: Agriculture and Animals; Conservation Dept.; Entertainment, Sports and Amusements
Type: Original
Date: February 9, 2004

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Conservation Commission Fund *	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds *	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

* expected to exceed \$100,000 per year.

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTIONS

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State**, the **Office of State Courts Administrator**, and the **Office of the Attorney General** assume this proposal would have no impact on their organizations.

Officials from the **Department of Conservation** assume the proposal would require restitution to the state for illegally taking trophy deer and would authorize the Conservation Commission to suspend, revoke, or deny a permit to hunt. The proposed language would credit restitution for illegal deer to the Conservation Commission Fund. The Commission assumes the impact could be positive after the expense of scoring antlers, however, the amount of impact is unknown.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes there would be a significant but unknown amount of restitution paid to the Conservation Commission Fund; and a minimal additional cost to the Department of Conservation for extra documentation, including antler scoring for certain poaching cases. Oversight assumes the Department of Conservation could assume the minimal additional cost with existing resources; however, if additional or unexpected costs are incurred these costs could be addressed through the budget process.

This proposal could affect total state revenue.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2005 (10 Mo.)	FY 2006	FY 2007
CONSERVATION COMMISSION FUND			
<u>Additional revenue</u>			
Restitution *	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
NET EFFECT ON CONSERVATION COMMISSION FUND *	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>

* expected to exceed \$100,000 per year.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2005 (10 Mo.)	FY 2006	FY 2007
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

DESCRIPTION

This proposal would require restitution to the state for illegally taking certain trophy deer; and

authorizes the Conservation Commission to suspend, revoke, or deny a permit to hunt for any person who fails to appear at a hearing or fails to pay a fine imposed for a violation of Missouri fish and game laws.

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 Conservation
Office of State Courts Administrator
Office of the Attorney General
Office of the Secretary of State

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mickey Wilson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
February 9, 2004